

general good of all the sufferers without distinction: that the subject has twice undergone discussion in the General Committee; and that the Sub-Committee are of opinion that the same cannot now be rescinded, notwithstanding their regret that the decision in question, has met the "solemn disapproval of the Petitioners, &c." The General Committee, with 25 members present, adopted this Report *unanimously*; and yet, on the 27th July, they rescind the measure in question by a majority of 30 to 10, which had been originally adopted in a meeting of 49, and subsequently confirmed in a meeting of 60, by a majority of 36 to 24. Nay, they rescind a measure which they had *unanimously* declared they were *deeply convinced* was for the *good of all*, and which *could not be rescinded!* What becomes now of the consistency of that Body in declaring, "that as far as it is in the power of the Committee to compel it, Proprietors are compelled to rebr'ld," &c. What becomes of the paraded restrictions which justified the enormous advantages awarded to the richer class of Proprietors, but which are abolished now that those advantages are secured?—leaving that *petted class*, "as far as it is in the power of the Committee," in the enjoyment of the favors heaped upon *them*, to the detriment of poorer sufferers, fettered by no other restrictions than those of their own inclinations! What becomes, also, of the principle "always avowed" (it is presumed no longer so) of "constraining Proprietors," &c.? What, of the benefit deceptively held out to poor Tenants in the shape of reduced rents, from the numerous houses which Proprietors were to be *compelled to build*? What, of "the distress of the time"—"the very kind of distress which chiefly exists," the "houses that are wanted"? What of the object, "second only in importance and pressing obligation to the relief of the destitute—the prevention of similar calamities"? What, likewise, of the "prudent precautions against the recurrence of fire, which the general experience had suggested"? What, even, of "the future safety of the City"? Surely the old majority will themselves be at length "constrained" to confess, that, whatever may be thought of the aggravated abuses of the Second Distribution, its *inconsistencies* can be neither palliated nor denied.

P. S.—The General Committee consists of about 120 members.

The celebrated blanks (see page 6.) are still in *statu-quo*, after a lapse of nine weeks, and the official publication of the Report, already published by the Secretary, is still delayed.

With reference to the seven cases left to be disposed of by the Committee of Distribution "as they pleased" (see page 39); it has *pleased* that Committee to pass them all, not only for their Dividends, but, six of the set they belonged to, for their "Canada-Insurance compensation" also. The reader uninitiated in the "mysteries" will ask what that is. The Committee decreed that the Canada Company's policies were worth only 12s. 6d. in the £., and then (with a few modifications) ordered 25 per cent on 7s. 6d. in the £., to compensate sufferers insured at that office. Compensation has thus been made upon about £35,000. of Canada Insurance; and, among the parties compensated, the £6,000 case mentioned at page 38 as one of the above set, received £112. 10s. to *make amends* for the bad fortune of having £1,200. of Canada Insurance! Query:—If the Canada Company should pay 20s. in the £., as some shrewd persons suspect they will, will there be any refunding?