

# TEXAS LAW | Tarlton Law Library Jamail Center for Legal Research

Citation: *Debates of the Texas Convention. Wm. F. Weeks, Reporter. Houston: Published by J.W. Cruger, 1846.*

Content downloaded from

Tarlton Constitutions 1824-1876 (<http://tarlton.law.utexas.edu/constitutions/>)

The text of these documents is in the public domain. That is, the original words and content are freely usable.

The images of the documents are copyrighted material; the copyright is held by the Tarlton Law Library. The copyrighted images may be used only with permission. Permission is granted to use the copyrighted materials in the classroom for educational purposes. Downloading, printing, publication, public display or otherwise using any of the copyrighted images, including on the web or in a forum other than a classroom, requires permission from Tarlton. Requests for permission to use these materials should be submitted online to [rarebooks@law.utexas.edu](mailto:rarebooks@law.utexas.edu).

If you are uncertain whether you need permission to use these materials, please contact us at [rarebooks@law.utexas.edu](mailto:rarebooks@law.utexas.edu).

Thursday, July 17th, 1845.  
Half-past 8 o'clock, A. M.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment.

Prayer by the Chaplain.

On motion of Mr. Gage, the resolution to establish a Land Office in Eastern Texas was taken up.

Propositions were made to establish Land Offices at several different points, all of which, together with the original resolution was, on motion of Mr. Forbes, referred to the committee on the State of the Nation.

Mr. Wright introduced the following resolution :

*Resolved,* That the committee on General Provisions be instructed to enquire into the expediency of establishing judicial counties, which was read and laid on the table one day for consideration.

Mr. Rusk offered the following resolution :

*Resolved,* That the committee on General Provisions of the Constitution, be instructed to inquire into the expediency and propriety of inserting the following article among the General Provisions, to wit :

All laws and parts of laws which are now in force in Texas, and which are not inconsistent with this Constitution, or the Constitution of the United States, shall continue in force until they may be repealed, altered or amended by the legislature; and no rights which are vested shall be divested, nor shall any rights or actions which have been divested by the Constitution and laws of the Republic of Texas, be re-vested, or in any way revived or reinstated by this Constitution, but the same shall remain and continue in the same situation as they would have done under the laws and Constitution of the Republic of Texas, before the adoption of this Constitution; which was read, and,

On motion of Mr. Van Zandt, the rule requiring it to lay on the table one day for consideration was suspended, and the resolution adopted.

Mr. Hogg offered the following resolution :

*Resolved,* That the Legislative Committee be requested to take into consideration the apportionment of representation, and the formation of Senatorial districts, also that the document herewith submitted, be taken under consideration, marked (A) fixing the Senatorial ratio at 1,000 voters, and document marked (B) fixing the Representative ratio at 400 voters, and report to this Convention the apportionment which they may deem the most practicable; which was read and laid on the table one day for consideration,

On motion of Mr. Love, Mr. Runnels was added to the committee on General Provisions.

Mr. Love also moved that the President of the Convention be requested to sit on said committee, which motion was adopted.

Mr. Jones offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That until the first enumeration is made, the counties lying between the Sabine, Red River and the Trinity River, (including those crossing the Trinity,) shall be entitled to 12 members in the House, and 6 in the Senate.

All counties lying between the Trinity and Colorado Rivers, (including Galveston, and excluding the counties crossing the Colorado,) shall be entitled to 11 members in the House and 5 in the Senate.

All counties lying west of the Colorado, including those crossing said river, shall be entitled to 7 members in the House and 4 in the Senate; which resolution was laid on the table one day for consideration.

Mr. Young offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the committee on the Legislative Department be instructed to enquire into the expediency of creating new counties, and report the same to the Convention; upon which the rule was suspended, requiring the resolution to lay on the table one day, and,

On motion of Mr. Young it was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Tarrant, the resolution of Saturday last, giving to John G. Chambers of Bowie county, Jefferson W. Oliver of the county of Sabine, and Memucan Hunt of the county of Galveston, mileage at the same rate as other delegates of this body, was taken up.

