

This is
of being
rokes of
er should
ld meet
ou need
pon the
a thing
and not
e direct

shews,
as been
y of the
vidently
Father's
up the
e mea-
he Pre-
re and
e Diet
Sanc-
omical
from
without
mpire's
Queen
listen
ed on
f Ba-
g no
e ad-
at she
ought
ere is
rence
es to
be

be one's Right, and defending what one knows to be one's own ; the former may be Obstinacy, but the latter never can. Besides, Sir, while the Queen of *Hungary* acts as she does, she has a Right to claim, not only the Guaranty of the Empire, but of all the other Powers, who guaranteed that Succession which she defends ; but the Moment she consents to divide or alienate that Succession, she gives up that Right ; and can you call her refusing to give it up Obstinacy ? If so, Sir, you must alter all Languages as well as Laws ; and teach us a new Dialect, in consequence of this new way of thinking.

From hence too appears the Nonsense of another Suggestion : Pardon the Expression, Sir, since I am going to prove it is just. We have heard the Queen of *Hungary* accused for not submitting this Dispute to the Imperial Diet, and for not accepting the Mediation of the States of the Empire when offered, though it was certainly impossible for her to do either. Could she submit to the States of the Empire the Decision of that Point, which they had already decided in the most solemn manner, and upon which solemn Act of theirs her Right is founded ? Or could she accept their Mediation after this their solemn Decision ? Would not either of these have been a palpable Absurdity, and was she not extremely in the Right to save the States of the Empire, in their present Circumstances, the Shame of taking on themselves an Office they could not perform ? Lay your Hand upon your Heart, Sir, and say whether these Propositions were not made on purpose to draw her into this Dilemma, either of departing from her Right, which she must have done by submitting to the one, or accepting of the other ; or giving her