

FRANK CASE EASY, BURNS ASSERTS

Real Criminal's Process Apparent Throughout the Murder Mystery, He Says.

HIS EVIDENCE FOR DORSEY

Solicitor General Declines to State Whether He Will Co-operate— Sheriff Gets Death Warrant.

Special to The New York Times.

ATLANTA, Ga., March 19.—“The slayer of Mary Phagan was a criminal of rank type,” said Detective William J. Burns this afternoon. “Furthermore, I see my way perfectly clear to point my finger at the guilty man. It is a simple matter. My investigation has been an easy one, and is growing easier as it progresses. It has merely meant the following of the trend of the criminal mind. This process, to a man of long experience with criminals, is no difficult matter.

“Throughout this murder there can plainly be seen the thread of the criminal's process. It is a simple thing to detect—simple, I mean, in a sane and normal investigation after the hysterics that always follow such a crime have died away. In all the various phases of the case the stamp of a crime-saturated mentality is indelibly shown. Fewer cases upon which I have worked manifested more obviously the criminal turn of mind of the perpetrator. And I can say this much: I am perfectly satisfied with results. I am utterly confident of success, and there is positively no doubt in my mind that I will soon be able to point conclusively at the slayer of Mary Phagan. In fact the detection of the murderer of that little girl is a matter so simple that, really, there was no use at all in bringing me to Atlanta to work on it.

“Will Deserve No Credit.”

“It is so obvious that when it finally is revealed to the public none of my men nor I will deserve one whit of credit for having solved the mystery. As I said before, it is purely a matter of tracing the course of a criminal mind.”

Mr. Burns was asked when he intended conferring with Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey and with the detectives at Police Headquarters.

“When I am near the finishing point,” he answered, “I will turn my data over to him, and he may act as he sees fit.”

Mr. Burns expressed the opinion that the Solicitor General had been misled.

“But it was by private detectives,” he declared. “The average private detective is one of the most diabolical evils with which we have to contend. If we take it for granted that he was misled in the Frank case I firmly believe he is the kind of man who will set about at once to rectify the wrong he has done.

“Dorsey was furnished with substance that tended conclusively to show that Frank was guilty. He did not collect that substance. It was collected by others and put in his hands. But he wouldn't be fooled twice. He is a man of extraordinary brilliance and intellect, and therefore I do not feel that he will fall to co-operate with me in my investigation. When I have reached the final stages, I am going to submit my report to him and let him go over my findings with a fine tooth comb, as thoroughly as he pleases. He will be convinced—I have no doubt of that—and through him I will get in touch with the detective department down at Police Headquarters. But I will have nothing to do with private detectives who worked on the case. I never smudge my hands with them.”

The attitude of Solicitor Dorsey toward the Burns investigation still remains a mystery. He will have nothing whatever to say for publication. He was asked the question point-blank:

“Will you co-operate with Burns?”

“I don't care to talk of the subject,” was his answer.

“Will you refuse co-operation?”

“I won't say one way or the other.”

Will See Conley When He Wants To

Burns scoffed at the idea that Jim Conley's lawyer or any one else could prevent him from seeing the negro when he decided the time had come to interview the self-confessed accessory of Leo

M. Frank in the slaying of Mary Phagan.

“Conley has been tried, convicted, and sentenced,” said Burns. “The idea that any one can keep me from seeing him is absurd. I am going to see Conley. The time has not arrived yet when the best results would be obtained in any talk with him, but when it does neither Mr. Smith nor any one else will stop me.”

The attention of the detective was called to meager testimony at the trial about the staple on the rear door of the pencil factory basement which was prised loose from the inside.

“Don't worry about that,” said Burns, “we will show you the facts in regard to the staple when the proper time comes.”

Apparently the detective has obtained new information on this point. At the trial, James Conley, who admitted carrying the body of the girl to the basement, disclaimed any knowledge of the staple, which had been pulled from the back door in order that a person might leave the building by that door without having the key.

Mr. Burns verified the report that he has summoned Dan Lehon, manager of his New Orleans office, to Atlanta. Burns has said he considers Lehon one of the best detectives in the country.

Interesting in connection with Burns' work on the case was the receipt by the Sheriff at the Tower to-day of Frank's death warrant—the order of Judge Hill of the Criminal Division of the Superior Court for Sheriff Mangum to execute the prisoner on April 17.

Reuben R. Arnold of the Frank defense, who appeared before the United States Supreme Court in Washington Wednesday, has gone to New York City. This fact has given credence to the report that an important point in the case has been developed in New York by the defense. Only a week ago Luther Z. Rosser, senior counsel for Frank, and Herbert Haas, one of the associate counsel, were in New York. Burns himself is said to have investigated several points in connection with the Atlanta case when he was in New York last week.

Meanwhile the demand that Frank be given a new trial continues to grow. The Atlanta newspapers are flooded with letters from prominent men and women from all parts of Georgia urging that a new trial be granted. Many of these letters are from lawyers, who say that no such trial as that of Frank was ever before held in a Georgia court.

Melville L. Covington, parole officer at the Atlanta Federal Prison, expressed himself as follows:

“I have been engaged in the prosecution of crime and in the handling of criminals for more than ten years and I have never before known or heard of a case being tried under such conditions and the verdict allowed to stand. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the courts, but I must say that at the time this man was tried the public mind was so inflamed that it was an impossibility to correctly weigh testimony in order to arrive at the truth. It would, I think, be folly upon the part of any one to insist that this feeling did not enter the court room and even pass through the keyhole into the jury room.”

IDENTIFIES MRS. HEVENOR.

Divorce Witness Tells of Raid on Room in Hotel Nassau.

A small, cheap black bag figured prominently yesterday in the suit for divorce brought by Harvey H. Hevenor, a lumber salesman, against Grace D. Hevenor. The bag was to be opened by George Seaborn, who had been a bellboy at the Navarre Hotel, on Nov. 12, 1913. David M. Neuberger, attorney for Mr. Hevenor, wanted the bag opened, but Frank B. McNish, attorney for Mrs. Hevenor, objected. Justice Giegerich finally said the witness could open the bag.

The bag had been found in Room 350 at the Navarre on the night in November. A man and woman had occupied the room from early in the evening until Mr. Hevenor and several friends routed them out of it. Several employees of the hotel gave descriptions of the man and woman. Mr. Hevenor says the woman was his wife, but she declares she was home on that night, and that she will be able to prove it.

The bag contained an assortment of silver-plated knives, spoons and forks; the torn fragments of a campaign poster, a few portiere weights, a torn underwaist, an empty beer bottle, and one small, dainty handkerchief. On the handkerchief were the initials “G. D. H.”

It came out that the man and woman had registered as “F. C. Wells, Chicago.”

Monroe W. Tingley, controller of the International Mercantile Marine, who was one of Mr. Hevenor's companions when the raid was made, testified that about 10 o'clock he got a telephone message that Mrs. Hevenor would be at the Navarre Hotel with a man named Wells. Frederick Cypher and Arnold Empey went with him to the hotel with Mr. Hevenor. He told about entering the room and finding a man and a woman there. Asked if he recognized the woman, he pointed at Mrs. Hevenor and replied:

“Yes, she is sitting there.”

Mrs. Hevenor looked squarely at him and smiled. The case will be continued to-day.