

# BURNS COMPLETES HIS FRANK REPORT

**Will Make It Public Early This  
Week—Expected to Pin  
Crime on Conley.**

## WHOLE COUNTRY WATCHING

**Detective Says He Has Found  
Unanimous Sentiment for New  
Trial for Frank.**

*Special to The New York Times.*

ATLANTA, Ga., April 5.—Detective William J. Burns announced this afternoon that he expected to make public his report on the Leo M. Frank case Tuesday or Wednesday.

"Of course," he said, "something may occur to delay the report, but I do not anticipate any delay. My work on the case is practically complete and my report will leave no question as to the identity of Mary Phagan's slayer. There will not be a single ground for the public to contradict me."

Sentences dropped by the detective in his interview indicated more strongly than ever that Burns in his report will exonerate Frank and pin the crime upon upon Frank's negro accuser, Jim Conley.

"The Phagan mystery is no longer a mystery," said Mr. Burns. "We have cleared it. I was confident from the outset that we would have success. It was no difficult task, and our work was simple—merely the following of the criminal trend of mind, which left so many manifestations in the Phagan tragedy."

"Do you think that Frank should have a new trial?" he was asked.

"Unquestionably he should," was the quick reply.

"Because of the state of the public mind at the time of the trial or because of the evidence?"

"I shouldn't like to say anything that would anticipate my report," Mr. Burns replied. The detective to-morrow will seek conferences with Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey, Detective Chief Newport A. Lanford and William M. Smith, counsel for Jim Conley. Mr. Smith recently issued a statement attacking the detective. Mr. Burns will see Mr. Smith with a view to getting a talk with Conley.

"I do not expect opposition from any of these sources," Mr. Burns declared. "I feel assured that they will give me full co-operation, and that there will be nothing hostile in their attitude toward me. It is not necessary for me to see Conley, but I want to see him before I make my report. I have merely sought to get at the truth of this case, and I do not see that public officers should protest against assisting me in unearthing the truth. I do not think Solicitor Dorsey is the kind of man who would buck against co-operation with me."

Mr. Burns has just returned from a journey to New York, Philadelphia, Kansas City, Mo., and Chicago, in all which cities he worked on phases of the Frank case.

"Did you find any material witnesses?" he was asked.

"I wouldn't say I found material witnesses," he replied, "but I did get material information. As I have always said, the solution of the case is right in Atlanta, but the information I obtained is valuable."

Mr. Burns seemed surprised at the great interest manifested in the case at the various places he visited. The moves in the case, he said, were being followed with interest throughout the whole country. He said sentiment was unanimous that Frank should have a new trial. Mr. Burns said he was asked everywhere about the charges of race prejudice and "frame-up" work by detectives.

"I had to explain over and over again," he said, "that the public excitement was caused by the atrocity of the crime and the fact that preceding crimes had gone unpunished. I declared again and again that the indignation was an evidence of a public conscience, which was aroused by the nature of the crime."

"People I talked with in Chicago were horrified that a man on trial for his life could be so vilified in a court room and in the rumor that was widespread before the trial—vilified to a degree that made his conviction on a charge of murder virtually a certainty. Because I cleared up this phase of the case I probably was understood there to have declared Frank innocent."

**FILLS DR. PRICE'S PULPIT.**

**Dr. G. A. MacDonald in Place of  
Pastor Who Is on Trial.**

An unusually large congregation attended the morning service yesterday at the Washington Heights Methodist Episcopal Church, of which the pastor is the Rev. Dr. Jacob E. Price, who is being tried by an Ecclesiastical Court on a charge of "unministerial conduct." Dr. Price himself was not present. His place in the pulpit was taken by the Rev. Dr. G. A. MacDonald, of Grace Methodist Church, Newburg, N. Y. Dr. MacDonald did not mention Dr. Price in his sermon. His subject was "Great Battles and Great Victories."

"There is, I dare say, not a person in this congregation who has not the thorn in the flesh and you are better men and women because of it," he said. "It is our weakness that helps to make us strong, that gives us sympathy for our fellow beings, none of whom is perfect."

E. B. Treat, a publisher at 241 West Twenty-third Street, who testified in favor of Dr. Price at Saturday's session of the court, said after the service that the congregation would take no action until after the verdict of the court had been made public.

"The congregation gave Dr. Price a vote of confidence when the charges against him were first preferred and that confidence still holds," he said.

The Ecclesiastical Court will meet for the third day of the trial this morning at the Metropolitan Temple. Witnesses for both sides will be heard and it is expected a verdict will be reached before night.

**BARNES ON THE ELECTION.**

**Republicans Should Vote "According  
to Their Individual Belief." He Says.**

William Barnes, Chairman of the Republican State Committee, issued a statement yesterday giving the Republican position on the special election to-morrow. Mr. Barnes says:

"The voters of the State will be called upon to-morrow to determine whether it is their judgment that delegates to a constitutional convention to revise the Constitution of the State of New York, shall be elected in the Fall of this year.

"Under the Constitution as it stands, this question will be submitted to the voters automatically in the Fall of 1916, and if then voted upon in the affirmative, delegates will be elected in 1917, at a time when there is no election pending for State officers, except members of the Assembly.

"Inquiry has been made regarding the Republican position on this matter. The Republican convention of 1912 declared in favor of submitting the question of a constitutional convention in 1913. This the Democratic Legislature refused to do, but called for a special election to pass upon the question, which will be held to-morrow.

"As the Republicans did not declare in favor of the holding of a convention, but in favor of the submission of the question, it is clear that Republicans to-morrow should follow their own judgment and vote "Yes" or "No," in accordance with their own individual belief as to the wisdom of holding a constitutional convention at this time, or of waiting until 1917."