The yeas and nays were called, and appeared as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs.	Ecker,	Pugh,
Goldsborough, P't	Galloway,	Purnell,
Abbott,	Greene,	Russell,
Annan,	Hebb,	Schlosser,
Audoun,	Jones, of Cecil,	Scott,
Baker,	Kennard,	Smith, of Wor.
Barron,	King,	Sneary,
Cunningham,	Markey,	Stirling,
Cushing,	McComas,	Stockbridge,
Daniel,	Mullikin,	Swope,
Davis, of Wash.,	Murray,	$\operatorname{Todd},$
Dellinger,	Parker,	Wooden— $35.$

NEGATIVE.

Messrs.	Dent,	Marbury,
Belt,	Duvall,	Mitchell,
Billingsley,	Edelen,	Miller,
Blackiston,	Henkle,	Morgan,
Brown,	Hollyday,	Parran,
Chambers,	Horsey,	Peter,
Crawford,	Johnson,	Smith, of Dor.,
Dail,	${ m Lansdale},$	Turner—25.
Davis of Charles.	Lee.	

So the question upon its adoption was decided in the affirmative.

Mr. Edelen gave notice that at the proper time he would submit the following amendment:

Insert as an additional section, the following:

Sec. —. The obligation of the Judges of Election to administer the oath required in section two, shall only exist in those cases whenever the vote of the person offering to vote may be challenged.

Mr. Belt submitted the following amendment:

Strike out section one of the third part of the Report;

Decided in the negative.

Mr. Davis, of Charles, submitted the following amendment:

Sec. 2, of part three, line one, strike out the word "may," and insert the word "shall;"