

Mr. TRUMBULL. As that bill will take some considerable time we shall hardly be able to get through with it this evening. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SUMNER. It being understood that this is the pending business.

Mr. TRUMBULL. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SUMNER. The Secretary will continue the reading of this bill to-morrow where he leaves off.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, on page 86, the reading being about two thirds through. The Chair hears no objection to the proposition of the Senator from Illinois. The Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

After some time spent in the consideration of executive business the doors were reopened, and the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 28, 1870.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALLISON. I call for the regular order.

Mr. PORTER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for action at this time a bill for the removal of political disabilities from Isaac H. Christian, of Charles City county, Virginia.

Mr. MAYNARD. Has Mr. Christian made application for the removal of his political disabilities?

Mr. PORTER. He has; and if the House will give me a few moments of time I will explain the necessity for the passage of this bill at this time.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I object.

DARRELL VS. BAILEY—LOUISIANA.

Mr. STEVENSON, from the Committee of Elections, submitted a report upon the contested-election case of C. B. Darrell vs. Adolph Bailey, from the third congressional district of the State of Louisiana, accompanied by the following resolutions:

Resolved, That Adolph Bailey is not entitled to a seat as Representative in the Forty-first Congress from the third district of Louisiana.

Resolved, That C. B. Darrell is entitled to a seat as Representative in the Forty-first Congress from the third district of Louisiana.

The report and resolutions were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEVENSON. I will call up this case as soon as the condition of the public business will justify it.

Mr. KERR. I ask permission to submit a minority report in this case.

No objection was made; and leave was accordingly granted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for reference.

Mr. MCGREW. I insist upon the regular order. If leave is refused to one member to introduce business out of the general order it should be refused to all.

The SPEAKER. The regular order being called for, the morning hour will now begin, at seventeen minutes past twelve o'clock.

Mr. PAINE. When the House adjourned yesterday the pending question was upon seconding the previous question upon a motion to limit debate in Committee of the Whole on the tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The mere fact of calling the previous question gives a question no higher rank, until the previous question is seconded and the main question ordered. In regard to the tariff bill, that bill having been made a special order after the morning hour, the

pending question at the adjournment of the House yesterday will come up immediately after the morning hour of to-day.

CORRECTION OF THE JOURNAL.

Mr. WOODWARD. I am recorded on the Journal as having been absent at the beginning of the session yesterday, when the motion was made for a call of the House. I was present, and voted in the affirmative. I ask that the Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

The House then resumed the consideration of a bill (H. R. No. 1328) to establish a department of justice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LAWRENCE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. JENCKES,] who desires to move some amendments to the bill.

Mr. JENCKES. I move to amend section three by inserting the word "naval" before the words "Judge Advocate General."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I move to amend section fourteen by inserting after the words "necessary to enable the President and heads of Executive Departments" the words "and the heads of bureaus and other officers in such Departments."

Mr. JENCKES. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FINKELNBURG. I would suggest the propriety of amending the third section of this bill by inserting after the words "the naval solicitor and naval Judge Advocate General" the words "who shall hereafter be known as naval solicitor."

Mr. JENCKES. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the gentleman to say that by this bill the law officers now in the Treasury Department are transferred to the new department. Are they under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury in any way, or are they under the control of the head of the new department?

Mr. JENCKES. They are subordinate to the Attorney General.

Mr. ALLISON. It seems to me they ought in some way to be responsible to the Secretary of the Treasury, for they are constantly required to be in communication with that officer.

Mr. JENCKES. Under this bill they have no necessary connection with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GARFIELD, of Ohio. On that point I would like to ask a question. When there arises a question as to a payment out of the Treasury, or the settlement of an account or claim, the Secretary of the Treasury may need at once a responsible law officer to come at his order and examine a question of that kind. Now, I want to know whether under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury will be compelled to rely on the Attorney General to detail an officer for such a purpose, or can he directly, as he now does call upon an officer, as he now calls upon the solicitor of the Treasury, to take up the specific business?

Mr. JENCKES. He can call upon the officer directly. That matter has been considered; and this bill does not disturb the existing relations in that particular.

Mr. GARFIELD, of Ohio. I am glad that such is the fact.

Mr. SCOFIELD. I wish to put an inquiry to the gentleman having this bill in charge. If one of the heads of Departments propounds an interrogatory to these law officers through the Attorney General and gets an answer, is he bound by the answer, or may he afterward go on and do as he pleases?

