

We do not mean to refuse to pay for the dyke when it will be declared to be a good and substantial work by competent persons, and when it will have been tested by high water. But is it just to force upon us the acceptance of a dyke after the report of an Engineer whose inability or partiality can be proved, and before such a work has had any chance of being tested by high water?

Since there is disagreement between the different parties interested, respecting the efficiency of the dyke, what we ask for is to have the matter decided by arbitration, in the manner described in the clause 4th of 'Sumas Dyking Act.' Let the contractor appoint an arbitrator, the owners of the land another, and such arbitrators appoint a third one, and should the decision of the arbitrators be unsatisfactory to any of the two parties, it would be subject to be set aside on application to the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

We sincerely hope that the Legislative Assembly will not refuse us a request so just and so moderate. Our sanguine opinion is that the Matsqui prairie may be reclaimed, and we are very anxious to have our lands *well and effectually* reclaimed, as the Dyking Act requires it. We feel confident that, should the remarks made by Mr. Navarre and Mr. Gore have been attended to, the Matsqui dyke would have proved to be satisfactory to all