

the liberties of Nova Scotians, the finest people on the face of the earth. The United States, France, even England herself, Italy, Russia, Prussia or Austria, would readily guarantee the independence of a country like this. I have not a shadow of doubt that our liberties would be guaranteed. But if it were not so, what then? Helpless, unable to protect ourselves against the surrounding nations, cast off by our rightful sovereign, rejected by her Parliament, destitute of any assistance from abroad we should have to yield to the inexorable decrees of fate; but we should do so with dignified resignation. We should then wrap around us the mantle of our rejected loyalty, our despised patriotism, and our injured and insulted rights, and if we must succumb to irresistible necessity, we will sink as Cæsar fell beneath the daggers of assassins at the base of Pompey's statue.

The House adjourned.

FRIDAY, Feb. 21.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

A call of the House was had, and the Repeal resolutions and amendments thereto were taken up.

On the resolutions being put to the House, the answer was in the affirmative.

It was moved that the vote be recorded in the Journals as unanimous.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that this was the first time he had ever heard of a member of the majority moving for a division under such circumstances. As the Speaker was aware—the voices decide and not the names. In the present case the voices had decided, and the House could not go beyond that. There was

only one way gentlemen could have a division, and that was by some one belonging to the majority calling "no" when the question was put; but whoever did so would be obliged to vote for the nays when the division took place.

Hon. SPEAKER said that the question had been put and decided in the affirmative, and now it was asked that a division be taken. He did not care to take the question in that way, unless it came from the minority. Parliamentary rules were made for the minority and not for the majority—in fact, they were intended to protect the weak. He would now, however, order that the vote be entered unanimously.

Mr. BLANCHARD would of course submit to whatever course the Speaker might adopt, but he would at the same time respectfully urge that no vote be entered unanimously except with the consent of the whole House.

Hon. SPEAKER said there were no negative voices, and therefore it was competent to enter the vote unanimously. He explained again, in answer to Mr. DesBrissay and others, that it was unparliamentary to take a division unless gentlemen answered "no" when the question was put.

Mr. BLANCHARD again contended that the vote could not be made unanimous except by general consent.

Hon. SPEAKER replied that silence gave consent, and the voices were unanimous.

Mr. MORRISON said the hon. gentleman was at last convinced on the question of Repeal.

Hon. SPEAKER hoped that gentlemen would not bring up such matters.

Mr. BLANCHARD did not require the member for Colchester to teach him his duty.