

- correct me at any time if they are not intelligible. You have expressed yourself in that first report in this wise: Mr. Sacco has said -- referring to these poison episodes -- A. Yes.
- Q --- that he doesn't believe in it now and that it was a prejudice. A. Yes.
- Q Did you believe he was sincere when he described these past delusions as being a prejudice on his part? A. I can only say that he made these statements quite consistently and with every evidence of sincerity, so that we had no evidence at all that they were insincere.
- Q You appeared, at my request, before his Honor at Worcester, two or three days after this report was mailed to Judge Thayer? A. Yes.
- Q And at that time Mr. Sacco was recommitted for a further period of two weeks? A. Yes.
- Q You then conferred, after you came back to Boston, I take it, with the three eminent physicians who had previously examined Mr. Sacco in the Dedham jail? A. Yes.
- Q How soon after you came back from Worcester did you confer with them? A. I immediately called them up to make an appointment to see them, and I conferred in the early part of the week following the Saturday on which the patient was recommitted.
- Q And you were also informed that Dr. James May had been appointed by his Honor to assist you in further examination and observation? A. Yes, sir.
- Q How soon after your trip to Worcester did you confer with Dr. May? A. If I am not mistaken, it was on the Tuesday after getting back. It was in the early part of the week.
- Q During the two weeks -- during the last two weeks, that is, from the time you were at Worcester until the date of this