

SALOON BAR PLANT CLOSES DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, May 22.—Five big factories of the Brunswick-Balke Collender company, the largest manufacturers of saloon fixtures in the United States, have closed down their bar fixture departments. The men who have been working on saloon fixtures will be given employment making talking machine cabinets, billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys.

"The day of the saloon is past, in the belief of the company's officials," explained H. P. Davenport, secretary of the company. "Also we desire to divorce the billiard room and bowling alley from the saloon as completely as possible."

Sermon Topics in City Churches

Earlham College and West Richmond Friends—Elliott Russell and Murray S. Keworth pastors; Bible school at 9:00 a. m.; Harrison Scott, superintendent; meeting for worship at 10:30 a. m.; Elbert Russell in charge; Intermediate and Junior Christian Endeavor at 2:15 p. m.; Christian Association at 7:00 p. m.; Earlham Hall; Fellowship Group at 7:00 p. m.; meeting with Mr. and Mrs. Elbert Russell, 610 National road; Ladies' aid Tuesday afternoon; prayer meeting, Thursday, 7:30 p. m.

First Baptist—North Eleventh, near Main street, W. O. Stovall, pastor; J. Will Ferguson, superintendent; "Welcoming Day" for all the people of Baptist churches in the city; worship with French and English hymns, subjects 10:40 a. m., "The Real in Religion"; 7:30 p. m., "Staying Away From Christ"; Sunday school, 9:15 a. m.; Young People's Meeting, 6:45 p. m.; kindergarten where small children are cared for while parents attend morning worship.

First Church of Christ, Scientist—North A. between Fourteenth and Fifteenth streets; subject, "Soul and Body"; Sunday school at 9 a. m.; services at 10:30 a. m.; Wednesday evening testimony meeting at 7:45; public cordially invited; reading room, located in south end of church edifice, open daily except Sundays and legal holidays from 1 to 5 p. m.

United Brethren—Eleventh and North B streets, H. S. James, pastor; Bible school at 9:20 a. m.; W. L. Eubank, superintendent; preaching at 10:30 and 7:30 by Rev. J. E. Shannon; Dr. Shannon will also give short address to the Bible school as a part of the Visitor's Day program which both Sunday school and church observe Sunday; Christian Endeavor meets at 6:30, Miss Ruth James, leader. Special music at all services.

First Methodist Episcopal—Corner Main and South Fourteenth streets; Harry Curtin Harman, minister; Sunday school at 9:15 a. m.; Delmont S. Brown, superintendent; preaching by the minister at 10:30 a. m.; Class Meetings at 11:45 a. m. and 6:30 p. m.; Epworth League, devotion at 6:40 p. m.; topic, "Are Children in Our City Getting a Fair Chance"; leader, Mr. Harold Brown; preaching by the minister at 7:30 p. m.

Second English Lutheran—North-west Third and Pearl streets, C. Raymond Isley, pastor; Sunday school, 9:00 a. m.; morning worship, 10:30 a. m.; evening worship, 7:30 p. m.; week-day prayer service, Wednesday, 7:30 p. m.

Second Presbyterian Church—Bible school at 9:15; morning worship, with reception of new members at 10:30; Junior C. E. at 1:30; Miss Ruth Bradley, superintendent; Senior C. E. at 2:30; Elmer H. Smith, president; popular service at 7:30; subject, "The Face of the Church"; music by the Junior choir; Prof. Woods, director; Elmer E. Davis, minister.

Whitewater Friends Church—Corner North G and Tenth streets, E. E. Chance pastor; Bible school, 9:00 a. m.; George Graham, superintendent; hour for worship, 10:30; "Brotherhood of Man"; Christian Endeavor, 6:20; evening service, "The Great Search"; prayer meeting Thursday at 7:30.

First English Lutheran—Corner Eleventh and South A streets, E. H. Howard, pastor; Bible school at 9 a. m.; E. B. Knollenberg, superintendent; special "Father's Day" exercises with an address by Prof. F. G. Pickell and solo by Frank Bruffett; morning worship at 10:30; A. Whitensday sermon by the pastor; Luther League meeting at 6:45 p. m.; evening worship at 7:30; sermon, "The Call of the Spirit"; special music by the Senior choir with mixed quartette. All are welcome.

