

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
41st Day

Thursday, April 7, 1960

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

COMMENT ON VOCAL ABILITY OF OPPOSITION MEMBERS

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to compliment the hon. members opposite on their vocal ability, but I think I would like also to point out to them that if they were half as good at logic and politics, there might be some hope for them. Probably they are in the wrong calling.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I thought yesterday was my last salutation, but I would like to welcome the group of school children from the St. Joseph's separate school in Saskatoon, with their teacher, Sister Mary Edson. I am sure the members will say how delighted they are to have them here, and hope their trip will be an enjoyable one.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to extend my best wishes to the Government members who have very wisely retired of their own accord, and for those who haven't, I promise them the fight of their lives in the forthcoming election.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker, that Bill No. 61 — An Act respecting Retailers, be now read a third time.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I have taken a great interest in the discussions that have gone on, both in Committee and in this House, in connection with the now famous Bill No. 61. I believe, having spent most of my life as a retail merchant in the province of Saskatchewan, that probably I can speak with a little independent retailers in this province, and also with what possibly would apply in connection with this particular Bill.

April 7, 1960

In the first place, I find that the Bill itself is a skeleton Bill, and it has one purpose and one purpose only, that I can see from reading the Bill, and that is the licensing and control of the retail business in the province of Saskatchewan. As far as the actual contents of the Bill, and the discussions that have taken place, I have found them to have been over-clouded by bringing in another issue that is not even mentioned in the Bill: that of trading stamps. Now, insofar as trading stamps are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I know very little about them, but if they are as iniquitous a medium of sales promotion as some people seem to think, then, of course, I would be bitterly opposed to the, but I can't conceive of where any independent merchant, or any independent retailer in this province or in any other part of Canada, could favour or be willing to invest in the Government the sweeping powers of control that this Bill contains, if it is passed as an act, simply to curb one item: trading stamps. It would mean that if the Government saw fit they could enforce, under this particular Bill, certain conditions and regulations so that possibly the cure itself, as far as trading stamps are concerned, would be worse than the disease.

We have had assurances from both the Premier and the Attorney General that the purpose of this Bill, insofar as they are concerned, is for one thing: trading stamps; but there is nothing set forth or spelled out in this Bill mentioning trading stamps, mentioning gimmicks of any kind, nor is there any regulation of any kind spelled out. As I said before, it is a skeleton Bill, investing in the Government powers that the people should be suspicious of and have doubt of, in spite of the assurances given by the two members of the Government.

I would like to point out to this Assembly that when those assurances are given, in view of the fact that for 16 years and over we have heard about policies and principles of the socialist party, the C.C.F. party, whereby they would like to eradicate, (In fact, some of their literature states quite clearly that their main aim and object in this province and in this country is to eradicate) the free enterprise system. In view of that particular fact, then I have no reason to doubt that the people are going to be controlled and the people this Bill is going to affect, have every reason to have doubts and suspicions about the ultimate purpose of this Bill.

There is another matter I would like to mention and that is that the independent retailers in this province have many problems, and one of these is in connection with organizations that operate in Saskatchewan, that have found very great favour with the Government opposite. In fact, they have aided these organizations in many, many, ways, and many of our retailers are in mortal dread of the day arriving, due to this promotion, when they may be forced out of business. In view of this, along with the avowed intentions of the C.C.F. socialists, then,

as I said before, I can't conceive of any independent, free enterprise retailer in this province being in support of this particular Bill. I can't possibly see how they could have confidence in the party that forms the Government and the members of that Government.

This particular Bill was discussed in this House. Then it was sent to the Law Amendments Committee. The Attorney General of this province, last night in the House suggested that I, along with others, was responsible for it going to the Law Amendments Committee. Well, I have my own opinion of why it was sent to the Law Amendments Committee, and that is that it was sent there in order to have a great array of support for the Bill and to intimidate those people like myself who oppose the Bill.

Opposition Member: — That's right.

Mr. Barrie: — I am not going to take much more time of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to say this before I resume my seat: that we have been accused, those of us who oppose this Bill, of being in support of trading stamps, of being in support of large, millionaire corporations that apparently operate in the trading stamp business, and that a vote against this Bill will be a vote for trading stamps. Well, I want to remind the members opposite, and I would suggest to them that they take a second look at this Bill, because a vote, in my opinion, for this Bill is a vote against every free enterprise merchant in the province of Saskatchewan. I am quite certain that in this province there will be a very dim view taken of those who support this particular Bill taken by the rank and file of the retail trade.

As I mentioned before, with this Bill the only assurances we have are from the two gentlemen of the Government, who say that their only purpose is saving stamps, but I, like many others, believe that there are other motives behind this Bill, and I don't think the assurance that has been given will dispel that suspicion and fear. I believe that they will take, throughout this province, a very dim view indeed of those people who will, by their support in this House, inflict upon the free enterprise trading retailers in this province the Bill and what it implies.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): I wish to speak, also briefly, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill which is before us. I was not a member of the Law Amendments Committee, but I did attend all of their sessions, or practically all of them, and I followed the proceedings with a very great deal of interest. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we in this House owe a great debt of gratitude to all the groups that came in here and presented briefs, for the time and the trouble that they took in preparing the briefs, and for the many constructive suggestions that were offered during the hearings. Many of these suggestions have been incorporated in the Bill.

April 7, 1960

There is nothing in this Bill that can hurt anyone, nothing that is a threat to anyone excepting the stamp companies, and those people who wish to use the services of stamp companies. At least, when this Bill is passed, no retailer is going to be forced against his will to use trading stamps, which they certainly would be if trading stamps became rampant in this province.

