

THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY CRESCENT. OFFICE NO. 23 ST. CHARLES STREET.

FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 5, 1853

WHIG TICKET.

For Congress, Second Rep. District: THEODORE G. RUNT.

The List of Letters will appear in this paper to-morrow as usual.

CONFLICT BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL TRIBUNALS EXAMINED.

The power of legislating in regard to the reclamation of fugitive slaves, is necessarily exclusive in Congress; and the same power cannot be constitutionally exercised by the States.

This being the policy of the General Government, is not the assumption of the power by the States at war with the authority conferred on the Federal Government.

What avails it that the National Government, in the exercise of that portion of its power which embraces this subject, if the State tribunals may immediately negative the action of the tribunals of the Federal Government?

If the power to reclaim fugitive slaves remains in the States, the grant of power to the Federal Government is nugatory and vain; and it would be in the power of any State Court to subvert the adjudications of the agents of the Federal Government upon a subject admitted to be within their appropriate action, and to have been clearly and necessarily included in their constitutional grant of power.

The power of reclaiming fugitive slaves, from its nature, cannot be a concurrent one, to be exercised both by the States and the General Government. It is beyond exclusively, to the one or the other.

It is the power of deciding the very delicate question, whether the fugitive demanded ought or ought not to be surrendered. Now it is very evident the tribunals of the Federal Government and of the States, may not always agree on this subject.

The decision of the State tribunals must be adverse to the decision of the Federal Courts, and necessarily an infringement of the Constitution of the United States.

In such a case it has been held, that although there is no prohibition in the States, yet the terms of the grant, by necessary construction, imply it; because a provision that one Government shall exercise exclusive power, is tantamount to a declaration that no other shall; for if any other could, it would cease to be exclusive; and such a declaration is therefore, in effect, a prohibition. Here, too, then, any action on the part of a State upon a subject thus exclusively granted to the Federal Government, would be repugnant to the Constitution, operating by its own intrinsic force.

The second class of constitutional provisions is where there is no express prohibition on the States. Where there was no prohibition to the States, the exercise of such a power on their part is inconsistent with the powers upon the same subject conferred on the United States.

It is admitted, that an affirmative grant of a power to the General Government is not of itself a prohibition of the same power to the States; and that there are subjects over which the Federal and State Governments exercise concurrent jurisdiction.

That law of Congress must be paramount, from necessity, to avoid the confusion of adverse and conflicting legislation. So far as the States are concerned, the power, when thus exercised, is then exhausted. This is the rule, as we understand it, settled by authority, in regard to the construction of the concurrent power of legislation in the States, and which is conceded to be binding upon the State tribunals on questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. This principle is undoubtedly essential to peace and harmony in the action of the two Governments.

The doctrine distinctly maintained is, that all police laws are constitutional, unless in conflict with some law of the United States. It is not legislation upon the same subject, or every seeming conflict, that amounts to unconstitutional collision. The rule applicable to collision is laid down with some distinctness in 1 Story's Com. 422: "In cases of implied limitation or prohibition, it is not sufficient to show a possible or potential inconvenience. There must be plain incompatibility, a direct repugnancy, or an extreme potential inconvenience, leading to the same result."

When we speak of concurrent powers, we mean when both can do the same thing; but it is contended, that when the two powers under discussion were confined to their proper spheres, not only the State authority could not do what could be done by Congress, but the reverse is true; that is, that they never are nor can be concurrent powers. It is not a concurrent power. A concurrent power excludes the idea of a dependent power. Every concurrent or other power in a State is subject, in its exercise, to this limitation, that in the event of a collision the law of the State must yield to the law of Congress constitutionally enacted.

In the language of the Supreme Court, in the case of Sturges vs. Crowninshield, 4 Wheat 196: "It is not the mere existence of the power, but its exercise, which is incompatible with the exercise of the same power by the States." But in the same case another principle is stated which is equally sound, and which is directly applicable to the point under discussion; that is to say, that it never has been supposed that the concurrent power of State legislation extended to every possible case in which its exercise had not been prohibited. And that whenever the terms in which a power is granted to Congress, or the nature of the power requires that it should be exercised exclusively by Congress, the subject is as completely taken from the State Legislatures as if they had been expressly forbidden to act on it." This is the character of the power in question.

