

Pritchett was a fugitive from justice when he signed the affidavit, and he gave as his reason for making the affidavit that he wanted the warrant against him to be withdrawn in order that he might return to Canada, and the warrant was withdrawn.

When Mr. Whitney moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government on the 22nd day of March, 1900, he read the Pritchett affidavit as the reason why the Government should be defeated. An Opposition that depends for a case on such evidence is certainly driven to the very last ditch, and Mr. Whitney's action in the matter is unworthy of the position he occupies as a member of the Conservative party. He must have known that Pritchett was a fugitive from justice. The affidavit itself declared that he had used a false name in order to get appointed Deputy Returning Officer. It is also stated that he had violated the Election Law by miscounting or "slipping" the ballots. All these facts are set forth on the face of the affidavit, so that at the time Mr. Whitney made his charge against the Government, he was using the testimony of a man who was a fugitive from justice, who had endeavored to pass himself off under an assumed name, and who had declared that he had violated the Election Law.

During the trial Pritchett was characterized by Judge Morgan as a self-convicted liar. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Whitney holds the original affidavit of Pritchett in his possession, and declares it to be a precious document. One of the proudest moments of his life was when he used that document.

The question may be asked why is not Pritchett prosecuted for personation.

The answer to that is that as the law stood at the time he personated one Marshall B. Johnson, there was no provision in the law for punishing for the personation of a Deputy Returning Officer. An amendment to that has been made, however, since by the Attorney-General.

Then why should he not be prosecuted for forgery?

The answer to that is, that under the criminal code the offence is not one that comes under the description of forgery.

Then why not prosecute him for perjury?

The answer to that is, he made his declaration in the City of Detroit where he was beyond the reach of Canadian law.

What will be thought of the leader of a Party who would attempt to make political capital out of affidavits made by such men as J. G. Pritchett?