

upon our Seats of Justice) But nothing of that kind can reasonably happen to a Jury. For, 1. They are return'd by a sworn Officer. 2. Must be Men of a clear Reputation, and competent Estate. 3. Being Neighbours, they may know something of the Business on their own Knowledge. 4. Their Office is but a Trouble, not accompanied with any great Honour, nor any Profit at all. 5. They are all solemnly sworn to each particular Cause. 6. The Party may challenge thirty-five in Case of Treason, and twenty of them in Felony, without shewing any Cause; and as many more as he can assign Cause against. 7. Of the Grand Jury, twelve at least must joyn in the Verdict, and of the Petty Jury, every Man of the Twelve must consent upon his Oath, or else 'tis all Nothing. And lastly, if they give a corrupt Verdict between Party and Party, they are liable to an *Attaint*. [But I do not find any *Attaint* lies in criminal Causes, where the King is a Party.]

Now, let any Man of Sense consider, whether this Method be not more proper for *boulting* out the Truth, for finding out the *Guilty*, and preserving the *Innocent*, than if the whole Decision were left to the Examination of two or three, whose *Interest*, *Passion*, *Haste*, or *Multiplicity* of Business may easily betray them into Error.

Deservedly therefore is this Trial by *Juries* rank'd amongst the choicest of our fundamental Laws, which whosoever shall go about openly to suppress, or craftily to undermine, and render only a Formality, does *Ipso Facto* attack the Government, and brings in an Arbitrary Power, and is an Enemy and Traitor to his King and Country; for which reason *English* Parliaments have all along been most zealous for preserving this great Jewel of Liberty Trials by Juries having no less than; fifty