Mr. JENCKES. That was fully explained

yesterday. The heads of Departments may act on their own discretion; but when they take advice we want to know what that advice is, so that the law department of the Government shall not be giving different advice to different heads of Departments or different bureaus.

Mr. SCOFIELD. The bill only takes care, then, that these officers shall be well informed on legal questions; and if afterward they choose to go wrong they are responsible.

Mr. GARFIELD, of Ohio. And the decisions of the law officers are to be recorded in a single office.

Mr. JENCKES. Yes, sir. I now insist on the demand for the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. JENCKES. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. LAWRENCE,] that he may finish his remarks.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, when the morning hour closed yesterday I had not quite finished the remarks which I designed to submit to the House on this bill. I had endeavored to establish two propositions: first, that this bill is necessary to secure uniformity in the legal opinions given to the President, the heads of Departments, the heads of bureaus, and other officers of the Government for the guidance of their official action; and secondly, that the bill is important in order to save the unnecessary expenditure of more than one hundred thousand dollars annually for extra-official fees to counsel. I think the facts submitted to the House by the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. JENCKES,] and those which I had the honor also to present, sufficiently prove these propositions. Upon the first point, however—the necessity of securing uniformity in the advice given to the officers of the Government—I propose to submit a few additional remarks.

We all understand that it is the duty of the President to advise Congress by message as to the measures which he deems necessary for the public good. We also understand that by usage there are certain officers of the Government, heads of Departments, who are members of what is called by common usage "the Cabinet." I am well aware that there is no law which organizes the Cabinet; but almost from the foundation of the Government the President has been in the habit of calling a council of the heads of Departments and taking their advice upon all important public matters; and these officers acting in that capacity are in common parlance called "the Cabinet." Now, the Attorney General is one of the officers who, in accordance with this usage, has been consulted by the President. The President takes the opinion of these heads of Departments; yet, as the law now stands, it is perfectly apparent that the law officers of the several Departments may advise the heads of the Departments in one way upon subjects of public importance affecting their Departments, and the Attorney General may advise the President and the Cabinet, when they are assembled, in a totally different way upon the same subject.

Now, I submit to the House that it is utterly impossible that the President can intelligently advise Congress or act without embarrassment on affairs relating to our international rights, obligations, and duties when there is a law officer in the State Department, as now, advising the head of that Department in one way while the Attorney General may be advising the President in a different way. And thus our rights in relation to foreign nations, our duties to them, are controlled, or are liable to be controlled, by different and conflicting counsels. We have an officer called an examiner of claims, the law officer of the State Department, advising the Secretary of State in matters affecting our foreign relations, our duties and obligations, while the President and Cabinet are receiving advice from the Attorney General.

Then the same difficulty, as the law now stands,

arises in almost every other Department of the Government. In the Treasury Department the Secretary of the Treasury is the head of the Department, including the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has its solicitor, and there is also a solicitor of the Treasury, and these different officers are advising, one the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the other the Secretary of the Treasury and some of the bureaus, on matters affecting the public interest and involving millions of dollars annually, questions of the gravest importance affecting our revenues, while the Attorney General may be advising the President, who is charged with the duty of executing the laws in a different manner. It will be impossible for the President to advise Congress intelligently or properly execute the laws while this conflict of legal opinions exists, with the conflicting modes of administration resulting from it.

Here, then, are questions of an international character which may affect the peace of our Government and the peace of the world. Here are questions relating to our revenues, affecting the interests of the States, the citizens, and the nation. Here are questions affecting the power of Congress over the States, the duties and obligations of the States to the national Government and their claims on it. As the law now stands there are or may be different and conflicting opinions given by the different law officers of the Government affecting all these questions. One case was alluded to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Beck] yesterday. Not long since Governor Senter, of Tennessee, applied to the President to furnish troops to aid him in the execution of the laws of that State. That application was very properly referred by the President to the Secretary of War, and he referred it to the Judge Advocate General of the Army. The Judge Advocate gave a written opinion, deciding that troops could not, under the Constitution and laws, be given to the Governor to aid him as he desired. It so happened in that particular case his opinion was correct; but he might have given a different opinion. This case is one of many which may arise when the Judge Advocate General may give one opinion and the Attorney General may give another; and thus the peace of these States would be imperiled by these conflicting, contradictory, irreconcilable law opinions, given either under the authority of law or without the authority of law.