Fairview Methodist Episcopal—Corner of Charles and Hunt streets; Sunday school, 9:30 a. m.; S. A. McDonald, superintendent; public worship, 10:30 a. m.; Epworth League, 6:30 p. m.; Memorial service, 7:30 p. m.; prayer meeting Thursday, 7:30 p. m.; morning theme, "Thorny Ground Bears Fruit"; evening, "The Heroic in Life"; special music, J. P. Channess, minister.

St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran—C. Huber, pastor; Sunday school at 9:00; George C. Bartel, superintendent; German services at 10:30, followed by the holy communion in German; English services at 7; at this service there will be the reception of members and the holy communion in English.

Grace Methodist Episcopal—Corner North Tenth and North A streets, J. J. S. Bridge, minister; Sunday school, 9:15; C. H. Kramer, superintendent; morning worship, 10:30; memorial service, Sol Meredith Post, S. A. R. ladies of the G. A. R. and Relief Corps and Sons of Veterans will attend; sermon subject "Our Departed Heroes' Message"; appropriate music; Epworth League, 6:30; class meeting, 6:45; evening worship, 7:30; subject, "The Open Books".

St. Paul's Episcopal—Eight and North A streets, Rev. J. S. Lightbourn, rector. Holy communion every Sunday at 7:30 a. m., also on the first Sunday of each month at 10:30; morning prayer and sermon at 5; Saints' days, holy communion at 9:30; other days by appointment.

South Eighth Street Friends—Francis C. Anscombe, pastor; Bible school, 9:10; John H. Johnson, superintendent; meeting for worship, 10:30; Phalanx Endeavor Society, 6:30;

MRS. WOODS TO MOTOR TO THE WEST COAST



Mrs. Al H. Woods, wife of the theatrical manager, will set out from New York soon on her second attempt to drive a motor car from ocean to ocean. Mrs. Woods says she will drive the car herself, and she has marked out her itinerary, which will take her through Cleveland, Chicago, Omaha, Denver, Salt Lake City and Los Angeles.

Mrs. Woods' first attempt to span the continent in an automobile was made a year ago as the outcome of a bet with her husband. Having reached Butte, Montana, she was compelled to give up on account of bad roads. At that time she said she would try again.

Ladies Aid society, Tuesday, all-day meeting; prayer meeting, Thursday, 7:30.

Trinity Lutheran—South A and Seventh streets, Rev. A. J. Beck, pastor emeritus; Sunday school 9 a. m.; morning service 10.

St. Andrew's Catholic—South Fifth and C streets, Rev. Francis A. Roell, rector; Rev. George James, assistant; low masses at 5:30 a. m. and 7:30 a. m.; singing by children's choir at 7:30; high mass at 10 a. m.; Sunday school, vespers and benediction at 2:30; Holy hour at 7:30 p. m. Wednesday.

St. John's Lutheran—South Seventh and E streets, Rev. A. J. Feeger, pastor; German service, 10 o'clock; evening service 7 o'clock; Sunday school, 9 o'clock.

St. Mary's Catholic—North A street, between Seventh and Eighth, W. J. Cronin, rector; A. B. Duffy, assistant; hours for masses, 6, 8 and 10; instruction at 2:30; vespers and benediction at 3; Holy hour Wednesday at 7:30 p. m.

North A Street Friends—First day school at 9:15 a. m.; meeting for worship at 10:30 a. m.; mid-week devotional at 7:30 o'clock p. m., at the North A Street Meeting House on Fifth day (Thursday) evening.

First Christian—South Tenth and A streets, L. E. Murray, pastor; Sunday school, 9:05 a. m.; F. G. Pickell, acting superintendent; communion service, 10:30 a. m.; Mrs. Ross of Canton, Mo., will speak at this service; Mrs. Ross is the mother of Emory Ross, a missionary in Liberia, Africa; evening evangelistic service, 7:30, subject of sermon, "The Descent of the Holy Spirit"; recognition of White Sunday; C. E. prayer meeting, 6:45 p. m.; Mrs. Burns, leader; S. S. Workers' conference, Tuesday 7:30 p. m.