I would like to say a special word of congratulation, Mr. Speaker, to the women's groups who appeared before the Committee, the Canadian Association of Consumers and the Council of Women. I thought their briefs were excellent, and among the very best briefs that were presented to the Committee. They were simple, and they were direct, they were well documented, but they weren't cluttered up with a lot of legal language. They came very quickly and easily to their point, and they left no doubt where they stood on this matter of trading stamps. They expressed unequivocal opposition to trading stamps; they described trading stamps as economic parasites, creating superfluous middlemen, operating moneymaking schemes at the expense of the consumers and producers. They expressed their opinion in no uncertain terms that there was a definite need for this Bill being passed, to rid this province of any threat of this vicious form of promotional device, this misleading that adds nothing to the value of the goods, that are offered but which does increase the price to the consumer, and limits the freedom of the consumers to purchase their goods where they wish.

Now, I think it should be pointed out that these women's groups were very representative groups. The Council of Women, for instance, in Regina, has 53 affiliated organizations, and they have a provincial organization also, and they are all opposed to trading stamps. If you look at the organizations represented in the Canadian Association of Consumers you find:

- The Canadian Dietetic Association
- The Canadian Federation of Business & Professional Women
- The Canadian Federation of University Women
- The Canadian Home Economics Association
- The Dominion Council of Women's Association (United Church of Canada)
- The Federated Women's Institute of Canada
- The Hadassah Organization of Canada
- The Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire
- The National Council of Canadian Daughters League
- The National Council of Jewish Women of Canada
- The National Council of Women of Canada
- The Y.W.C.A. of Canada
- The Federation of Co-op Women
- The Salvation Army
- The Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada
- The Pioneer Women's Organization
- The Catholic Women's League
- The Homemakers' Clubs.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, a very representative group of consumers, and I want to say that I was never prouder in my life, Mr. Speaker, than I was of those women that came up and did such a competent and capable and forthright job before the Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised at the attitude of the Liberal party on this question. As a matter of fact, I would have been very much surprised if they had taken a different attitude, because they are being quite consistent with their philosophy and their performance in the past. When it is the consumer, or the little guy, against big business, Mr. Speaker, they are always on the side of big business.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, at the close of the war when goods were in short supply, that we in the C.C.F., together with the labour unions, consumers and the municipalities, pleaded with the Federal Government. . .

Mr. Speaker: — I must ask the hon. member to speak on this Bill.

Mrs. Cooper: — All right, I will leave that, but we know where the Liberals stood on that case. Here is another issue of the same kind, where the interests of the consumers and the small businessman and the co-operatives are pitted against trading stamps. Where do the Liberals stand today? On the side of the privileged groups once more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Humboldt, (Mrs. Batten) for placing on my desk, and all our desks, this poem, if you can call it such, and I would like to thank the members opposite for their song, if you could call it a song, and their poem if you could call it a poem. However, I think that this shows, probably better than any other single thing, the light way they treat a very serious matter. Because their diction wasn't very good when they were singing their song, I am going to read two paragraphs to show the attitude of the Opposition on this point.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mrs. Cooper: — Can I not read it?

Mr. Speaker: — No, it has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mrs. Cooper: — They passed it around, they sang it and we've read it. As I say, the fact that they treat it so lightly, the fact of these trading stamps that could be blanketing the province today, they talk of it as a mere hallucination. Now, if they think that this is a mere hallucination, believe me, it is a \$700 million hallucination in the United States. It's no hallucination, it's a great reality, and if

April 7, 1960

they think this is an hallucination they are completely out of touch with reality. The people who came in here to oppose it didn't think it was an hallucination, and if it hadn't been for the prompt action of the Attorney General, for which I am very grateful, and for which these people are very grateful, trading stamps would have had a real foothold already in this province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that perhaps it is a very good thing that this particular issue came up at this particular time, because I know of no instance, no better instance, to clearly define the opposing philosophies of the C.C.F and the Liberals. Some of you may have remembered, back a few years, when certain scurrilous pamphlets were put out by Gladstone Murray, and one of them was 'Stand Up and Be Counted.' Well, we in the C.C.F., Mr. Speaker, have never been afraid to stand up and be counted when our principles are at stake. The important thing is, Mr. Speaker, who are we to be counted with and who are we to be counted against? On this issue I am very proud and very glad, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure all the members on this side of the legislature are very glad to be counted with the consumers' organizations, the C.A.C., the Council of Women, labour organizations, the co-operative, the Farmers' Union, the small retailers as against the stamp companies, some of the large chain stores, the Leader-Post, the Star-Phoenix, and the Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in telling you I am going to support this Bill.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, if I can be heard over all this hubbub, I sparked the debate, but I am only one of these little dealers who have a little two by four shop, you see. When I saw this Bill come into the House it upset me. Unfortunately, I was not on the Committee, either. Unlike Mr. Barrie, he says he has been in it and I am just going into it. I've got a bunch of licenses already, and I am just wondering, but it's neither here nor there.

I would just like to place my cards on the table as to where I stood when I sparked the debate on Monday, March 13. I made it quite clear, and it is in the records of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I did object, rightly, to the trading stamps. You can check that in the records of the House, but I didn't like the approach they were taking, and when I resumed the debate on the following day, I still emphasized my stand on the dangers there were in the trading stamp deal, but I didn't like the approach the Government was taking. I think the stand they take is that if a person has a little sliver in his hand, let us take the arm. I think that is the approach, but they make a tremendous big issue that we are opposed to the trading stamp deal when, in fact, we are not. We are opposed to the methods and the way of dealing with it. As I said, when you have a sliver, you don't amputate the arm.

Let's deal with it specifically. Nowhere, at any time, when the Bill was presented, was there any mention of the trading stamps. Every member of the Government, Mr. Speaker, who has got up so far has mentioned time and time again we are dealing exclusively with the trading stamps.