If, then, we would preserve uniformity in the legal opinions which are to guide us in our international obligations, in our interstate obligations, in relation to our revenue upon which the State and the nation may be called to act this bill is a necessity, and one which cannot be properly dispensed with. If the present system be continued the result will be that we will continue to have, as we now have, "confusion worse confounded."

But I think I need not pursue this branch of the subject further. Certainly enough has been said to demonstrate the necessity of this bill to secure uniformity of legal opinions given by the various law officers of the Government on the various subjects on which they are called to act.

So far I have said nothing of the details of the bill, and I wish to say but a few words in relation to these. This bill proposes to establish "the department of justice." I should have preferred to call it the law department, because more in analogy to that which prevails in England, from which we have derived many of our institutions, but I do not regard it very essential whether we call it the department, of justice or the law department. Its purpose is the same whether you call it by one name or another. The bill which I had the honor to introduce on the 19th of February, 1868, in section three provided—

"That the following bureaus shall be established in this department: a bureau of international law; a bureau of revenue law; a bureau of military and naval law; a bureau of postal law; a bureau of land

law; a bureau of patent law; and a bureau of the Court of Claims; and there shall be a principal officer in each of said bureaus to be called a solicitor."

I believe that the present Attorney General prefers that the department of justice should not be thus subdivided into bureaus. But all these subjects are covered by the bill, and it is within the power of the Attorney General to assign the duties which would belong to these several bureaus to one or more of the officers authorized by the bill. The bill which I had the honor to introduce and the bill now before the House agree in transferring to the department of justice all the present law officers of the Government at Washington and in consolidating them all into one department, giving the Attorney General a supervisory power over them all, and intrusting to the department all the subjects properly cognizable by such a department, whether they are assigned to various bureaus, as contemplated by my bill, or generally to the department provided for by the bill now under consideration.

There is this difference, however, and it is one to which allusion was made by several gentlemen who spoke on this bill yesterday. The present bill does not interfere with the present Judge Advocate General of the Army, but leaves him and his eight assistant judge advocates to continue as law officers in the War Department. I would have preferred that the Judge Advocate General of the Army and so many of his assistants as were necessary should have been transferred to the department of justice, and that the duties now devolving upon the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the solicitor and naval judge advocate, should all have been devolved upon one officer; and it would not be material whether that were done under the general provisions of this bill, or by the establishment of a separate bureau in this department, to be denominated, as my bill originally proposed, a bureau of military and naval law.

Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to ask whether the bill is so changed as not to subject the Judge Advocate General of the Army to its provisions?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is changed as my colleague desired. I beg to say, as I have already stated to the House, and my colleague would have been aware of it if he had been listening, that this bill does not interfere with the Judge Advocate General of the Army or his assistants so far as their official existence is concerned. This bill, however, does transfer to the law department, or the department of justice as it is now called, the cognizance of all subjects of martial law, and the cognizance of all subjects of military and naval law, except that portion of the administration of military justice which relates to military courts-martial, their proceedings, and the supervision of their records. If a question of martial law is to be determined by the law officers of the Government it will now belong to the Attorney General or to this department of justice. It will not belong to the Judge Advocate General of the Army. He will not be called upon for any opinion relating to martial law or military law, except as to that portion of the administration of military law which relates to military justice. In other words, the Judge Advocate General, instead of giving legal opinions to the Secretary of War relating to the status of States of this Union, their right to call upon the Government for military protection or military aid, and other grave constitutional questions, will be limited, as the law under which he was appointed designed he should be, to the mere supervision of the records and proceedings of military courts-martial; and as to these it will be the duty of the President and Secretary of War to ask the opinion of the Attorney General on all important or doubtful questions. The Judge Advocate General will perform duties administrative in their character and almost exclusively so.

I would have preferred, as I have already re-

marked, that the whole Judge Advocate's office should have been transferred to this department of justice. There are now in the War Department a Judge Advocate General and eight assistant judge advocates. Every duty now performed by these officers would be performed under this bill much better than they will be in the War Department. I hope that the Committee on Military Affairs will take up that subject so as to abolish the offices of the Judge Advocate General and his assistants, with a view to having their duties transferred to the department of justice. If this is done, it will be in the interest of retrenchment, economy, and of the efficiency of the public service of the country. It will tend to unify the construction and administration of the laws of the United States, and to make the administration of this department and of all the law services of the Government symmetrical.

