

A workman is killed by falling from a scaffolding erected by another. The scaffolding has given way. The builder may be to blame.

A person dies from the results of a surgical operation; if the operation has not been properly performed, or if it was performed when it should not have been performed, it may be a case of crime.

A person falls from a roof and dies from injuries occasioned by the fall; if another has directly or indirectly contributed to this fall, it may be a case of crime.

A child dies scalded, burned, while he was in the charge, or while he should have been in the charge of another. It may be a case of criminal negligence.

Many analogous occurrences might be cited, but these will suffice to show the usefulness of investigation in all cases of violent death.

48. No doubt investigation in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred prove the absence of homicide.

It is not for that reason, however, that fitting investigation should be dispensed with. If earnest investigation is not made in all cases, how is the crime-stained accident to be known from that which is not so?

Much more so, if death following upon an accident is allowed to pass unnoticed, and plain murder alone is to be investigated, murderers will soon lend their crimes the appearance of accidents.

It would be encouraging crime.

Finally, investigations are made to discover things not apparent at the first glance. They are hardly useful in the case of patent murder. They are so in the case of secret homicide.

All accidents may conceal homicide.

I stop here; this is sufficient to convince all sane beings of the necessity of investigation in all cases of violent death.