When the debate was started there was no mention of it. The reason I take a stand, and a very firm stand (you have to mention that) is the fact that the Government has licensed pretty near everything today. I mention that because right in my hometown, Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned when they established last year a Machine Dealers' Bill, licensing the machine dealers. They closed that dealer, Mr. Speaker, after he had been in business for 37 years. The Government inspector came into my hometown and told that man, you've got to paint your place. These, are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, we take objection to this Bill; why I personally, take objection to this Bill. He has been there for 37 years and he's got to enlarge his premises. Why do we object to things like that, this licensing set-up? Who is next? Sometimes I suspect the farmer could be next. The barbers are licensed, the plumbers are licensed, the electricians are licensed, the people who sell gas are licensed, everybody and everything that you do is licensed.

Mr. Lopton: — And air compressors. Soon you'll have to have a licence to breathe.

Mr. Coderre: — I stated, Mr. Speaker, that I am in opposition to trading stamps, but I also state, most emphatically, the way of handling it is not to amputate the arm to deal with trading stamps, or not to kill the body to deal with the disease, and I presume that is the method the Government proposes to use and I can't accept that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would just like to say one or two words on this question because of some of the arguments that have been raised from across the floor of this House, and because of the actions that have been taken in matters that have been referred to in a similar manner by the Government, and of which, actually, they have taken the opposite course that they are taking here in this present year.

During the last session we had an Act to increase liquor outlets in this province, and I remember quite well that the Premier stated in this House that the Government should not be legislating morality, in the sense that someone wanted to see it legislated for in this House, with regard to things like the consumption of alcoholic beverages. I would just like to state, with regard to the thousands of dollars that have been mentioned in this House, millions of dollars, that the so-called stamp companies are making in the United States, that it is costing the people of the United States today between three and four dollars per capita. That is what it is costing the people of the United States with regard to trading stamps, according to the figures that were used by the member for the City of Regina (Mrs. Cooper). However, today in this province, it is costing the people of this province, individually, between forty and fifty dollars per capita, per year, for the consumption

April 7, 1960

of alcoholic beverages, and yet last year the Government took the stand that morality could not be legislated for by the members of this Legislature. This year, they use as their main argument that the people must have legislation in this province to protect them from themselves. That is the statement that was made in the Committee. I wasn't a member of it, but I sat through most of it, and I heard, running through the arguments of many of the people there that the people had to be protected from themselves. They haven't the common sense, they haven't the reasoning, the intelligence, to decide what is good or bad for themselves, and this is exactly opposite from the story that we have heard in the past with regard to other measures from this Government in this legislature.

We have developed with regard to the retail trade, also with regard to the wholesale trade in this province, particularly throughout the smaller centres of Saskatchewan, a co-operative system that was established to help to control the retail trade, to help to provide to the people an organization which would end the ills of retail business and provide to the consumer a fair price for goods and a fair deal when he went to the store in his own community. Today we are saying, by passing this legislation, that the co-operative organization failed. That is what this Government is saying, that the co-operative organization cannot do the job it was established to do, to provide fair competition for the people of this province. We are stating that the Government should now enter into the picture, and it should force upon the people what they should have or what they shouldn't have; what they should buy or what they shouldn't buy. I believe that we have a system established here which controls today the largest segment of retail and wholesale trade in the province of Saskatchewan, the largest single controlling interest, and I think with the work that they can do among the people, the educational work that we can do, that has been done through this Committee since we sat here during this session, with educational work that can be done by those organizations that presented briefs here, that we are opposed, as they said to trading stamps, as most of us are.

I know when I go to stores I don't particularly like to see a trading stamp. I don't even like to see these little slips of paper that you get in practically every store in the province today; you put them in a box and maybe you win a stove or a deepfreeze, or some other item for your house at Christmastime. Usually these type of things are carried on at Christmas time, because that is when people do an extra amount of shopping, and all stores, including co-operative stores, in this province, have carried on arrangements of that type during the past year. I am going to say here that the first time I ever saw a trading stamp, that I can remember, was about 13 years ago in the province of Saskatchewan.

People say here that the Attorney General and the Provincial Government have been protecting us from the trading stamps. I

received trading stamps in the small town in which I live, 13 years ago, and I've still got them. Those stamps are in the drawer of my office at home. There was nothing said across the way here by the Government, that there was anything wrong with it at that time, but today, all of a sudden, there appears to be a 'cancerous growth' in the province of Saskatchewan, according to our friends across the way, that must be controlled. but it is not for that purpose that this legislation is brought in. That has been the excuse. One or two organizations have asked for a licensing Bill, but the Government of this province didn't want to bring in, didn't have the courage to come into this House and say we want another licensing act, what we are asking you for is an act to control trading stamps and because we are all opposed to them, we will get behind the legislation and save the face of the present Government from the requests that have been made by certain organizations for straight licensing and controlling legislation by the Government of this province.

I think that if the Government had come before this legislature and said to the members that we felt, for the good of the retail business in this province, that we should have licensing legislation, that then they would have come with an honest story to the members and they might have received different consideration. But to come with a story, after they had been approached by the Retail Merchants, that they were here to protect the retail merchants – well, let us look at the facts.

The Retail Merchants claim that for some years they have been asking for licensing legislation. In most cases they didn't mention these trading stamps.

Mr. McDonald: — They never did.

Mr. Gardiner: — They did in a wire. They mentioned it once in a wire to the Government. But in their main brief which they presented to the Government, their main request was for the straight licensing of retailers in this province, but the Government today say that they are not going to answer their request. They are refusing to answer the request of the Retail Merchants, and yet they are the people that say we listened to the requests and the desires of those people that are most closely affected by these matters that we are dealing with – the little man. And yet they stand up and say the Retail Merchants represent them, but they state that unless the laws of Canada prove ineffective with regard to trading stamps they aren't going to put this legislation into effect. In other words, they aren't answering the request of the so-called little merchants, as they call them, who have appealed to the Government of this Province, as they think, for licensing legislation. Well, I think that the truth of the matter is that there are so many retailers around this province not represented by the organization that made this request, and as the majority of small retailers realized what was going on, in that organization, maybe some of the members that do belong and pay their fees, wouldn't have belonged as members back through the years.