First Presbyterian—North Tenth and A streets; worship next Sunday at 10:30 a. m. and 4:00 p. m.; Sunday school at 9:15 a. m.; Joseph John Ray, pastor; W. C. Wisler, S. S. superintendent; subject of morning sermon, "Two Poor Prayers"; at the afternoon service which has been changed for this Sunday only from 4:45 to 4:00 o'clock the pastor will preach the Baccalaureate sermon to the graduating class of the high school, the subject of the sermon will be, "A Master's Mastery"; special music will be furnished by the quartette; pastors and people of the city cordially invited.

East Main Street Friends—M. S. Hinckle, pastor; Bible school, 9:20; Percy Smith and Lewis Campbell, superintendents; morning worship, 10:30; C. E. 6:30; Lillian Eves, leader, topic, "Religious Reading: What and Why"; evening meeting for worship, 7:30; from 1:30 to 3:00 or 3:30 in the afternoon, a number of teams of Young Friends will engage in a simultaneous effort to reach a number of the homes of those preferring East Main Street Meeting; owing to the high school commencement on Thursday evening, it has been proposed to hold the prayer meeting on Wednesday evening. This will be decided in the Sunday morning meeting.

Central Christian—Corner North Twelfth and B streets, W. R. Motley, pastor, residence 106 South Twelfth street; Sunday school, 9:05 a. m.; preaching, 10:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.; morning subject, "The Ninth Commandment"; Y. P. S. C. E., 6:30 p. m.; community night, Thursday night. You are cordially invited to all the services of this church.

Whooping Cough.
"When my four children had whooping cough a few years ago I gave them Chamberlain's Cough Remedy. There is no better remedy made for this disease," writes Mrs. John Gratz, Bluffton, Ohio. Obtainable everywhere.—Adv.

Text of Bond's Statement on Plan To Buy Light Plant of R. H. L. & P.

To the Public Service Corporation
Committee of the Commercial Club:
Gentlemen:

Your communication to the Mayor and Board of Works under date of the 17th inst., was referred to the special committee appointed by the Mayor to consider matters relating to the proper solution of the electrical situation in this city, and the same has been duly considered and I have been requested to make reply thereto, which is, also, a statement to the public.

A reasonably full discussion of the main question involved together with such incidental propositions as naturally cluster around the same, must necessarily be rather long, and then many pertinent things will be left unsaid.

Permit me at the beginning to assure you that we, who are acting for the City, have absolutely nothing to conceal, and are willing at all times to give to you, and to all other citizens of this city, full information.

Your communication contains the information that upon your invitation Mr. Tripp, Vice-President of and Mr. Olney, general counsel for the United Gas and Electric company with headquarters in the city of New York, and the real party in interest in this present controversy, together with Mr. Wilfred Jessup, local attorney for, and Nimrod Johnson, manager of the Richmond Light, Heat and Power Company, met with you on the evening of the 15th inst., and that Mr. Tripp "casually" remarked that the City was now irrevocably committed to the purchase. It seems rather strange that such a remark coming from such a source, ostensibly made casually, but which might have been cunningly planned, should have produced such a panic, as is indicated, in our conservative committee. And from your communication, as well as from newspaper publications since made, we are informed that all of Mr. Tripp's associates assented to his casual remark.

When did Mr. Jessup change his opinion? Was it after he had consulted with Tripp and Olney? On the afternoon of the 12th inst., he and I argued legal questions before the Wayne Circuit Court in the suit brought by the City to enjoin the privately owned light plant, and on the 13th inst. he was again in court. I am sure that he is not a man who would make a statement of this kind without having a very good reason for it. It is right and proper for any person to change his opinion, if upon further consideration he deems his former opinion erroneous.

The real question which seems to be agitating the public mind at this time is the City's liability for the steps which it has already taken to acquire the property of the Power Company? Or stated in another way—"Has the City already PURCHASED, and nothing remains to be done except to fix the price which the City must pay?" Or is the City, "at this time," or in the future stage of this proceeding will have, the right to abandon the same?

