

The question recurring upon the adoption of the amendment,

Mr. Robinson demanded the yeas and nays,

The demand being sustained,

The yeas and nays were called and appeared as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs.

Dunbar,  
Robinson,  
Rullman,

Turner,  
Fitzjarrell,

Snowden,  
Dashiell—7.

NEGATIVE.

Messrs.

Mattingly,  
Usilton,  
Hodges,  
Baldwin,  
Whitelock,  
Curtis,  
Given,  
Lankford,  
Gunby,  
Ford,  
Ward,  
Cockey,  
Neal,

Purnell,  
Riggs,  
Vandiver,  
Culbreth,  
Goldsborough,  
Rusk,  
Berkemeier,  
Lewis,  
McWilliams,  
Hoblitzell,  
Stewart,  
McAleese,  
Gill,

Chaisty,  
Harig,  
Sanders,  
Farrow,  
Ranger,  
Jones,  
Griffith,  
Rawlings,  
Sprigg,  
Brown,  
Rinehart,  
Lamotte,  
Browning—39.

So the amendment submitted by Mr. Robinson was rejected.

Pending the call of the roll, in taking the vote upon the above amendment submitted by Mr. Robinson,

Mr. Hinks declined to vote because he deemed the proposition unworthy of consideration by this House.

Mr. Nail also declined to vote for the reasons advanced by Mr. Hinks.

Mr. Rutledge declined to vote for the reason that the amendment offered by the member from Anne Arundel is a sneer and reflection on the majority of the House who voted for the amendment of Mr. Hoblitzell.

Mr. Scott declined to vote because he considered the proposition too trifling to receive any consideration from gentlemen interested and earnestly engaged in advancing the best interests of the entire people of the State.

Mr. Donaldson refuses to vote because this proposition is belittling of the whole subject, and cannot be entertained consistently with the self-respect of this House.

Mr. Clark declined to vote because he considered the proposition unbecoming, undignified and ridiculous.