

Atlanta's Change of Heart.

By acquitting the Burns detectives who were accused of bribing witnesses to give testimony favorable to LEO M. FRANK, the jurymen before whom the case was tried, besides presumably bringing in a just verdict, showed that there has been a notable and commendable change of public sentiment in Atlanta. No longer is it taken for granted, there, that any charge against FRANK or his friends is true—no longer is there fierce resentment against anybody who questions his guilt or demands that it be proved legally and fairly, as that of any other man would have to be.

What the fate of these detectives would have been if they had been brought to trial in the earlier days of excitement, when juries were subjected to the influence of threatening mobs, does not require telling. Now the jurymen are allowed coolly to weigh the evidence presented, and their verdict corroborates the general impression that the case made out against the detectives was too weak to justify conviction. Their acquittal goes far toward refuting the charge that money has been spent corruptly in FRANK'S behalf, for it can safely be assumed that the prosecution, in its effort to sustain this accusation, used the best case it had.

The people of that city have been—they must have been—impressed by the fact that every disinterested investigation of the Frank case has resulted in the announcement of a firm belief not only that FRANK did not have a fair trial, but that he was innocent. Such was the conclusion reached by representatives of The Kansas City Star, The Baltimore Sun, and The Chicago Tribune, by DON SEITZ of The New York World and ARTHUR BRISBANE of The New York Journal, by C. P. CONNOLLY of Collier's Weekly, by three separate investigators sent to Atlanta by THE NEW YORK TIMES, and by not a few others.

An Old Trick Again Is Successful.

Late Sunday night there came to THE TIMES office by telephone an angry inquiry from a relative of the man whose slaying of his wife, two daughters, and himself had been the horrifying discovery of the day. This inquirer wanted to know why THE TIMES reporter to whom had been lent for reproduction in this paper a photograph of the elder of the two murdered girls had not returned it, as he had promised to do, before 10 o'clock in the evening.

Now, that picture had not been taken, with or without promise of its return, by any TIMES reporter or by anybody in any way connected with or employed by THE TIMES. What had happened is what has happened many times before—a reporter on the staff of another paper, feeling that its name would be less efficacious in inspiring confidence and in getting for him what he wanted, had falsely declared himself to be a reporter for THE TIMES. As the picture appeared in only one of New York's Monday morning papers, anybody who chooses to examine them all can easily find out for which one of them the reporter misused the name of THE TIMES.

A Decision Making for Safety.

Street car conductors are not the only men engaged in constant dealing with and handling of the public who are far too ready to diagnose as intoxication the case of anybody coming under their observation who shows one or more of the symptoms caused by excessive indulgence in alcohol. As many of these symptoms, including the unconsciousness, the thickened speech, and the nausea that are the most familiar consequences of drink, are also those of other and very serious maladies and seizures, these hasty judgments often result in deaths that could have been prevented by proper medical care promptly given.

It is a source of justifiable satisfaction, therefore, that the Court of Appeals has reversed the Appellate Division, to the extent of ordering a new trial, in a case in which the latter tribunal had set aside a verdict for damages found in the trial court against a street railway company whose employe had delayed for hours before summoning medical aid for a passenger suffering from a stroke of apoplexy.

The conductor erred, the Court of Appeals held, not in making the false diagnosis of drunkenness, but in assuming his competence to make any diagnosis at all of the malady of a man overcome by sudden helplessness in his car. It also held that a jury might have found from the evidence that a reasonably prudent person would have seen that the passenger was in a critical condition and needed immediate attention. The duty of the company to carry its patrons safely was declared to include that of giving them more than ordinary care when conditions change as they did in this instance.

The lesson of the decision should be heeded by policemen, since they, also, are too ready to make the diagnosis of drunkenness, and of ambulance surgeons more than one might give it careful thought without wasting their valuable time.