

beach, upon the terms stated in the last mentioned order in Council.

But these gentlemen have since petitioned repeatedly to have the rent reduced, principally because, as they allege, a concession was made to Mr. John S. Campbell, of a beach lot upon more favourable terms.

The petitioners have been answered by a Report of Council, entering into various distinctions between the two cases, and the Report goes to shew, that the instances were not parallel, and that the concession to Mr. Campbell was not more favourable under all the circumstances, than that to Messrs. Bonner and Petry.

But the Committee do not, at this time, think it expedient to enter into these questions of comparison. They cannot say, that they would have assented to so palpable an undervaluation, as that made by the experts, and in the disposal of the property of the Crown—they would have avoided carefully any comparison of sales to be made, with others already perfected. They think the only question must be, whether the petitioners have or have not been charged more for the property, than its real bona fide value—and with a view to this question, the Committee are of opinion, that no injustice has been done.

The Committee are respectfully of opinion, that even if the case attempted to be made out, of a great difference between the terms upon which the land was conceded to Mr. Campbell, and those upon which they purchased, was fully established, it would only have proved, that a great error had been committed in the case of the former sale; and the discovery of an error is, in the opinion of the Committee, the weakest reason in favour of its being perpetuated. For these reasons, the Committee respectfully recommend, that the claim of Messrs. Bonner and Petry be finally dismissed. The Committee have carefully examined the claim of Mr. James Reyner, in relation to this lot and improvements thereupon, in which he claims