April 7, 1960

I am quite certain that those members or individuals that have made representations to the members of this House, from every constituency, individual independent retail merchant, have given a strong voice to a protest for a licensing legislation for retail merchants in this province. I know that each one of us as individuals deplore the use of instruments such as trading stamps or gimmicks of any kind in business, but at the same time if people say that we have freedom to choose in the province of Saskatchewan, when we have an organization that is built by you people and the people on this side of the House, in your own communities, we have an organization there that is strong enough to withstand the onset of trading stamps in this province and to put out an educational program which would defeat any effort of trading stamp companies or any other undesirable interests coming in to the province of Saskatchewan.

I am prepared to place my faith in the co-operative organizations and the independent individuals in this province, before I place my faith in the Government of this province. And so, Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I will not support this legislation.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. members opposite, I thought possibly I should say a few words, as I have been in business at one time and I know something about the small merchants out in the country who have to compete with chain stores and others of that kind.

It is strange to listen to the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. J.R. Barrie), to hear him talk about free enterprise, because I have been wondering for some years now where this free enterprise is. I don't think that any sensible person will agree that these monopolies are free enterprise. The only ones that are left, and are fighting for their lives, are these little merchants who have asked us to legislate for them who are free enterprisers in the country.

Now, the hon. member who just spoke (Mr. Gardiner) said that only one or two organizations have approached the Government of Saskatchewan, to try to protect them from these pernicious things that are trying to come to this province, and I suggest to him that when you talk about consumers of this province, it is not just a little organization. Certainly, the merchants who, through their organization, asked this government to legislate for their protection is not a small organization because it is comprised of more than 2,000 merchants of this province. It is true that some of the merchants do not belong to this organization, but most of them who do not belong are probably those who are associated with the chain stores, of which we have heard so much lately.

I would like to ask the hon. member opposite who said that

nearly everything is licensed today, if we should not license, say, dealers for weights? We have had cases through history where we found that some of the merchants were not too honest, and for that reason there is a licence, and these weights are inspected from time to time, to see that the customer gets the right weight of the goods that he is purchasing. What about licensing, say, petroleum products? Is it in the public interest, for example to have petroleum in cans, all over the store? Would it not be in the interest of the public that these places should be inspected, that petroleum should be kept in proper containers, and for that purpose that the merchant should be licensed? There are many regulations of that kind, and I would say that whether the former Liberal Government legislated those laws or this Government, they were always legislated for the purpose of looking after the public good. This Bill, No. 61, is for the same purpose. It is to protect the public from these ‘vipers’ as I call them, that have tried to come into this province and tried to get part of that hard-earned dollar that these people get for a living.

I don’t think I am too far wrong in having said those things, because I just happened to be reading a book, that I have on the desk here, and I would like to quote from this book. It is called ‘A Generation of Vipers’. I would suggest that the hon. members opposite read it.

Mr. McDonald: — What’s the title?

Mrs. Batten: — Probably by Karl Marx.

Mr. Berezowsky: — This is on page 211, about business. He goes on to show how business has developed over the years, and here is what he said:

“Starting with the thesis that competition is the essence of democracy. . .

which I believe that members on this side of the House and members on the other side of the House believe in. We believe that part. . . but he points out what has happened. . .

“ . . . it is of interest business men undertook the bastardization of the truth, first as recorded above, would be elimination of competition wherever possible and by all means imaginable. (2) the establishment of the notion that business competed only with itself and never with any other requirement of mankind, and by means of the latter absurdity business was able to kick around and decimate the people and their needs with virtually no compunction whatever for the result.”

April 7, 1960

In another paragraph it says this:

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am just trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of this Bill is to try to protect the public. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must present his own views and not the views of other people in this matter.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I entirely with what the writer has said here, and I believe that the purpose of this Bill is to protect the public from these ‘vipers’, as I have said, who are trying to come into this province and destroy our merchants, and are trying to ‘suck the blood’ of the working people of this province. I am certainly going to support the Bill.

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend a lot of time hashing and rehashing this Bill No. 62; we’ve heard nothing but that for ten days. What has happened since about 7:30 last night, to me, is a bunch of ‘eyewash’, and I don’t think anyone is going to get the gains they feel they may get out of this publicity. However, my colleagues and I have decided on a very short statement that is the result of our discussing this thing, working with it, all through the time since it was brought on the floor, and therefore I will just read a very short statement which is outstanding on this matter:

“There is no need to add to the many words spoken during the session and in the Law Amendments Committee concerning the introduction of Bill No. 61. On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I want to make it abundantly clear that we are opposed to any legislation that will directly or indirectly curtail the freedom of legitimate individual merchants. However, believing the Federal Criminal Code inadequate to prevent the use of trading stamps, we of the Social Credit Party will support Bill No. 61, as amended, on the basis that it will be proclaimed only if it becomes necessary to do so to control the use of trading stamps and for no other reason.”

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate. I wasn’t a member of the Law Amendments Committee, but I did sit in the Committee for most of the hearings of the Committee, and I must

say that I enjoyed what I heard. However, I feel, because the Attorney General and the Premier have made certain charges which they and no one else can substantiate, that the record should be made clear and abundantly clear on this occasion. I understand that the Attorney General himself is a fervent collector of trading stamps. As evidence to prove that, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Attorney General has two gifts or prizes that he won because of the collection of trading stamps. We often see out in front of the House or in front of his home examples of those prizes that the stores in Regina gave out when they were issuing trading stamps. I understand that the most common prize or gift that one would win was a jellybean, and I suggest that the Attorney General has two pregnant jellybeans.