I deem it useless to attempt to set forth every reason or to give the citation of every authority in support of the opinion which I entertain upon these matters, and shall, therefore, at this time deal only in general principles, all of which are supported by an abundance of authority, and shall cite only such authorities as are deemed necessary in order to elucidate these propositions. The law under which this proceeding before the Public Service Corporation is pending is being new and having never been before our courts for construction upon the questions involved, should be analyzed according to the usual meaning of the words therein contained and elucidated by the application of legal principles in other matters and proceedings analogous thereto.

The proceedings now instituted by the city to acquire the property of the utility named rests upon that right or power known as eminent domain, which is the right of the nation or the state or of those to whom the power has been lawfully delegated to condemn private property for public use and to appropriate the ownership and possession of such property for such use upon paying the owner just compensation to be ascertained, according to law. This right is inherent in all sovereignties and exists in the state without any constitutional recognition and is not by the state delegated to municipal subdivisions thereof and to private individuals; and this right has been by our legislature, acting for the state, delegated to municipalities in certain cases and statutory procedure enacted whereby such right may be fully enforced. It is generally recognized, however, that there must be some public necessity in order to justify the taking of private property for public purposes but the right and power to determine such necessity rests with the state itself, but may be delegated in any particular case to the party who may be granted the right to exercise this power, and the great weight of authority is that where the right of eminent domain has by the state been delegated to a city and it has been given the authority to determine the necessity of exercising such a right, that its determination that a necessity exists for exercising this power is final and that the city has the right to pursue the course designated by statute.

According to those propositions, therefore, the action which the city has taken up to this time amounts to a determination that a necessity exists for acquiring this plant, and having determined that such necessity exists, which is always necessary to be done before any such proceeding is instituted, it is now proceeding as by law provided, in order that it may ultimately acquire this property.

One of the rights conferred upon cities by the public service commis-

City Attorney holds city has not yet purchased the plant of the competing utility and that the city has the right now to abandon the proceedings without the consent of the utility—That the city has the right within the time allowed by the commission, after the value of the plant is fixed and the terms and conditions named, to abandon this proceeding, but in such event it would be liable for the necessary costs.

sion law, Acts 1913, page 167, etc., is stated as follows:

"Any municipality shall have the power, subject to the provisions of this act, to acquire by condemnation the property of any public utility," etc. This is the power which the city is now exercising.

Another provision of this act is as follows:

"Any municipality shall have the power, subject to the provisions of this act, to purchase by an agreement with any public utility any part of any plant, provided that such purchase and the terms thereof shall be approved by the commission after a hearing as provided in this act."

It seems to me that those who regard that the city has already purchased, must be considering this part of the statute. It no doubt would be true that if the city and this utility were to enter into a contract, containing definite terms and conditions, and if in any exceptional case an injury is done to him, he is entitled to reparation. On the other side the rule in question is a necessity in view of the rational conduct of public affairs. The question whether a public improvement is wise or unwise, expedient or inexpedient, cannot be answered by any one who is ignorant of the expense that it involves, and therefore to require public agents in handling these matters to disregard this plan would be altogether absurd.

In construing any statute authorizing one of these undertakings every reasonable intention should be against reading it in a sense that would put the public in this false position. The legal effect of such acts should be held to be that they compel the land owner to offer the public the required land at the ascertained price and that when the price has been finally ascertained the public has a reasonable time within which to make an election either to accept or reject the offer.

The doctrine as settled has the great preponderance of judicial opinion in its favor, and it should not be disturbed or called in question.

The American and English Encyclopedia of Law, in considering this question, says:

"In the majority of states the rule is that the taking is not completed until there has been payment or security for compensation, or until the condemning party has entered into possession of the land. At any time before this the company may abandon the proceedings and no payment of compensation will be necessary."

The supreme court of California, in discussing this question, says:

"It is a mistake to suppose that any title comes from mere appropriation of another's property or from the taking of the legal proceeding to condemn it. The right to take upon the terms adjudicated accrues from the legal proceeding without the payment of compensation. The confirmation of the report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in a condition to be a purchaser; the other party is in a situation of a vendor making an agreement of sale and the property is not yet sold. The report of the commissioners, then the price becomes fixed. But no right to entry—much less of title—accrues so far. The petitioner condemning, the representative of a state, is then in