But I will state to the House why, in my judgment, no transfer of the Judge Advocate General or of his duties to the department of justice has been proposed in this bill. If this had been done the bill would have encountered the opposition of some of the officers of the Bureau of Military Justice and their friends, and so great is the power of men in office, so difficult is it to abolish an office, that we were compelled in the consideration of this subject to leave the officers of this bureau untouched in their official tenure in order that this bill might get through Congress. But so far as the solicitor and naval Judge Advocate General is concerned, he is transferred with all his supervisory power over naval courts-martial, and the records and proceedings of such courts; so that to that extent this bill accomplishes the great purpose which it has in view of bringing into one department the whole legal service of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said to show that this bill ought to become a law. I cannot conceive of any objection to it, and none has been presented.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. Will the gentleman allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I would like to know if this is the same bill, or substantially the same bill, as he introduced and which was before the Judiciary Committee during the last Congress?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes; it is much of it in the same words, and I think I am correct in saying that it had the consideration and indorsement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. ELDRIDGE,] and I think of every member or almost every member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. No; the gentleman is a little mistaken about that. I did not quite agree to that bill. I thought it would add another department to the Government, and ultimately another Cabinet minister, and I think now that will be the result of this bill. I think that is the purpose which the gentleman has in view.

Mr. LAWRENCE. The gentleman from Wisconsin understands very well that by law there is no such thing as a Cabinet officer. There is no law creating a Cabinet in this country.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman take notice that there is such a thing in the Constitution as the heads of Departments?

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I was about to remark that.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I have taken notice of the Constitution some time ago.

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, take notice of it in your bill.

Mr. LAWRENCE. The Departments have been organized under the laws of the United States, which authorize the President to call upon the heads of Departments for their written opinions; but there is no law which provides for their assemblage in Cabinet council, or which organizes or recognizes a Cabinet.

The Cabinet is the creature of usage only. But since the establishment of the office of Attorney General the Attorney General has been a member of the Cabinet by usage just as much as any head of a Department. He ought to be in the Cabinet. There ought not to be a Cabinet without a law officer; and this bill, while it creates a department, or converts what is now the office of Attorney General into a department, does not create a Cabinet officer. It is proposed to create a department, and by the usage the Attorney General will continue to be a member of the Cabinet, as he has been since the foundation of the Government. The bill proposes to put the Attorney General precisely upon the same footing as the other heads of Departments of the Government; and to that I think there ought not to be any objection.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I hear with profound satisfaction the announcement of the gentleman that he looked at the Constitution some time ago.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes; some time ago.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I hope that he will take another observation, and I think then he will come to the conclusion implied in the query of his colleague from Ohio, [Mr. BINGHAM,] that the Constitution does recognize the heads of Departments, and whatever by law, usage, or otherwise, we all know the fact that the President of the United States has a Cabinet. We also know the fact that the number of which it is composed has been increased since the first organization of the Government. We know that the tendency is in that direction. I believe that it is one of the ultimate purposes of this bill to increase the number. It is said that there is wisdom in a multitude of counselors, but there is expense in all this thing. The moment this new department is established the pay of its head will be raised to that of a Cabinet minister, and this is one of the steps that we are taking all the while in the direction of augmented expenditures of the Government. I should have thought the gentleman's love of economy would have led him in the other direction. I suggested that idea to him when the bill similar to this was before the Judiciary Committee in the last Congress, and I supposed that he would have been in favor of and advocating propositions which reduced expenditures, and not of those that are constantly increasing them.

Mr. LAWRENCE. If the gentleman had heard the remarks made yesterday and the figures given he would have seen that this is a measure of retrenchment. But I have said enough to the House on this subject. I hope the vote will now be taken and that the bill will pass.

Mr. JENCKES resumed the floor.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. I desire to ask the gentleman one question. I understood the gentleman to say that this bill ought to have included the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and is defective in that respect, and that the reason why a provision in reference to him was omitted was from the fear that that officer would defeat the passage of this bill. I wish to know if it is true that that motive operated upon the committee?

Mr. JENCKES. That matter is not within the domain of our committee, but belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WELKER. I ask unanimous consent to move an amendment to section seventeen of this bill, by inserting the word "hereafter" before the words "authorized by law;" so that that portion of the section will read:

And no counsel or attorney fees shall hereafter be allowed to any person or persons, besides the respective district attorneys and assistant district attorneys, for services in such capacity to the United States, or any branch or department of the Government thereof, unless hereafter authorized by law, and then only on the certificate of the Attorney General that such services were actually rendered, and that the same could not be performed by the Attorney General or solicitor general, or the officers of the department of justice, or by the district attorney.

