The Oregon Statesman.

VOLUME 7. SALEM, OREGON TERRITORY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1857. NUMBER 26.

The Oregon Statesman.

[illegible]

[illegible]

One reader cries, your strain's too grave—
Too much morality you have,
Too much about religion;
Give us some witch and wizard tales,
Of slip-shod ghosts, with fins and scales,
And feathers like a pigeon.

I love to read, another cries,
Those monstrous fashionable lies—
In other words, those novels,
Composed of kings, and priests, and lords,
Of border wars and Gothic hordes,
That used to live in hovels.

No, no (cries one), we've had enough
Of such confounded love-sick stuff
To craze the fair creation;
Give us some recent foreign news,
Of Russians, Turks, the Poles, or Jews,
Or any other nation.

The man of dull scholastic lore
Would like to see a little more
Of first-rate scraps of Latin;
The grocer fain would learn the price
Of tea and sugar, fruit and rice;
The draper, silk and satin.

Another cries, I want more fun,
A witty anecdote or pun,
A rebus or a riddle;
Some wish for missionary news,
And some, perhaps, of wiser views,
Would rather hear a fiddle.

The critic, too, of classic skill,
Must dip in gall his gander quill,
And scrawl against the paper—
Of all the literary fools,
Bred in our colleges and schools,
He cuts the greatest caper.

Another cries, I want to see
A jumbled up variety,
Variety, in all things—
A miscellaneous hodge-podge print,
Composed (I only give the hint)
Of multifarious small things.

I want some marriage news, says miss,
It constitutes my highest bliss
To hear of weddings plenty;
For in time of general rain
None suffer from a drought, 'tis plain,
At least not one in twenty.

I want to hear of deaths says one,
Of people totally undone
By losses, fire and fever;
Another answers, full as wise,
I'd rather have the fall and rise
Of raccoon skins and beaver.

Of grave or humorous, wild or tame,
Lofty or low, 'tis all the same,
Too haughty, or too humble;
So, brother editors, pursue
The path that seems the best to you,
And let the grumblers grumble.

☞ The Northern Indianian thus parodies a popular hymn in bewailing the woes of unpaid printers:

O, how happy are they
Who the printer do pay
And have squared up for one year or more;
Tongue cannot express
The great joy of the press,
When delinquents have paid the old score.

Printers, all the day long,
Labor hard for a song;
O, that all their hard fate could but see—
They have worked night and day,
And of course want their pay,
To buy their sugar, coffee, and tea.

One would hardly believe
What few dimes they receive,
For the paper addressed to each name,
Yet, 'tis farther below
Than some people know,
Or they'd pay up for fear or shame.

Drinking Among Young Men.

This indiscriminate drinking must eventually make its mark upon our city population. We can see it already betraying itself in the rising generation. It is impossible for any man to drink even pure liquors six or seven times a day, without suffering fearfully in constitution. And when he transmits this impaired constitution to his son, who in turn impairs it still further by the same course, it requires little foresight to see that we are preparing a population for our cities, that will not in physical frame be much better than those wretched children called Aztecs, who were exhibited here some time ago.

This love of drink and bar rooms is every day increasing. Every day sees fresh poison saloons springing up in various parts of the city. Every day sees our youth becoming more and more the victims of this habit, for really we think it more a habit than a passion. It is no love for joviality that tempts them. It is not the hot exuberance of youth. It is not the evanescent impulse of the gay young fellow who is sowing his wild oats.—It is a cold, deliberate confirmed habit. No atmosphere of recklessness or jollity surrounds the drinking groups. No peals of merriment atone for the act, by proving that at least it is unusual. A grim and melancholy air pervades each countenance. The drinks are poured out, the glasses raised and touched with a loathsome air of custom, and each man swallows his portion with the same impassive countenance he would wear if he were drinking a glass of pure water. All the concomitants that partially redeem or excuse drinking, as far as it can be redeemed or excused, are wanting in this sad and formal ceremony. The actors drink, not because they love it, and want to be merry, but because they have been accustomed to do it ever since they were boys, and it has now become a habit which is more imperious than if it were a passion.—*N. Y. Times.*

A Prayer cut Short.—Parson B. was truly a pious man and at the long grace which usually followed the meals, he and the whole family reverently knelt, except the parson's brother, who being o'er much fidgety was over-looking the garden. One day, it was summer time, the parson was unusually favored; not appearing to notice the fidgety actions of his brother, who kept twisting about, until finding no end to thanks, he broke it with—

"Cut it short, Parson—cut it short: the cows are in the garden playing h—l with the cabbages."

