Frederick, (Mr. Johnson,) allowed to each a representation according to federal numbers, but contained no provision for a new apportionment under a new census. In this respect the substitute was defective, because the Legislature would be at a loss to determine whether a new apportionment ought to be made after each national census, or at intermediate periods, according to the annual change of population. In the proposition he was about to submit, he had provided against all uncertainty, and made it the duty of the Legislature, after every national census, to apportion the delegates among the several counties of the State according to their respective population.

Mr. G. then offered the following substitute, which was read:

The Legislature at its first session after the returns of the national census of 1860 are published, and in like manner after each subsequent census, shall apportion the members of the House of Delegates, among the several counties of the State, according to the population of each, and shall always allow to the city of Baltimore four more delegates than are allowed to the most populous county; but no county shall be entitled to less than two members, nor shall the whole number of delegates ever exceed eighty or be less than sixty-five. And till the apportionment is made under the census of 1860, the city of Baltimore shall be entitled to nine delegates, Baltimore county to six, Frederick six, Washington five, Allegany four, Prince George's three, Anne Arundel three, Carroll three, Montgomery two, Harford three, Charles two, Howard two, Calvert two, St. Mary's two, Somerset four, Worcester three, Dorchester three, Caroline two, Talbot two, Queen Anne's two, Kent two, and Cecil three.

Baltimore city	9 members
Baltimore county	6
Frederick	6
Washington	5
Allegany	4
Prince George's	3
Montgomery	2
Anne Arundel	3
Carroll	3
Harford	3
Charles	2
Howard	2
Calvert	2
St. Mary's	2
Somerset	4
Worcester	3
Dorchester	3
Caroline	2
Talbot	2
Queen Anne's	2
Kent	2
Cecil	3
	73

Mr. DORSEY moved that the further consideration of the order of the day be postponed, and the substitute be printed; which was not agreed to.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the substitute.

Mr. TUCK thought they had better lay the subject on the table, and rescind the order passed two days ago allowing each gentleman five minutes to make an explanation, whether he offered an amendment or not; for the House would bear in mind that gentlemen were in the practice of raising questions of order when they had an opportunity of discussing the question. He moved to lay the substitute and amendment on the table.

The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. TUCK, to lay the substitute and amendment on the table, and determined in the negative.

The question again recurred upon the adoption of the substitute as offered by Mr. GRASON.

Mr. JENIFER moved so to amend the substitute by striking out and inserting to "Prince George's 4; Charles 3; Howard 3; Calvert 3; St. Mary's 3; Caroline 3; Talbot 3; Queen Anne's 3; Kent 3; and Montgomery 3."

Mr. JENIFER demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered and taken, and resulted as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Sollers, Jenifer, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hodson, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Kilgour and Waters—34.

Negative—Messrs. Donaldson, Selman, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Colston, Phelps, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore City, Brent, of Baltimore, City, Sherwood, of Balt. City, Presstman, Ware, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitspatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown —49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The question again recurred upon the adoption of the substitute as offered by Mr. Grason.

Mr. THOMAS, moved to amend the substitute by striking out "nine," in 15th line, and inserting "ten," and by striking out "three" in the 8th line, and inserting "four;"

Mr. BRENT, of Balt. city, moved for a division of the question, which was taken upon striking out, and determined in the affirmative.

The question then recurred upon the amendment as offered by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. DORSEY, moved for a division of the question upon the amendment;

The question was then taken on the first branch of the amendment, to strike out "nine" and insert "ten."

Mr. DORSEY demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered and taken, and were as follows: