

## Lightning Storm Causes Forest Fire Peril

### Arson Case News Jury

#### Rosser Action To End Today; Arguments On

Teamster Official Sent Men to Burn Mill Is Claim of Hayter

Defense Stresses Doubt of Accomplice Story; Harkins Missing

DALLAS, Ore., July 8.—(AP)—The arson trial of Albert E. Rosser, 44, former secretary of the joint council of AFL teamsters in Oregon, was near an end tonight. Circuit Judge Arlie G. Walker predicting the jury of nine farmers, a bookkeeper and two women would receive the case tomorrow, 10th day of the trial.

Special Prosecutor Oscar Hayter, Dallas, and Defense Attorney Charles Robison, Portland, presented their final arguments to the jury late today, each speaking for an hour.

Tomorrow morning Defense Attorney George Vanderveer, Seattle, and Special Prosecutor Ralph E. Moody, Salem, will give their final arguments, which will be followed by the court's instructions. After that, the jury will begin deliberations to determine whether Rosser is guilty of a charge of complicity in burning the non-union Salem box factory last November 20.

The defense ended its case at 11:30 a.m. today after its 12th witness testified. The state rested its rebuttal case at 2 p.m., after which arguments began.

Men Sent to Burn Mill Says Hayter  
Hayter, speaking softly, said the testimony of the 21 state witnesses proved that Rosser asked Clarence Adams, former head of the Portland teamster hiring hall who is under a similar arson indictment, to send three men to Salem to burn the mill.

Robison, in an impassioned speech in which he quoted at length from the bible, told the state's case rests largely upon the testimony of Al N. Banks, former business agent of Salem teamsters who is serving 12 years in prison for paying \$105 to Ernest Carson, John Newlands and Cecil Moore to burn the plant. The latter three have pleaded guilty.

Robison charged that Banks, who refused to implicate Rosser in a confession last February, testified against Rosser in the trial so he could get a parole.

"We are not trying the unions," Hayter said. "We are trying the improper use of them. The rackets of an Al Capone shrink into insignificance when you consider the millions of men who might be forced into a union. This is a case of momentous importance as to whether a group of men may be permitted to pervert an organization to their own wealth and aggrandizement."

Freud Against Unions Intimated  
"They used to try men in England under a conspiracy statute for joining a union," Robison said. (Turn to page 2, col. 5)

**Oddities**  
... in the News.  
WASHINGTON, Pa., July 8.—(AP)—The mercury rose to 90 degrees, highest point of the year, and county commissioners mopped their brows as they settled down to a meeting. Then, as the first order of business, they voted to spend \$196 for new blades on county snow plows.

BUTLER, Pa., July 8.—(AP)—Rosie, a nine-year-old cow, is living the life of a housewife in a cottage-like barn equipped with gas heaters and running water. Rosie's gabled home has a front porch, a kitchen with a sink, an ice box and a lawn-like meadow on which she browses. Every day she gets a bath.

Mrs. Jennie Nixon, owner of Rosie, explained she built the home in the style of a house to "demonstrate that a barn does not have to be an eyesore."

PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y., July 8.—(AP)—The immigration officer cast an eye over a bunch of passengers newly arrived from Bermuda on the British flying boat Cavalier today.

"Where's Frith?" he demanded. "Alexander John Frith is a British subject."  
Frith didn't answer, but his mother, Mrs. Marion Frith, did. She held up a nine-month-old baby.

"This is Alexander John," she said. He's British. I'm American. I retained my citizenship when I married a Bermudian."  
Frith and mother were allowed to proceed to Detroit for a visit.

#### Denies That I 'Gent in London'



Prince Frederick of Prussia, grandson of former Kaiser Wilhelm, who emphatically denied that he was the "gentleman in London" whom Count Haugwitz-Reventlow allegedly wanted to "shoot like a dog." A remark that "I could marry the man who might some day be emperor of Germany," figured in the break-up between former Barbara Hutton and her Danish court, it was reported from London.—LIN photo.

