

Mr. Anderson submitted the following proposed amendment to the proposed amendment :

Strike out all after the word "provided."

Which was rejected.

The question then recurred on the proposed amendment as submitted by Mr. Wilkinson.

Mr. Wilkinson demanded the yeas and nays.

The demand was sustained.

The yeas and nays were called and appeared as follows :

**AFFIRMATIVE.**—Messrs. Carrico, Maddox, Collins, Wooters, Green, Anderson, Sterling, Meredith, Smith, of Dorchester, Miles, Franklin, Wilkinson, Hayman, McSherry, Gaver, Bevard, Hayward, Deen, Smith, of Washington, Garrott, Laird, Young, Hosken, Sr., Haines, Sellman, Tracey, Ellegood, Laws, Moore, Bittinger—59.

**NEGATIVE.**—Messrs. Speaker, Combs, Garner, Strong, Brashears, Donaldson, Hatchins, Sappington, of Anne Arundel, Ireland, Lane, Orrick, Cole, Elliott, Hamilton, Jr., Monmonier, Schlaffer, Kirk, Beeks, Grove, of Cecil, Bowie, of Prince George's, Hill, Wallen, Grove, of Frederick, Sappington, of Frederick, Stearns, Thompson, Fuld, Fitzgerald, Brennan, Fox, Carter, Field, Bowie, of Balto. city, O'Connor, Gallagher, Gill, Sams, Sanders, Frincke, Carr, Cornthwaite, Shafer, Barber, Stottlemeyer, Berret, Leeds, Haslup, Michaels—48.

So the proposed amendment was rejected.

On motion of Mr. Sams,

The vote by which the following proposed amendment submitted by Mr. Sams on the 11th, viz.:

**AMENDMENT PROPOSED.**

But this section shall not apply to any property whatsoever belonging to the Johns Hopkins University and the Johns Hopkins Hospital, which is hereby exempted from State and municipal taxation.

Was postponed until the conclusion of the second reading of the bill, was reconsidered.

On motion, the said proposed amendment was then considered.

Which was rejected.