

# \$1,000 BRIBE OFFER TO IMPLICATE FRANK

Mrs. Miller Swears Colyar Tried  
to Hire Her to Impugn Ac-  
cused Man's Morals.

## OTHER DETECTIVES ACCUSED

Pencil Factory Girls Swear Officers  
Sought to Manufacture Evidence  
—Story About Dorsey.

Special to The New York Times.

ATLANTA, Ga., March 14.—The sworn statement of Mrs. Hattie Miller, a young Atlanta woman, that A. S. Colyar, in the interest of Leo M. Frank's prosecutors, made her an offer of \$1,000 to swear to an infamous story on the witness stand has been given out by the convicted man's counsel. Mrs. Miller swears she flatly refused the offer and ordered Colyar to leave her residence. Her affidavit is considered one of the most material to be presented on the application for a new trial for Frank before Judge Ben Hill next month.

Four other affidavits were revealed by Frank's attorneys to-day. In one of these Miss Nellie Wood, a former forewoman at the National Pencil plant, swears that Solicitor General Hugh Dorsey once admitted to her that he had been misled by the detectives in regard to her testimony. She also accuses Detectives Bass, Rosser, Norris, and Chewning of seeking to "frame up" scandalous testimony for her to give against Frank. She says that on one occasion she was fairly surrounded by detectives who strove to coerce her into agreeing to tell a story which they had concocted.

Another affidavit is by Miss Lillie Mae Pettis, sister-in-law of Mrs. Nellie Pettis, who testified at the coroner's inquest that Frank had made certain advances to her. Miss Pettis declares that she does not believe her sister's story and that Detective Bass Rosser endeavored before the trial of Frank to get her to swear to a similar story against the factory Superintendent, which she refused to do.

An important feature of her affidavit is an alleged advance made by Jim Conley, the convicted negro accomplice. She swears that at one time in the pencil factory Conley approached her, saying "Miss Lillie, you sure is a pretty gal and I wish I was a white man." She says that she and some other girls while coming down the stairway one day were accosted by the negro, who said: "Are you girls going to quit the factory?"

He was told that they were not. "I am sure glad," she says he answered, "because I'm going to give all of you a Christmas present."

### Colyar's Alleged \$1,000 Offer.

Mrs. Miller's testimony is considered to be of exceptional importance. A. S. Colyar has figured in several famous criminal cases. Mrs. Miller swears that Colyar visited her at the Marietta Street residence in June, 1913, told her he was a lawyer and was trying to work up evidence against Frank and asked her if she did not at one time work in the pencil factory. Upon her reply that she had been employed by Frank, she swears he flatly made a proposition for her to swear in an affidavit that Frank had been intimate with her.

"Colyar made me an offer of \$1,000 to tell such a story," she swears in her affidavit. The affidavit continues:

Deponent became insulted and indignant at Colyar's offer and promptly told him to leave her house; and when Colyar saw that she was angered, he told her not to get mad, that he was only making her a fair business proposition. He further added that "we

want you to swear that Mr. Frank coaxed you in his office, even if it is not true."

He again said that "we will give you \$1,000 for such an affidavit delivered on the witness stand." Deponent again, told him that under no circumstances would she swear to a lie for him or for any one else for any amount of money. Then Colyar asked if she would not swear that Mr. Frank had at least attempted to become familiar with her, and deponent told him that under no circumstances would she swear to a lie for him. Just before Colyar left her house he asked her not to tell any one he had been to see her, but deponent did not promise him not to tell it.

Miss Nellie Wood, formerly a forewoman in Frank's factory, who accused detectives of trying to get false evidence against the prisoner, swore in her affidavit:

### Confused by Detectives.

Deponent says that either Detectives Chewning, Norris, or Rosser, or perhaps all of them, but just which she cannot now individually recall, while talking with her at her place of business, would endeavor to make her admit that Mr. Frank had, while talking to her in his office, grabbed her and attempted acts of violence, all of which insinuations she promptly denied. Deponent now says that when these questions were being asked her they were asked in a very confusing manner by reason of the fact that she was actually surrounded by detectives, and that first one and then another would ask her questions; and deponent cannot now recall just how the questions were made by the detectives to get her on record and have her make statements that were not true.

Deponent states she had a conversation with Solicitor Dorsey and explained to him that none of the insinuations that he told her he understood had come from deponent were true. Mr. Dorsey said to deponent: "Well, I have been misled and did not understand the situation."

At the same time Mr. Dorsey explained to deponent that it was a great disappointment to him. The deponent explained to Mr. Dorsey personally that it was impossible for her to go on the witness stand and swear to anything against Mr. Frank.

