## THE TIMES AND DEMOCRAT

ORANGEBURG, S. C., FEBRUARY 24, 1904.

## FORMER STATE HOUSE COMMISSION'S REPLY.

Text of the Answer to the Legislative Committee's Report on the State House.

Neither the lives nor the property of the members of this commission are threatened, but that which is as dear

the facts before the people, has been denied. You have, however, accord-ed us the privilege of making a state-

ment in writing, which we will now proceed to do, and endeavor to make this report in as parliamentary lan-

of the committee made upon the floor

of the legislature to the contrary and without any assertion on our part that such reflection was intentional. That

the impression that such a reflection

reference to every daily paper pub

lished in the State, wherein the ac-tion of the commission is character-ized as an "infamy," a "scandal," etc.

If the committee was innocent of any intention to attack the characters of

those constituting the commission it

was most unfortunate in its use of the

English language. The members of this investigating committee now give

it to be understood that their vicious attack was directed against the archi-

tect and the contractors and charitably

suggest that this commission was dup-ed and bamboozied by these employes, and that we were to be forgiven for our

weakness, and that the charge against

If the committee did not mean to re-

flect upon this commission, why does

it refer to us in its report as follows: (These references being taken at ran-

"The contractors broke one of the

columns into two pieces, and rather than put the contractors to the expense

of replacing the broken column they

mission) from putting them in at all.

they paying the State \$500, leaving them \$3,400 profit on that transaction."

(Report, p. 7.)
Surely, the honorable gentlemen of

the investigating committee would not dare to say that any one filling a

fiduciary position could be generous with the State's money, or intentionally

State to another party.
Again: "A fine slate roof, bought by

the State at a heavy expense and which

the proper word to convey its meaning,

would have been "mis-appropriation") was with the knowledge and consent

was with the knowledge and consent of this commission, whose duty it was

to protect the interests and the prop

erty of the State. The investigating committee called before them the sec-

retary of the commission and had be-fore them for inspection the minute

book and all the records of this com-mission. That committee knew, or ought to have known, and we believe

did know, that before the contract was awarded it was agreed that the suc-cessful bidder should become the owner

possession of the material of this root

dom from the report.)

us of being fools must not be seriously taken as reflecting upon us.

made is abundantly proven by

presented to your honorable body a report of the joint committee appointed under concurrent resolutions adopted at the session of 1893, "to consider the several reports of the commission on the commission for the completion of the State house and your honorable body such statement the completion of the State house and facts relating thereto," of which committee Hon. Robert Aldrich, of Barnwell, was chairman, and Hons. R. I. Manning, of Sumter, J. O. Patterson of Barnwell, J. M. Rawlinson of Richbarnwell, J. Barnwell, J. M. Rawlinson of Richland and T. Y. Williams of Lancaster were members.

This report contained the findings of said committee and the testimony upon which said findings were based.

The sole testimony relating to the work included therein was that of "Captain" S. S. Hunt, who swore that he was a resident of Washington, D. C., and for four years had held the position of "Superintendent of construction of the United States capitol, Washington, D. C." Said Capt. Hunt proceeded in unqualified language to condemn, each, and early parties of condemn each and every portion of the work on the State capitol which had been done by the commission ap-pointed for the completion of the build-

ing.
No other or further testimony relating to the work of construction on the building was taken, except that of A. W. Edens, inspector of plumbing of the city of Columbia, who was questioned in regard to the newly erected

water closets.

The testimony of these two witnesses was concealed from the public and the undersigned until the said report the undersigned until the said report was presented to your honorable body. Upon this testimony the aforesaid committee concluded, among other things, that "the testimony taken revealed a dark picture," (p. 13), "a monstrous swindle," (p. 13), and that "it would regard it remarkable indeed if there is not some remedy, civil or crim-inal, or both, to bring these malefactors to justice and to some extent to re-dress the wrongs of the State." (p

REQUEST FOR A FULL, FREE AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGA-

Feeling that they had been unjustly clusions had any foundation whateverif there was even ground to suspect such a condition of affairs—that there should be made a full, thorough and searching investigation into this mat-ter, certain members of the commission for the completion of the State house met in the city of Columbia and adopted the following memorial, which was presented to your honorable body along with and accompanying a resolu tion providing for such an investiga-'Gentlemen of the General Assembly:

