
PETITION.

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia.

We, the undersigned, property owners in the Municipality of Surrey, hereby humbly pray that your honourable body will not permit the insertion of any clause in the "Municipality Amendments Act" which will enable the Municipal Council of Surrey to legally assess property owners in said Municipality for certain moneys illegally spent by the said Municipal Council in the carrying out of certain dyking operations, to legalize the expenditure of which the said Municipal Council lately sought to pass through the House a Bill intituled the "Surrey Municipality Enabling Bill," which was very properly thrown out by your honourable body.

The said money was spent, not by the desire of the parties who are to be benefited by the said dyking scheme, nor by the desire of the whole of the ratepayers of the said Municipality, but on the authority of certain members of the said Municipal Council, who mismanaged the work and, solely on their own responsibility, spent many thousands of dollars on the work over and above the amount authorized by the original Bill; and now, having spent this large additional sum, and having, we are credibly informed, permitted the bondsmen to escape their liability, and also having failed to pass through the House their Enabling Bill, they purpose to carry out their designs, if possible, by having certain clauses inserted in the "Municipality Amendments Act," and thus to lay upon the unfortunate owners of lands within the area of the said dyking scheme a grievous burden, none of which will fall upon any of the members of the said Municipal Council—one man excepted—as all the rest do not own any land within the said area.

A more numerous signed petition, signed by those residing on the spot, will, in course of a few days, be laid before your honourable body. Meanwhile, this petition, signed by certain of the property owners at present resident in Victoria, is placed before you that you may be fully acquainted with the facts of the case. Meanwhile, it is earnestly hoped that your honourable body will not permit any such injustice to be practised under the sanction of law.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

J. D. PEMBERTON,

pp. F. B. Pemberton.

MOODYVILLE SAW MILL Co. (Limited),

pp. R. P. Rithet, President,

R. Seabrook.

JOHN B. CHANTRELL.

[Seal.]

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

—o—

NEW WESTMINSTER ENABLING BILL.

—

April 2nd, 1891.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Committee beg leave to report: That under and by virtue of the resolution in that behalf your Committee, after the fourteen days' notice set out in the resolution had been duly given to all parties, met and heard a large volume of evidence (which is returned with this report) on the matters dealt with in this Bill (No. 12) intituled "An Act respecting the Corporation of New Westminster," hereunto attached.

Your Committee find that the Council of the said City during the year 1889 deliberately exceeded the powers granted to it under the Act known as the "New Westminster Act, 1888," and amendments thereto.

Your Committee are of opinion that the said Act so submitted for inspection and report should not be passed in its present form, but should be so amended that while giving the ratepayers of New Westminster an opportunity of legalizing the past large expenditure of moneys, care should be taken that proper safeguards should be inserted to prevent any further illegal outlay on the works mentioned in the Bill; but in no case do we report or recommend that the Corporation of New Westminster should be empowered to carry on private electric lighting.

We further think from the evidence adduced that Bill (No. 12) should have been introduced as a Private Bill, with all the formalities and precautions attendant on that class of Bills.

GEO. B. MARTIN,

Chairman.