

country is the widespread use of political patronage, both provincially and federally; and the sooner we can get away from it—and the Post Office Department is a department where every effort should be made to clean out patronage—the better off Canada will be.

Mr. EULER: The hon. member speaks of a post office building which is quite unfit for occupation. The information I have is that the revenues are \$65 a year. We pay the postmaster \$100. So, if we want to regard the matter from the point of view of revenue, we can hardly afford a much better building than the one now in use. However, I am free to say that, whether or not the revenues are quite sufficient, every post office building should at least be a credit and should not warrant the description that has been given of the one to which the hon. member refers. I shall be glad to have an investigation made with regard to it.

The hon. member said something more, regarding patronage in the Post Office Department, that all these positions should be placed under the civil service commission. I believe that theoretically I would be inclined to agree with him; but when I point out to him that during the Christmas rush we employed from Halifax to Vancouver some 7,400 extra men for perhaps only a few days, I think he will admit that that is hardly an occasion for action by the civil service commission.

Mr. COLDWELL: I did not mean that.

Mr. EULER: He also made reference to what has been done in the Department of National Revenue. As it happens, that department is merely regularizing by statute a practice which it has been observing for a long time.

Mr. COLDWELL: A good practice.

Mr. EULER: These appointments have been made for some years by the civil service commission, and will continue to be made in that way.

Mr. CLARKE (Rosedale): What was the total cost of the transfer of the business from St. Clair and Appleton avenues to a new location east of Oakwood avenue—the post office which, I think, was referred to a short time ago? I wish to know the total costs of all kinds, including painting and general expenses; also the terms of the lease of the old building which was vacated, the amount per annum paid on that lease, and the total amount per annum that is paid for the new quarters. I understand that both of them are rental propositions. Also, what is the

length of the lease of the new premises; what was the remaining duration of the old lease, and why was the change made. I know the building fairly well, and it seems to me that the old place was well located, well established, giving good service, and doing all that could be expected. It is rumoured that this is another case of patronage. I do not wish to have too much of this patronage going on all the time in the Post Office Department.

In my own district, when I made an inquiry last year about the employment of the temporary staff of the Toronto post office, I discovered upon getting the names and addresses that people were hired from all parts of the country, not in Toronto at all. I support the suggestion of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell), that the Post Office Department should rid itself of this terrible condition of patronage. Last year I made inquiries about a change of a sub-post office in my district, and I was informed that the reason was that the defeated Liberal member had the first say in placing or changing the site of that sub-post office. I was surprised to hear that. I did not think patronage dug as deep as that. As an innocent newcomer I was surprised. However, we learn as we go along. Perhaps the acting Postmaster General (Mr. Euler) will give the information.

Mr. EULER: The cost of the removal was \$481. Leases were for five years respectively. The former space was 5,655 square feet, costing \$5,400 per annum; the present space is 8,671 square feet, costing \$6,840, and would have cost at the same rate as we paid for the other space, \$8,280 per annum.

Mr. MacNICOL: Why does the minister keep saying what it would have cost, when the department made no inquiry? I might just as well say that if I had bought a certain suit, it would have cost me \$125; but I did not buy it; I got one for \$25. That is no argument at all.

Mr. EULER: If I paid \$80 for one suit and wanted to buy another I would assume I would pay \$80.

Mr. MacNICOL: This is not a question of suits; it is something else altogether, namely that the government was offered 7,460 square feet, and the acting Postmaster General says the department did not inquire—

Mr. EULER: I did not say that.

Mr. MacNICOL: I understood the minister to say the department did not inquire from the owner whether they could have more space.