

municipality and *no one* has complained nor is there any indication that anyone has destroyed same.

This statement I have made as a statement of fact and I challenge anyone to show me in the evidence where there is anything otherwise.

Secondly, that from March 1955, until the 18th of July, 1956, which is the franchise date given by the city, there was adduced by any record or testimony, any evidence, the City of Sudbury, through its city council or any association and I have in brackets—except the coal venders, they objected, considerably against receiving gas as a utility.

So, I will paraphrase this; from March to July there was no opposition. Sudbury wanted gas.

Thirdly, that the city of Sudbury never considered owning its own distributive gas system, and in fact not one municipality owns its system, in Northern Ontario.

Fourth, that from March 1955, until the Sudbury franchise was signed, there was no competitor to NONG in northern Ontario as a gas distributing firm.

Fifth, that the three council members (Fabbro-Dubary-Guimond) who voted against the franchise bylaw, gave evidence of their reasons: to delay and get more advantageous terms in the agreement, and not because they were against this NONG company or against the franchise.

Sixth, that no one, not one member of the city council or any city official has at any time, in any hearing stated that his thoughts or acts have been influenced by Mayor Landreville. And I will refer to the evidence of each, as I have it broken down.

Seventh, that there is no evidence from testimony or document showing or capable of showing that Landreville did any act to favour this company or favour any terms of the franchise for this company or of any disloyalty to his duties as mayor.

Eighth, that no evidence exists that Landreville has denied or refused to disclose to anyone, more specifically to any person in authority, that he had obtained an option and shares in NONG company.

Ninth, that there is no evidence anyone in authority has questioned Landreville as to ownership of shares during the years 1957, 58, 59, 60, 61 until September 1962.

Tenth, that there is any evidence Landreville, after his appointment as a judge, said anything or did any act, on or off the bench, which is capable of this interpretation: influencing others or being influenced by the fact he had an option or had shares in that stock, in that company.

Eleventh, that there is no evidence indicating that Landreville as mayor had special knowledge, as distinct from city officials and members, of NONG finances or feasibilities which he may or did in fact use for his personal benefit.

Twelfth, that as to the character of Landreville not one member of council or city official has said, as appears from the transcript, anything derogatory as to his handling of the city matters. Quite to the contrary; I have been described very briefly by witnesses as a leader, a man who would allow all members of council to express his opinion, allow council to vote as he saw fit, and I give you this under oath: that I was not the type of a mayor who would canvass, solicit aldermen, controllers to vote either pro or con a subject matter to come up at the meeting that night, which is all too prevalent in certain councils.

Thirteenth, that as to the integrity of Landreville as a man, a lawyer, in any public office, or as a judge, there is on the transcript any evidence, from any witness, hearsay or otherwise which can bring his integrity into question.

Fourteenth, Mr. Fortier might see fit to admit that (a) I received the shares by mail from the brokerage house in Vancouver called Continental Investments Company, in my name; (b) that I signed a receipt for the same; (c) I wrote a letter of acknowledgment to Continental; (d) Landreville sold all his shares at various times through the same broker—Ross Knowles & Co.; (e) Landreville kept and produced all sales slips of stock to the Securities Commission on its first inquiry in 1962; (f) Landreville deposited all revenue in his personal bank account.

I was questioned by the Securities Commission officers. They examined all withdrawals and the conclusion was that there was no evidence whatsoever, other than I used the revenue from the sale of those shares for my benefit and that of my family. I will point out to you in the evidence quite patently what is to me a crucial fact, which Mr. Rand sees fit to be absolutely silent on; is when I received this option in July, 1956, from Mr. Farris, what was the