From an investigation of the report of the joint committee "to consider the several reports of the commission on the completion of the State house and facts relating thereto," we, the under-signed members of the commission, authorized and directed "to complete the State house," feel that the report of the committee does us a manifest injustice, as it, wittingly or unwittingly, unfairly condemns our acts and the work approved by us without giving us an opportunity to be heard and even refusing to allow us a hearing. Many of the allegations of error and incompetency are easily explained. Certain conclusions could not and would not have been drawn had available evidence been heard. Above all, we feel that an impression that must nec-essarily result from the tenor and essarily result from the tenor and terms of the report would not exist if it were allowed the opportunity to be

Therefore, believing that the general assembly can have no intention of excuse any one from performing a duty condemning us without a hearing, as delegated through an agent of the of the commission upon whom you imposed an involuntary public duty, should be allowed to account for that trust and to give their answer and explanation to any allegation or insinuation, do most respectfully memoralize your honorable body to make provision for giving us a hear-ing in order that further and all evidence may be produced that may give light upon the question before the committee, and that our evidence and reply to the report of the committee should become a public record of your honorable body of the same permanency and dignity as the report itself.

"Respectfully, M. B. McSweeney, Duncan Bellinger, R. H. Jennings. Robert J. Gantt,

W. J. Johnson. When the said memorial was preof all the material torn out of, or off of, the State house, and that the taking sented Hon. T. Y. Williams introduced in the house of representatives, and Hon. Robert Aldrich in the senate.

the following resolution:
"Whereas, certain members of the was simply exercising the right of ownership, both under the general law

be received and considered by the general assembly whenever presented." Whereupon your honorable body saw edy, civil or criminal, or both, to bring these malefactors to justice, and to some extent redress the wrongs of the fit to refuse the request for the said full, free and fair investigation, but instead adopted a resolution permit-tin, the commission for the comple-

some extent redress the wrong sale wrong secret, one-sided tribunar or secret, one-sided tribuna office deem it proper to state that their self-respect forces them to treat this language as if it does not express the ideas or opinions of the respective members of the investigating committee; yet we have reason to know that many intelligent people of this State believe "the malefactors" referred to leave the then governor and the then atnicipal guard around the scaffold, or-dered the drums to be beaten. The words of the French king were thus are the then governor and the then attorney general, inasmuch as the only inference to be drawn from such language (if intelligently used by a man of ordinary education) is that these officers "attempted" and "undertook" to destroy the only remedy that the to us as life and property—our repu-tation and good names—has been as-sailed, and our respectful request that your body appoint a committee to hear-both sides of the matter, and lay all State had against the employes who had committed a palpable and noto-rious fraud and swindle upon the commonwealth.

Laying aside expressions of indignation and using simply the language of criticsm, we feel that the words of the distinguished composer of the report, as he addresses the dome of the capitol, justly describes these two paragraphs in correction, with the report.

this report in as parliamentary language as our justly outraged feelings will permit, and the facts will justify. But, gentlemen, what we asked and demanded of your body which we feel we had a right to demand, was that all the evidence in this matter be brought to light, that the committee be empowered to summon witnesses and have them examined under oath and not to confine the investigation to such evidence as could be secured from voluntary testimony.

Justly describes these two paragraphs in connection with the report:

"This is the crowning piece of this work in more senses than one. Taken all in all it is simply infamous. To start with, an uglier and a more unsightly creation could not be devised even had it been properly constructed but our observation shows that it is nothing short of a miserable fraud."

(Report, p. 9.)

We feel that we are unjustly reflected upon. We knew that we had discharged

such evidence as could be secured from voluntary testimony.

Many witnesses to important facts refuse to make affidavits, but they could be compelled to testify at such hearing.

THIS COMMISSION HAS BEEN

We see that we are unjustly renected upon. We knew that we had discharged our duty faithfully and honestly. We knew that the State had received full value for every penny we had expended, and we only asked an opportunity to prove these facts.

rearing.

THIS COMMISSION HAS BEEN
REFLECTED UPON AND THE
PERSONAL INTEGRITY OF ITS
MEMBERS ATTACKED BY THE
REPORT.

