

But yet it is not an safe Matter to rid. Marched betwixt  
 their several provinces. Because, 1<sup>o</sup> Albeit the grand  
 Juries among Criminals arise from Circumstances  
 inferring that a Crime was Committed *op. ausilio* *Ap-*  
*tentia*, Mandate. *Bl.* of such a one: It is Relevant in  
 Law to label Art and part in General against an  
 Offence to the Commission of a Crime, without qualify-  
 the Manner of Accasion act 1541 Parl. 12 J. 6 whereby  
 the Justice necessarily turn Judges of the Relevancy  
 of the qualifications of Art and part labelled in ge-  
 ral, which offend in *Apicibus Juris*. 2<sup>o</sup> In advising  
 proof, some convenient points of Relevancy concern  
 the habilitie of witnesses, and the Import of Extra-  
 Judicial Confession frequently fall to be Considered  
 The Import of presumptions both also been Remit-  
 to the Consideration of the Justice August 1638 *Tob-*  
*Matrimon* 12 Aprile 1637 Andrew Math. Albeit  
 the quality and Circumstances of presumptions are  
 in effect the grounds and Relevancy of them. In  
 overindubie the Justices are only to Judge what is  
 Law, and the Justice Matters of fact. Thus by an  
 Act of the Privy Council of Scotland Dated 3 December  
 1669 and Recorded in the Books of the Journal that for  
 day, it was Declared, that the Justices are to Determine  
 all questions arising concerning the Relevancy of  
 proof: And that if the Jury should proceed to Accuse  
 notwithstanding of what is found to be legal Evidence  
 by the Justice, they are liable to be tried by an Appeal  
 of Error, and punished. For the Justice are sufficient  
 Judges of proof as to the Matter of fact: Yet whether  
 the testimony of a witness or Confession of a party  
 be legal proof *de jure*, or Not, is a point of Law  
 belongs to the Judge, and Not to the Jury. *Regulatione* *the*  
*liber*

labelled falls under the Cognizance of the Justices: there-  
 fore Advocates in any intricate case should not label  
 art and part simply, but specify grounds Art and part,  
 whereby the Judge will Determine the Relevancy of the  
 qualifications of Art and part. Sir George M. *the* *Prin-*  
*part* 2 Epit. 23 54 is of opinion, that all Inconveniences  
 of this sort might be Remedied and perfectly Cured, by  
 Subjecting the proof as well as the Relevancy to the  
 Cognizance of the Justices; which he offers as an Ex-  
 pedient over Law, and Inference with the Reason  
 following. 1<sup>o</sup> There is a Contingency or Affinity betwixt  
 Relevancy and proof, that they cannot be well separa-  
 ted in order to advising by Different Judges: And Many  
 intricate points of Relevancy fall to be Considered in  
 Examining proof. 2<sup>o</sup> Justices are oft times ignorant  
 persons who stumble at what is referred to them,  
 and Mistake what is found Relevant: And its Dange-  
 rous for them in Criminal causes to Judge according to  
 their private knowledge without Lawfull proof. In other  
 learned and civilized Nations, the Judges Decide both  
 the Relevancy and proof. Thus as we have already  
 observed from the old custom of Employing an In-  
 quest in civil cases; there is the like Reason to set them  
 also in Criminal trials: Especially Considering, that  
 for saving Expenses, Justices are seldom or never taken  
 out of the place where the Crime was Committed, but are  
 generally Burgesses of Edinburgh who know as little  
 of the Matter of fact as the Judges, and persons of that  
 kind are at a mighty loss in their private affairs by such  
 unnecessary Diversion. In England, and in Commissions  
 of Oyer and terminer in Scotland, the the Chairman  
 of the Court directs the Jury what is Law; yet they  
 mostly Determine both the point of Law and fact  
*de* *Supra*  
 When the Discourses to the Jury are Ended, they  
 Case