All powers of the States, as sovereign States, must be subject to the limitations expressed in the United States Constitution, nor can they any more be permitted to overstep such limitations of power by the exercise of one branch of sovereignty than by the exercise of another. They are forbidden to them, and what they cannot do, directly, they should not be permitted to do by color, pretence, or oblique indirection.

In the Blackbird Creek Marsh Company, the Court held that a State law was not invalid merely because it made regulations of commerce, but that its invalidity depended upon its repugnancy to the law of Congress, passed in pursuance of the power granted. (2 Peters 246; 11 bid, 133; 14 bid, 67; 16 bid.)

If Congress has the power to regulate a subject matter, a State cannot interfere to obstruct or impede such regulation. The General Government, though limited, is supreme on those

subjects upon which it has power. (Martin vs. Hunter, 10 Wheat 381; Cohen vs. Virginia, 6 Wheat 381; Wigg v. Pennsylvania, 16 Peters, 589.)

The doctrine of State legislative interposition assumes the position, that the constituted agents of a State may arrest the execution of any law emanating from the National Legislature. It maintains that a State may impose a fine or penalty on any person employed in the execution of any law of the United States. The carrier of the mail, the collector of the revenue, the marshal of a district, the recruiting officer, may all be inhibited, under various pretexts, and may be arrested in the performance of their respective duties. This doctrine further asserts, that each member of the Union is capable, at its will, of attacking the nation, of obstructing its progress at every step, of acting vigorously and effectually in the execution of its despotic will, while the nation stands naked, denuded of its defensive arm, and incapable of protecting its agents or executing its laws, otherwise than by proceedings which are to take place under the mischievous interposition.

If the United States cannot rightfully protect the agents who execute a fugitive slave law authorized by the Constitution, from the direct action of State authorities, in the performance of their duties, they cannot rightfully protect those who execute any law.

It is a maxim applicable to the interpretation of a grant of political power, that the authority to create must infer a power effectually to protect, to preserve, and to sustain. (See McCulloch vs. Maryland, 4 Wheat, Rep., 421.)

It is no less a maxim, that the power to create a faculty of any sort, must confer the power to give it the means of exercise. A grant of the end is necessarily a grant of the means.

All Governments which are not extremely defective in their organization, must possess, within the means of expanding as well as well enforcing their own laws. To allow a State to arrest the execution of a law of Congress, would be equivalent to expunging the act from the statute book, and leave it dependent upon the fluctuating will of the State Legislatures, obeying or disregarding, at pleasure, this constitutional provision, and giving or refusing operation to it, by enacting or repealing laws upon the subject, and thus changing a fixed, permanent, established, fundamental law, operative or inoperative, as the Legislatures might act.

The general scope and objects of the Constitution preclude, therefore, the idea that the States should retain their absolute political independence, or that they possess any right under it to annul the acts of the National Government. The same conclusions result with equal certainty from a view of its particular provisions. Had it been intended that the States should possess the important power of annulling or repealing, at discretion, the acts of the General Government, this power would, undoubtedly, have been given to them in express terms. It is not even pretended that the Constitution contains any such express concession. Not only is there no express concession to this effect, but the idea that anything of the kind was intended, is precluded by several provisions of an opposite character. "This Constitution, and the laws and treaties made in pursuance of it, are the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." By this provision, any act of a State, whether performed in its sovereign or legislative capacity, pretending to annul an act of the General Government, is declared in advance to be null and void.

We think the State tribunals have no such power. The act of 1850 was enacted by Congress for the purpose of carrying into effect a national object. It is therefore a national measure, brought into existence by the exertion of the legislative power of the Union, and it would be innumerable if any State Legislature could impede the execution of a law made for national purposes, relative to a distinct matter over which the National Legislature has the exclusive right of legislation. Congress has a right to judge of the proper means of executing its laws; it has the power of directing those means by any law not forbidden by the Constitution; and no State Legislature can, consistently either with the letter or spirit of the Constitution, interfere with the exercise of this power. It is certain that the power itself is the power of the nation—that the whole Union are at once the grantors, and, (by their representatives,) the depositories of it—the subject matter upon which, or with a view to which it is executed, is entirely a national object, and that the sovereignty of Congress over it was commensurate for national ends.