Life but a Span of Horses.—Life is a span of horses; one is "Age," the other "Prime," up and down hill our course is; "Go in," ponies—"make your time."

Boyhood plies the whip of pleasure: youthful folly gives the stroke, manhood goads them at his leisure: "let 'em rip," "they're tough as oak."

"Hi, ya! there," the stakes we'll pocket; to the wind let care be sent; time 2:40—"whip in socket, give 'em string and let 'em went."

On the sunny road to fifty, "Prime" is drowned in Lethe's stream; "Age" is left, lame, old, unthrifty; life then proves a one horse team."

"Age" jogs on, grows quite unsteady, reels and slackens in his pace; "kicks the bucket" always ready, "give it up"—Death wins the race.

☞ Every lie, great or small, is the brink of a precipice, the depth of which nothing but Omniscience can fathom.

The Constitutional Convention.

Monday, a. m., Aug. 31, 1857.

Mr. KELLY stated to the convention that owing to the illness of Mr. Deady, it would be necessary, under Rule 2d, for the convention to elect a President, pro tem; he therefore moved that Mr. Grover be chosen President, pro tem; adopted.

Mr. OLNEY moved a call of the house, there being less than a quorum present; adopted.

Mr. McCORMICK offered the following resolution; "That it is the sense of this convention that it conclude its labors on or before the 21st of September next.

Messrs. Kelly and Kelsay opposed the resolution.

Mr. McCORMICK replied that he offered the resolution in good faith, and desired to facilitate business by its adoption. Resolution adopted.

Mr. CHADWICK moved that the convention go into committee of the whole, Mr. Boise in the chair.

The judiciary report was taken up.

Mr. OLNEY moved to refer this report back to the committee, unless some member desired to amend it.

Mr. KELLY desired the motion to be withdrawn, to consider section 9. Motion withdrawn.

Mr. KELLY moved the adoption of section 9.

Mr. WILLIAMS stated that this was a new feature, and he desired to see it pass. He thought that public officers should be tried as other men are for crimes.

Mr. FARRAR. Section 9 makes provision to get rid of officers for incompetency and for offences. Section 10 gives the power to the Governor to remove the prosecuting attorney. He could see no good reason for this double remedy.

Mr. OLNEY favored the sections as they are, because the relation between prosecuting attorneys and grand juries was such that improper advantage might be taken of it.—The legislature should have the power to present the prosecuting attorney to the Governor for removal. He did not desire that prosecuting attorneys should be made exceptions before grand juries. Rather than the prosecuting attorney should have the power over the grand juries, he would favor the provisions of sections 9 and 10.

This section was adopted.

Mr. PACKWOOD moved the adoption of section 10.

Mr. MEIGS moved to amend section 10 by striking out "may" and insert "shall," so that it will read "The Governor shall remove, &c.

Mr. WILLIAMS opposed the amendment, and cited the case of Loring of Massachusetts, who was by address of the legislature of Massachusetts presented to the Governor of that State for removal, who refused to remove him, and the whole country approved of it. It was a proper check upon party persecution.

Mr. KELSAY favored the amendment on the ground that the section placed too much power in the Governor.

Mr. STARKWEATHER favored the amendment. He preferred to trust the legislature rather than the Governor.

Mr. GROVER did not know the sentiment of the committee on the veto power of the Governor. The Governor would have no veto power over the legislature unless the section remained as it is—in this particular he therefore favored it as it is.—He thought the removal of Loring would have been an unjust thing—because it was for doing his duty as a United States officer and not for an abuse of his duties as probate judge of that State.

Mr. MEIGS sustained the motion on the ground of making officers directly responsible to the people.

