

the Frank case and in which he sets forth the grounds upon which he grants Leo M. Frank's application for a commutation of his sentence of death to one of life imprisonment, follows:

Executive Office, June 21, 1915.

In re Leo M. Frank, Prisoner at State Court. Sentenced to be executed June 22, 1915.

Monday, April 26, 1913, was Memorial Day in Georgia and a general holiday. At that time Mary Phagan, a white girl of about 14 years of age, was in the employ of the National Pencil Company, located near the corner of Forsyth and Hunter Streets, in the city of Atlanta. She came to the factory a little after noon to obtain the money due her for work on the preceding Monday and Tuesday. The defendant, paid her \$1.20, the amount due her, and this was the last time she was seen alive.

Frank was tried for the offense and found guilty the succeeding August. Application is now made to me for clemency.

Over 100,000 Appeals for Clemency.

This case has been the subject of extensive comments through the newspapers of the United States and has occasioned the transmission of over 100,000 letters from various States requesting clemency. Many communications have been received from citizens of this State advocating or opposing interference with the sentence of the court.

I desire to state in this connection that the people of the State of Georgia desire the esteem and good-will of the people of every State in the Union. Every citizen wishes the approval of his fellows, and a State or nation is not a mere political entity. It is a Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson wrote that when in the presence of a great event it is necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another people, it is their duty, among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature entitle them, to assume, in the presence of all mankind, that solemn obligation, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Many newspapers and multitudes of people have interpreted the case of Leo M. Frank and have declared the conviction to be a blot upon the honor of a State and a disgrace to the name of a nation. This opinion has been expressed by those who have not read the evidence and who are unacquainted with the facts of the case.

I have been unable to even open a large proportion of the letters sent me, because the number is so great that I could not through them gain any assistance in determining my duty.

The number of letters is most heinous one. A young girl was strangled to death by a cord tied around her neck and her body was left in the punishment of death. The only question is as to the identity of the criminal.

The responsibility is upon the people of Georgia to protect the lives of her citizens and to give to the murderer the punishment of death. The only question is as to the identity of the criminal.

The responsibility is upon the people of Georgia to protect the lives of her citizens and to give to the murderer the punishment of death. The only question is as to the identity of the criminal.

Time of the Murder Fixed.

Dr. Harris, the Secretary of the State Board of Health, and an expert in this line, examined the contents of Mary Phagan's stomach ten days after her burial and found from the state of the digestion of the cabbage and bread that she must have been killed within about ten minutes after she had eaten the meal.

"Newt" Lee, the negro night watchman, testified that he went to the factory at 11:30 o'clock and when he came up he saw Frank and Lee in the hands of "Newt" Lee and told him to go out and have a good time until he came back. Lee and Frank preferred to lie down and sleep. When Lee returned Frank changed the slip in the door and Lee went to bed.

Reluctant to View the Girl's Body.

On Sunday morning at about 3 o'clock, after "Newt" Lee, the night watchman, had telephoned the police station of the discovery of the dead body and had been taken to the morgue, they endeavored to reach Frank by telephone, but could not get a response. They telephoned at 7:30 Sunday morning and told Frank that they wanted him to come down to the factory, and when they called he would be there. Frank and his wife were living, and he trembled. The body at that time had been taken to the undertaker's, and according to the testimony of the officers who took Frank to the undertaker's establishment to identify the body, Frank showed a great deal of interest in the body and did not go into the room where it lay, but turned away at the door.

No Change of Venue Requested.

Frank went to trial without asking a change of venue and submitted his case to a jury that was acceptable to him. He was ably represented by counsel of conspicuous ability and experience.

During the progress of the case, after evidence had been introduced laying the crime, with many offensive details, upon Frank, the feeling against him became intense. He was a general superintendent of the factory, and Mary Phagan was a poor working girl. He was a Cornell graduate, and she dependent for her livelihood upon her labor. According to a witness, whose testimony will be submitted by me, she worked only one day, since she only worked one day in the week, because of lack of material, this general superintendent solicited her to yield to his importunities, and on her refusal, she was killed.

The relation of these facts anywhere and in any community would excite unbounded condemnation. If the evidence in the court room manifested their desire to resent toward Frank, it was largely the evidence of feeling beyond the power of a court to control. It would be difficult anywhere for an appellate court to have a trial court, to grant a change of venue in a case which occupies ten days, because of the intensity of the feeling against Frank which developed in the progress of the evidence was in the atmosphere, and the general superintendent of the factory, and the feeling of the public was strong.

Presumption of Conley's Veracity.