Mr. JENCKES. I have no objection to that amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. As the previous question is operating, it will require unanimous consent.

No objection was made; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODWARD. Is it too late to offer amendments to this bill?

The SPEAKER. It is, except by unanimous consent, as the main question has been ordered.

Mr. WOODWARD. I ask unanimous consent to move to amend this bill by adding to it the following:

SEC. —. And be it further enacted, That the offices of Judge Advocate General and of all his assistants be, and the same are hereby, abolished.

Mr. ARNELL. I object to that amendment.

Mr. ARCHER. Is it in order now to move that this bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

The SPEAKER. It is not, pending the operation of the previous question.

Mr. NIBLACK. I move that this bill be laid upon the table.

The question was taken; and upon a division there were—ayes 34, noes 73; no quorum voting.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. JENCKES and Mr. NIBLACK were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes twenty, noes not counted.

So the motion to lay the bill on the table was not agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was then ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The question was upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. WARD. I call for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken upon ordering the yeas and nays; and upon a division there were—ayes 20, noes 87.

So (one fifth not voting in the affirmative) the yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill was then passed.

Mr. JENCKES. I move to amend the title by changing the word "a" to "the," so that the title will read: "A bill to establish the department of justice."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

Mr. JENCKES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LIBRARY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PETERS. I have been instructed by the joint Committee on the Library to ask unanimous consent of the House to have taken from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution No. 169, for the transfer of an unexpended balance of appropriation to the book fund of the Library of Congress.

The joint resolution, which was read, provides for transferring to the fund for the purchase of books for the Library of Congress the sum of \$2,500, appropriated by acts approved July 30, 1868, and March 3, 1869, "for the expenses of exchanging public documents for the publications of foreign Governments," the same being an unexpended balance not required for that purpose.

No objection was made; and the joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table, read three times, and passed.

Mr. PETERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PORTRAIT OF MAJOR GENERAL THOMAS.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on the

Library, reported the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring therein.) That the joint Committee on the Library be authorized and directed to procure a portrait of the late Major General George H. Thomas, to be placed in a conspicuous position in the Capitol, as a memorial of his great services to his country and his distinguished worth as a soldier and citizen; and that the cost of such portrait, not exceeding \$2,000, be paid in equal proportions out of the contingent funds of the two Houses of Congress.

The question was upon the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PETERS. I propose to call the previous question, and then I will yield for debate if desired.

Mr. NIBLACK. I think there will be no opposition to this resolution. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

The resolution was then adopted unanimously.

Mr. PETERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

VENTILATION OF THE HALLS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. JENCKES, from the joint Committee on Ventilation, reported a joint resolution (H. R. No. 271) in relation to the ventilation of the Halls of Congress; which was read a first and second time.

The question was upon ordering the joint resolution to be engrossed and read a third time.

The joint resolution, which was read, provides that the sum of \$3,000 shall be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of making experiments in the ventilation of the Halls of the Capitol, to be drawn by the Clerk of the House, and expended under the direction of the joint committee of the two Houses on that subject.

Mr. CULLOM. Does the gentleman wish to ventilate this subject by any remarks?

Mr. JENCKES. One of the objects of reporting this joint resolution is for the purpose of ventilating the subject of ventilation. Within the past few years there have been several special committees of the House appointed on this subject. It is one in which every member of this body is personally interested. The result of the appointment of these committees has been the printing of a considerable body of literature, amounting now to quite a large octavo volume, but without, hitherto, any beneficial or practical result. We have any number of theories upon this subject of ventilation, any number of speculations; and the committee now have before them a number of propositions from different individuals, each of whom thinks himself competent to afford us perfect ventilation and to improve the lighting and heating facilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that when this committee was appointed it was expected to do something; the House did not intend that the committee should waste its efforts in making reports of the conjectures of the members or other persons upon this subject, but desired some practical result.

In order to arrive at any useful conclusion whatever we find it necessary to ascertain the precise state of facts to which all the science that is being poured out upon us is to be applied. We find there is as great a difference in the opinions of these scientific experts as to the evils which they are expected to remedy as there is in the remedies which they offer. They all agree that at some time the air of this Hall is in what may be called an unnatural condition, not conducive to health or to work, and that it is necessary to provide some means to improve it. But as to the precise cause of that condition hardly two persons agree. This may seem surprising, but so it is. I think that if members will confer with each other they will find as many conflicting opinions as there are members. The reason for this every one will