

901538

E. E. CRUSSELLE, Sworn for the Movant. I am a court reporter and reported part of the testimony of Dr. H. F. Harris, at the trial of Leo M. Frank during the month of August, 1913, in Fulton Superior Court; The following testimony is a portion of the testimony of Dr. Harris, which I reported, and which appears on pages 1481 and 1482 of the stenographic record of the testimony in said cause:

Q. Doctor, when did Mr. Dorsey first talk with you about making this autopsy? A. I don't remember.
Q. How long before you made the examination did he talk with you? A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall when you made the first examination? A. It was on May 5th, if I remember correctly.
Q. May 5th? The child died on April 26th or 27th - that would be about nine days afterwards? A. Yes sir, if I am correct, in that statement, it was.
Q. Did Mr. Dorsey request you not to make the examination public? A. He did.
Q. Did he request you not to tell it to anybody? A. He did.
Q. And you observed that request? A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand he was making the request as a Solicitor General or as an individual? A. Well, he didn't state there; he just called me up and asked me if I would make the examination. I told him that I was not well, and that I would prefer very much not having anything to do with it. He talked to me a little while, and finally I said 'If you really wish me to do it, ~~just because~~ and you think I can be of any service to you, I will do it, just because I like you.' I felt that way about it; otherwise I would not have had anything to do with it.
Q. What did he tell you to examine? What parts of the body did he tell you to examine? A. He told me he wanted me to examine the case and, tell him all I could about it.
Q. What had you in your mind - what were you seeking to determine by the autopsy? What did you understand you were seeking? A. There was some suggestion of poisoning at the time when I went out there, but I saw at once that there was no reason for assuming that. I failed to state on my direct examination that the stomach content was tested for alkaloid poisoning, and there was none present. Of course I dismissed that from my mind. As soon as I saw the girl, I saw that it was a matter of strangulation."

LEONARD HAAS, Sworn for the Movant. I have read the brief filed by Solicitor General Dorsey in the Supreme Court of Georgia in the case of Leo M. Frank vs. State of Georgia. Pages 58 and 59 of said brief contain the following language:

"FIRST: HAIR.

R. P. Barrett (p. 42) was a machinist for the National Pencil Company. He says, 'On Monday morning, April 28th, . . . between 6:30 and 7 o'clock. . . I found some hair on the handle of a bench lathe. . . The hair was hanging on the handle, swinging down. Mell Stanford saw the hair. The hair was not there Friday.'

"Counsel for defendant tried to make it appear that the girls sometimes curled their hair about where Barrett found this hair, but as to this Barrett says, 'The gas jet that the girls sometimes used to curl their hair on is about ten feet from the machine where the hair was found. . . I ~~don't~~ know' he says, 'the hair wasn't there on Friday, for I had used that machine up to quitting time, 5:30.'

"Mary Phagen, it will be remembered was not there Friday.

"Darley, at the beginning of his cross-examination, says, 'Barrett showed me some hair on a lever of the lathe. It was 20