

solicitor advised that it must be delayed due to the fact that it was not drafted in time to be typed out due to pressure of other work. That was the reason. Then, came, just at that period—May 8—the famous debate in the House of Commons. Mr. Howe said—and I refer to *Hansard* of May 14, 1956—in the House of Commons:

It also doubts the propriety of using taxpayers' funds to operate a gas business in competition with the privately-owned...industry. In short, it would appear that all governments have reached the conclusion that the long range transmission of natural gas is a field for private enterprise, with government assistance if necessary...and operation.

On May 17, the first and second readings of the bylaw is made and I recall that the bylaw was supposed to be, at that time, all ready. There was another motion before the Board of Control and this was the second motion, mind you, approving the bylaw.

On May 18, the city solicitor submitted to the members of the council by correspondence a copy of the agreement. He does not object to any clause or anything. He is satisfied with it. Basically it is again the agreement supplied to us by the Ontario Fuel Board as a draft.

On May 22, the bylaw was read for the first time and considered as read the second time as well; being a bylaw to authorize a franchise agreement with Northern Ontario Gas. There was hardly any opposition, if not unanimous.

On May 24, the Fuel Board issued a notice printed in a newspaper for a public hearing the purpose being whether they were going to dispense with a vote of the electors.

On June 7, the Fuel Board held a meeting in the Sudbury Public Library auditorium. I was there; there were several members of council there and some of the public. Mr. Crozier—this can be read in this transcript of the Rand Commission—stated that he went clause by clause; explained and answered all questions. I had nothing to do at that meeting but sort of sit next to him at the table. There were questions put by some citizens as well. It appeared at that time to be satisfactory to everybody who was there. This was on June 7.

On June 11, the Fuel Board granted an order dispensing with a referendum and the only formality there remains is to read the bylaw for the third time.

I must not presume that all of you have sat on municipal councils, but in our council and councils generally, may I explain the practice. A bylaw is read a first and second time and there may be, at the second reading, some debate or no debate. Sometimes there is debate at the third reading, and much debate at the third reading, except in that type of bylaw which needs provincial approval by one of its commissions or boards. So that a money bylaw or any bylaw which needs a board's approval is read a first and second time and fully debated. That is in the transcript and stated by several persons.

Then, for all intents and purposes, that bylaw, that second reading is final because it goes to one of the departments in Toronto; they examine it; if it is unsatisfactory they return it with suggested amendments; if it is satisfactory it receives the provincial stamp of approval. Then it is sent back to the municipality and it is read for the third time as a matter of course, because if on the third reading we re-argue this bylaw and start changing any parts thereof, we have to send it back to the provincial government to have the amendment re-approved. Therefore, the custom is, for the sake of expediency, of having full debate at the end of the second reading.

Now, on July 15, I can tell you that the city solicitor wrote a long letter—

Senator Hnatyshyn: What date was that?

Mr. Landreville: June 15, 1956. There had already been lots of delay, in my opinion. The bylaw had been read a second time, approved by the Fuel Board and the City Solicitor wrote a long letter. It is an exhibit—

Mr. Fortier: June 19.

Mr. Landreville: Oh, June 19, I beg excuse.

The Joint Chairman Mr. Laflamme: An exhibit.

Mr. Landreville: No, the letter is dated June 15 but the meeting was on June 19. It was submitted June 19 to the council meeting. So, on June 15 our solicitor submitted and I recall, I may tell you, being annoyed because he brought up a lot of points which had been previously brought up and he asked that the matter be postponed indefinitely. I had in mind the request of Mr. C. D. Howe and the importance of getting this through, and I made notes on my copy of the letter, which is on file as an exhibit, of my answers