It is hard to conceive that any man's power of fabrication of minute detail could reach that which Conley showed, unless it be the truth.

The evidence introduced tended to show that on Sunday morning Frank took out of the tin trunk the money he had admitted at that time and punched for each half hour, and corroborated by the fact that some punches had been missed. The suggestion was that he had either manipulated the clock or had some other means of which was so expert as to be unable to read the slip correctly.

Gov. Slaton's Statement and Justifies His Act of Clemency.

Special to the New York Times.

In all our commercial enterprises. Many newspapers and nonresidents have declared that Frank was convicted without a trial and that the verdict in large measure, those giving expression to this utterance have read the evidence and are not acquainted with the facts. The same may be said regarding many of those who demand his execution.

In my judgment, no one has a right to an opinion who is not acquainted with the evidence and the case and must be conceded that the jury who saw the witnesses and beheld their demeanor and beheld the position as a general rule to reach the truth.

Presents the Salient Features.

I cannot, within the short time given me to decide the case, enter into the details outlined in thousands of pages of testimony. I present the more salient features and have a right to ask that all persons who are interested in the determination of the matter shall read calmly and dispassionately the facts.

This case proved that Leo M. Frank, the General Superintendent of the factory, was in his office a little after noon on Monday, April 26, 1913, and he admitted having paid Mary Phagan \$1.20, being the wages due her for the day.

Conley's Testimony Reviewed.

By these affidavits there was admitted the substance of the evidence that he delivered on the stand, which, in brief, was as follows:

Conley claimed that he was asked by Frank to come to the foundry Saturday night to get a pencil sharpener. Frank expected to meet some woman; he was to lock the door leading into the factory; and when he whistled he was to come to the door.

Story of Finding the Body.

Conley says that he found Mary Phagan lying in the metal room, some 200 feet from the office, with a cloth tied about her neck and under the head as though to catch blood, although there was no blood at the place.

Attacks on Frank's Character.

Frank put his character in issue, and the State introduced ten witnesses attacking Frank's character, some of whom were factory workers. It was testified that Frank's reputation for lasciviousness was bad, and some told that he had been seen making advances to Mary Phagan, whom Frank had proposed to marry.

Case Revolves About Conley.

The admission of Conley that he wrote the letter found at the body of the girl, together with the fact he admitted he played in the transaction, combined with his history and his explanation as to both the writing of the notes and the removal of the body to the basement, make the entire case revolve about Conley.

Conley's Three Affidavits.

The defense procured under notice one statement and three affidavits taken by the detectives from Conley and introduced them in evidence.

Conley's Three Affidavits.

The first statement, dated May 18, 1913, gives a minute detail of his actions on the night of April 26 and specifies the salient features of the case and bears the signature of Conley and his attorney.

Holloway testified: These cords are all over the building and in the basement.

Darley testified to the same effect. The cords mentioned in the testimony that was presented to the jury for solution.

The State claimed to the jury that witnesses for the defendant, under the suggestion of counsel, would change their testimony as they might operate against the defendant.

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

Conley Contradicts Himself.

In his affidavit before the detectives testified he wrapped the body in a crocus sack at the suggestion of Frank, but on the trial he testified he wrapped up the body in a piece of bed-tick "like the shirt of Solicitor General."

SLATON COMMUTES FRANK SENTENCE

Continued From Page 6.

At the pencil factory at some time between 12:05 and 12:10, Monteen Stover looked at the clock and says she entered at 12:05. A suggestion is made that the time clocks, which were punched by the employes, might have been fast. This proposition was met by W. W. Rogers, who accompanied the detectives to the scene of the murder on Sunday morning, and who testified (page 200): "I know that both clocks were running, and I noticed both of them had the exact time."

Therefore Monteen Stover must have arrived before Mary Phagan, and while Monteen Stover was in the room. It hardly seems possible, under the evidence, that Mary Phagan was at that time being murdered.

Time Evidence Favored Frank.

Lemmie Quinn testifies that he reached Frank's office about 12:20 and saw Frank. At 12:30 Mrs. J. A. White called to see her husband at the factory, where he was working on the fourth floor, and left again before 1 o'clock.

At 12:30, according to Denham, Frank came up to the fourth floor and said that he wanted to get out. The evidence for the defense tends to show that the time taken for moving the body, according to Conley's description, was so long that it could not have fitted the specific times at which visitors saw Frank. It will be seen that when Mrs. White came up at 12:30 the doors below were unlocked.