This contention is made notwithstanding the disclaimer of the members
standing the disclaimer of the members
that their good names have been assailed and that they owe it, not only to themstanding the disclaimer of the members
that their good names have been assailed and that they owe it, not only to themstanding the disclaimer of the members
that their good names have been assailed and that they owe it, not only to themstanding the disclaimer of the members of the State house commission have been honored by the people of South Carolina, and they feel that
their good names have been assailed
and that they owe it, not only to themselves and their families but to their
people as well, that the greatest and fullest flood of light should be thrown upon the whole transaction. HOW THE SO-CALLED INVESTI-GATION WAS CONDUCTED. That against which we most stren-

uously protest is the manner in which the joint committee conducted the inrestigation. It was denied upon the commission had asked for a hearing. The attention of your honorable body is, therefore, especially asked to what consider to be undeniable facts in connection with the report of the joint committee hereinbefore referred to It will be noted that said committee was empowered to consider the several reports of the commission for the completion of the State house, to appoint and to summon witnesses. We contend that the report of the majority of the commission, as well as the report of the minority, should have received the same consideration, and that witnesses

should have been impartially sum-moned to sustain or attack both. The majority report is practically dismissed with a quotation of less than four lines, whereas the dissenting and accusing report of Mr. Marshall, the minority member, is set out at large in 11 specifications, and all of the testimony taken is directed against the majority and in favor of the minority report; and the committee thereupon, to use their own language, "feel con-strained to report generally that the minority report of Senator J. Q. Mar-shall was fully sustained by the evitaken and by the visible facts for all to see for themselves who choose

to go over the building and make even a casual examination of it." It will be remembered that both of these reports went officially to the legferred to the joint investigating com-We contend that each should afforded perfect protection for years, was taken off and appropriated by the contractors." (Report, p. 8.)

The inference necessarily drawn from this statement is that this "appropriahave received the same consideration as the other. We submit evidence to as the other. We submit evidence to show that Mr. Marshall attended the sittings of the committee during the taking of the testimony herein, whereas no member of this commission was present at any time. (See testimony of D. H. Means, exhibit E, and of J. B.

Garfunkel, exhibit F.) It is an admitted fact that no single member of the commission, with the exception of Mr. Marshall, was notified that he could be heard before the committee or given notice as to the time or place of meeting of said committee. We tender testimony to show that at least two of the non-attending members of this commission notified two of the five members of the committee that the commission desired to be heard in their own behalf and that such requests were treated with silent con-(See affidavits of Messrs, Johnson and Bellinger, marked respectively Exhibit B and Exhibit A.)

ALL THE ISSUES ARE FULLY DISCUSSED

ABLE THE ISSUES ARE FULLY DISCUSSED

Again: In referring to the satisfaction entered by the governor on the bond given by the contractors, the lucid composer of the report uses the following language: "This surrender and attempted discharge of this bond, the tempted discharge of the report uses the follow-discussion and the state's only security for the vast losses sustained, was not the act of the commission, as the governor alone, advised, as it is said, by the attorney general, as it comes within the scope of their discussions of the witness were bound not to divulge the questions that had been it comes within the scope of their it comes within the sco

tor. (See affidavits of J. B. Garfunkel, Exhibit F.) Is the life, liberty, property or good name of any citizen of South Carolina safe when he can be tried by any such secret, one-sided tribunal of socalled

charged with the construction of its buildings; that his name does not appear in the "blue book" which contains the names of all government employes wherever located; while the directors the contains the names of all government employes wherever located; while the directors that it is involving questions of the replacement of the architect. As business men they felt that

mission are not architects, and the legislature was aware of this fact when they appointed us to this duty. We do assert, however, that we gave careful thought and study to the details and science of the work, and left no effort unturned to fully acquaint ourselves with the minutiae of the problem presented. We do not suppose that anyone ever constructed a building, however humble it might be, but after completion he discovered that he might have made desirable changes and improvements. It is easy to criticise the builder after his work is done. A building erected by human hands is never perfect, and this, of course, is true with which John 1 of the work on the State house, but we to cover its walls. do assert that the general result was to the satisfaction of the commission, and we further believe that it would satisfy the taxpayers of the State who are paying for this work were they familiar with all the facts surrounding the task assigned us and appreciated the difficulties which we encountered and the problems presented in the construction of this building. Since completion of our State house usands have visited Columbia and inspected this work, and expressions as of the commission voted for Frank P to the beauty and magnificence of this building have been heard on every

The State House commission alleges that if there are some defects in the South Carolina capitol, that the responsibility rests not upon the commission, but is due to the fact that \$175,000 was totally inadequate to complete the building in conformity with the original work on this structure. The State House commission endeavored to complete the building so that it would present an mposing appearance. did not atter. ing to the methods of 50 years ago, all with whom we knew he had had but took advantage of improvements in methods of construction, and for this it has no apology to offer.