Mr. STARKWEATHER offered the following amendment: Strike out all of 10th section after "attorney" in 2d line and insert "for corruption in office."

Mr. FARRAR opposed the amendment He thought the section preferable as it is.—He referred to the case of Mr. Loring and the legislature of New Hampshire, where officers had been removed upon address to the Governor, not because they had been corrupt in office; but simply because they were not of the black republican party.—He did not approve of the provision in section 10 which provides for the removal of the prosecuting attorney by address. He prefers that the prosecuting attorney should be presented by the grand jury and referred to a recent case in this Territory where the grand jury had presented a prosecuting attorney for an infamous crime, who was put upon his trial. He had faith in grand juries and they would present officers in all cases where crimes had been committed by them.

Mr. WILLIAMS differed with Mr. Farrar about the constitution of New Hampshire, and sustained the section as reported. Further discussion was carried on between Mr. Williams and Mr. Farrar by way of explanation.

Mr. MEIGS stated that the Governor would have the same power with the word "shall" as the word "may," when the whole section was considered.

Mr. STARKWEATHER spoke to his amendment.

The chair decided that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Clackamas was not under consideration.

Mr. STARKWEATHER then supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wasco.

Mr. CHADWICK supported the section as reported. He did not consider that the proposed amendment amounted to anything. The amendment proposed to bestow upon the Governor the same power as the section now gave him—hence we would gain nothing by the change.

Mr. SHATTUCK opposed the proposed amendment, but desired to amend the section in other respects.

Mr. DUNCAN favored the amendment. The amendment was lost by a vote of 14 ayes, 19 nays.

Mr. OLNEY offered the following amendment to the same section; "but no such judge or prosecuting attorney shall be twice removed by the Governor for the same cause." He desired that an appeal should be taken from the Governor to the people. This would prevent the removal of any officer without a good cause—not merely for political causes.

Mr. FARRAR opposed the amendment. He thought the persons charged should have the privilege of being heard in their defence—before the bar of the house or Senate, when tried. He did not believe the assembly had the right to strike at any man without giving him a hearing in his defence.—He would give unequivocally the judge and prosecuting attorney an opportunity to be heard in their defence.

Mr. Olney modified his amendment so that those officers should have an opportunity of making their defence, as follows:—"But no such judge or prosecuting attorney shall be removed without an opportunity of making their defence, nor be twice removed by the Governor for the same offence."

Mr. MARPLE opposed the amendment.

Mr. KELSAY was in favor of turning a man out of office as often as may be. For getting drunk—for a man if he gets drunk has an honest heart in him—he joins the sons of temperance—swears off—he goes around and asks to be made a judge—he is put on the bench again. Now put him on the bench, he gets drunk. Now take the gentleman's proposition. He was in favor of the legislature to remove him.

Mr. OLNEY explained—that the gentleman misapprehended the amendment, which states that the Governor shall not remove an officer twice for the same cause.

Mr. KELSAY stated that he did not like the amendment, any how.

Messrs. Grover, Farrar and Williams opposed the amendment.

Mr. OLNEY in support of the amendment read from the constitutions, wherein he found similar provisions as those contained in his amendment. He stated that he accepted the suggestion of the gentleman from Multinomah (Mr. Farrar) as part of his amendment, but finding that gentleman opposing the amendment he would now withdraw it all together.

Mr. KELLY offered the following amendment: After the word "concur" in 3d line in section 10, insert "for incompetency, corruption, malfeasance or delinquency in office or for other sufficient cause stated in such resolution"—adopted.

Section 10 was then adopted.

Mr. GROVER moved to take up section 12—adopted.

Mr. FARRAR offered an amendment which was lost.

Mr. PEEBLES moved to strike out all after the word "ability" in 3d line of section 12.

Mr. KELSAY opposed the amendment, for the reason that a judge ought to be eligible at any time to an office, or a seat in the U. S. Senate. He was opened to promotion. If the judge was honest, it is the only test he makes. A judge, honest in his politics and sentiments, he was in favor of. He liked this test for office, and wanted no other.

Mr. McCORMICK opposed the amendment. He favored the section as reported—as it was reported it favored no party, but had an object in view beneficial to all.