At the request of Gen. Hunt, Mr. Bache withdrew his name as a claimant.

Mr. Van Zandt moved to recommit the resolution to the committee on the State of the Nation.

Mr. Tarrant said he was opposed to any reference: but if it was to be referred, he should prefer a select committee. The resolution stands on its own merits: it embraces only an act of sheer justice to the people of Bowie county and to Dr. Chambers, who was necessarily compelled to incur these expenses. Under the circumstances, he was called upon by every consideration as a patriot and a republican to attend and claim his seat. He trusted the proposed reference would not be made.

Mr. Van Zandt withdrew his motion; and the resolution was adopted.

Mr. Rusk offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That Horace Burnham be, and he is hereby declared to be entitled to the same pay for mileage to and from the city of Austin, as the members of this Convention. Adopted.

Mr. Evans assigned his reasons for voting against the resolution inviting the United States' troops within the territory of Texas, which,

On motion of Mr. Rusk, were ordered to be entered on the journals, and are as follows:

## PROTEST OF MR EVANS.

The undersigned, impelled by an imperative sense of duty, has, with extreme reluctance cast his vote in opposition to the passage of a resolution, requesting the government of the United States to introduce the forces of the United States into Texas, and desires to lay his reasons therefor before the Convention.

The resolution above referred to, was, in the opinion of the undersigned, an unnecessary assumption of power on the part of the Convention, as it appears from the various letters which have been submitted to its consideration,—that the objects contemplated by the resolution have been fully accomplished without the intervention of any act by the Convention, three thousand United States troops being then on their march to occupy the exposed portions of the frontiers of Texas, Mr. Donelson, in his letter to the President of the Convention, acknowledging the receipt of the Ordinance, giving the assent of the people of Texas to its annexation to the United States, uses the following language: "From the date of this Ordinance, Texas will have acquired a right to the protection of the United States, and the undersigned is happy to inform you that the President of the United States, *has taken the steps to afford this protection in the most efficient manner, against Mexican and Indian invasion.*"

The undersigned has said, that in his opinion, the resolution was an assumption of power. He has been led to this conclusion from the belief that it required the ratification of the people of Texas to an act of the Convention, in which the public interest is involved, to give it force.—Texas is yet an independent sovereignty, and the action of this Convention must be ratified by the people of Texas and the government of the United States, before that sovereignty can be merged in that of the Union. Until these prerequisites are fully obtained, the Constitution of *independent* Texas is still in force, and binding upon us as citizens, owing allegiance to the Republic, its Constitution and laws. He would not be understood to urge, that the Convention is bound by the Constitution in their enactments, only so far as relates to those things which are not to be submitted to the people; thus far, the individual members are bound to obey its high behests, and act within its prescribed limits. They were deputed by the people of Texas, to draft for *their* consideration and approval, an Ordinance accepting the terms of annexation, and the plan of a State Constitution: here their authority ceases, and when they travel beyond, their delegated powers are at an end, and their acts are but acts of private citizens owing allegiance to the Republic, and sworn to support its Constitution.

The resolution was unnecessary, because the proper department of the government had already taken all steps necessary to secure the desired object. The only department of the government authorized to invite, or even *assent* to the introduction of foreign troops within the ter-

ritory of Texas, is that authorized to form treaties; by this branch of the government, the invitation has been extended as will be seen by the joint resolution of the last Congress for this purpose, approved by the President of the Republic.

The joint action of both Houses of Congress, and sanction of the President, necessarily includes all parties connected with the treaty making power, and they alone should be held responsible for any ill which might ensue. The Convention should never have thrust itself by an unnecessary and an unauthorized act, between them and a just responsibility, should evil consequences arise out of the invitation.

