

or Discourse, though the Witnesses roundly swear all the express words in the Indictment, yet unless they will relate and set forth the Substance of the whole Talk, 'tis impossible the Jury should judge of the Matter; for the foregoing and subsequent words may render Expressions that are innocent and loyal, which taken to halves, may be rank Treason; as if one should say, *To affirm the King has no more Right to the Crown of England than I have, (which is the Opinion of the Jesuits, of His Majesty, if once excommunicated by the Pope) is detestable Treason.* And two Men at some distance, not well hearing, or remembring, or maliciously designing against his Life, should swear — That he said *The King had no more right to the Crown than he had.* Now that the Man did utter these very words is true; but if you ask the Evidence the rest of the Colloquium, they shall tell you there was much more Discourse, but they cannot remember it; what Satisfaction is this to a Jury? Or would it not be hard, for a Man to be put to hold up his Hand at the Bar, under the frightful Charge of Treason in this Case? Or if a Minister, in his Sermon, should recite that of the Psalms, *The Fool hath said in his Heart there is no God:* Jesuited Evidence may now come and charge him with Blasphemy, and swear that he said, *There was no God:* And ask them what Expressions besides he used, may excuse themselves, and say, 'Tis a great while ago, we cannot remember a whole Sermon, but this we also positively swear, *He said there was no God.*

The Inquiry of a Grand Jury should be suitable to their Title, a *Grand Inquiry*; else instead of serving their Country, and presenting real Crimes, they may oppress the Innocent, as in the Case of *Samuel Wright* and *John Good*, at a Sessions in the *Old-Baily*, about December 1681. Good indicts
Wright