

in opposition; in their defence, I am not afraid to enter the lists with Hortensius, and to ascribe to them the character not only of impartial and sensible men, but, on this occasion, of *preservers of the constitution*; my reasons for thinking so, I submit, gentlemen, to your impartiality, and to that of the public. Hortensius asserts, that suspension is not an unconstitutional *idea*; and endeavours to shew that those dangers which are justly apprehended from the assumed powers of another House of Commons, are not to be feared, though the doctrine of *suspension* should be admitted. He asserts, "that with respect to the Member, expulsion is *more severe*." I admit, gentlemen, that it is so; but, I say, that it may yet be less UNCONSTITUTIONAL with respect to the constituent; for in the case of suspension, the constituent has no power to choose an innocent person, in the room of the guilty; had Hortensius been content to *palliate* this measure by an appeal to analogy or to precedent, I should not have envied him the possession of such a defence. I admit that the power of suspension *has* been exercised, as well as that of inflicting *corporal punishments*, and of *imposing fines*, though by no means so frequently. But when he asserts it to be a *constitutional idea*, when he insinuates that it should be revived after the disuse of near and hundred years, when he appeals to reason and justice, the only recommendations of precedent, I must deny so *dangerous* a position; I must condemn the