

*Mr. Fox* condemned such a nomination, as infinitely too small. To transmit the British constitution to all the colonies of Great Britain, *Mr. Fox* said, he well knew was impossible ; but to pretend to do any thing like it, and to name 30 persons as a popular assembly representing 100,000, was so gross a fallacy, that he hoped it would be no longer attempted to be said that we gave Canada even a sketch of the British constitution, or any thing like it.

*Mr. Powys* said, the number of inhabitants he understood amounted to 150,000.

*Mr. Barnard*, in answer to *Mr. Powys*, said, that was supposed to have been the number of inhabitants in the whole province of Canada, before it was attempted to be divided.

*Mr. Dundas* said, they could not pretend to give Canada the same constitution as they themselves lived under : all they could do was to lay the foundation for the same constitution, when increased population and time should have made the Canadians ripe to receive it, and to enjoy the same blessings.

*Mr. Fox* insisted on it, that an Assembly consisting of 30, as the representatives of 100,000, might be an excellent Assembly, a wise Assembly, a virtuous Assembly, or an enterprising Assembly, but it could not be called a popular Assembly.

*Mr. Martin* wondered that *Mr. Dundas* should argue that the constitution would be ruined by a more equal representation. Did he wish the Assembly in Canada, *Mr. Martin* asked, to resemble some representative bodies in other countries, where there were sham elections, and footmen dressed up in their masters' clothes, and sent to parliament.

*Colonel Simcoe* read an extract from an American paper, to prove that the Congress thought a very small number sufficient for the members forming the House of Assembly for a western province, and that two or four would be enough to represent Montreal and Quebec.

The qualifications of electors were moved and agreed to