The decision of the Judiciary of Pennsylvania takes the whole power over the reclamation of fugitive slaves, from the tribunal created by Congress, and by a strange proceeding exercises plebeian jurisdiction. This is an unauthorized assumption of judicial power, because it regulates the proceedings of the judicial tribunals of the United States.

We contended that whenever an act of Congress creates an offence, the State authorities have no jurisdiction regarding it.

We refer to a few of the cases in the State courts and first to the Commonwealth vs. Freely, Virginia Case, 32. This was an indictment for robbing the mail. Under an act of Congress which gave, in express terms, jurisdiction to the State Courts. But the Court of Errors in Virginia decided that they could not, under the Constitution, exercise it; and the whole Court entered the following judgment: "The Court doth unanimously decide that, as the offence described in the indictment in this case is created by an act of Congress, the said Superior Court, being a State Court, hath no jurisdiction thereof."

The same question came before the Supreme Court of New York, in United States vs. Lathrop, 17 Johns 4. This was an action of debt, brought to recover a penalty of \$150, under the act of Congress passed August 2, 1810, for selling spirituous liquors by retail, contrary to the provisions of that act, which, in terms, authorized the State Courts to take jurisdiction of offences committed under it. The Court decided that Congress could not confer jurisdiction on the State Courts, and they dismissed the action.

The case of Ely vs. Peck, [1 Connecticut Rep. 219.] was an action brought on a statute of the United States, to recover damages, which the plaintiff, as owner of a schooner, had sustained by the dereliction of the defendant. This act, also, in terms, conferred jurisdiction of the subject upon the State Courts; but the Supreme Court of Connecticut declined to act under it, holding that Congress cannot vest any portion of the judicial power of the United States, except in a Court created and established by itself, and that the State Courts are not created and established by Congress, and are not amenable to that body.

No principle is better settled, or more reasonable in itself, than that no State Legislature can, in any manner, invest or interfere with the process of the courts of the United States, or prescribe forms of proceeding under the laws of Congress.

The object of the law of 1850 was to invest the commissioners with full power to authorize, to receive, examine, and decide upon the validity of any asserted claims for the reclamation of fugitive slaves. Their decision, within the scope of their authority, is conclusive and final. If they pronounce the claim valid or invalid, their award in the premises is conclusive. The parties must abide by it as the decision of a judicial tribunal. The attempt to arrest its issue by a State tribunal, or deny its con-

clusiveness, is a manifest violation of the exclusive authority of Congress. It is doing that directly which the law itself prohibits to be done directly. It is, in effect, impeaching collaterally a sentence which the law has pronounced to be valid.

The act of 1850 is auxiliary to the Constitution. It does not deal with principles which the Constitution does not bear in its bosom. It contains subsidiary clauses, dependent provisions, flowing as corollaries from the Constitution.

In saying that the law of 1850 is just such a law as that of 1793, we mean that it is identical so far as it respects its object, the reclamation and giving up fugitive slaves. It acts simply as the echo of the act of 1793. It may with some propriety be called the twin brother of the act of 1793; its duplicate, its reflected portrait, for it re-creates with a tried fidelity all that the act of 1793 stipulates.

The doctrine advanced by the Judiciary of Pennsylvania would, perhaps, prove also that the Federal Government ought not to have the power of creating officers to operate internally—a position that would defeat the provisions of the Constitution, and all the purposes of the Union. The truth is, that no Federal Constitution can exist without powers that in their exercise affect the internal policy of the component members. It is equally true, that no Government can exist without a right to create subordinate officers for those purposes which proceed from, and concentrate in itself. The act of 1850 is simple and operative in its nature, general in its principle, and not at the disposal of a single will. There can be little confidence in a security under the revival of thirty discreet deliberators. It must, once for all, be defined and established on the faith of all the States, and not revocably by any, without the assent of the general compact.

Nobody objects to a State enforcing its own laws; all that is claimed is, that in executing them, it should not violate the laws of the Union, which are paramount.