This duty, gentlemen, was not so-

licited, and there is not a member of this commission but sacrificed his per-sonal interests and affairs in the discharge of the duty imposed upon him. It was not ours to fix the sum necessary to do the work. That was the province of the legislature. We did what we were directed to do, complet-ed the work your predecessors contemplated within the appropriation they made. We did not deem it your wish or desire that we should apply to you for additional appropriation when we found the funds provided insufficient for the employment of foreign artists and for the purchase of \$10,000 ceilings. That question was not ours, but yours. upon to sustain him only so long as in the combined wisdom of the commis-

sion he was right. As to purely tech-

Columbia to teach the officials and citizens of this State the aesthetic as sim of an investigating committee, as well as architecture, who testifies in order and not to prosecute of the State that the plants were sufficient to the state of south carolina." (Report of the State of South Carolina where an Investigating committee only it that the plants were sufficient to that the plant was carried out the State competent to pass upon a technical year. The sum of a sum of a lant method to person and the strength of the sum of a su may appoint to prosecute suits in the interest of the State. This commission, under the provisions of the law constituting it, elected an architect and paid him the usual fees to design and superintend the work of completion of the capitol. The commission, under the provision of the law, let the work to the lowest, bidder. If there has been early and secured a most desirable contract under superintend when the other bids submitted under them ranged up as high as \$212,000, which seemed to the capitol. The commission, under the provision of the law, let the work to the lowest, bidder. If there has been compelled by the contractor to furnish a new column. To quarry and carve a new column would have cost the State at least to the price necessary to justify that superintend the work of completion of the State house about the provision of the law, let the work to the lowest, bidder. If there has been compelled by the contractor to furnish a new column. To quarry and carve a new column would have cost the State at least to contract or in engaging to erect the work of completion of the State house about the contract under the provision of the contract, plans and specifications, that the commission and specifications, that the commission that the contract under the provisions of the contract under the provision of

sion in the expending of the limited sum at our disposal to make all permanent work good and substantial, to conform

South Carolina either desired or pur-posed to have them now. When they are willing and able to pay for these things they can be placed there. portions of the building, as well as the new, and notwithstanding the so-called words of this "architect, Hunt," to "rust out in a few years," which was placed there by the commission, of which Senator Marshall was a member, fifteen years ago, the main cor-ridor of the building was unsightly and unadorned by the beautiful marble with which John R. Niernsee designed

AS TO THE SELECTION OF

THE ARCHITECT.
In selecting an architect for the work was the sincere desire of the commission to put aside personal considerations and to secure for the State the services of the best and most experienced man whom we could find. Two plans were presented to the commission, while numerous architects were Milburn, whose plans seemed best adapted for the work contemplated Mr. Milburn had not only enjoyed wide experience in the erection of public buildings throughout the south, but came with the prestige of employment Besides, he had erected the Thompson auditorium at Charleston, the cour house at Anderson, and other build ings, which within the personal knowledge of members of the commission nposing appearance. It had proven satisfactory and he was

tiols. Consequently, the commission thought they were justified in the selection they had made.

If the report of the joint investigating committee, however, is followed to its logical conclusion, it is evident that it was the opinion of that committee it was the opinion of that committee that the commission made a mistake in electing an architect at all, but that we should have sent to Washington for a hanger-on around the national capi-tol, to instruct us not only how to erect a building, but incidentally to show how to avoid insu'ng the memory of a distinguished are tect and imposing disgrace upon t State of South

that the plans were sufficient but that furnish a column to replace the one if the true intent and spirit of them broken. The column was a portion of was carried out the State would set the material to be furnished by the cure a good job. Not being ourselves State under the contract and there competent to pass upon a technical was no doubt in the minds of a mapoint of this nature, we knew no higher or better authority to whom we ful examination of the contract, plans could refer the matter. That we had secured a most desirable contract uncould have been compelled by the con-

