any Law to be, that is enacted (as you fay) by Perfons chosen contrary to Law.

Page 13. " The Acts of an English Parlia-"ment, whenever they shall be arbitrary, and the "defpotic Mandates of a Persian Sophi, are equally "tyrannical." Still splitting on the Rock of Comparison: And why is the Persian Monarch to be lugged in as a Tyrant? Surely those only are Acts of Tyranny, which are oppressively enacted contrary to the established Laws of a Country: But the Persian Empire acknowledges the Will of their Sovereign as a Law, therefore his royal Mandates can in no Sense be deemed tyrannical. But to shew this Argument of our Author, in its proper Light, I will state it fyllogistically.

The Acts of an English Parliament, and the defpotic Mandates of a Persian Sophi, are equally tyrannical.

But the despotic Mandates of a *Persian* Sophi are not tyrannical.

Therefore the Acts of an English Parliament are not tyrannical.

In the fame Page you fay, " It may eafily " happen that a Minifter may distate as despoticly " as a Sophi." Which Expression I imagine contains a finall Contradiction in Terms. For, to distate, is lawfully to command fuch Persons as have no referved inherent Right to difobey. But. if the Senate of Great Britain have a Right to give a negative Voice, no one can then properly be faid to distate to them : Much lefs a Minister. for that is a Term of fubordinate Condition : But to dictate is the Office of one legally invefted with fupream Power, therefore a Minister can no more be a Dictator, than a Dictator can be a Minister. They are Incompatibilities in fe. But Inaccuracies and