

be proved - with the exception only that Dr W. advised  
Dr P by false pretences to go to the College - that he persuaded  
that he wanted him to go there to receive the money due  
to him, which in fact his sole intention was to extort  
him to go there for the purpose of oppression -

This fact is altogether denied - & the proofs in  
relation to it will be explained -

The Gov<sup>t</sup> will attempt to prove two facts. 1. That  
the Dpt designated the fund in the ticket wrong, as  
the source from which he was to provide himself with  
means of pay<sup>t</sup>, & that that fund was otherwise  
disposed of. 2<sup>d</sup>. That Dr W. had no other  
means from whom he could have raised so much  
money as he professes to have paid.

& I enq<sup>r</sup> will they not ask why Dr W. did not buy Dr P's house?

The first fact will be fully denied, & openly  
admitted - & to be explained.

As to the 2<sup>d</sup> fact, it will be seen that the  
Gov<sup>t</sup> rely wholly on circumstances - in direct proof

And the circumstances are general inability  
- frequent in various matters in former occasions  
- & particularly instances of inability to pay

3 See what evidence they produce in this  
subject from the same.