SENATE TO MR. SOUTHWELL.—A number of the friends and admirers of Mr. Southwell, from different sections of the Union, manifested their regard for him, on the eve of his departure for Spain, by a farewell serenade at Washington, D. C., on Monday, the 25th ult. The company, with a marine band, proceeded to the residence of Mr. Southwell, where appropriate airs were performed and an address delivered by Mr. A. G. Haley, of Mississippi. Mr. Southwell replied in his usual eloquent manner, in the midst of which he was enthusiastically cheered.

The proceedings closed with the martial air of "The Marseilles Hymn," and a farewell cheer to the distinguished politician and orator.

Mr. Southwell left the following day for New York.

It is rumored in Washington that our fellow-townsman, Capt. A. M. Dupere, who led the charge at the National Bridge, is likely to receive a desirable commission.

The steamer J. S. Chenoweth, from the Ohio river, has jarred us late Louisville papers.

The Chesapeake and Delaware Ship Canal. The New York Mirror says of the ship canal which is to unite the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays:

Though other places will be benefited by this work in an eminent degree, it is the city of Baltimore that will take the cream and reap the greatest benefit of prosperity. Memphis Conventions may meet from year to year, and resolve and re-resolve in vain; practical action is the only thing that can accomplish their darling objects, one of which will be partially attained by this project. It will do more to build up a Southern City, and make it worthy the name of a rival to New York, than anything and everything that has hitherto been attempted. It will put into the lap of Baltimore much of the trade that is now sent to Charleston and Savannah, and draw some from Mobile and New Orleans. The wonder is that Baltimore has been so long insensible to the importance of the work.

The furniture and household effects of the late Hon. Wm. R. King, Vice President of the United States, were sold at auction, in Washington, on Tuesday, the 23rd ult. The Republic says the furniture was rich and beautiful, the greater part of it made in Paris. Among the many articles a rosewood Chickering piano was sold for \$247; a pair of rare bronze vases, with marble pedestals, \$169; a statuette of Cupid, 500; four sets of window curtains, with cornice and lustres, \$50 each; four arm chairs, \$30 each; a pair of Egyptian marble tables, elaborately carved and inlaid, two beautiful gilt and inlaid Biedermeier tables, and an oval center table, richly gilt and inlaid, with shell, were purchased by the Rev. Mr. W. C. C. of the President of the United States, for \$500 for the set.

SAVES AND STEAM.—The Sovereign of the Seas, a sailing ship, made the voyage from New York to Liverpool in nine days and nine hours, beating the steamer Canada that started with her.

This is the quickest trip ever made by a sailing vessel. The shortest previous one was made by the cutter Enterprise, Captain Ely, (now of the Collins steamship Pacific,) about ten years ago, in fourteen days and six hours. This Sovereign of the Seas has beaten by eleven hours.

HEAVY DAMAGES IN FAVOR OF A CALIFORNIA PASSENGER.—In the case of Orrin S. Bonstedt against Cornelius Vanderbilt and Daniel Drew, tried at the Ulster (New York) Circuit Court, for the great wreck in the Hudson river, the plaintiff for the sum of \$100,000. The action was for cruel and improper treatment of a passenger, who took passage by the Vanderbilt new line of steamers between New York and San Francisco, and for delay on the route.

HEAVY BANK ROBBERY.—The Mechanics' and Traders' Bank in Jersey city, was entered on Monday night, and \$50,000 of \$5000. The robbery was committed by a party of five, with which they entered the bank and plundered the vault of the above amount in bills and specie. Sheriff Maxwell led a bundle of the money on Monday, containing \$120,000, principally in the form of New Jersey Bank, which the thieves also carried off.

GOLD IN EAST TENNESSEE.—The Athens Post, of the 22d ult., says: "We have seen, within a few miles of the city of Athens, a large quantity of gold in the form of nuggets, and in the richest sort of specimens, and plenty of them where those who saw it were obtained."

MR. L. S. BULLOCK is now exhibiting his magnificent invention of the "Atmospheric Telegraph," in Worcester, Massachusetts, where it attracts much attention. It is proposed to lay down a line for the transmission of parcels of letters between Boston and Worcester, preliminary to the through line to New York.

An old German song says, in accounting for the general want of veracity among men— "Who ever tells the truth he goes to bed."

The journeyman house carpenters of New York are on a strike because their employers desire to reduce their wages from \$2 to \$1 75 per day.