Another feature of the evidence is that the back door in the basement was the former means of egress for Conley when he desired to escape his creditors among the employes. On Sunday morning, April 27, the staple of this door had been drawn. Detective Starnes found on the door the marks of what he thought were bloody finger prints, and he chipped off two pieces from the door, and which looked like "bloody finger prints." The evidence does not disclose further investigation as to whether it was blood or not.

The motive of this murder may be either robbery, or robbery and assault, or assault.

There is no suggestion that the motive of Frank would be robbery. The mesh bag was in Mary Phagan's hand and was described by Conley, in his redirect examination, at the trial for the first time. The size of the mesh bag I cannot tell, but since a bloody handkerchief of Mary Phagan's was found by her side, it was urged before me by counsel for the defense that ladies usually carried their handkerchiefs in their mesh bags.

If the motive was assault, either by natural or perverted means, the physician's evidence, who made the examination, does not disclose its accomplishment. Perversion by none of the suggested means could have occasioned the flow of blood. The doctors testified that excitement might have occasioned it under certain conditions. Under the evidence, which is not set forth in detail, there is every probability that the virtue of Mary Phagan was not violated on the 20th day of April. Her mesh bag was lost, and there can be no doubt of this.

Conley "Depraved and Lecherous."

The evidence shows that Conley was as depraved and lecherous a negro as ever lived in Georgia. He lay in wait and described the clothes and stockings of the women who went to the factory.

His story necessarily bears the construction that Frank had an engagement with Mary Phagan, which no evidence in the case would justify. If Frank had engaged Conley to watch for him, it could only have been for Mary Phagan, since he made no improper suggestion to any other female on that day, and it was undisputed that many did come up prior to 12 o'clock; and whom could Frank have been expecting except Mary Phagan, under Conley's story? This view cannot be entertained except as an unjustifiable reflection on the young girl.

Why the negro wrote the notes is a matter open to conjecture. He had been drinking heavily that morning, and it is possible that he undertook to describe the other negro in the building so that it would avert suspicions.

It may be possible that his version is correct.

The testimony discloses that he was in the habit of allowing men to go into the basement for immoral purposes for a consideration, and when Mary Phagan passed by him close to the hatchway leading into the basement and in the gloom and darkness of the entrance he may have attacked her. What is the truth we may never know.

The jury which heard the evidence and saw the witnesses found the defendant, Leo M. Frank, guilty of murder. They are the ones, under the laws, who are chosen to weigh evidence and to determine its probable value. They may consider the demeanor of the witnesses upon the stand and in the exercise of common sense will arrive with wonderful accuracy at the truth of the contest.

Under our law, the only authority who can review the merits of the case and question the justice of a verdict which has any evidence to support it is the trial Judge. The Supreme Court is limited by the Constitution to the correction of errors of law. The Supreme Court found in the trial no error of law and determined as a matter of law—and correctly, in my judgment—that there was sufficient evidence to sustain the verdict.

But under our judicial system the trial Judge is called upon to exercise his wise discretion, and he cannot permit a verdict to stand which he believes to be unjust. A suggestion in the order overruling a motion for a new trial that the Judge was not satisfied with the verdict would demand a reversal by the Supreme Court.

In this connection Judge Roan declared orally from the bench that he was not certain of the defendant's guilt; that with all the thought he had put on this case he was not thoroughly convinced whether Frank was guilty or innocent, but that he did not have to be convinced; that the jury was convinced, and that there was no room to doubt that; that he felt it his duty to order that the motion for a new trial be overruled.

This statement was not embodied in the order overruling the motion for a new trial.

Under our statute, in cases of conviction of murder on circumstantial evidence, it is within the discretion of the trial Judge to sentence the defendant to life imprisonment. (Code, Section 63.)

The conviction of Frank was on circumstantial evidence, as the Solicitor General admits in his written argument.

"Judge Roan Misconstrued His Power."

Judge Roan, however, misconstrued his power, as evidenced by the following charge to the jury in the case of the State against Frank:

"If you believe beyond a reasonable doubt from the evidence in this case that this defendant is guilty of murder, then you would be authorized in that event to say: 'We, the jury, find the defendant guilty.' Should you go further, gentlemen, and say nothing else in your verdict, the Court would have to sentence the defendant to the extreme penalty of murder, to wit: 'To be hanged by the neck until he is dead.'"

Surely, if Judge Roan entertained the extreme doubt indicated by his statement and had remembered the power granted him by the Code, he would have sentenced the defendant to life imprisonment.

In a letter written to counsel he says: "I shall ask the Prison Commission to recommend to the Governor to commute Frank's sentence to life imprisonment."

