

the ditch were long enough. Farmers, though, as a rule, have a great dislike to have anything done about their places by other parties. Being very conservative as a class they generally are of the idea that a piece of ditching would be cheaper to them if they did it themselves, although it should take up all their spare time for a summer, than if the whole job was let by contract and thrown out in a couple of weeks. Engineers will find that to be their greatest trouble in advocating the Municipal Act in preference to the 1883 Act, although the fact that the cost of such drainage will extend over ten years, with interest at the low rate of five per cent., is a great incentive to have drainage done under the Municipal Act. The Municipal Act does not provide for the appointment of an engineer, it says: "An engineer or Provincial Land Surveyor," whereas, the Ditches and Watercourses Act of 1883 (Sec. 4.) states that every Municipal Council shall appoint an engineer to carry out the provisions of this Act, and in Section 21 it defines the word engineer as meaning "civil engineer, land surveyor, or such person any municipality by by-law may deem competent to perform the duties required under this Act." I am informed that movements have at several times been made to have the word engineer struck out of Section 4, and the words Provincial Land Surveyor inserted in place of it. Such a proceeding is altogether unnecessary as the *engineers* (!) appointed by several municipalities are, by their awards, etc., working gradually their own extinction.

The Ditches and Watercourses Act (Sec. 5) provides that *any owner* may force an outlet for the drainage of his lands, which is a distinction from the Municipal Act, which makes it necessary for the majority in number, etc. To sum up the Ditches and Watercourses Act, any owner can call a meeting of the several other owners who would be affected or benefited by a ditch or drain to agree, if possible, on the portions of such ditch or drain to be dug by each. Failing to agree, the first-mentioned owner may request the engineer appointed by the municipality to be called on to examine the premises and make his award, from which award any party interested can appeal to the County Judge. Under this Act the award is made in respect to the *quantity of the ditch to be made and completed by each party*. The quantity is to be expressed in the award as from stake marked — to stake marked —, describing the position of each stake. It is always best, however, to determine the position of the stakes by the calculation of the number of cubic yards or feet, and find from the result, by a direct proportion, the amount of dirt each party has to remove, which will generally bear the same ratio to the whole number of cubic yards or feet that the amount of his land to be drained bears to the area of the whole tract to be drained. Any award made under this Act, which allots money payments to one or more parties, instead of portions of the ditch, would not be worth the paper that it was written on, and would be immediately set aside by the County Judge, should the award be appealed. The last sentence is a distinction from the Municipal Act, in which the report specifies a certain value of the improvement to each lot, which value the party owning said lot is to pay, or, as it is given in some reports, the value of improvement is given at a certain sum per acre, and the cost of the ditch or the increase of the rate of taxation is placed at a certain per cent. of that value. For instance, the value of the improvement is placed