

to be paid as aforesaid, and if as a result of said examination the said board shall determine that said sewage, or the result thereof, contains any impurities detrimental to the oyster or fish industry of the State, said board shall, and it is hereby clothed with the authority to prohibit any further discharge of said sewage, and also any of the results thereof, as aforesaid, by said city, and when so prohibited the right of said city so to discharge said sewage and the results thereof shall cease.

“But no such examination shall be required to be made within a shorter period than three months from the time of the previous examination. And every examination made as hereinbefore provided, shall be made public at the expense of said city.”

Which proposed amendment to amendment proposed was rejected by yeas and nays, as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs. Baker,	Marsh,	
Dennis,	Messick,	
Dodson,	Wilkinson,	
Gray,		—7.

NEGATIVE.

Messrs. President,	Moses,	
Beasman,	Peter,	
Betts,	Putzel,	
Bouic,	Rohrback,	
Brewington,	Williams, of Har.,	
Bryan,	Williams, of A. A.,	
Crothers,		—13.

The question then recurred upon the amendment proposed by Mr. Bryan, as amended.

Which proposed amendment, as amended,

Was adopted by yeas and nays, as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE

Messrs. President,	Crothers,
Beasman,	Moore,
Betts,	Moses,
Bouic,	Peter,