

doctrine of reviving those claims of the House of Commons, which were in use *before* the revolution; for I know *how far* the doctrine would extend, if admitted. The dispute, during the times of *wisdom* and *liberty*, has more weight with my mind than a few precedents during the times of *bondage* and *ignorance*. The argument lies in a narrow compass; *during the suspension* of a representative, is not the constituent *deprived* of his representative in Parliament? Has he, or has he not a constitutional right to be represented? Has he a power of choosing another in the place of the offender? Has the nation its full number of representatives, whilst four of them are disabled from acting? Is it not a grievance where the constituents are obstinately refused, even the *one* man who is their favourite? Is it not a *greater* grievance to be precluded from *even* the *second* man of their choice, or the *third*, or the *fourth*, or any representative at all? Hortensius has attempted to answer this plain argument; take his own words, “with respect to the constituent, expulsion is not more lenient than suspension; because, during the interval between expulsion and a new election, the electors are unrepresented; and because, during a similar interval, in the instance of suspension, they may apply for their member, until which application they cannot comply; and until the refusal of which application, Parliament cannot be called severe.” To this I answer, it is a  
gross