

*Supply—Post Office*

of view of the safety of children or young people sent by their parents to buy stamps or obtain mail or for any of the purposes for which they go to a post office, and for the last ten years it had been very largely used by all the residents thereabout. I might mention that it was where I got my mail; I used it a great deal, bought large quantities of stamps there and used it for any other postal business I had to transact. The building was specially constructed for post office purposes, I assume in accordance with plans prepared under the former Liberal government. It has three outside walls, one on St. Clair avenue, one on Appleton avenue, and another on a lane running parallel with St. Clair avenue. Presumably upon instructions of the former Liberal administration, it was furnished with very large windows on both avenues and the lane so as to admit all the light possible.

Last spring, towards the end of April, and just before I sailed for the coronation, a rumour came to me that the site was about to be changed, and immediately afterwards the owners of the building and the land came to see me about the matter; but as I was sailing in a day or two I could do nothing more than write, wire or telephone—perhaps I did all three—to the Minister of Public Works. I did not receive a reply to the letter I assume I wrote until after I came home. In any event I called up the Minister of Public Works and apparently wired him on or about April 29. At that time no contract had been entered into for the moving of the post office. Upon my return I found that it had been moved out of ward six into ward five, some five hundred feet or more or less east of the former location and on the opposite side of the street. I also learned that on May 7 a letter was sent to the Postmaster General, which was signed by, I believe, Mr. J. L. Shannon—that appears to be the name—and from which I wish to read some statements:

Hon. J. C. Elliott,  
Postmaster General,  
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

In connection with the proposed removal of postal station "L" from the corner of St. Clair and Appleton avenues to a point on the south side of St. Clair avenue approximately one hundred yards east of Oakwood avenue, I am enclosing herewith a petition signed by approximately three hundred residents, store owners and business men in the community who are strenuously objecting to the removal of the post office from its present location. The present building is situate on a corner and is accessible and convenient to the business section of the community. The proposed new site is located in a less advantageous position, will be cramped

[Mr. MacNicol.]

for parking space, is inaccessible, and persons seeking to use the post office will have to cross a dangerous intersection, as four car lines—

Mr. KIRK: Mr. Chairman, what item are we on now?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. 258.

Mr. KIRK: I wondered whether the hon. member's remarks are relevant to this item.

Mr. MacNICOL: They are relevant, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to proceed until I am through.

—as four car lines and one bus service pass this spot.

Note that in the former location of the post office erected for the Liberal government when it was in power before, they made an admirable selection for a public building of this kind, but the present building is located adjacent to several car lines and a bus route.

Mr. EULER: Does my hon. friend say that the former building was erected by the government?

Mr. MacNICOL: Erected on plans prepared, or at least suitable, I am told, for the former Liberal government. I have learned a good deal about what occurred at that time, but I am not going to refer to it; perhaps the less said about it the better.

Mr. EULER: I am trying to get information. I understood my hon. friend to say that the building was erected by the government.

Mr. MacNICOL: Erected for the government and, I am told, in accordance with plans suitable for the government. I assume that the government, when arranging to occupy a new building, would be interested in the plans. I will continue from where I left off:

It seems hard to understand why a bright, airy building, specially built for a post office, and ideally located to serve the needs of the district, should be abandoned, and a post office put in the proposed location, and in a building which, at best, must be a make-shift.

It is not I who am passing these comments about the present post office building; I am just reading this letter:

In your letter notifying Mr. Calderone of the proposed change, you state that the premises are too small. What I would like to know is why he was not given an opportunity of remedying this condition, if it existed, as he owns the store next door and the entire upstairs, and any additional space would have been immediately available. This whole matter was put through without giving Mr. Calderone an opportunity of making any necessary alterations to the building for increased space, and the people in the district are putting their own construction on the matter.