

THE LEGAL NEWS.

VOL. XVIII.

OCTOBER 1, 1895.

No. 19.

CURRENT TOPICS AND CASES.

In the interest of the administration of justice it is to be lamented that in cases where nearly all the witnesses are of the same nationality as the accused, counsel cannot or do not act in concert in an endeavor to secure a jury speaking the language of the prisoner. Mixed juries are objectionable on several grounds. In the first place there is the obvious objection that the trials usually take nearly double the time that would be consumed if no translation of evidence and no duplication of the addresses of counsel and of the judge's charge were necessary. Take the Demers case, for instance, in which after a trial lasting a whole month the jury have disagreed. This case would probably have been concluded within sixteen or seventeen days if the jury had been composed of persons speaking the same language. In the next place, we have a strong impression that the jury never follow or appreciate the evidence so well if it has to be translated; and this is especially true if the translation is a poor one, or if the interpreter becomes over-fatigued, as is apt to occur in the course of a long trial. Still more important is it that during a trial in which the evidence is long and complicated the jury should be able to communicate freely with one another, without the cumbersome medium