Deponent says that at no time could she interpret the actions of Mr. Frank and the patting on her shoulders, which he did during these conversations, as undue familiarity, and now believes, as she has always believed, that Mr. Frank was a perfect gentleman, and that he did not intend to convey to her the impression that he was trying to become unduly familiar with her at any time.

### Dorsey Suspicious of Frank.

Information that Solicitor General Dorsey on April 26, 1913, the day of the murder, saw Frank on the street, and at that time became suspicious of him because of his actions, has been placed in the hands of the Frank attorneys. Mr. Dorsey, although he never figured as a witness, declares he heard the shot which he contended Mrs. Daisy Grace fired into her husband's spine. Next to the Frank case, the Grace case is the most celebrated in which Mr. Dorsey has figured.

According to the new information placed in the hands of the defense, Mr. Dorsey attended a meeting at the McClure wholesale house on the Saturday Mary Phagan was murdered. The meeting began at noon. Mr. Dorsey, who is Vice President of the McClure Company, left the meeting with C. W. McClure some time after 2 o'clock. The Frank defense will contend, it is said, that the Solicitor General then saw Leo M. Frank, probably about Hunter and Whitehall Streets, and that some action on the part of Frank aroused Mr. Dorsey's suspicions. The Solicitor was so suspicious, it is alleged, that he later called Mr. McClure over the telephone to ask him if he, too, did not think Frank acted queerly. This, however, is denied by Mr. McClure.

Mr. McClure says that he is of the opinion that he and Mr. Dorsey left the store about 3 o'clock. At that time,

Mr. McClure says, he did not know Frank even by sight, and he has no recollection of meeting him. He did see the Montague brothers, Directors of the pencil factory, on the walk to the "movies" with Dorsey, he says.

Mr. Dorsey refused to discuss the case. He was asked if he would make an affidavit as to what he saw Frank do on the street if requested to do so by the defense, and replied: "I can't cross bridges until I get to them."

Although Luther Z. Rosser and Reuben R. Arnold, counsel for Frank, refuse to discuss the matter, it is considered probable that they will attempt to put the Solicitor General on oath to support the charge the defense will make in the extraordinary motion for a new trial that Mr. Dorsey became convinced of the guilt of the defendant before many of the facts in the case became known, and that he discarded all testimony that did not fit in with his theory of the murder. The defense is expected to charge that the Solicitor General's knowledge that Frank was on the street at that time accounts for his

discarding the testimony of Mrs. J. B. Simmons of Birmingham that she heard screams at the factory between 2 and 3 o'clock on the day of the tragedy.

### Frank Recalls Nothing Unusual.

When informed that the Solicitor General was said to have seen him on the day of the murder, Frank declared that if Mr. Dorsey did see him he could think of no action on his part which could have aroused anybody's suspicion.

"When I was on Whitehall, near Hunter Street," Frank said, "I had two things on my mind. One was to walk by Jacobs's Pharmacy and buy some cigars, and the other was to get to the factory. I did both things, but I do not remember turning suddenly or any other action which might be construed as suspicious. I might have been jostled in the crowd, however."

At that time Frank says he did not know the Solicitor General by sight.

Frank paid his respects to Newport Lanford in a criticism of the detective chief's published declaration that Jim Conley told the truth on the stand, and that any change he might make in his sworn statement now, even under the

pressure of Detective Burns's questioning, would be a lie pure and simple. Frank said:

"What gift of omniscience permits our great detective chief to look into the very soul of the negro and distinguish the instant he veers from the lies that he has been telling to the straight course of veracity? Conley made his first statement May 18. That was a tissue of lies. Chief Lanford and his detectives admit that. He made another statement on May 24, a third on May 29, and a fourth on May 29, each one different and all more or less untruthful. Then came the trial. Conley testified and again added to and took away from the statements he had made before.

"That is the truth and the whole truth," said the detective chief and the Solicitor General, but how do they know that it is? What supernatural power is theirs that they can pick from a mass of admitted and confessed lies and say that that which they have chosen is the truth and is a sufficient basis to hang a man?

"Each successive statement the negro made he swore was the truth and the whole truth, and yet each one was different. How can Chief Lanford arbitrarily say the fifth statement, the one which he made on the witness stand, is true and the others are false? He not only says this much, but he goes further and declares that anything the

negro may say in the future which changes his story on the stand will be a lie.

Atlanta certainly is fortunate in having a detective chief who is able not only to determine with supernatural insight just the moment the subject of his wonderful powers forsakes untruth and tells the facts but can with unerring accuracy foretell whether this person in the future is to tell the truth or a lie.

"I am not particularly interested in the chief's announcement that he will oppose Detective Burns if Burns seeks to see Conley. I don't imagine that Burns will let that worry him much. I have enough confidence in him to believe that he will arrive at the truth in spite of any obstacles that may be put in his path. I do not even know that he will care to see Conley at this stage of his investigations."