Now, Bill No. 61, Mr. Speaker, was introduced, according to the Attorney General. . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure what the hon. member said or what he meant, but if he meant any reflection on me, I suggest that the either say a little more or explain what he meant. I am sure that what he said is a mystery to me, but he said something that he should either amplify or withdraw.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I'll amplify it as I wouldn't want to withdraw it. I think if the Attorney General would ask some of the members of his family what a pregnant jellybean is, they'll tell him it's a Volkswagen.

I want to carry on, Mr. Speaker, with the reasons of the Attorney General for introducing Bill 61; it was to curb the use of gimmicks, which, in the words of the Attorney General, were responsible for the increase, or some increase, in the cost of goods and services that are being made available to the people of Saskatchewan. But I want to remind the Attorney General, and you, Mr. Speaker, that the Government that sits opposite have been responsible this session for passing legislation that increases the cost of living to every consumer in Saskatchewan. Not only have they changed legislation with respect to the co-operatives landing credit, but they have now placed the co-operative organizations in the position of a finance company, and no person in this House, I am convinced, would like to see the co-operative movement destroyed, and I do believe that by allowing this extension of credit. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McDonald: — I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, to show that the Attorney General or the Premier, in this House, has never mentioned any gimmicks other than the trading stamps, and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no evidence has been produced in this House that any organization in Saskatchewan have asked for legislation to outlaw trading stamps.

April 7, 1960

Now, I have a copy of the brief that was presented to the Government by the Retail Merchants' Association, and nowhere in that brief can I find any reference to trading stamps. I went to the Clerk's Office this morning and got the brief that was presented, and had my secretary make a copy of it. Now, I defy the Attorney General, the Premier or anybody else to show me where the Retail Merchants' Association asked for protection against trading stamps. The Retail Merchants' Association did ask for certain legislation, but now the Attorney General and the Premier have told the Retail Merchants' Association, and told this House, that they are not prepared to comply with their request, because last night, during this debate, they were asked certain questions. One of the questions was to the effect of whether the Government would ever bring this legislation into effect if it was found that trading stamps could be curtailed under federal legislation. I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, the reply given to that question by the Attorney General. He said this, and I quote:

“The Premier and myself have both given emphatic assurance on behalf of the Government, that this legislation will not be proclaimed except as a means of preventing trading stamps within the ordinary meaning of the term.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did the retailers ask for? The retailers asked for protection against wholesalers selling retail in the province of Saskatchewan; they asked for a penalty against wholesale houses who carried out this practice, but in the legislation is there any penalty on wholesalers? The only penalty imposed in the Act is on retailers. So, apparently, if you ask for protection for yourself you are liable to end up with legislation to penalize you; and that is exactly what has happened with the legislation that is now before us. Clause 9 of the brief, presented by the retailers prior to Bill 61 being printed, said this:

“That a penalty section be added to deal with any wholesaler or supplier not complying with the Act.”

What did the Bill say? The Bill doesn't mention wholesalers; it only mentions retailers and the only person that can be penalized is the retailer, not the wholesaler.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised, with the type of legislation that the Government has brought in. It wasn't necessary for the Retail Merchants' Association, or any other association or organization, to ask for this legislation. This is part of the C.C.F. program. You cannot blame this one some other organization, in or outside the province of Saskatchewan; the blame for this legislation must be placed on the shoulders of the C.C.F. party and the C.C.F. Government. I want to repeat that this is only another step to implementing the full program of socialization of the C.C.F. party.

Why do I make that statement? I want to refer to the 'Speakers Handbook' of the C.C.F. party. What do they say? Mr. Speaker, I often wonder if you knew that this was in it. This is an official document, tabled in the Legislature.

"Our co-operative organizations in Canada are far too insufficient to allow us to have much hope of setting up distribution on a co-operative basis, with the co-operative system we have no. We might have a state distributing agency, first in which the present storekeeper would become a civil servant, and the prices governed by the state to give people a decent standard of living."

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General cannot blame the Retail Merchants' Association for this Bill; he cannot blame the co-operative movement. His own party say that the co-operative movement is insufficient to deal with this problem. The whole attitude of our friends opposite is that this is another spoke in the implementation of the C.C.F. program, which in the end result would completely socialize every organization in the province of Saskatchewan and if they had their way, every organization in Canada. These people, Mr. Speaker, are Fabian socialists, and what is a Fabian socialist? A Fabian Socialist is an individual who believes in the complete socialization of our economy.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. gentleman is getting a long way from the debate.

Mc. McDonald: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I am not a long way from the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the hon. member to get back to the Bill.

Mc. McDonald: — I want to suggest that I have never been away from it. For instance, the Attorney General and the Premier want to put the responsibility for the implementation of this Bill 661 on to someone else. I suggest it is not true, Mr. Speaker, and I want to repeat that this is another move by the present administration, to endeavour to put into effect the complete socialization of our economy.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General, when he was speaking on third reading last evening, referred to dishonest advertising, lies and misrepresentations. But there is nothing in the Bill dealing with this dishonest advertising, lies and misrepresentations. I want to suggest that there is a good reason for that, because the people most responsible for this type of advertising are the people that sit opposite, and the party that they represent. I have in my hand a copy of that rag, 'The Commonwealth', — here's another one, I have two of them now — of recent date, February 10, 1960. Now in this rag, they claim that Mr. Wooff is a sitting member for Turtleford. Well, it is my understanding that Mr. Wooff was defeated in 1956.

April 7, 1960

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. gentleman is departing very much from the discussion before the House.

Mc. McDonald: — I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are discussing dishonest advertising, lies and misrepresentations.

Mr. Speaker: — If we follow that line we can cover the whole field.

