

faces on St. Clair avenue. It is on the north-east corner. Then, east of the main entrance, in the same building, is a store. I know that the former government, while in office, was offered the whole building, and I am surprised to hear the acting minister say that no inquiry was made of the owner as to whether or not they could have more space.

Mr. EULER: I did not say that.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am glad to hear that. Did the government inquire?

Mr. EULER: I do not know.

Mr. MacNICOL: Do the officials know?

Mr. FACTOR: May I interrupt the hon. member to tell him that the owner's solicitor had seen me, and had told me that the owner of the old post office had no further space to give to the government.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, but I know the hon. member for Trinity—I mean Spadina—knows as well as I do—

Mr. FACTOR: I am not the member for Trinity.

Mr. MacNICOL: He knows as well as I do that it is one building. In the first place the government rented part of the building, and they left the store on the right side of the front door. The hon. member for Trinity knows that well, because he lives out there.

Mr. FACTOR: I am not the member for Trinity.

Mr. MacNICOL: For Spadina, then.

Mr. EULER: I do not know that much is to be gained by continuing this discussion. I am sure the hon. member will accept my answer when I say that I have asked for all the correspondence there is in the matter and it discloses that there is nothing in the department to indicate that the owner of the first property ever offered the property either for the additional amount of \$50 a month, or free. The hon. member now admits that it was not offered free. I would say this without attempting—to use a vulgar term—to pass the buck, if there were any necessity to secure a new space it would not be the Post Office Department that would enter into negotiations; it would be the Department of Public Works. But I would still say that in the final analysis the department required more space, and that it received more space at a less price per foot than we were paying before. That is my final answer.

Mr. MacNICOL: I cannot let the acting minister get away with the statement that he received more space at a less price per

foot, basing his statement on his figures of a few moments ago, namely 78.8 cents and ninety-five cents. As I have said, with the additional part the department could have had, the price then would have been eighty cents per foot, or 1.2 cents more per foot.

Mr. EULER: I have no knowledge that that was ever offered to the department. I do not question the hon. member's word when he says he had a conversation with the owner, and that he was told that an offer had been made at \$50 a month extra. But so far as I know, the department has no knowledge of that offer, and I think it would be fair to assume that if he wanted to rent us more space, naturally he would be asking the same rate per square foot as he received for the space we already had.

Mr. MacNICOL: The acting minister would not treat anybody like that. He is too square a man to treat anybody like that—after having a tenant for ten years to just—

Mr. EULER: Did the hon. member say I was a squarehead or a square man?

Mr. MacNICOL: I said "a square man." I would not say anything unkind about the minister.

Mr. EULER: I am sure the hon. member would not.

Mr. MacNICOL: But I would not treat anybody like that, and the minister would not, either. I have quite a number of tenants, and certainly I would not expect to be treated like that by a tenant, nor would I treat a tenant in that way. I say this is one of the shabbiest transactions between the government as a tenant and the owner of a building I have ever come in contact with, and I do not believe for a moment that more space is all that was behind this.

Mr. HEAPS: From what I have heard of this discussion I would not be surprised if there was a nigger somewhere in the wood-pile.

Mr. MacNICOL: Half a dozen.

Mr. HEAPS: I was thinking of only one. If that nigger could be discovered, I think we would find written across him the word "patronage."

Mr. LAWSON: In whitewash.

Mr. HEAPS: I think something should be said about patronage while we are discussing this particular vote. I am very much opposed to patronage and I think the less hon. members