

LONDON-PARIS PLANE FALLS INTO CHANNEL

Two Bodies Reported Picked
Up by Steamship Bound
for Boulogne.

FOLKESTONE, England, June 3.—A London-Paris passenger airplane fell into the English Channel off this port today.

Later it was reported that a steamship bound for Boulogne had picked up two bodies.

It was believed that the machine was one which left Croydon aerodrome at 10:30 o'clock.

This plane was piloted by an aviator named Morin and carried two passengers, an Englishman named Ley and a Frenchman named Corrall.

MRS. CARL IS GUILTY; GETS LIFE TERM

(Continued From Page One.)

Hancock County, introduced evidence which removed all doubt.

It was believed that the evidence that Shelly County should ready to convict one whom they believed guilty of a crime which involves social duty."

MRS. CARL'S LAWYERS ARE SILENT.

Ed K. Adams, one of the attorneys for Mrs. Carl, would make no statement regarding the future plans of the defense.

Adams, the verdict which stamped Mrs. Carl as a murderer, Mrs. Erdoson, the niece, who has been constantly at the side of her aunt, broke down and cried as she conferred with Mr. Adams, after the verdict was read.

Judge Blair read the verdict at 8:30 o'clock this morning, after the jury had been deliberating for nearly four hours. The verdict was not reached until 7:30 this morning.

On the first ballot the jurors stood 10 to 2 for conviction, it was said.

WILL SENTENCE LATER.

Judge Blair announced that formal sentence will be pronounced later.

A close study of the case in which the State was allowed to introduce evidence concerning the alleged death of Alonso B. Carl by arsenic poisoning for the purpose of showing motive for the death of Frank Carl, shows that Prosecutor Waldo Gings of Hancock County, where the offense was committed, had prepared one of the strongest and most substantial cases in the history of the State.

It was thought that the powerful and convincing closing argument of Prosecutor Bassett of Shelly County aided the jury in seeing clearly the evidence in the case. Mr. Bassett talked for nearly two hours and hammered home his argument to the jury that the case contained no reasonable doubt.

The defense made a strong effort to clear the defendant, but the evidence appeared to be too convincing.

When the jury had been out all night, counsel for the defense began hoping the verdict might be one of acquittal.

Some expected that the jury would disagree. Attorney Adams, for Mrs. Carl, visible, was very disappointed at the verdict which sends his client to prison for life.

Prosecutor Bassett, in making the closing argument for the State, asked the jury "not to fear inflicting the death penalty" if they should find Mrs. Carl guilty of first degree murder. He contended only a first degree murder verdict would answer the act was done—then the defendant is guilty of murder in the first degree."

In discussing proof of motive, Judge Blair said: "Proof of motive to commit the crime is not an indispensable element to conviction." While motive may be shown as a circumstance to aid in fixing the crime on the defendant, yet the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the defendant in order to convict, and the jury would be justified in inferring a motive from the commission of the crime itself, if the commission of the crime beyond the death and is proven beyond a reasonable doubt, as required by law. However, if you find on a careful examination of all the evidence in the case, the prosecution has failed to show any motive on the part of the accused to commit the crime charged against her, then this is a circumstance which the jury ought to consider in the accused's favor in making up your verdict."

The court outlined the following five points the State must have proven by the evidence in the case beyond a reasonable doubt before the jury would be warranted in finding the defendant guilty:

"1. The death of Frank Carl, named in the indictment."

"2. His death was caused or hastened by arsenic administered to him."

"3. The defendant, Clara Carl, feloniously administered arsenic to said Frank Carl, or that she feloniously caused arsenic to be administered to him, or feloniously participated in such administration of arsenic to him."

"4. Said Frank Carl died within a year and a day after said arsenic was administered to him."

"5. The arsenic was administered to said Frank Carl in Hancock County, Ind., and caused or hastened his death and that his death ensued before the bringing of the indictment."

Judge Blair specifically instructed the jury, "You are instructed that the defendant, Clara Carl, is on trial for the charge of murder as set out in the indictment; that she is not being tried on the charge of any other offense whatever, except the one charged in the indictment."

"You find there has been evidence given in the case to the effect that the defendant, a short time before the alleged murder of Frank Carl, killed and murdered Alonso B. Carl by poison then you may consider the admission of such other crime. If any, of the defendant, if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt, by the evidence, that she did commit such other crime only of terminating whether she said death had motive in causing the death of the said Frank Carl. You have no right to consider such evidence for the purpose of punishing the defendant for the crime in the indictment charged."

