

would be the impropriety of suspending them for ever, by an act of perpetual operation? With regard to the Noble Lord's argument relative to the evading of these Indemnity Bills, he admitted, if any person neglected to conform, merely for the sake of evading the law, he certainly acted in direct opposition to an Act of Parliament, and did not conduct himself as a good subject ought to do. While an act was deemed fit to remain in force, it was the duty of every good subject not to evade it. Indeed the only justification of evading a statute, that could be for a moment maintained, was, where that statute notoriously ought not to remain in force; and when to evade it, on account of its nature and tendency, was meritorious. He trusted, however, that the House would consent to go into the Committee, because, if they meant to resist the repeal of the Test Act, they ought, at least, to go into the Committee, to inquire whether it was fitting or necessary to be repealed, or not, and not deny the requisition, as if they were ashamed even to look at the Statutes in question; as if they were ashamed to examine, lest they should be convinced.