Mr. WILLIAMS prefered the section as it is, and opposed the amendment. He illustrated his remarks by referring to the case of Judge Trumbull of Illinois, who was elected to the United States Senate by the assembly of Illinois in violation of a provision of the constitution of Illinois similar to this under consideration. Notwithstanding the constitution of the United States provided for electing senators he believed that if this principle was incorporated into this constitution it would prevent any judge holding office in the future State, from accepting any other office while on the bench.

Mr. WATKINS inquired if the oath referred to offices which were to be filled by the people of the State, and foreign appointments.

Mr. WILLIAMS replied that he supposed the incumbent would consider himself bound by the oath in any event.

Mr. PACKWOOD favored the section as reported.

Mr. MARPLE opposed the section and favored the amendment.

The amendment was lost.

On motion of Mr Kelly the committee rose and reported the bill under consideration, back to the convention.

Mr. KELLY moved that the report now before the convention be referred to the judiciary committee—adopted.

Adjourned.

Afternoon Session, 31st.

Convention came to order, Mr. Grover in the chair.

Mr. OLNEY moved that the roll be called, present 38 members; 28 absent.

Mr. PEEBLES offered a resolution setting forth that 300 copies of the journal of the convention be ordered printed.

Mr. KELLY was opposed to it on the ground of its expense.

Mr. McCORMICK moved to lay the resolution on the table—carried.

Mr. PEEBLES moved that the convention resolve itself into committee of the whole.

Mr. KELLY moved to take up report No. 5, on the executive department.

Mr. OLNEY moved to insert the word "supreme" in the first line.

Mr. GROVER moved to erase supreme and insert "chief"—carried.

Mr. STARKWEATHER moved to strike out line three in section two.

Mr. KELLY was opposed to the amendmendment. Why should a man be elected our chief executive who had only just arrived amongst us? A man should know something about the State before he assumed to take into his hands the reins of the government.

Mr. STARKWEATHER supported his resolution in favor of the amendment. He thought that no shackles should be put upon the people in the choice of their officers; no evil could arise from so doing.

Mr. MARPLE was in favor of the people selecting their officers without regard to limit as to residence.

Mr. WAYMIRE was in favor of limiting the office to those who had resided in the State three years. He was in for a good acquaintance before he bestowed favor upon any man.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. KELLY moved that the word "within" be changed to "of."

Mr. MARPLE moved to amend—lost.

Mr. KELLY moved the adoption of section 3.

Mr. MATZGER moved an amendment to strike out "or under this State."

Mr. KELLY opposed the amendment—amendment lost.

Mr. FARRAR moved to amend by inserting "or any other power," and spoke in support of his amendment.

Carried, and section adopted.

Mr. OLNEY moved to strike out "legislature" and insert "general assembly."

Mr. KELLY opposed it on the ground of it being immaterial about the name, and contending that the word as at present was better understood.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. FARRAR moved to still further amend by striking out "Speaker of the House of Representatives," and insert "President of the Senate."

Mr. KELLY opposed the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS favored the amendment.

Amendment lost. Section adopted as amended.

Mr. OLNEY moved to amend section 5, by striking out "at the next regular session thereof."

Mr. KELLY opposed the amendment.

Mr. APPLEGATE moved to amend—lost.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved to strike out section 7.

Mr. KELLY was opposed to striking out on the ground that the present Governor knew more about Oregon than anybody else.

Mr. BURCH moved to strike out provision giving the Governor power to call out forces to execute the laws, &c. He believed that it belonged to the article upon the militia—lost.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved to strike out the clause contemplating the creation of a council composed of officers of State, to control the action of the Governor in granting pardons. He thought Governor's council antiquated and old fogyish. He believed the responsibility should be imposed upon the Governor alone, and that thus the power would be exercised more carefully, and with better judgment. Besides the council would increase the expense.

Mr. KELLY was indifferent to the fate of the motion. The provision had been borrowed from the constitution of Indiana.—In some of the States complaint had been made of the too free exercise of the pardoning power, and this had been the occasion of this council. But it was hardly probably that there would be ground for complaint in this respect.