Carolina over \$2,000,000, it would have been the height of folly for our commission to attempt with the limited amount given us to carry out the design of the original architect, who designed and contemplated a \$5,000,000 building. The act further stipulated that not one dollar of the money appropriated should be expended until a contract for the completion of the building within the amount stipulated was made, and this contract we were directed to make and did make. It has been the purpose of the commission having accepted the work is commission to attempt with the limited amount given us to carry out the better to aid them in enforce ing the performance of the contract which they entered into with McIlvain-united that not one dollar of the money appropriated should be expended until a contract for the completion of the legislation that this bond was not at any time under the control of the legislation that this bond was not at any time under the control of the legislation that the performance of the contract which they entered into with McIlvain-united the performance of the contract which they entered into with McIlvain-united that the performance of the contract which they entered into with McIlvain-united that the performance of the total them in enforce in the total them in enforce in the total them in enforce in the better to aid them in enforce in the total them in en of the contract which it secured. The commission having accepted the work of the contractor, the bond given to secure the performance of the contract to the satisfaction of the commission became ipse facto cancelled and an-nulled, when the commission expressed work good and substantial, to conform as ecure the performance of the contract as near as possible to the original building, and if there has been, as alleged, "cheap and shoddy work" put upon the building, an investigation will reveal that such work can be easily removed at any time, without marring in any way, the substantial postions of the contract to the satisfaction of the commission became ipsc facto cancelled and annulled, when the commission expressed itself satisfied with the job; and the endorsement upon the bond was merely a ministerial duty done by the goving any way, the substantial postions of the contract to the satisfaction of the commission became ipsc facto cancelled and annulled, when the commission expressed itself satisfied with the job; and the ministerial duty done by the goving and the commission expressed itself satisfied with the job; and the commission expressed its HUNTING FOR HUNT.

We are convinced, gentlemen, from such evidence as we are able to secure, that the sole witness against us was state cares to pay for. Only \$1.990 such evidence as we are able to secure, that the sole witness against us was falsely represented to the people of South Carolina, as an "expert architect" in charge of the work of the United States government, when his name does not appear in the list of the United States government employees and he is tomaged with the construction of its buildings; that his name does not appear with the states government who are converted to the building, and that it can be replaced by as costly material as the placed by as costly material as the placed by the members who belong to under the circumstances. We are informed by the members who belong to the legal profession that if said bond was spent for the roof. This roof it was pent for the roof the legal profession of the officers of the State unmarred by any endorse of the State unmarred by any endorse. In addition to the \$600 above mentioned as a part of the consideration for relieving the columns the commission reserved for the benefit of the state the remarks of the contractors, the obligors, and the state the remarks of the remarks of the contractors, the obligors, and the state the remarks of the remarks of the state the contractor of the under the circumstances. We are informed by the members who belong to under the circumstances. We are informed by the members who belong to under the circumstances. We are informed by the members who belong to under the circumstances. We are informed by the members who belong to under the

that the specifications would be so con-strued, (See opinion of the attorney general, exhibit H), but there is abun-dant evidence that all who filed a bid for the work did so on the basis of getting in partial payment the old ma-terial that was removed. Mr. J. B. Confuntal the man best qualified to know this fact, the man whom the investigating committee itself summoned to testify in regard to this old material, swears that he knows of his ders for the work filed their blds upon the basis that the old material, all of it, would go to the contractor. (See affidavit of J. B. Garfunkel, exhibit J). If any further evidence of this fact was necessary the reply of W. A. Chester-man, one of the bldders, and of J. E. Burgess, another to the same affect in Burgess, another to the same effect, in response to a telegraphic inquiry that

response to a telegraphic inquiry that ("In my capitol bid I figured on all old material being my property." See telegrams, exhibit G.) should do so.

No one doubted for an instant that not only as a matter of right but under the strict letter of the law and the contract this old material want to the contract this old material went to the contractor, until over a year after the contract was let, when Senator Marshall filed his protest. An investiga-tion resulted, when the fact developed that the con'ractors had actually allowed the State a credit for this old material in their estimate sheets. Thereupon the attorney general gave to the commission this opinion, which has been completely ignored by the investigating committee, notwithstanding the fact that it was in their possession; that not only of right, but of law, this material, under the contract, was not the State's. (See opinion attorney general, exhibit H.)

Every member of the commission ex-cept Senator Marshall believed had they attempted to claim this old material under all the circumstances, they would have been acting not only unfairly, but dishonestly, with the con-tractor. The contractor had actually given the State value for this material, and the specifications had been so construed and made absolutely plain before the bids were even filed. The peofore the bids were even filed. ple of the State do not ask their public servants to do a dishonest deed. It our opinion it would have been dis honest to have attempted to take from earn. the contractor that for which he had

demand is made that the State shall attempt to dishonestly from the contractor the value of prop-erty sold by the State for full consid-eration, this end must be obtained iron, that fact would add nothing to that of the members who compose this and easier to get out of shape.

why hip to make provision to give them a hearing in reply to the general assembly to make provision to give them a hearing in reply to the several reports of the joint committee to consider the several reports of the joint committee to consider the several reports of the ordinated for the completion of the State house, and facts relating thereto.