* * * It is possible that I showed undue deference to the jury in this case, when I allowed the verdict to stand. They said by their verdict that they had found the truth. I was in a state of uncertainty, and so expressed myself.

* * * After many months of continued deliberation, I am still uncertain of Frank's guilt. This state of uncertainty is largely due to the character of the Conley testimony, by which the verdict was largely reached.

"Therefore, I consider this a case in which the Chief Magistrate of the State should exert every effort in ascertaining the truth. The execution of any person, whose guilt has not been satisfactorily proven, is too horrible to contemplate. I do not believe that a person should meet with the extreme penalty of the law until the court, jury and

Governor shall have all been satisfied of that person's guilt. At the proper time I shall expand and enlarge upon these views directly to the Prison Commission and Governor.

"However, if for any cause I am prevented from doing this you are at liberty to use this letter at the hearing."

It will thus be observed that if commutation is granted, the verdict of the jury is not attacked, but the penalty is imposed for murder which is provided by the State and which the Judge, except for his misconception, would have imposed. Without attacking the jury, or any of the courts, I would be carrying out the will of the Judge himself making the penalty that which he would have made it and which he desired it should be made.

A Similar Commutation Approved.

In the case of Hunter, a white man charged with assassinating two white women in the city of Savannah, who was found guilty and sentenced to be hung, application was made to me for clemency. Hunter was charged, together with a negro, with having committed the offense, and after he was convicted the negro was acquitted. It was brought out by the statement of the negro that another negro, who was half-witted, committed the crime, but no credence was given to the story, and he was not indicted.

The Judge and Solicitor General refused to recommend clemency, but upon a review of the evidence, and because of the facts and at the instance of the leading citizens of Savannah who were doubtful of the guilt of the defendant, I commuted the sentence in order that there should be no possibility of the execution of an innocent man. This action has met with the entire approbation of the people of Chatham County.

In the case of John Wright, in Fannin County, two men went to the mountain home of a citizen, called him out, and shot him and were trampling on his body, when his wife, with a babe in her arms, came out to defend her husband. One of the men struck the babe with his gun and killed it. Wright was tried, found guilty, and sentenced to death. Evidence was introduced as to his borrowing a gun, his threats, and his escape after the shooting occurred. At the time he was an escapee from the Fannin County Jail under indictment for felony.

I refused to interfere unless the Judge or Solicitor General would recommend interference, which they declined to do. Finally, when he was on the gallows, the Solicitor General recommended a reprieve, which I granted, and finally, on recommendation of the Judge and Solicitor General, as expressed in my order, I reluctantly commuted the sentence to life imprisonment. The doubt was suggested as to the identity of the criminal, and as to the credibility of the testimony of prejudiced witnesses. The crime was as heinous as this one, and more so.

In the Frank case three matters have developed since the trial which did not come before the jury, to wit: The Carter notes. The testimony of Becker, indicating that the death notes were written in the basement, and the testimony of Dr. Harris, that he was under the impression that the hair on the lathe was not that of Mary Phagan, and thus tending to show that the crime was not committed on the floor of Frank's office.

While made the subject of an extraordinary motion for a new trial, it is well known that it is almost a practical impossibility to have a verdict set aside by this procedure.

The evidence might not have changed the verdict, but it might have caused the jury to render a verdict with the recommendation to mercy.

Can't Face "An Accusing Conscience."

In any event, the performance of my duty under the Constitution is a matter of my conscience. The responsibility rests where the power is reposed. Judge Roan, with that awful sense of responsibility which probably came over him as he thought of that Judge before whom he would shortly appear, calls to me from another world to request that I do that which he should have done. I can endure misconstruction, abuse, and condemnation, but I cannot stand the constant companionship of an accusing conscience, which would remind me in every thought that I, as Governor of Georgia, failed to do what I thought to be right. There is a territory "beyond a reasonable doubt and absolute certainty" for which the law provides in allowing life imprisonment instead of execution.

This case has been marked by doubt. The trial Judge doubted. Two Judges of the Supreme Court of Georgia doubted. Two Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States doubted. One of the Prison Commissioners doubted.

In my judgment, by granting a commutation in this case I am sustaining the jury, the Judge, and the appellate tribunals, and at the same time am discharging that duty which is placed on me by the Constitution of the State.

Acting, therefore, in accordance with what I believe to be my duty under the circumstances of this case, it is ordered that the sentence in the case of Leo M. Frank is commuted from the death penalty to imprisonment for life.

This 21st day of June, 1915.

JOHN M. SLATON, Governor.