There are yet existing contingencies which may defeat the annexation of Texas to the United States. The dearest, longest and most cherished hope of the people of Texas, may never be fully realized. The Convention must be apprised that there are many delicate subjects which *must* be enquired into, and acted upon, which may change the tide of popular feeling, even in Texas, upon this great measure. It has been proclaimed upon the floor of this hall, that some action was demanded by the people upon the land titles of the country; all must be aware that this is a subject which strikes a sensitive chord in the public mind, that thrills with painful intensity, from one end of the Republic to the other, and any error here, might rouse a feeling of alarm in the Republic, which, like "Banquo's ghost," will not "down," but may in the end prove fatal to annexation.

Are there no fears to be entertained as to what will be the "final action" of the United States? Do not the terms of the resolution itself involve a proposition which *may* be construed into an interference with the question of boundary? May not some clause be inserted into the body of this Constitution now being framed, whether from haste, passion or misconception, which may cause its rejection when presented to the U. States for its acceptance? If such should be the result of the labors of the Convention, the attitude of Texas, left as she would be to her own resources, with a large body of foreign troops within her limits, by her own invitation, would be truly an unenviable one.

The undersigned, having thus given his reasons for his vote, desires they may be spread upon the journals.

(Signed,)

L. D. EVANS.

On motion of Mr. Young, the report of the committee on the Executive Department was taken up, and

On motion of Mr. Van Zandt, the Convention went into committee of the whole on the said report: Mr. Darnell in the chair.

In section 2d, Mr. Bache moved to strike out the words "qualified electors," and insert citizens qualified to vote for Representatives," to show what branch of qualified electors is meant: there are qualified electors for militia officers under twenty-one years of age. Rejected by the Convention.

Mr. President Risk moved to strike out "General Assembly," and insert "Legislature," throughout the report. Adopted.

Several amendments were suggested and adopted by the Convention in the 3d section.

In the 4th section, (term of office of the Governor,) Mr. *Runnels* moved to amend by striking out "four" and inserting "two." He believed that two years was ample time.

Mr. *Lewis* said he would explain the reasons which had induced him as a member of the committee to advise and propose the election of the Governor for four years. It was the general understanding, he believed, that the majority of members here were in favor of biennial sessions for the Legislature. If the Governor, then is elected for two years only, he will have the opportunity of presiding over only one session; and that term of service is too brief, he thought to enable him to accomplish anything at all. It is insisted by many that the duties of Governor are in a manner unimportant; that he could have no policy to carry out, no measures to accomplish, for which a protracted administration would be desirable. He thought differently. A State has its policy as well as a nation; and to enable a chief magistrate to accomplish anything, he should have a longer term of service than one term of the Legislature. In this case, he comes into office; he presides over one session, without any previous influence over the policy of the country; and he goes out without doing anything, without any impress of character upon his administration. And unless his term of service is lengthened, you had perhaps as well have no Executive at all. With biennial sessions, four years for the Governor, in his opinion was short enough. If the sessions were to be annual, he would be in favor of two years.

Mr. *Runnels* said that he differed very essentially from the gentleman from Montgomery. That gentleman advocates the long term principle for Governor, on the ground that it is necessary to enable that functionary to carry out, and consummate his own particular policy. The government will be divided into three distinct departments; Legislative, Executive, and the Judiciary. And he held that it would not be proper nor in conformity with the republican institutions of the country, that the Executive should exercise an influence over legislative action. The Legislature is elected directly by the people to carry out their views of policy, to execute their will, and sustain their interests. And when you elect a Governor, is it a Dictator, for the purpose of thwarting their wishes, and throwing obstacles in the way of the legislation of the country? Or is it simply for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to him, and seeing the laws faithfully executed after they are enacted? Is it for the purpose of dictating to the Legislature what laws they shall, or shall not pass? I deny (contin-

tinued Mr. Runnels,) that he should influence the action of the Legislature in any manner whatever. It is his duty, it is true, to offer such suggestions as he may think conducive to the welfare of his country: beyond this he cannot, and should not go. For himself, he had seen too much of dictatorial power, in this country perhaps as well as others.