"Be It Resolved by the general assembly to the State is the victim, approsembly of the State of South Carolina That any evidence, explanation, or oth
"Be It Resolved by the general assembly to make provision to give them a hearing in reply to the report of the joint committee in the same resolution, the purpose of of the work can convey an adequate house, and facts relating thereto.

"Be It Resolved by the general assembly to make provision to give them a hearing in reply to the report of the joint committee to consider that this objection was not well found that this objection was not well found. As the best evidence of the fact that this complaint was not well found that this objection was not well found. As the best evidence of the fact that this complaint was not well founded. As the best evidence of the first or ground floor progress of the commission for the commission for the commission that either the archive. It is true, but this complaint was not well founded. As the best evidence of the fact that this complaint was not well founded. As the best evidence of the fact that this complaint was not well suggested that this objection was not well suggested that this objection was not well on that this objection was not well using the ones with small defects in the tract. As the best evidence of the fact that this complaint was not well using the ones with small defects in that this objection was not well using the ones with small defects in that this objection that this objection was not well on that this obj

it would be necessary for the State to

about \$500, and a delay in the work of 30 days.

According to the plans there were to be two columns placed within what is now the open floor space on the front portico. These columns supported none of the weight of the walls of the structure, and were located by the architect within this area because under the approved plans the State had on hand two columns that could be used for purely ornamental purposes. The con-tractor proposed to the commission that he would deduct the cost of raising these two inner columns into posi-tion and the cost of the unfinished carving of caps for same if they could be left out, and the work proceed. Upon the report of the architect that the strength of the structure of the completed building would be in no wise impaired, this solution of the problem was deemed the best and most expedient, inasmuch as the funds in the hands of the commission were limited, the work would not be de-layed and no damage would be done the structure. At a subsequent meet-ing of the legislature the broken columns were appropriated and given by the State to Greenwood and Spartan-

burg.
The question of utility having been settled to the satisfaction of a ma-jority of the commission it then became one purely of taste and ornament. and upon this issue we considered that the best interests of the State were subserved by carrying to completion

State the remnants of the broken columns.

THE CEILING IN THE MAIN
LOBBY.

One of the most serious charges
brought by the investigating committee related to the removal of the ceiling in the main lobby and this is a
typical illustration of their methods.

terial that was removed. Mr. J. 10,000, but that the condition of the man best qualified to senate lobby, which had not been removed, and the cornice of the main beautiful that the condition of the main moved, and the cornice of the main moved, and the cornice of the main that the condition of the main moved, and the cornice of the main moved. lobby, which was still there, consti-tuted three-fourths of the work for which less than \$8,000 had been paid, and that the ceiling that had been own knowledge that the different bid-ders for the work filed their bids upon removed cost, 15 years ago, less than \$2,000. It is a very plain piece of work with little ornamentation and certainly not beautiful. Architect Wilson in his report stated that it could now be put back for about \$1;800. This celling, as the records show, was

an actual inspection of it will show that the ceiling taken out was nothing but galvanized iron. The committee found that "the contractors bodily took and carried away and converted to their own use this valuable and beautiful part of the old building," (p. 7) when one of the five witnesses whom they themselves put upon the stand certified and could have told them that moved "worthless even as junk." affidavit of J. B. Garfunkel, Exhibit F). Dr. Babcock, superintendent of F). Dr. Babcock, superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane, certifies that the ceiling is now in his paid in as an officer of the State. certificate of J. W. Babcock, Exhibit

The commission put back exactly the same material they took out, simply requiring the contractor to replace worthless and damaged material with new material of the same kind.

The wanton misrepresentation which it was necessary for this so-called "architect" to make to show that the removal of a dozen squares of galvanized iron which was in bad shape bent and rusted, and replacing it with other galvanized iron of a pattern which better suited the round boub-in he was paid and which he was evidently industriously endeavoring to

If the ceiling removed could be properly designated as "steel ceiling" that put in its place could be so desigretake nated, as it is the same material. If other official agencies than its beauty and would make it flimsier

Carolina.

AS TO THE FFICIENCY
OF THE ANS.

When Senator Marshall made the objection that the plans for the work were insufficient, we referred the matter to the architect with directions to show to our satisfaction if he could that this objection was not well found.

That of the members who compose this and easier to get out of shape.

AS TO THE BROKEN COLUMNS.
Under the terms of the specifications pletion of the State house under this are out and the five unfinished will be completed and used by selecting the show to our satisfaction if he could that this objection was not well found.