

After this state of facts relative position of L & Dr W. - what the effect of L. had been on Dr W. was the subject?

Now consider the general scope & purport of L: testimony - is to be taken as certain that Dr W. had the total possession of the premises & that he did in fact effectively exclude all other persons? - not only the scope - but design.

and further, that L means to fasten the imputation upon Dr W. by every circumstantial circumstance - the only matter to be considered.

Notes: The difference between truth and fabrication - The deceptive effect of truth - the complicated & imperfect complexion of falsehood.

Now trace L: conduct as he describes it -

1. Friday afternoon - & evening especially - when yet he had no ground of suspicion.

2. Saturday morning - the Sunday day - being sent out of the room by Dr W. - just & the indication that Dr W. was unwilling that he should be able to see what was going on below - & what was there.

3. Told Frankston this day that he saw Dr P. 2 or 3 days before - important proof of probability that Dr W. would have in this same effectual manner taken pains to offend L. that the weather was wrong then.