Mr. Lewis said he thought the gentleman had misunderstood him. In no part of his remarks had he expressed a wish to invest the Governor with dictatorial power.

Mr. Runnels said he did not attribute it to him. But it was an inference drawn from the position he assumed. The gentleman did remark that he believed the Governor should have a longer term for the purpose of carrying out his individual views.

Mr. Lewis rejoined, that neither could it be inferred from anything he had said that he wished to give the Governor dictatorial power. He had remarked that the Governor should have the power of carrying into effect the measures to which he was known to be favorable when elected to the chief magistracy. What are the duties imposed upon him by this Constitution? "He shall from time to time give to the General Assembly information of the state of the government, and recommend to their consideration, such measures as he may deem expedient." What is he to recommend, and how, and to whom? Directly to the people? No, sir. It is through another medium that he is to make his communications to the country: through that of the Legislature. It is to that body that he is to recommend such measures as he may think when carried out will redound to the advantage and benefit of the country. It is an obligation imposed upon that officer by the Constitution, and he wished to give him an opportunity of carrying into effect the measures he may think proper to recommend. Why impose upon him duties the object of which cannot be attained unless you give him also the necessary time? In the canvass preceding his election, he has published his views in relation to all the great measures of public policy: he has submitted them to the people, and they elect him because he advocates this or that measure, and not simply from personal considerations. When he makes a recommendation, it is as Governor, elected by the people to represent the people in relation to their State interests: and it is because he thinks the public good would be promoted by acting upon it. Was this, then, proposing to give him dictatorial power? By no means. He only wished to give him an opportunity, by co-operating with the Legislature of the country, to accomplish such measures as he knows to be desirable to the people. It is through this medium that New York has accomplished her great work there: it is through this medium that Kentucky has carried out her system of internal improvements. Do Wilt Clinton had to contend against this most strenuous opposition on

the part of the influential men of his State: yet, elected by the people, and sustained by the people, he completed the great work which he had undertaken. Did he assume, or did the people of that State invest him with dictatorial powers? No, sir. Here were two distinct lines of policy placed before the country. De Witt Clinton was in favor of that, to which most of the prominent men in the country were opposed. If he could have presided but for one session, could he have accomplished anything? Certainly not. And other gentlemen may aspire to the governmental chair who entertain different views of the policy of the country. [Now is it not proper when the people elect a man whose views are in accordance with theirs, that he shall have an opportunity to carry them into effect? And can he do so in one session? He thought every gentleman would agree with him that little or nothing could be accomplished in that time.

*Mr. Brown* said: He thought it better for the Governor to hold his office for four years than two, if, as suggested by gentlemen, the sessions of the Legislature should be but once in two years. The principles of our government rest upon the sovereignty of the people and the responsibility of their rulers. And if the Governor goes into office, recommends such measures as he thinks necessary to the welfare of the State, and retires before their final accomplishment, there is no responsibility at all. The Governor who follows is not responsible for the policy of his predecessor; and the former who had no opportunity to carry it out, is certainly not responsible. And he conceived his responsibility at last to be totally taken away by short periods of election. For this reason, if for no other, if the term of the Legislature should be made bi-ennel, he thought that officer should be appointed to preside for at least two terms. There are two sorts of measures operating in the policy of a State; one of those which stand by themselves, independent of all others; another, and much the more numerous, of those which are mere links in a chain of measures, a series of measures connectedly operating upon the people. Society is more affected by these than by any others. It is necessary that the Governor should be a sufficient time in office to secure stability to the government and consistency to the measures adopted. And he believed it unnecessary to distrust the person by the frequent recurrence of elections.

*Mr. Runnels* said: With regard to the necessity of giving the Governor a long term of service to enable him to see such measures consummated as he may have recommended, let us suppose that those measures are unpopular and disadvantageous to the people, should they not have an opportunity to put a stop to them by the election of another? And again: is it not reasonable to suppose that if they are approved by the people they would re-elect him with the object of seeing them consummated? In one part of the Constitution it is provided that the



Governor shall not be eligible for more than four years out of eight. Now, if he is elected for two years, and his administration should be very popular with the people, and they desire its continuance, believing it fraught with much good and importance to their interest, could they not re-elect him? If his policy is good, they will support and re-elect him; if bad, they will choose some other person, in order that measures may not be maintained and carried out which they consider injurious.