Mc. McDonald: — I suggest that we had the whole field last night. It is quite in order to answer these charges, Mr. Speaker, I must produce evidence. It isn't good enough for me to stand up here and say there is no dishonest advertising in Saskatchewan. I want to prove that there is.

Mr. Speaker: — Dishonest advertising is on the part of the people for whom this Bill is presented.

Mc. McDonald: — I would suggest that 'The Commonwealth' also is the hope of those people who print it, that it is going to have some effect on the people, but if you have ruled it out of order it is perfectly all right. The paper is available and the date is February 10, 1960, for anyone who wants to read it, there are several articles in here that couldn't be further from the truth. I suggest they are dishonest, and I suggest they are lies, and I suggest that they are misrepresentations.

Another matter I wanted to refer to, Mr. Speaker, was the attack last night by the Attorney General on the solicitors and their clients who appeared before the Law Amendments Committee.

I have never seen such a disgraceful exhibition in the 12 years I have sat in this House. Organizations with their solicitors come to the Law Amendments Committee to present a case. The Attorney General was a member of the Law Amendments Committee. It was on his invitation that these people appeared. He had the opportunity to pit his knowledge of the law with other solicitors who appeared on that occasion. He had every opportunity to question the officials of different organizations when they were in Committee, but rather than doing that, he waits until he can come into the House, the sanctity of the House, the protection of the House, to make charges that he or no other member ought to have made, against persons and individuals who, because of the protection we are given in this House, have no opportunity of defending themselves. I think it was a shameful exhibition on behalf of the Attorney General, and sometimes I am concerned for his very health.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What charges?

Mc. McDonald: — I want to refer now for a moment to the attitude of the Premier, and I am sorry that he is not in his place. I thought last night when the Premier took part in this debate that it was

too bad the debate had not been two or three days earlier, as I am sure he would have won an 'Oscar' for the most versatile act; but the 'Oscars' were awarded two or three days earlier. He began his remarks, portraying the type of Boris Karloff, as he always does. Whenever the Premier is confronted with an argument that he cannot answer, he turns to personal abuse and attack. This is exactly what happened last night when he endeavoured to reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Humboldt. Having proceeded from this character, he tried to portray the life of Fred Astaire, and he danced a little jig back and forth and played to the gallery. Having completed that manoeuvre, then he developed the life of Mickey Rooney, and looked for all the world like Mickey Rooney, when he is about to attack some great monster.

Let us return to this brief that was presented by the Retail Merchants' Association prior to the existence of Bill 61. Last night, in dealing with this matter, the Premier referred to the Brief that was presented by the Retail Merchants' Association after the Bill had been printed, and they were in possession of it, but he very handily refrained from reverting to the brief that was presented by the Retail Merchants' Association, asking for legislation to protect themselves, as I mentioned earlier against wholesalers who were selling retail, against selling goods by auction, and against certain unethical practices that have been allowed to take place in our province.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Retail Merchants' Association circulated a petition, I believe in the year 1958. Among retailers in Saskatchewan and at that time I understand from the copy of this petition that was tabled in the Committee, they were asking for legislation to protect retailers against these unethical practices. At that time my colleague and desk-mate signed that petition. At that time the now leader of the Liberal Party was in favour of legislation of this type. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that the legislation we have before us, namely Bill No. 61, has no relationship in any particulars, to the protection that was asked by the Retail Merchants' Association. I want to repeat that no evidence has been brought forward to this House from any organization, asking for legislation to protect ourselves against trading stamps. As far as I am concerned, I have been on record for a number of years with regard to my attitude, toward trading stamps. I have had the opportunity of taking part in the opening of many new shopping facilities; some of them for the Co-operative movement; some of them for chain stores, some of them for private individuals. I have been one of the words of advice, if I should ever be classed in a position to give advice to anyone, to anyone of these people, that I sincerely would hope they would conduct their business in such a manner that it wouldn't be necessary to use gimmicks of any description to promote trade in their place of business. It has always been my contention that if you have good products at competitive prices, then you ought to be able to compete in the community in which you reside.

I also noticed last night that the Premier referred to legislation which was placed on the statute books in the province of Alberta in 1937, in an effort to curtail the use of trading stamps.

April 7, 1960

I am wondering why the Premier had not introduced this legislation in Saskatchewan at a much earlier date, because in 1935 he was a Social Crediter. I have evidence in my hand to prove it. In the first election in which the Premier ran, he was a Social Credit candidate, and it is a wonder to me. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is certainly digressing on the subject.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He's not only out of order, but he's wrong.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to table the document to prove that I am not wrong. He was a Social Credit candidate in the election of 1939.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It's wrong, and you know it.

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly it is so. Also last evening some Government speakers endeavoured to chastise the Opposition for not producing an alternative to Bill 61. Mr. Speaker, it is not our shirt tail that is in the wringer! It is the shirt tail of the Government that is in the wringer, and I'm not going to. . .

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We're not going to pull it out, either.

