

ESCAPED MEN GO ON TRIAL

Two Escaped Convicts On Trial For Killing Policeman

Greenfield, Ind., Feb. 10.—(UPI)—Paul Pierce, 26, and Donald Joseph, 28, escaped convicts from the Indiana state prison, went on trial in Hancock Circuit court today for the murder of Orville Quinnett, 33, Indianapolis detective sergeant.

Quinnett was wounded critically in a gun battle at an Indianapolis apartment Dec. 7. He died in city hospital 11 days later.

Paul Chatham, detective sergeant, who accompanied Quinnett to the apartment, was shot in the foot. They sought to arrest Pierce and Joseph in connection with the slaying of Frank M. Levy, Anderson patrolman.

Pierce, identified by Quinnett and Chatham, later confessed his guilt, police reported. Joseph has remained silent.

The men were indicted by the Marion county grand jury Dec. 21 and pleaded not guilty before criminal judge Frank P. Baker who granted change of venue, designating Greenfield for the trial.

Joseph and Pierce were captured by state police officers Dec. 10 near Milroy at the home of Silverton Headie, 47, paroled convict. Both had been wounded at Indianapolis. Criminal records of Pierce and Joseph date back to more than five years ago.

On Oct. 4, 1934, while serving sentences imposed by the Marion county court, Joseph and Pierce escaped from the Indiana State prison farm.

Test Your Knowledge

Can you answer seven of these ten questions? Turn to page Four for the answers.

In the Roman Catholic Church, what is a requiem mass?

2. Which state is nicknamed the Hawkeye State?

3. Where is Dismal Swamp located?

4. Name the instrument used by physicians for examining the heart and lungs by sound.

5. What was the family name of Henry VIII of England?

6. When did the reign of the Czars end in Russia?

7. Who was Justinus Andreas Christian Kerner?

8. Which American city was named in honor of William Pitt?

9. In which state did "Dorr's Rebellion" occur?

10. What trade was pursued by Paul Revere?

1. Who wrote the novel, "Henry Esmond"?

2. In which country is the city of Rangoon?

3. Who was Stephen Phillips?

4. Where is the Abraham Lincoln National Park?

5. What is an assay office?

6. The eruption of which volcano destroyed the cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum in 79 A.D.?

7. What river forms part of the boundary between the U. S. and

PUBLIC SALE

The undersigned will sell at public auction on the Lincoln Highway, 6 miles west of Van Wert, Ohio, on

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 12th, 1936

Commencing at 10:30 A. M.

13 — HEAD OF HORSES — 9

One matched pair bay mare colts, coming 2 yrs. old, an outstanding pair of mares; Roan horse, 3 yr. old, wt. 1600 lbs., sound well broke; Bay horse, 2 yr. old, wt. 1700 well broke, sound; Roan mare, 4 yr. old not in foal but a good brood mare, wt. 1450 lbs.; Light bay horse, 4 yr. old, wt. 1450 lbs., sound well broke; Dark bay horse, 4 yr. old, wt. 1500 lbs., well broke, sound; Sorrel mare, 4 yr. old in foal sound well broke; 3 coming yearling colts, Bay, Sorrel and Roan; one brown mare, smooth mouth, wt. 1400 lbs.; one bay smooth mouth mare.

9 — HEAD OF CATTLE — 6

Gurnsey cow, 8 yr. old, calf by side; 4 coming 2 yr. old heifers will be ready in April; 2 three yr. old cows will be fresh in April; 1 Jersey cow, yr. old, wt. 1400 lbs.

61 — HEAD OF HOGS — 61

12 spotted Poland China gilts; 7 Chester white gilts; 7 Duroc gilts; Hampshire gilts all to farrow from Mar. 14th to Apr. 12th; Duroc sow will farrow April 12th; Chester White tried sow farrow April 10th; 1 Hampshire; 1 Hampshire and 1 Duroc boar all yearlings; 21 feeder hogs wt. from 90 to 140 lbs. immunized.

TERMS—CASH


FLOYD HOBLETT, Owner

ROY S. JOHNSON—Auctioneer

W. A. LOWER—Clerk

M. E. Ladies Aid will serve lunch.

THIMBLE THEATER



NOW SHOWING—"TWELVE MILES ON A GALLON"



LIFTS MARTIAL LAW IN STATE

Gov. McNutt Removes Martial Law In Sullivan, Vigo Counties

Indianapolis, Feb. 10.—(UPI)—Martial law was lifted in Sullivan and Vigo counties today by Gov. Paul V. McNutt, placing the entire state in the hands of civil authorities for the first time in this provision valid.

The second test came on a suit by Mayflower Farms, Inc., to test a part of the statute which provided that dealers who advertise their milk widely must sell it to stores for one cent a quart more than non-advertising dealers. The court by a five to four vote held this provision valid.

Local authorities now have under control conditions which precipitated declaration of martial law in the area, Gov. McNutt explained.

The court by six to three held this provision invalid and sent the case back to the New York courts to determine whether the restriction could be separated from the first provision which was held legal.

Martial law was lifted in Clark and Floyd counties 19 days ago. Labor disturbance at the New Albany and Jeffersonville plants of M. Fine and Sons, shirt manufacturers, caused local authorities to ask for troops, January 20.

A series of shootings and bombings in connection with coal mine labor disputes caused proclamation of martial law in Sullivan county Oct. 9, 1933. After a few weeks, military rule was enforced by only a skeletonized force.

Justice George Sutherland, who wrote the opinion, recalled attempts to stifle expressions of opinion in England. A newspaper and advertising tax to control the press, Sutherland said, was passed by parliament in the 18th century at the request of Queen Anne.

The taxes then, he said, were referred to as a tax on knowledge.

Each of the English laws, Sutherland said, made it clear those taxes were not for revenue but to control opinion.

The framers of the constitution, the opinion said, were well aware of the English fight which had then gone on for 80 years and of other taxing attempts in Massachusetts.

DELINQUENT TAX

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE)

will receive a certificate of title from the county auditor. If the tax is not paid by the original owner within two years a tax title will be issued by the auditor.

The penalty on delinquent tax which follows the tax sale is 10 per cent on the total for the first six months; 15 per cent for the second six months and 25 per cent for the balance of time, which would be one year.

COURT HOUSE

Collection of Account

In the case of Myrtle Vizard, et al. to collect accounts and note from Lulu Walters, appearance was filed by Fruchte and Litterer for the defendant rule to answer.

Estate Case

In the case of the Department of Financial Institutions in charge of the People's State Bank of Berne vs. H. F. King and Viola King absolute rule against defendants to answer on or before February 18th.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

Estate Case

In the case of the Department of Financial Institutions in charge of the People's State Bank of Berne vs. H. F. King and Viola King absolute rule against defendants to answer on or before February 18th.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial institutions vs. Abraham Bierberstein and others, appearance was filed by attorneys Fruchte and Litterer for Ruth Wittner, rule to answer.

In the case of the state of Indiana on relation of the department of financial