*Mr. Davis* said: as he had been chairman of the committee he would state the term of four years did not entirely meet his approbation, although in accordance with the views of the majority of the committee, he should vote for the amendment.]

The amendment was rejected.

*Mr. Lewis* proposed to add, "and shall have resided in the same four years immediately previous to his election." Adopted.

*Mr. President Rusk* moved to strike out "but shall not be eligible for more than four years in any term of eight years." Rejected.

*Mr. Anderson* moved to add "regular" before "time of his installation," to provide for contested elections; a succession of which, without such an amendment, might in time throw it out of the power of the Legislature to act. Amendment adopted.

*Mr. Scott* moved to strike out the word "native," with a view to test the sense of the Convention.

*Mr. Davis* stated that it was the intention of the committee that every citizen of Texas, now, from what country soever he might be, should be entitled to the privileges of all other citizens, and should be eligible to any office in the gift of the people. They entertained the opinion, however, that the Governor should be taken from among the native born citizens of the United States. Such was still his opinion. He was willing that all those here, at the adoption of the Constitution, should enjoy any other office, but this one ought to be entrusted to none but those reared up under all the institutions of the country.

*Mr. Baylor* said: It is with great reluctance, Mr. chairman, that I intrude at any time any remarks of mine upon the Convention. But it seems to me to be my duty on this occasion to call the attention of the House to one part of the Constitution of the United States.

"Art. IV. §II. 1. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Now, I would barely suggest for the consideration of this Commit-

ter, if we retain the word "native" in the section in question, and which it is proposed to strike out by the gentleman from Montgomery, whether we may not be retaining an expression which may bring this clause into collision with the section referred to in the Constitution of the U. States. Suppose, a foreigner has by a compliance with all the provisions of the acts of Congress relating to naturalization, become under such acts, a citizen of the United States. We know that the General Government has the right to pass laws of naturalization. If a foreigner then comes into the United States, and complies with the provisions prescribed in those laws, he is then entitled to all the immunities, rights and privileges, of any other citizen of the United States, excepting only, in the case of certain disqualifications found in the Constitution itself. He cannot, for example, be President of the United States; and there may be some other instances of exclusion. But in every particular, unless excluded by the Constitution itself, he is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of every other citizen of the country. Then, sir, we will suppose for a moment that a foreigner who has been naturalized under the acts of Congress referred to, shall emigrate to Texas. If we deny him the privilege of being Governor, shall we not place him in an inequality so far as that office is concerned, with other citizens of the United States, and by retaining this peculiar expression in our Constitution, may we not come into conflict with the provision which I have heard? For, sir, the native citizen who should emigrate here, after remaining the usual period, and having arrived at the proper age, would be entitled, if he should receive the suffrages of his fellow citizens, to be Governor of this State. I merely throw out the suggestion, because I am extremely solicitous to do nothing which even, by implication, could come into collision with any provision in the Constitution of the United States. So far as the General Government is concerned, it was perhaps wise and proper that foreigners should be excluded from becoming President of the United States. It was supposed that none but a native ought to be elevated to so dignified and important a station. It was thought that his attachment to his home and country, would bind him to his native land with stronger ligaments than if born in a foreign country. And an additional reason was assigned by our fathers for this restriction: that if foreigners should be elevated to that station, they might be more subject to foreign intrigues; and the government might then be weakened and finally overturned. But I do not see why they should be refused the privilege of being elected Governor, in the Constitution we are about to form. I repeat, in conclusion, that it is my extreme solicitude not to do any thing, and not to retain any thing in our Constitution which may come into collision with the fundamental law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, which will induce me to vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Montgomery. Adopted.