Mr. McDonald: — We're not going to pull it out of the wringer. We've done that too often. If we hadn't pulled their shirt tail out of the wringer continuously for 16 years, they would have been defeated many years ago. We no longer will be responsible for that action, Mr. Speaker. From here on, when this Government is standing on the brink of oblivion as they are today, rather than bailing them out as we have in the past, we are going to give them a push over the cliff, and in they go.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — It was also mentioned last evening that members should make their stand on this particular question. According to the best direction that they could receive from the people they represent. I can honestly tell you that during the whole time this Bill has been in question, I received one telegram from one individual in my constituency in support of the legislation — just one! I received armfuls of telegrams, letters, telephone calls, personal visits from people in my constituency opposing the legislation. If I supported this legislation, I doubt if it would be wise for me to return to my constituency. I attended meetings of the Chamber of Commerce, Boards of Trade, over the last three weeks in my own constituency, and without exception every meeting I attended resolutions were passed unanimously, opposing this legislation. It is my conviction that the vast majority of people in Saskatchewan, irrespective of any political party, are opposed to this legislation.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — This is one of the final nails in the coffin of my friends opposite, and we are not intending to pull their shirt tail out of the wringer. It will only be about next July when the Government which replaces this one can do what ought to have been done. That is not too long to wait. I don't think stamp companies or anyone else are going to move in here in great hordes between now and July, and when July arrives, action can be taken that should have been taken on this occasion. We are not interested in regimenting and controlling, socializing any more of Saskatchewan's economy. We believe that people are entitled to freedom of choice. That is the type of legislation that ought to be brought into this House, that would warrant the support of all political parties in this House. I am not surprised at my friends in the Social Credit, who are, as they have announced, going to support Bill 61. They haven't any alternative. Their own party in Alberta are even worse culprits than these people.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's right.

Mr. McDonald: — What else could they do? But we are not concerned with the stand of the social Credit Party, Mr. Speaker. We are only concerned with the health and welfare of the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They seem to like it, though.

Mr. McDonald: — It's perfectly all right for the lady member of Regina to say that the Liberal Party represents big business. Well, now, I only want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Government which sits opposite who are the friends of big business. Who are the people that are touching the resources of this province for a few individuals? The people that sit opposite.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — Who are the people who are on radio, television, newspapers and all over the country, every day of the week, with funds that are supplied by big business? The people who sit opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What funds?

Mr. McDonald: — The people who, by their own admission, receive \$400,00 to fight one campaign from the labour unions. Who are the friends?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's a lie! That's a lie!

April 7, 1960

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't know whether the hon. member knows that that is wrong, or not, but it certainly is. For no campaign has the C.C.F. received \$400,000 from a labour union, or anybody else, to fight any campaign.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table the evidence again in support of that statement. This comes from one of your own organizers. I have sent to my office for it, and you'll get it, just the same as you got the evidence to prove that your own leader was a member of the Social Credit Party. Anything that I . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is getting a long piece away from the motion which is a third reading of Bill 61.

Mr. Gardiner: — How about the Attorney General. Last night he wandered away from the motion all the time.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friends don't want to accept my statements, then I will produce the evidence to prove it. I have never made a statement in this House that I cannot substantiate, and I am not going to start now. The whole thing is this, that my hon. friends wouldn't recognize evidence, if they met it on the street. These people are a little touchy, and I sometimes wonder in what spirit the Attorney General is held by his colleague. You know, one of his colleagues mentioned to me not long ago. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — I'm dealing with Bill 61, Mr. Speaker. Not long ago when we were discussion Bill 61, he said he was concerned about the attitude of the general public with regard to Bill 61. He said he never was convinced that from the day the present Attorney General was appointed to his post, that sooner or later he wouldn't bring about the defeat of the Government. Well, of course he has almost accomplished that, Mr. Speaker, and we are most happy to see that he is bent on shoving this legislation through, despite the fact that the vast majority of the people in Saskatchewan are opposed to this type of legislation; despite the fact that my friends opposite seem to think that it is the only manner they could adopt, in endeavouring to curtail the use of trading stamps. I don't believe that. The Liberal Party doesn't believe it. The province of British Columbia have only recently endeavoured to outlaw trading stamps in the province of British Columbia. Whether they have been successful or not, I don't know. There are arguments by lawyers for both sides of the case. I wouldn't even hazard a guess. Maybe their legislation will be declared ultra vires; maybe it will not. Maybe ours will, I don't know. I

want to make it abundantly clear that the Liberal Party of this province are opposed to trading stamps.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Prove it!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — No matter what my friends opposite may say, we are opposed to the socialization of the merchants of this province. We are opposed to the implementation of the program as announced by the C.C.F. Party. We cannot support this legislation. I will be pleased to table the evidence I referred to, as soon as the page boy brings it from my office.

I cannot support this motion.

April 7, 1960

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I shall start my remarks the way several other hon. members did, by saying that I had no intention of taking part in this debate, because I was rather confused as to what subject I should talk about. Whether I should try to get the Opposition to improve the tenor in their voice when they sing in this Legislature, or whether I should discuss the briefs that were presented to the Law Amendment Committee, or whether I should run the risk of being in order, and attempt to discuss the Bill. So this is what I propose to do. When this Bill was first brought in to this Legislature, it is possible at that time there may have been some reservations as to the advisability of this type of legislation at this particular time, (and I am not thinking politically, either). I have no reservations as to the powers we were vesting in the Government or in the Provincial Secretary. In my 16 years that I have been in this House I have never seen any of the powers which we have given to the Government as a Legislature, or to any one individual Minister, ever been abused, and I have no reason to believe that under these circumstances any rights and powers that we give to the Executive Council or to a Minister, would be abused. But I did have some reservations that insofar as this was an undertaking to bring under license a group of people which it might be necessary to bring under license — a group of people which heretofore have not been licensed. There was some question in my mind as to the necessity of it, but I was indeed pleased when the Provincial Secretary, in giving second reading of this Bill, referred it to the Law Amendments Committee, which they gave to us in that Law Amendments Committee, and the other members who sat in on that Committee, an opportunity to have placed before them the facts from the respective organizations, and I am convinced that every member who sat on that Committee came out of that Committee convinced there was a necessity, not only in the interests of the retail people, but in the interests of the consuming public of this province, that some protection and some form of regulations was not only desirable, but it was absolutely necessary. Not only so far as the potential possibility of trading stamps in the province of Saskatchewan are concerned, but there are other abuses, several of which have been referred to by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition — other abuses in the distribution of goods within this province which at some time in the future may be required to be regulated and controlled, in the interests of the consuming public.

