

# PETITION.

—o—

*To the Honourable the Speaker and the Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia, in Parliament assembled:*

The humble petition of the undersigned owners of land within the valley of the Serpentine River, proposed to be assessed under the Surrey Dyking Scheme, sheweth:—

That whereas a Bill, entitled “An Act relating to certain public works in the District of Surrey,” has lately come to our notice:

And whereas the said Bill is for the purpose of validating certain illegal assessments upon us, in connection with the Surrey Dyking and Drainage scheme:

And whereas your petitioners have received no notice that this Bill would apply for powers to levy a special assessment upon landowners within the Dyking scheme survey:

And whereas the following facts were clearly proven by sworn evidence before the Private Bills Committee, and by certified copies from the Clerk of the Surrey Council:

(1.) That the scheme was illegal, there being no authority to dyke within the “Municipal Act, 1889.”

(2.) That out of the 51 persons finally included within the scheme, only 22 signed petition in favour of same, and consequently the majority required by law was not obtained.

(3.) That a petition signed by the largest farmers within the scheme was presented to the Surrey Council in the spring of 1890, before the second expenditure, protesting against the manner in which the work was being done and stating that further expenditure would be waste of money.

(4.) That your petitioners had no opportunity to withdraw from the second assessment, as the money was expended before the by-law was passed levying the assessment upon us.

(5.) That our lands have not increased in value on account of the dyke, as the works are broken and useless.

And whereas the passage of this Bill would validate the Surrey Dyking and Drainage Scheme, and under the “Municipal Act, 1891,” the Council could then be compelled to keep the works in repair, against the wish of the majority:

And whereas the Surrey Corporation refused to authorize the Reeve of 1891 to issue debentures for the above expenditure:

And whereas Mr. J. Punch signed the above documents some three months after he had vacated the office of Reeve and after the Surrey Council had refused to issue same:

Therefore, your petitioners pray that your honourable body will reject the aforesaid Bill and allow the Courts of Law to settle and adjust the many vital matters in dispute:

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

Dated this 29th day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1892.

Ernest M. Wiltshire,  
John T. Morton,  
George W. Cann,

C. C. Cameron,  
William Johnson,  
Christopher Brown,

And 7 others.