

be perfectly sure that it will not be less than that but rather a great deal more. You will find on further investigation that it is likely to be another million. But suppose we put it at \$2,000,000; I predict now, notwithstanding that apparently we are approaching the time when we shall have better commodity prices and when people will be able to buy this very necessary foodstuff, sugar, that less sugar will be sold during the next twelve months than has been sold in the past year. Why? Because the commodity has been made artificially dearer. A great many people will not take half a teaspoonful in their cup, and a great many will do without it altogether. I predict a loss not of \$2,000,000 but of many more millions in this estimated revenue of \$20,000,000 because of the inability of tens of thousands of people to put even a little nibble of sugar in their tea. The hon. member for Red Deer read a communication and I too have received one. It is not under my hand at the moment but I can recite the substance of it. The writer is a lady and she says, "We have been in the habit of having two iced cakes per week, and now we will have only one." There is one instance where the revenue is cut in two, and there are, I believe, tens of thousands such.

Mr. McINTOSH: Following up the remarks of the hon. member for Melville, may I say that the government is creating a piece of fiscal machinery in this sugar tax which will help to grind it to pieces from coast to coast. "The mills of the gods grind slowly but they grind exceeding small," and the government will be exceeding small by the time they meet the opposition which a tax of this kind will arouse from one ocean to the other.

Mr. MORAND: Rather a sweet way of going out.

Mr. McINTOSH: Perhaps so, but bitter for the people taxed. Last night I was making an observation in connection with the sugar tax when the house rose. I said that the liquor tax had been reduced \$2 per gallon and the Minister of Finance, in putting forward his point of view with regard to this reduction, said it was made from the standpoint of revenue. He said that a still lower reduction would give a greater return. May I impress upon the Minister of Finance that when the question of reduction is in his mind—I am referring to the reduction of \$2 per gallon upon liquor—when he has fiscally dealt with liquor he ought to carry his reductions a little further and cancel this sugar tax. By taking that action I believe the minister would

[Mr. Motherwell.]

bring credit to his government and to his department. It is a most obnoxious tax and even though the government may be in need of revenue, I, for one, do not believe it is necessary to tax sugar.

Last night I was making an observation in connection with the argument used by the minister to support his two million leakage statement that certain daily newspapers had interpreted ministerial opinion to the extent of saying that a tax would be levied on sugar, tea and coffee, when the budget was brought down. The minister said that the newspapers had not been correct in their prediction with regard to tea and coffee although they had guessed successfully with regard to sugar. The minister referred to the predictions made by the Canadian press with regard to budget taxation and used these to support his argument that the government was not responsible for the leakage. That is one point of view taken by the government with regard to the daily newspapers of Canada. When we were discussing the radio estimates the other night we had an example of another point of view. At that time we were told that as far as the criticism of the daily press in connection with radio estimates was concerned, the press did not know what it was talking about. There we have two points of view, one to the right and one to the left. More than likely the government will be soon taking a third position, a compromise position in regard to the functions of the daily press.

However, I do not imagine it makes much difference to the press whether or not it satisfies the viewpoint of the government in regard to this sugar tax, or whether its constructive criticisms against the radio estimates have been upheld. May I add that it is my deliberate opinion that the daily press is complementary to good government in Canada. We need to have not only the best news service from the press, but we need also editorial opinions. An editorial opinion will help to complete and safeguard the work of self government in Canada. It will make it more efficient and help democracy as we have it in Canada to function more successfully from coast to coast. As far as the government supporting or not supporting the daily press in its opinions is concerned, it matters not. As we said the government will next be occupying a compromise position, a kind of half and half position, a milk and water position or, as has been whispered to me, a mugwump attitude. Whether or not this or any other position is taken, as a newspaper man I say that it does not make very much difference. The press