

ment grounds of the back premises of the hotel.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course, nature unadorned has its own beauty; but I do not know that fine buildings are an offence to the eye, but quite the contrary.

Mr. FOWLER. I am speaking of the rear of the hotel.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where will the hotel offices be?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The plan provides for a terrace extending over the canal. The offices are to be below that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How are the people to get into the park—through the bar of the hotel?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There will be a space of 120 feet from the hotel to the other side of Mackenzie avenue.

Mr. PERLEY. The right hon. gentleman said that the people of Ottawa had decided that they wanted the hotel there. I do not understand that the people of Ottawa had anything to say about the situation at all. The people of Ottawa want a good hotel in the city; but if a vote of the people of Ottawa were taken to-morrow as to whether they would prefer to have the hotel in Major's Hill Park or in another place, they would vote to have it in another place. The great majority of the people of Ottawa want an hotel, and when the government offered this land to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purpose, the people of Ottawa were willing to have it there, but would have preferred to have it somewhere else. This hotel is going to get the benefit of the whole of Major's Hill Park. Even if there is a space left as an entrance, the park really will become a back garden for the hotel. The hotel may be built in such a way that its front will really be on Major's Hill Park; so that the guests of the hotel will practically have the use of the whole park, while the people of the city of Ottawa will not make very much use of it at all. If the government have made up their mind to put this Bill through, I suppose they will put it through. At the same time, I think it was a very wrong and improper thing for the government, without consulting parliament, to have made an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which they ask their followers to put through, whether they think it right or not, in order to put in this place an hotel which will entirely cut off the view of the new buildings which it is proposed to erect on Mackenzie avenue, and which this hotel will certainly make it very hard for any one to see.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. PERLEY. I would ask the minister whether it is possible for a person standing on Dufferin or Sappers' bridge to see the new buildings on Mackenzie avenue when the hotel is between the two.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he goes and plants himself in one spot where he cannot see the new building, of course his view will be blocked.

Mr. PERLEY. Well, he might go to Sussex street and see them, I suppose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or he could take a balloon.

Mr. PERLEY. This hotel will cut the government property in two, and there are plenty of places just as good for the purpose as that particular spot.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

Mr. PERLEY. I would think just above the Supreme court is as good a site as can be found in the world for a hotel, and there are other places. I do not see that the hon. gentleman is warranted in putting a hotel there on the plea that the city of Ottawa wants it. The people of Ottawa need a hotel but they do not want it in that particular place.

Mr. BENNETT. Have these plans been ear-marked and before the Bill passes, will there be an agreement between the government and the company to put up a hotel according to them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are ear-marked in this sense. They are in the custody of the city. The mayor allowed me to have them for the purpose of showing them here. They will be returned to him and we will see that these identical plans are submitted to the Governor in Council for approval.

Mr. BENNETT. As far as the city of Ottawa is concerned, they have practically nothing to do with the giving of the land or the construction of the hotel beyond their arrangement with the company regarding taxes. On the passage of this Bill, this land will rest in the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before giving a conveyance, we must have the plans submitted to us and approved by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. What is there to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway coming back in a couple of months and saying: We will not build on these plans. They will then be free to exact new plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clearly not because the city has acted in good faith and entered into a written agreement with the company by which the company have bound themselves to build according to these plans. The Governor in Council will not allow any departure from these plans unless, on the advice of our chief architect, we think they should be altered. But we will allow no