Adopted: the word "native" was stricken out, and the section as amended adopted by the Convention.

Mr. Cunningham proposed to strike out the 5th section, and insert in place of it a section providing for a fixed annual salary of two thousand dollars.

Mr. Young proposed twentyfive hundred.

Mr. Davis said that he would explain the reason why this section was framed by the committee as it was. In fixing the salary of the Governor, there are three things to be taken into consideration: the responsibility of the office, its duties, and the ability of the government to pay. And believing that in the present condition of the country it was not in the power of the government to pay such a salary as it should pay, and ought to pay when better able, the committee thought it best to leave it to the discretion of the Legislature, supposing it would be fixed at the first session in accordance with present circumstances; and that at a subsequent period the salary would be increased.

Mr. Forbes said he hoped it would be fixed in the Constitution. If there was any subject rather than another upon which he considered himself instructed, it was economy. He was anxious that salaries should be fixed, and he believed that the people are willing to have the Convention fix them. He thought they should be fixed permanently, or at least for some period of time. He believed it the duty of this body to fix the salaries of officers, so that the people may know what they have gained by the change of government.

Mr. Hogg said that he intended to vote against the amendment. He was unwilling that this Convention should now fix permanently salaries, believing that circumstances at present might require lower salaries than those which may be proper and practicable some three or four years hence. Not but he would be as willing as any man to give good salaries; but he believed the country entirely unprepared at this time to fix them at what they should be. He would therefore prefer leaving this matter to the Legislature.

Mr. Moore said he considered this one of the most important questions submitted to this Convention. It is very important to be able to tell the people, when your Constitution is framed, how much this government is to cost them. He was unwilling to vary the principle contained in this section. Why say "the salary shall not be increased or diminished," &c. Why is this inserted? Because you are unwilling that the Governor should go to any member of the Legislature, and say to him, "vote to give me a high salary, and I will give you a public office." It is to prevent him from using any undue influence upon them, and them from using it upon him. He hoped that in adopt-

ing this Constitution the Convention would carry out the views recommended by the committee who reported on yesterday, and furnished us with what they considered a correct statement of the revenues of the country, and the amount of the salaries as they thought they should be established, in order to come within the income of the country. When this Constitution shall be submitted to the people, it is very desirable to inform them how much the government will cost. If they should be led to believe that it laid them under a burden of taxation greater than that of Louisiana, Arkansas, or other neighboring States, they may be induced to vote against it. It is important to emigrants, for if our taxes are too great, they will not immigrate here. Let our government be as stable as possible, and the salaries also stable; let them be so fixed that there shall be no inducement to the exercise of undue influence between the various branches of the government. Let us make our taxes lighter than those of any other country, that emigration may pour in in floods; and when we shall have derived from the industry of those emigrants a large surplus revenue, it may constitute something either towards the liquidation of our public debt, or to diffuse the blessings of education among the children of the country.

Mr. *Caldwell* said: It appeared to him that fixing the salary of the Governor to continue the same as long as the Constitution stands, would present a difficulty, as great as if it did not contain any salary at all. It is true we do not know at present the exact amount of revenue which may be anticipated. We might, however, prescribe the salary of the first Governor. We can make some sort of an estimate of what the revenues will be for two or three years. But by fixing the salary now, we may fix it far below what the people or government will be able to stand hereafter. And why narrow down the powers of the Legislature? Why not leave this matter to the Legislature, which comes directly from the people, and is directly responsible to them. Let the responsibility be upon their shoulders, and not upon ours. He was willing to leave it to the Legislature for the future. If we shall see proper to remain as we are, and to become the mammoth State of the Union, we shall be able to afford salaries much more liberal than in case of a division into two States. He would prefer leaving it, establishing perhaps in some other part of the Constitution what the pay shall be for the present.

Amendment lost.

Mr. *Jones* proposed an amendment, giving the first Governor a salary of two thousand dollars.