The spiritualists of Illinois are to have a grand knocking convention at Farmington on the 29th of next month.

On the 1st of July there were 42 cases of cholera, and 20 deaths at St. Petersburg.

TELEGRAPHED TO THE CRESCENT.

By the National Int.

Later from Rio de Janeiro.

BALTIMORE, August 3.

The bark Rio has arrived here, bringing dates from Rio Janeiro to June 22. Her cargo consists of coffee, which is coming slowly at Rio, and that prices had slightly advanced. Flour was dull.

Senator Douglas, August 3.

It is reported here that Senator S. A. Douglas, of Illinois, now in Europe, has become a convert to the Roman Catholic faith, and has publicly joined the church at Rome.

Railroad Disaster—Louis, August 3.

A train of cars on the Delaware and Raritan Railroad, containing two hundred passengers, mostly workmen on the road, yesterday ran off the track near Lambertville, N. J. Ten persons were killed, and fifteen or twenty badly injured.

Kentucky Election.

LOUISVILLE, August 1.

The majority in this city for Preston, the whig candidate, in the congressional election, which was held on the 28th of July, is estimated to be about 5000. Breckenridge is probably elected by a fair majority in the Ashland district.

LOUISVILLE, August 1—10 P. M.

Breckenridge's election in the Ashland District is conceded.

LOUISVILLE, August 2.

Four whigs are elected to the Lower House from this city. Nothing yet heard from the districts below.

One whig and one democrat are elected to the Legislature on the county ticket.

LOUISVILLE, August 3.

Stanton, Democrat, has been re-elected to Congress in the Mayfield district by a small majority. As far as heard from, the whigs have gained two members on the State ticket for the Lower House.

Breckenridge's majority over Letcher, so far, is 620.

Ohio River—Steamboats.

LOUISVILLE, August 1.

The river here is falling, with 4 feet water in the canal.

The steamer Catherine Hays has arrived, and the following have departed for New Orleans: the Fanny Smith, the Statesman, the Franklin Pierce and the Dove.

LOUISVILLE, August 2.

The steamer J. P. Smith arrived, and the Wernupka has departed for New Orleans.

By the Southern Int.

Eastern Mail.

MOBILE, August 4.

The Eastern letter mail has arrived, bringing dates from New York of the 28th and 29th ult. The paper mail is not received.

The following communication from Mr. Pandely, in reply to the statement of Mr. Wiltz, in yesterday's paper, claims a brief notice at our hands. It is not true that we are "actuated by any other motives" than those which should govern every good citizen and although the statement against Mr. Pandely is certainly staggering, if not positive, as to his status, yet there has been no desire upon the part of any one connected with the Crescent to prejudice, by a single line of editorial, the public against him.

It is not true that Mr. Pandely's social and political position is now pending before a competent Court of Justice, and it is somewhat singular that he should attempt to impose such a belief upon the community.

The only question before the Court is that of the right of the Council to examine into the qualifications of a member whose eligibility has already been reported favorably upon.

If Mr. Pandely has no fear of the result of the investigation, why has he not use the Proprietor of this paper and Mr. Wiltz for liars? He was told, if he would resign, for the purpose of using Mr. Wiltz, that no publication would be made. His lawyer, we believe, and his friends advised him to do so; and one thing at least is certain, that neither could he have been cognizant of his having written a letter which would have been discarded for its improper tone from our columns, were it not that he might probably in such case attempt to arouse a sympathy in his behalf, on the ground of persecution, which seems to be the chief object of this communication in to-day's paper.

The Crescent is no one's "organ," and has made no assault upon Mr. Pandely. As we said before, we have nothing to do with this affair, and shall hazard no remarks relative thereto; it is a matter entirely between the accusers and the accused, in which we will not interfere farther than to set either party the space necessary for accusation and defense—admitting the productions of either party so long as they are couched in gentlemanly language—just as we would any ordinary business advertisement.

NEW ORLEANS, August 4, 1853.

Mr. Middle—Inasmuch as you have thought proper to publish a long list of documents, together with elaborate comments thereon, for the purpose of insinuating that I was a traitor to my country, you will, I hope, permit me to publish this card in reply to the unwarranted and abusive attack on my status as a free white citizen of the State of Louisiana and of the United States.

