

Under these circumstances, and if, as has been alleged, this report was sufficiently definite and positive to warrant prompt action, what was the duty of those responsible for the administration of justice in this province,

This matter surely should not have been permitted to end in the present unsatisfactory condition. The blood of the murdered girl still "cries from the ground." It was due to justice, it was due to the witness, who is necessarily under a certain amount of suspicion, and it was due to the protection of the public, and possibly of the girl herself, that some definite action should have been taken.

It is impossible to suppose that those responsible for the administration of justice have not been kept advised of, at least, all information that has become public property; and now the difficulties of the case are largely increased by the fact that the principal witness—the only witness who was in the house at the time of the murder, and who was in the mental condition spoken of by the specialists—has been permitted to leave the country.

Even if we assume that the Crown has not lost sight of the wanderer and she is being shadowed, is that sufficient? Is this the action that should have been taken? How long is this to go on? It is quite possible that at any moment the shadower might be outwitted, or that some catastrophe might occur.

It is not right that the innocent should be kept under suspicion; it is not right that the guilty should go unpunished, and it is not right, if the theory above referred to be correct, that a dangerous lunatic should be at large. The responsibility does not now rest on those who had charge of the inquest, but on those who are responsible for the administration of justice in this province. There may be some good reason for the inaction of the government, but if so the public would like to know it. If there is no good reason, this inaction is surprising and most reprehensible.