After having heard the evidence that was placed before that Committee, I have no reservations at all in supporting the Bill in its original form, Mr. Speaker, but after the amendments which have been introduced, (incidentally by the Provincial Secretary himself) this has made this Bill one which I am convinced that no one reasonable person could possibly oppose. It could be that it is possible that there are those people who could have opposed the original Bill, insofar as they may not trust responsible Government Ministers, but I have always done it in the past, and I suggest I will continue to do so in the future.

What have we done with this Bill? The arguments have been presented in this House to the effect that we are giving arbitrary powers to the Govern-

ment in the original Bill, they suggest to the Provincial Secretary. What is the Bill that we have before us now? We have taken away any arbitrary powers that they have suggested have been given either to the Provincial Secretary, or to the Executive Council. We are now in this position: that the onus of the administration of this Retailers' Act, if and when it is proclaimed, rests with the Advisory Board which is composed of a selected number of people, six in number, of respective organizations within this province, including the Retailers, the Chamber of Commerce, the committee-operative movement, and it is in their hands, and the hands of this Legislature. I have seen several Licensing Acts put through this House, but this is the first instance in which I have seen it placed in the Act, in which the Provincial Secretary must come back and place before the Legislature, subject to the scrutiny of the Legislature, all the rules and bylaws and regulations passed under the Act.

So, in the final analysis it will be the Legislature which will be perpetuating any discriminatory powers or actions upon the retail trade or any other trade in this province. We here in the Legislature, or those who will be the Legislature in the future, will have to accept the responsibility if there is any abuse made of this Act, because it is in their hands and in nobody else's hands.

Because this Bill has been so amended in this manner, I suggest that nobody can oppose it on the basis that it is giving undue power to the Government. It is not doing, as the Leader of the Opposition has suggested, undertaking in any way to socialize retail trade here in this province. In no way can it be suggested that that is the object, or that it can be done, under this Bill, if and when it is proclaimed.

Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there must be a reason – I would like to believe the members opposite when they say they are opposed to trading stamps. I would like to believe them, but I have no alternative but to accept that when they oppose it, they must be in favour of trading stamps, because when we sat in that Committee, there was no suggestion made as to any further improvements that could be made in this Act, and that is what the Law Amendments Committee's job was to do. We were given a Bill, and it was our job to bring back, if possible, a better Bill.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't think that remark is fair, at all, because I personally brought up on at least I would say a dozen sections, suggested improvements, and I questioned the advisability of certain things, and therefore the remark is not correct.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown: — I will concede that the hon. member for Humboldt did make certain suggestions, which I suggest were not necessarily improvements over what was being submitted by the Provincial Secretary, as amendments to the Bill at that particular time. I would say it was the responsibility of this Committee to endeavour to bring back a

April 7, 1960

better Bill than was sent to them, if it was at all possible. I say I have no objections to the original Bill insofar as the powers are concerned, but I suggest that we have brought back a better Bill than we originally started out with.

The member for Melville referred to the fact that he was prepared to trust the co-operative movement. I am prepared to trust the co-operative movement in this province. It was the representative for the co-operative movement, the Federated Co-ops and Co-operative units who were the strongest advocates of this particular type of legislation. Legislation not only to protect the consuming public against trading stamps, but also that we should have legislation to protect other abuses within the retail distribution of goods. I am prepared, and that is one of the final decisions that convinced me that Bill must be right, was the wholehearted support given by the co-operative movement, by the labour organizations, and the United Farmers of this province. When we have four organizations such as that: your commercial co-ops in the form of the Federated Co-ops; your Co-op Union which represents all the labour organizations and the farmers, all asking for this type of legislation, if I had any other reservations before, that would automatically remove them. These people are convinced that this is the only means within provincial jurisdiction by which we can control, and in the ultimate end, abolish trading stamps, and they are prepared to support it. On that basis I have no alternative but to give my wholehearted support to the motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division by 30 to 14.

At 4:20 o' clock p.m., His Honour the Administrator, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and having given Assent to the Bills presented to him, said:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you for and congratulate you upon the work you have done. I wish also to express my confidence that the approval of the programs and plans presented to you will continue to provide the services necessary to the growth and development of our Province.

The Address you presented to Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of the birth of her second son reflects the sentiments and affection of the people of Saskatchewan who rejoiced in this happy event.

The Emergency Acreage Payment Program which you provided for made much needed assistance available to farmers who were unable to complete their harvesting operations last fall. The co-operation of municipal officials enabled this program to be completed with dispatch.

You have approved legislation which will make crop insurance available to farmers wishing to take advantage of this type of protection.

For a number of years you have made provision for a program to bring electric power to the farms of Saskatchewan. This program is now nearly completed. The Family Farm Improvement Act which you have passed will make it possible to further modernize our farms.

The program to assist towns and villages to install sewer and water systems will contribute to the growth of our communities.

Many small and large communities throughout the Province have enjoyed the benefits and convenience of natural gas. It is gratifying to note that provision has been made to extend this service to other centres.

You have again made provision for schools in the Province to receive additional grants. The extension of the scholarship program will enable more students to obtain further education.

Your decision to authorize the Government to assist rural municipalities to re-gravel grid roads will be welcomed.

You have approved a program which will assist rural telephone companies to improve and extend their services.

The legislation you have passed to extend regional parks will provide additional facilities to meet the recreational needs of the people of the Province.

You have made provision for assisting in the further development of the industrial potential of Saskatchewan by establishing a Department of Industry and Information and by approving legislation which authorizes the establishment of municipal industrial development corporations.

I am pleased to note that you again extended suitable honours to the Richardson Rink, 1960 Dominion Curling Champions.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the public service and assure you the sum of money voted will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I desire to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the session and wish you the full blessing of Providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Hon. Mr. Walker, Provincial Secretary, then said:

April 7, 1960

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.