"You must consider said evidence for the purpose only that I have stated, and you may give it such weight for such purpose as you think it is entitled. But if you find that the commission of such other offense, if any, has not been proven to have been committed by the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should not consider such evidence for any purpose whatsoever."

DISCUSSES EVIDENCE OF GLASSCOCK RELATIONS.

The court, in discussing the evidence submitted concerning Mrs. Carl and Ed Glasscock, an attorney of Greenfield, said:

"The State was permitted to introduce evidence as to the conduct and relations of the defendant and one Glasscock at the time of and prior to the alleged homicide. Such evidence has been al-

RELEASED FROM CHAINS



MOVIES MUST LEAVE SCHOOLS, IS BOARD RULE

Visual Learning Falls From
Graces of Educational
Body.

Visual education, at least that part of it which is given by motion pictures, in all probability will be dropped from the curriculum of the Indianapolis public schools when the next school year opens. The department was established by the board of education in Indianapolis last year. Five projecting machines were purchased and Miss Julia Landers, formerly Democratic national committeewoman for Indiana, was placed in charge at a salary of \$3,000 a year.

At a conference of board members Dr. Marie Haslep, chairman of the board, said that she was in favor of doing away with visual education until the time came when the machines and equipment were greatly improved over those now in use.

E. U. Graf, superintendent of schools, while admitting visual education as now conducted has not succeeded completely, said it was doubtful in his mind if it deserved to be continued entirely an educational method which certainly would prove successful in years to come.

However, Charles L. Barry, president of the board and W. D. Allison, sided with Dr. Haslep and it is believed the department will be discontinued. Ever since the new board went into office in 1921, there has been a strong opposition to the effect that Miss Landers would be removed at the earliest opportunity. Her appointment was suggested and backed by members of the old board belonging to the faction opposed to President Barry.

The session was enlivened by the mysterious and entertaining disappearance of Adolf Emhardt, member of the board. Mr. Emhardt walked in with a box containing full of papers and notes, sat down, unlooped all his ammunition, then, without a word to any one, packed it all up and, like the hero of the popular song of a few years ago, "turned around and walked right out again."

There was a period of astonished silence on the part of the other board members, then Mr. Barry jumped to his feet and rushed out of the room in pursuit. He returned in a few minutes saying he had been unable to find the fleeing one and when the board adjourned the mystery of the disappearance still remained unsolved.

The "platoon" system of education in use in a number of other cities was advocated by Dr. Haslep, but did not meet apparently, with the enthusiastic support of other members of the board. Dr. Haslep was not discouraged and said she would ask the matter be considered in the future.

The platoon system is simply the high school method applied to grade schools.

Pupils, even down to the primary grade, do not remain in one room all the time or recite to one teacher in all subjects.

They move from room to room, reciting to different teachers.

In view of the possible discontinuance of the program in 1923, it was decided no increases in the facilities of the school will be made and pupils entering next year will be warned it may be impossible for them to complete their course of study at the institution.

Sixth Ward Meeting on Fire Prevention

A meeting of citizens of the Sixth Ward will be held at fire headquarters, Main and Vermont streets, Monday night. The meeting has been called for the purpose of organizing a local fire prevention and beautification inspection. Frank C. Jordan of the Indianapolis Water Company, Jacob Riedel, in charge of fire prevention work, Fire Chief John O'Brien, Mrs. Eleanor Beall, woman fire prevention chairman of the Sixth ward, and Dr. Edward A. Willis, head of the fire prevention work in the ward, will be present.

"Notify the proper authorities of this action here," Judge Anderson said to G. J. Simons, group chief of prohibition agents. "This man ought not to be a citizen. He cannot speak the English language so any one can understand him, and he is a violator of the law."

"The police have held the legal definition of reasonable doubt and circumstantial evidence and other customary instructions applicable to the case. The court discussed at length, murder in the first degree, second degree murder and manslaughter. He defined the various degrees of punishment for the three offenses. He also discussed the meaning of malice in law."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said:

"But good character does not license the commission of crime and if you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant as charged, after considering all the evidence in the case, including that of good character, such good character should not shield her from proper punishment."

The court, in instructing the jury concerning the weight to be placed upon the evidence submitted by the defense in an

attempt to prove good character, said: