

Order of Encampment, July 22d, and August 5th.

STATE OF N. C., GEN'L HDQRS., ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE, RALEIGH, July 2, 1890.

[General Orders, No. 11.] Unless otherwise directed by special orders, the movement of the troops to the encampments to be held at Camp Latimer, near Wrightsville, on July 22d and August 5th, 1890, will be as follows:

FIRST REGIMENT.—Colonel, J. W. Cotten, Tarboro.

Company A.—Captain, J. H. Foxhall, Tarboro; via W. & W. Railroad; leave on morning of the 23d of July.

Company B.—Captain, Richard Williams, Greenville; via W. & W. Railroad; leave on morning of 23d of July.

Company C.—Captain, J. J. Bernard, Raleigh; via R. & D. R. R., leave on afternoon of 23d July.

Company D.—Captain, W. T. Hollowell, Goldsboro; via W. & W. R. R.; leave on afternoon of 23d July.

Company E.—Captain, J. E. Wood, Elizabeth City; via Norfolk and Weldon; leave on evening of 21st July.

Company F.—Captain, P. J. Macon, Warrenton; via Weldon; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company G.—Captain, W. H. McDevitt, Washington; via Jamesville and W. & W. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d July.

THIRD REGIMENT.—Colonel, W. F. Gray, Winston.

Company A.—Captain, Robert B. Glenn, Winston; via C. F. & Y. V. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d of July.

Company B.—Captain, J. C. Tippton, Greensboro; via C. F. & Y. V. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company C.—Captain, Henry Perry, Henderson; via Oxford and Durham; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company D.—Captain, W. A. Gattis, Jr., Durham; via R. & D. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company E.—Captain, W. A. Roberts, Oxford; via Durham and R. & D. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company F.—Captain, E. C. Holt, Burlington; via R. & D. R. R. and Goldsboro; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company G.—Captain, G. W. Howlett, Reidsville; via Greensboro and Goldsboro; leave on morning of 23d July.

Company H.—Captain, A. J. Ellington, Reidsville; via Greensboro and Goldsboro; leave on morning of 23d July.

Band of Third Regiment.—Drum-Major, Ches. W. Rice, Newtow; via R. & D. R. R.; leave on morning of 23d July.

Second Encampment, August 5th to 12th, inclusive.

FOURTH REGIMENT.—Colonel, J. T. Anthony, Charlotte.

Company A.—Captain, J. F. Armistead, Statesville; via Salisbury and Goldsboro; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company B.—Captain, W. W. Metz, Goldsboro; via C. F. & R. R.; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company C.—Captain, R. A. E. Hyatt, Waynesville; via Salisbury and Goldsboro; leave on evening of 4th August.

Company D.—Captain, Duff Merriam, Asheville; via Salisbury and Goldsboro; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company E.—Captain, Robert S. Young, Concord; via R. & D. R. R.; leave on morning of 4th August.

Company F.—Captain, W. F. Holland, Salisbury; via C. F. & R. R.; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company G.—Captain, John D. Malloy, Lumber Bridge; via C. F. & W. & W. R. R.; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company H.—Captain, W. R. Keenan, Wilmington; will report at Camp at 6 p. m. on 5th August.

Company I.—Captain, H. R. Thorpe, Rocky Mount; via W. & W. R. R.; leave on morning of 5th August.

Company J.—Captain, Wm. Black, Maxton; via C. F. & R. R.; leave on evening of 5th August.

Company K.—Captain, John F. Bruton, Wilson; via W. & W. R. R.; leave on morning of 5th August.

TROOP CAVALRY.

The Scotland Neck Mounted Rifle Regiment (dismounted)—Captain, G. S. Whitte, via Weldon; leave on morning of 5th August.

II. Commanding officers are cautioned to observe and strictly enforce the regulations regarding the transportation of troops by rail, prescribed in Article XVIII, State Guard Regulations.

III. Detachments of each regiment en route will be commanded by the senior officer of the line present.

IV. The commanding officer of each company, detachment or regiment, will notify the Adjutant General by telegram, upon taking the cars for the point of destination, and will promptly notify him in case of accident or serious delay, addressing him at Wrightsville.

V. The headquarters of the Adjutant General will be at Wrightsville from the 20th of July, where all communications for him should be addressed.

VI. Encampments of the North Carolina State Guard being held by authority of law, all officers and enlisted men of the several regiments required to be present for duty.

The officers of the several regiments absent from their regiments, with all the facts regarding the cause of absence. They will also forward to these headquarters the names of the several regiments, with all the facts regarding the cause of absence. They will also forward to these headquarters the names of the several regiments, with all the facts regarding the cause of absence.

By order of the Commander-in-Chief: JAS. D. GLENN, Adjutant General.

FIRST SESSION.

Conference Report on Consular and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill Approved in Senate—An Effort to Take Up the Tariff Bill Defeated—The Shipping Bills Debated—Bill to Forfeit Lands Granted to Uncompleted Railroads Debated in the House.

By Telegraph to the Morning Star.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, July 7.—The conference report on the Consular and Diplomatic Appropriation Bill was presented and agreed to.

Mr. Morrill moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the tariff bill. He said after the tariff bill was taken up it could be laid aside informally until the two shipping bills were disposed of.

Mr. Harris asked the presiding officer whether the two shipping bills would come up as "unfinished business" at 2 o'clock.

The presiding officer (Ingalls) replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Harris suggested to Mr. Morrill not to make his motion till after 2 o'clock, but Mr. Morrill said he preferred to make it at the present time.

Mr. Gibson asked Mr. Frye whether he did not propose to ask for the consideration of the river and harbor bill to-day.

Mr. Frye said he had given notice to that effect, but was not personally concerned about its consideration to-day. He would certainly, however, feel obliged to ask its consideration before the tariff bill could be completed.

He would not now antagonize the tariff bill with the river and harbor bill, but if the tariff bill were going to consume two or three weeks he would not consent to yield that length of time to it.

Mr. Edmunds—We will take the judgment of the Senate upon it.

Mr. Plumb—It will not do to ask unanimous consent to take up the river and harbor bill during the pending of the tariff bill, because certainly one member of the Senate will object to that.

Mr. Frye—I shall not ask unanimous consent.

Mr. Plumb—Then the Senator would have to move to take up the tariff bill at 2 o'clock, without notice.

Mr. Gorman—Do I understand that the Senator from Vermont desires to take up the tariff bill and have it considered during the pending of the tariff bill? Mr. Edmunds—That is what he wants to do. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. Gorman repeated his question.

Mr. Morrill already stated that I will give the tariff bill to the Senator from Maine for his shipping bill, but I desire to have the tariff bill before the Senate at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Carlisle—I am unable to see, for me to do anything but to take up the tariff bill with the methods of proceeding in this body, that anything is to be gained by taking up the tariff bill at this time; certainly not if it is to be laid aside from time to time.

The Senator from Maine desired to complete the consideration of the shipping bills, and that after that he desired to take up the tariff bill.

Mr. Edmunds—That is what he wants to do. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. Gorman repeated his question.

Mr. Morrill—The Senator from Maine will not sustain it, so that when the tariff bill is taken up for consideration we may proceed with it in the regular way until it is completed.

Mr. Edmunds—We are to bring the session to a close at an early period, it is necessary that we take up the most important bill that is before us. My purpose was merely that the tariff bill should be ordered to the top of the list of the two shipping bills so that Senators who desire to speak on the subject at large will have an opportunity to do so. Then we can go on with the other amendments as the bill progresses.

Mr. Harris—I do not know that anything can be gained by taking up the tariff bill at 2 o'clock, and then having it laid aside with the fall of the gavel at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Morrill—We will have gained the reading of the bill.

Mr. Edmunds—object to further debate.

A vote was taken on Mr. Morrill's motion and the result was—yeas 16, nays 24; no quorum.

Then there was a call of the roll, to which 49 Senators responded. A vote was again taken, and the Senate refused to take up the tariff bill (yeas 20, nays 29).

Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Davis, Dixon, Dolph, Edmunds, Fairbank, Faulkner, Frye, Gorman, Harlan, Hiseock, Manderson, Merrill, Platt, Pugh, Quay, Sawyer, Sherman, Stockbridge—total 20.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Bate, Berry, Carlisle, Cannon, Chandler, Hammon, Harris, Jones of Arkansas, Mitchell, Pasco, Payne, Plumb, Ransom, Reagan, Squire, Stewart, Teller, Turpie, Vest, Voorhees—total 29.

Mr. Reagan said that he agreed most heartily with the purpose of building up again the tariff bill, but that he did not agree with the policy of the pending bills. The United States had a revenue system that approached prohibition of international commerce.

At the close of Mr. Reagan's remarks the election bill was received from the House, and was, on motion of Mr. Frye, ordered to lie on the table until the return to Washington of Mr. Hoar, chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Morgan addressed the Senate, on the subject of the tariff bill. He suggested to Mr. Frye to let the experiment be tried of permitting American citizens to buy ships abroad, and to sail them under an American flag.

Mr. Morgan yielded the floor temporarily, and Mr. Sherman presented the conference report on the silver bill. After it was read in full he gave notice that he would call it up for action to-morrow morning.

Mr. Morgan continued his argument against the subsidy shipping bill. The truth of the matter was, he said, that the ocean carrying trade was overdone; and until that condition of things was altered freight must be carried by vessels of our own flag.

Mr. Frye made some additional remarks in support of the bills and concluded by saying that he hoped to get votes on both bills to-morrow. He earnestly hoped that both bills would be sent to the House, and he believed that if they were one of them would be sent at 5 o'clock adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The Speaker having directed the Journal to be read, Mr. Rogers, of Arkansas, raised the point of order that no quorum was present.

The Speaker counted 91 members, and on motion of Mr. McKinley a call of the House was ordered.

One hundred and sixty-seven, (a quorum), having responded to their names, the Journal of Thursday's proceedings was read.

Mr. Bland, of Missouri, rising to a question of privilege, sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a press dispatch, stating he was absent from the conference meeting on the Silver bill on Saturday last. In order that he should not be placed in a false light and appear to be neglecting his duty, he read a note, which he had received from Mr. Conger, chairman of the House conference, stating that there would not be a meeting of the conference Saturday.

On motion of Mr. Payne, of Illinois, the House went into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Senate bill to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, with the House substitute therefor. Mr. Payne explained that the bill, in its general provisions, proposed to forfeit and restore to the public domain all public lands, wherever situated, which have been granted in aid of construction, where railroads have not been completed at the expiration of the term for which they were granted.

Mr. Payne stated that there had been thirty-seven railroads aided by acts of Congress, which had not been completed within the time fixed by Congress. Twelve of these grants had been forfeited, comprising 50,000 acres. That left twenty-five roads which had not been acted upon. Nine had been fully completed. That left sixteen railroads which were now uncompleted, and the House substitute recommended forfeiture of all lands lying opposite such portions of the roads as were not constructed. It was his opinion that no bill of a broader character than this could ever pass the Senate and become a law. A careful estimate was to the effect that this would restore to 70,000 acres to the public domain.

Mr. Oats, of Alabama, approved the bill because it forfeited only lands situated along uncompleted portions of the road.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

Mr. Stone, of Missouri, took the position that forfeiture should be made of the lands which had been granted by a railroad at the time fixed in the granting acts for the completion of the roads.

cede, to retrograde, to go back, and to the hostile Treasury Department. He should not vote for the bill. He would vote for any bill that bettered the present law, but he agreed with the Senator from Texas, (Coke), that the conference bill was not an improvement on the present law. It was more vague than the present law, more uncertain, and left more discretion to the Secretary, and consequently involved the interests of the people in more doubt.

Mr. Teller said that much as he disliked the bill, he would not vote against it—a measure that thwarted the will of the people for free and unlimited coinage of silver—was he compelled to support the present law, or would he be able to secure free coinage of silver at the present session—not that he did not believe that there was a majority in its favor in the House of Representatives, but because under a present law he could not do so.

Mr. Teller—Does not the Senator recognize the fact that under that section the Secretary of the Treasury can pay treasury notes in silver if he chooses?

Mr. Teller—Then it is simply a question of how the Secretary will exercise that discretion.

Mr. Cockerill—No question about that. Mr. Teller—Does not the Senator agree that the Secretary of the Treasury will be able to pay the notes in silver if he chooses?

Mr. Cockerill—Certainly.

Mr. Cockerill—Think not; not at all. Mr. Teller—That is the way that France has maintained her parity between the two metals. When the price of gold rises, she issues gold, and when the price of silver rises, she issues silver.

Mr. Cockerill—Precisely what I have said. The article is from a reliable representative of gold interests, and it is a warning from the Senator from Nevada (Jones) to put silver on the same level of equality with gold.

This conference report is intended as a bold declaration that the country is still on a single gold standard, and that in the re-issuance of the standard, the Secretary of the Treasury can drive the country to part with every dollar of gold and can lock up in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury that is the most dangerous power ever given to a Secretary of the Treasury since the foundation of the government.

Mr. Platt—Does the Senator mean to say that he would not give to the Secretary of the Treasury discretion as to which coin he would pay in?

Mr. Cockerill—I certainly would give him that discretion. I would say: "Redeemable in coin."

Mr. Platt—That is all that there is to this.

Mr. Cockerill—That is true; but there is with it a declaration, which is the fatal thing, and that is that the gold standard still exists and must be maintained.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.

The Speaker, while admitting the necessity for absolute correctness in the record of those members present, and in voting, stated that even if the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were a quorum present. He therefore declared the motion to table carried, and put the question on the vote on the conference report. The vote resulted—yeas 111, nays 83—and the Speaker was unable to count a quorum.

So the conference report was not agreed to for the present.

Mr. Dingley entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Marine Signal bill was passed, and then at 5:55 the House adjourned.

Mr. Cockerill—In other words, the distinguished Senator from Nevada is withdrawing his challenge to the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert, and is willing to accept the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.

The Speaker, while admitting the necessity for absolute correctness in the record of those members present, and in voting, stated that even if the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were a quorum present. He therefore declared the motion to table carried, and put the question on the vote on the conference report. The vote resulted—yeas 111, nays 83—and the Speaker was unable to count a quorum.

So the conference report was not agreed to for the present.

Mr. Dingley entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Marine Signal bill was passed, and then at 5:55 the House adjourned.

Mr. Cockerill—In other words, the distinguished Senator from Nevada is withdrawing his challenge to the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert, and is willing to accept the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.

The Speaker, while admitting the necessity for absolute correctness in the record of those members present, and in voting, stated that even if the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were a quorum present. He therefore declared the motion to table carried, and put the question on the vote on the conference report. The vote resulted—yeas 111, nays 83—and the Speaker was unable to count a quorum.

So the conference report was not agreed to for the present.

Mr. Dingley entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Marine Signal bill was passed, and then at 5:55 the House adjourned.

Mr. Cockerill—In other words, the distinguished Senator from Nevada is withdrawing his challenge to the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert, and is willing to accept the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.

The Speaker, while admitting the necessity for absolute correctness in the record of those members present, and in voting, stated that even if the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were a quorum present. He therefore declared the motion to table carried, and put the question on the vote on the conference report. The vote resulted—yeas 111, nays 83—and the Speaker was unable to count a quorum.

So the conference report was not agreed to for the present.

Mr. Dingley entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Marine Signal bill was passed, and then at 5:55 the House adjourned.

Mr. Cockerill—In other words, the distinguished Senator from Nevada is withdrawing his challenge to the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert, and is willing to accept the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.

The Speaker, while admitting the necessity for absolute correctness in the record of those members present, and in voting, stated that even if the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were a quorum present. He therefore declared the motion to table carried, and put the question on the vote on the conference report. The vote resulted—yeas 111, nays 83—and the Speaker was unable to count a quorum.

So the conference report was not agreed to for the present.

Mr. Dingley entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Marine Signal bill was passed, and then at 5:55 the House adjourned.

Mr. Cockerill—In other words, the distinguished Senator from Nevada is withdrawing his challenge to the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert, and is willing to accept the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill.

Mr. Jones, of Nevada—Are you advocating a change in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury? Do you desire a change and Mr. Tillman and Mr. Sherman? Not at all. My contention is not that. My contention is against the language of the conference bill, which withdrew his challenge to the names of Messrs. Crain and Filtrill, but persevered in it as far as the names of Messrs. Enloe and Herbert were concerned.