

The yeas and nays were called and appeared as follows:

## AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs. Abbott,	Hoffman,	Pugh,
Annan,	Hopkins,	Purnell,
Baker,	Hopper,	Robinette,
Barron,	Jones, of Cecil,	Russell,
Carter,	Keefer,	Sands,
Cunningham,	Kennard,	Schley,
Cushing,	King,	Sneary,
Daniel,	Larsh,	Stirling,
Davis, of Wash.	Markey,	Sykes,
Dellinger,	McComas,	Thruston,
Ecker,	Mullikin,	Todd,
Farrow,	Murray,	Valliant,
Galloway,	Negley,	Wickard,
Greene,	Noble,	Wooden—44.
Hebb,	Nyman,	

## NEGATIVE.

Messrs.	Clarke,	Marbury,
Goldsborough, P't	Crawford,	Mitchell,
Audoun,	Davis, of Charles,	Miller,
Belt,	Duvall,	Morgan,
Berry, of Balt. co.	Earle,	Parker,
Berry, of P. Geo.	Edelen,	Parran,
Billingsley,	Harwood,	Peter,
Blackiston,	Henkle,	Scott,
Bond,	Horsey,	Smith of Car.
Briscoe,	Johnson,	Smith, of Dor.
Brooks,	Jones, of Som.	Thomas,
Brown,	Lansdale,	Wilmer—37.
Chambers,	Lee,	

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

Mr. Clarke, of Prince George's, appealed from the decision of the Chair, declaring the amendment of the Standing Rules offered by the gentleman from Baltimore city adopted by a vote of 44 in the affirmative and 37 in the negative, upon the ground that the Rules of Order having been adopted by a majority of the members elected to this Convention, they can only be changed by a vote of the majority of the members elected to the Convention, and upon the ground that according to parliamentary practice, where it takes a majority of the members elected to any deliberative body to adopt a rule, it requires the same number to change or repeal.

Mr. Daniel moved to lay the appeal on the table.