

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 Resol-  
 utions 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 divi-  
 sion, and that was by some one belonging to  
 the majority calling "no" when the ques-  
 tion was put, but whoever did so would  
 be obliged to vote for the nays when the divi-  
 sion 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. Par-  
 liamentary 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 en-  
 ter the vote unanimously. He explained  
 again, in answer to Mr. DesBrisay 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 Res-  
 ol.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD did not require the mem-  
 ber for Colchester to teach him his duty.