Mr. *Davis* suggested to add to the section "the first Governor shall receive a salary of \$2,000, and no more."

Mr. Young said that he for one was in favor of paying the officers of the State, including the Governor, fair salaries. He held that the Governor was one of the first and most important officers of the State, and believed that his salary should not be inferior to any in the government. It has been suggested that the Convention would be in favor of giving the Justices of the Supreme Court a salary of 3,500 or 3,000 dollars. He saw no just reason why their salaries should exceed that of the Governor. The time of the Governor will be as exclusively taken up as that of any other officer. It is true he may have his farm or his negroes; but so may the Judge of the Supreme Court. Why should they be entitled to a greater salary, when their expenses are not estimated as equal to that of the Governor? They are not required by the nature of their office to entertain the company that the Governor must; and he could see no reason why a Judge should have a higher salary. In fact, however, he did not believe that any one of the salaries spoken of is sufficient.

Mr. Lipscomb said not having intended to say a word on the subject, he would only remark that economy in new beginners in private life, is one of the first virtues: and in a new beginning government it is very important. He for one was not willing to attach a salary of more than \$2,000 to any office formed by this Convention.

Mr. Baylor said he should vote for moderate salaries throughout, and more especially so far as the Judiciary is concerned. He thought \$2,000 sufficient either for the Executive or the Judges.

Mr. Young said that he neither anticipated being a Judge nor Governor, but expected to remain a plain citizen of Texas. At the same time he would like to see those officers receive adequate salaries. He, too, was in favor of economy, but there seemed to be some diversity of opinion with regard to that principle. There was, he believed, a great degree of extravagance disguised under the word economy. He was in favor of paying officers a fair compensation. His object was that the offices should be filled by men who are qualified. He for one was opposed to fixing salaries at so low a point as to forbid men of capacity from filling the offices to which they are attached: and he was equally opposed to fixing them at a point which would exclude any individual who has not the means within himself to defray the requisite expenses of any station. He wished the matter of compensation to be so arranged as that any and every body might aspire to civil offices: though he did not wish, on the other hand, to enrich any body, or any set of men.

Mr. Jones thought the remarks of the gentleman on the subject of compensation did not apply in their full force, to Texas. The first Convention is admitted to have contained a greater amount of talent and ability than any body which has since met here, except this. And

their services were rendered without compensation. He would ask any gentleman here if we have not had superior talent upon the bench since the reduction of the salaries of District Judges? He believed, indeed, that if no salaries were granted, we should secure more intelligence, if not more disinterestedness.

The 5th section was adopted, with amendments.

On motion of Mr. Van Zandt, the committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again. Report adopted.

On motion of Mr. Moore, the Bill of Rights was recommitted to the committee on General Provisions for revision. Whereupon,

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow morning, at half past 8 o'clock.

Friday morning, July 18, 1845.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment.

Prayer by the Chaplain.

The credentials of Ballard C. Bagby, a delegate from the county of Red River, were presented: and on motion of Mr. Young, Mr. Bagby was invited to take his seat as a member of this body.

On motion of Mr. Gage, Mr. Bagby was added to the committee on the State of the Nation.

Mr. Evans presented the petition of Charles S. Hensley, praying for the establishment of a new county, adjacent to the Forks of the Trinity; which was referred to the committee on the Legislative Department.

Mr. Lipscomb offered the following resolution;

*Resolved*, That the committee on General Provisions be instructed to enquire into the expediency of authorizing the Legislature to protect, by law, from forced sale, a certain portion of the property of all heads of families.

Which was read and laid on the table one day, for consideration.

Mr. Hemphill offered the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the committee on General Provisions be instructed to inquire into the expediency of declaring, in the Constitution, that all certificates for headrights, and all claims, grants, and evidences of title to lands, which were issued to fictitious persons, or were forged, are, and the same were, null and void from the beginning.

On motion of Mr. Young, the rule requiring the resolution to lay on the table one day for consideration, was suspended.

"Judiciary Committee" was inserted, in the place of "Committee on