#### Engine Explosion Leaves Five Dead

Three of Train Crew and two Transients Are Mishap Victims

MISSOULA, Mont., July 8.—(AP)—Searchers picked through scattered wreckage of a heavy Northern Pacific freight locomotive tonight hoping to find the bodies of two of the five persons railroad men said were killed last night when the locomotive exploded.

Five others were injured when the locomotive, pulling a freight of 60 miles an hour eastward from Missoula, exploded near Willis, 27 miles east of Missoula, in western Montana.

The blast demolished four freight cars, derailed five others and scattered parts of the locomotive into the Missoula river.

The dead:  
Ernest M. Westin, 54, engineer, Missoula.  
Timothy E. Dunlap, fireman, Missoula.  
Ernest G. Bedillion, 55, brakeman, Missoula.  
Elwin C. Nissen, 21, a transient, Missoula.

A 15-year-old boy, riding with a group of 70 transients reported on the train, and known only as Raymond to his associates. He was believed to be from Norfolk, Nebr.

#### Over One Million Of Tax Collected

Marion county collected \$1,121,111.34 in current and delinquent taxes during the first six months of 1938, Sheriff A. C. Burk announced yesterday in his semi-annual report as tax collector. Of this sum \$961,068.52 was received on the 1938 tax roll.

Total collections for all years represented 71.15 per cent of the current roll only. Actual collections of 1938 taxes alone amounted to 61.01 per cent of the 1938 roll.

During the half year the collector handled \$1,147,709.80 which included \$26,589.46 car-borne. (Turn to page 2, col. 5)

#### Playgrounds Hold Pet Day; Peruvian Cavies Steal Show

Three Peruvian cavies, a mother and two babies, stole the show at the Olinger playground pet parade yesterday, chiefly because old and young present thereby received their first introduction to this animal which looks somewhat like a rabbit, has long hair and short ears.

Joan and Garneth Borrego, who took first prize for the most unusual exhibit with the trio of cavies, report the cavy babies are born with eyes open and teeth ready for business, which latter accounts for their ability to eat vegetables within a few hours after their birth.

Other prizes awarded at the pet parade by the judges, Mrs. Louis Amort, Mrs. Ronald Craven and Miss Jennie Williams, were:  
Best trained, Robert Frederickson with a Scotty dog; largest, Theodore Covatt with a St. Bernard; best dressed, the between Juanita Teem's dog "Spot" and

#### Praise Handed Barkley Mild, Kentucky Talk

President Claims He Is Neutral; Also Lauds Chandler Record

Speaks at Unveiling of Pioneer Monument; Oklahoma Next

ABOARD PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S TRAIN ENROUTE TO OKLAHOMA CITY, July 8.—(AP)—President Roosevelt gave his blessings to two new deal senators seeking renominations during the day and tonight stopped a few minutes in the home-town of Senator Logan of Kentucky to laud him.

Stopping first at Marietta, Ohio, on his swing to the Pacific coast, Mr. Roosevelt endorsed Sen. Robert Buckley, being opposed for the democratic nomination by former Gov. George White.

Later at Covington, Ky., he had words of praise for Sen. Alben Barkley, senate floor leader, but tempered his remarks with compliments for Gov. A. B. Chandler, opposing Barkley. Early in the evening at Louisville he commended Senator Barkley's usefulness to the nation without mentioning the name of Chandler.

At Bowling Green, center of Kentucky's famous blue grass region, the president said Sen. M. M. Logan, Kentucky's junior senator, had "stood firm" last spring against "dragging the judiciary into a political campaign."

There were reports then that Logan might resign to accept a position in the judiciary, clearing the way for Chandler's appointment to the senate.

