

Mr. Hoblitzell moved that the further consideration of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The question recurring upon concurring in the motion,

Mr. Hoblitzell demanded the yeas and nays.

The demand being sustained,

The yeas and nays were called and appeared as follows:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs.

Mattingly,	Smith, of Dor.,	Hoblitzell,
Boyer,	Waters, of Dor.,	McGlone,
Hodges,	Briscoe,	Stewart,
Turner,	Ward,	Gill,
Bird,	Gwynn,	Hart,
Lancaster,	Cockey,	Chaisty,
Baldwin,	Neal,	Farrow,
Whitelock,	Riggs,	Ranger,
Curtis,	Hinks,	Canby,
Smith, of B. co.,	Naill,	Griffith,
Given,	Koons,	Rawlings,
Fitzjarrell,	Vandiver,	Sprigg,
Dodson,	Culbreth,	Rinehart,
Gunby,	Berkemeier,	Donaldson,
Ford,	McWilliams,	Bfowning—45.

NEGATIVE.

Messrs.

Dunbar,	Rutledge,	Atkinson,
Usilton,	Goldsborough,	Brooke,
Rullman,	Lewis,	Brown,
Hooper,	McAleese,	Lamotte,
Constable,	Loane,	Gordy—17.
Hance,	Sanders,	

So the motion prevailed, and the further consideration of said bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Gill moved that the vote by which said bill had been indefinitely postponed, be reconsidered.

Mr. Hoblitzell made the point of order that the bill having been indefinitely postponed, a motion to reconsider was out of order.

The Speaker, decided that: The point of order being raised, that a motion to reconsider the vote by which a bill was indefinitely postponed cannot be entertained, it becomes necessary, not only to construe Rules twenty-one and twenty-nine of this House, but also to review the previous action of this body, upon a similar question, when the Chair was occupied by the Speaker *pro tem*. The only difference between that