The question of my social and political position is now pending before a competent Court of Justice, and it would perhaps have comported better with these facts of even had and limited to the judicial authorities, and to the citizens, to have left the decision of this to me and my family—important question to the consideration of an enlightened and independent Court and Jury, than to attempt to insinuate the truth of my status by different publications of suppressed evidence, most of which is inadmissible in any Court of Justice. But it would seem that you, sir, and those at whom insinuation the libel against me was published in your paper, are actuated by different notions of propriety, and are ready to avail yourselves of every means, however contemptible and base they may be, to blast my fair name and name.

But by this it may, my articles will find that their aim to injure me will be signally defeated. For I shall prosecute the suit now pending, in which I challenge the strictest scrutiny into my blood and name, and in which I will prove beyond all cavil, doubt, or dispute, that I am a descendant as one of the thirteen self-constituted emigrants who have paraded what they are pleased to call their documentary evidence with such an air of self-satisfaction and of triumph.

The question which my enemies have raised is essentially a judicial one, and I have no fear of the result of the investigation in the proper forum.

But please you, sir, and those whose organ you paper is, to continue your insidious assaults on me, I shall take no further notice of them, but will patiently let the decision of every citizen, the "Egis of the Law" be spread over every citizen, however humble he may be.

I. PANDELY.

IMPORTANT TO PLANTERS.—The following letter was written by a gentleman well known to the firm to whom it is addressed, and its contents are of importance to all having the care of plantations:

NEW ORLEANS, Jan. 5, 1853.

Dear Sir, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th inst. in relation to the matter of the late Mr. J. S. Bulluck's estate, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant, J. S. Bulluck.

ANNISEED—50 sacks in store, for sale by J. S. Bulluck & Co., 100 N. 2nd St.

SCOTCH SNUFF—50 boxes Broom's, in store, for sale by J. S. Bulluck & Co., 100 N. 2nd St.

SPIRITS OF NITRE—30 casks in store, for sale by J. S. Bulluck & Co., 100 N. 2nd St.

ESSENCE OF PEPPERMINT—200 boxes in store, for sale by J. S. Bulluck & Co., 100 N. 2nd St.

CASTILE SOAP—100 boxes in store, for sale by J. S. Bulluck & Co., 100 N. 2nd St.

LOCAL MATTERS.

Report of the Charity Hospital for Tuesday, August 3.

Admissions 71; Discharges 41; Deaths 4; Recoveries 28; Other Dismissals 10.

Daily Report of the Intermittents in all the Cemeteries of the city for the 24 hours ending at 6 o'clock P. M., on Thursday, the 4th inst.

Protestant, 6; Roman Catholic, 4; Hebrew, 2; Infants, 1; Total, 13.

First District School, Directors. A meeting of the School Board of the First District was held last evening, but only six members—Messrs. Bowie, Moore, Criswell, Hahn, Moseley and Simpson—were present at the hour appointed.

ISSUE.—An inquest was named John Flaherty, residing at the corner of Claiborne and St. Louis streets, was yesterday charged before Recorder Landon with having killed his wife and child, who were sick with the yellow fever. He was taken care of by the police.

Whipped Him.—Richard Welch, for assaulting John Drury with a whip on the 23d of July, was yesterday committed to the First District Court under bonds of \$100.

Rooms for the Poor Free.—During the prevalence of the epidemic, several poor persons, of a family of general means, have the use of the rooms in Building No. 24, under the care of the Board of Health, for the purpose of recovering from the effects of the disease.

House and Sign Painting. A. WOODS, No. 60 Customhouse street, near Royal.

City Bank of Cochran & Co. 35 Camp street.

Wm. O. Diboll, CARPENTER AND BUILDER, No. 170 St. Joseph street.

Dr. Edw. Jenner Carr, Surgeon, No. 75 Camp st.

Bargains, Bargains, Bargains! PRICES REDUCED! ALFRED MUNROE & CO.

Magazine Street, Corner of Market.

Wines, Liquors, Cordials, etc., etc. BOTTLED AND KEPT AT THE SIGN OF THE BOTTLE, 100 N. 2nd St.

Office Mobile and New Orleans.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.

Office of the Board of Health, No. 24 Building.