President Roosevelt again took (Turn to page 2, col. 3)

#### Thieves Operate At UO Dormitory

EUGENE, July 8.—(AP)—A drive of state and city police against a warehouse of crime here in which citizens have been burglarized of considerable property was intensified today after the discovery that thieves had invaded the men's dormitory at the university and escaped with \$100 worth of cash, clothing and other belongings of summer students.

Two youthful automobile thieves were captured Thursday night, Chief of Police Carl Bergman said, adding that the youngsters whose names were withheld because of their ages had confessed to three thefts. Police also have arrested Lee Koche and Fred Meyers, and Bergman said 14 burglaries had been cleared up by their confessions.

#### 200 Russ Planes Delivered, China

HONGKONG, July 8.—(AP)—A fleet of fully 200 soviet Russian warplanes for China was reported today by a reliable source to be in the process of delivery for service in the Chinese-Japanese war.

This source asserted some of the aircraft already had been flown to Hankow, provisional Chinese capital, while others were being assembled and tested at points in eastern Turkestan, near the western border of Mongolia.

#### Peggy Frantz dog 'Patsy'; smallest, Darwin Bliss on 10 minutes; prettiest, Dorothy Ann Zeran with a Toy Spitz.

Pet day at Leotte yesterday produced 72 entries, with man's best friend, the dog, by far the most popular. Four prize-winning entries were dogs, the best-trained, ugliest, prettiest and best-dressed.

The pet parade was under the direction of Rachel Yocom, girls supervisor at Leslie. Her program was followed by a kindergarten program, under the supervision of Mrs. Katherine McGinnis and Miss Ruby Moorehead.

To Marshall Smith went the award for the best trained pet, a dog; Allan Carson topped the "ugliest" award with his water dog; Barbara Pearson, the prettiest, with a dog; Jerome Johns, the most unusual, with a turtle; Bob Thompson, the smallest, with a fly; Marvin Strode, the largest, with a dog.

Executions usually are held on Mondays.

TALLAHASSEE, Fla., July 8.—(AP)—Gov. Fred P. Cone signed a death warrant today calling for execution of Franklin Pierce McCall the week of July 25 for the kidnaping of five-year-old Jimmy Cash, jr., of Princeton, Fla.

Superintendent L. F. Chapman of the state prison at Raiford will determine which day of the week will be confessed kidnaper's last. Executions usually are held on Mondays.

#### Old Appraisal May Figure in Condemnation

Two Estimates Made in 1935 Get Mention; Banfield Heard

Trial to Resume Monday When State to Rest; Fee Issue Decided

Two three-year-old appraisals made of the Patton property being sought by the state capitol reconstruction commission entered the commission's condemnation suit shortly before adjournment was taken late yesterday afternoon until 9 a. m. Monday.

"Which appraisal?" asked Commissioner T. H. Banfield, when questioned under cross examination whether the \$32,000 offered by the two women owners of the Patton property was greater or less than the commission's appraisal.

"There were several," Banfield explained.

The witness then stated that the offer was less than an appraisal made by the state tax commission but said, when asked, concerning an appraisal made for the legislature in 1935, that there was no other appraisal of record.

But the legislative appraisal, he added under further questioning by John H. Carson, one of the defense counsel, was "about the same" as the commissioner's offer.

Carson then demanded that both appraisals be produced, saying later that cross examination would be concluded with their presentation.

M. Devers, assistant attorney general, yesterday was the first time he had ever heard of the legislature's appraisal.

Banfield testified that he offered a proportionately lower price for the Patton than for the adjoining Kay property because the latter was "a better location for an apartment house or hotel, with a vista off across the park rather than a view only of cold, bare building walls."

Before Banfield took the stand for the last time, Judge L. H. McMahan called counsel into chambers to ascertain whether or not it was intended by the state to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price but to show that the capitol commission had endeavored to offer Mrs. Patton and Mrs. Charlton "fair and just compensation." If not, he said, the state had no case because it was required by the constitution not merely to get the property for the lowest price