

Q. I am going to have one more try. Look at the daily record of hours of work and tell us what the reference to 6 o'clock, 21.8.1961 means?

A. 21.8.61?

Q. I know what that means. What does the 6 o'clock?

A. On the 22nd? [*Sic*]

Q. Yes.

A. Well, it is roughly the time I finished driving, when I reached home.

Q. But I thought you said ...

A. Probably that Monday night I did not put that 6 o'clock in, just put it down as near a time as I could get it. I am not a clock-watcher.

Q. But you were still in the shop till seven?

A. I might have been in the shop after seven. I am not saying it is seven o'clock.

Q. Then what is the use of the 6 o'clock in the column?

A. What I do with my private time is nothing. That is a quarter of an hour slip of the pen, as you might say.

Q. You are not having a slip of the mind are you?

A. No, I am not. My brain is as good as yours. (Vol. XII, pp. 29-30.)

Once again there was this contradiction, so common among prosecution witnesses, between certainty about crucial events (such as the time he went into the sweet shop on the Monday and Tuesday, exactly who was in there at the time, etc., etc.) and vagueness when it came to linking the surrounding circumstances to these events. His entries in the logs, said Mr Harding, which appeared to suggest that he had called in at the sweet shop earlier on the Tuesday than on the Monday, were vague. In this respect he was not a clock-watcher. But when it came to precise details about going into the shop, his memory was absolutely clear and his clock-watching precise.

I interviewed Mr Harding on April 7th, 1970, over a cup of tea in ... although obviously