Mr. WAYMIRE opposed the motion He thought the check would prove a salutary one. Petitions for pardons were easily obtained, and pardons were not seldom inconsiderately granted.

The motion was adopted, yeas 16, nays 15.

Mr. GROVER ~~moved to amend~~ by striking out the provision declaring the term of office of Governor to commence on the 2d Monday of January, 1858, and making the terms commence at such time as may be provided by law, or by the constitution—adopted.

Article of administration department was taken up.

Mr. WAYMIRE moved to strike out the office of treasurer. It was proposed to give the Governor a good salary, and he thought he could transact the duties of treasurer.—The treasurer's fees alone, would make a pretty good salary for the Governor, and not much in addition would be required.

Mr. KELLY said he had no objection to striking out. But he thought the time might come, when we became populous, that we should need a treasurer. He would provide that when the population became large the legislature might create the office of treasurer.

Mr. WAYMIRE thought it would be 50 years before we should need a treasurer.—Consolidate the offices, and we decreased the taxes.

Mr. BOISE was in favor of making the Governor ex-officio treasurer for the present and empowering the legislature to create the office of treasurer at a specified time.

Mr. WAYMIRE had no objection to this if the time was put 20 years.

Mr. BOISE said the convention could fill the blank with such number as they thought proper. We should give the Governor such salary as would enable him to live at the capital, otherwise none but citizens living there could afford to be Governor. If we constituted him treasurer, we could afford to give him such salary as would enable him to reside at the seat of government.

Mr. KELLY had misgivings about uniting these two offices—it was a union of purse and sword. In case of defalcation in treasury department, it would be the duty of the Governor to cause to be put in force the law against him. Of course he could not do this if he was both Governor, and treasurer.

Mr. KELSAY said if he was made treasurer bonds would be necessarry, and it would be a novel proceeding to require the Governor to give bonds.

Mr. GROVER saw no difficulty in uniting these two offices if it was desirable. The Governor of the Territory had always been treasurer of U. S. funds, and had given bonds as such.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. PACKWOOD moved to strike out the provision declaring the Governor ineligible for more than four in six years—lost.

Mr. WAYMIRE moved to fix the time when the legislature could sever the offices of Governor and Treasurer at 20 years—lost.

Somebody moved 15 years—lost.

Mr. KELLY moved 10 years—carried.

Mr. KELLY moved to require the Governor, while Treasurer, to keep an office at and reside at the seat of government, in the same manner as Secretary—adopted.

Mr. PACKWOOD moved to define the duties of the clerk of county court to be clerk of circuit court, county and probate clerk and auditor—carried.

Mr. WAYMIRE moved to strike out the county treasurer, and make the county judge treasurer. It would not take fifteen dollars worth of time for the county judge to discharge the duties of treasurer, and we now pay a treasurer from $400 to $800.

Mr. WILLIAMS thought this union improper. The judge was auditor, and when auditing a claim must draw a warrant on somebody, and it ought not to be on himself. His warrants in the hands of the treasurer, would be a means by which it could be ascertained if he had conducted the business honestly.

Mr. WAYMIRE saw no difficulty.

The motion was lost.

Committee rose and convention adjourned.

Tuesday, a. m., Sept. 1, 1857.

Mr. MARPLE offered a substitute for the judiciary report which was referred to the judiciary committee. The substitute provides for a supreme court apart from the district court, consisting of one chief justice, until such time as the people shall signify their desire that the number be increased, and that then two associate justices shall be added to the supreme bench. He said the object of this system is to prevent the judges from passing in the supreme court upon their own acts and opinions in the district courts.

Mr. STARKWEATHER offered the following resolution: That the Governor of the State of Oregon shall receive an annual salary of $1,200; the Secretary of State $1,000; Justices of the Supreme Court $1,500; and county judges, auditors, treasurers, sheriffs, coroners, and surveyors such compensation as provided by law.

On motion of Mr. Grover laid on the table.

The military article was, on motion of Mr. Kelly, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time Thursday.

Mr. MARPLE moved to strike out three and insert one, as the term of years which the Governor should be required to reside in the Territory before being eligible to the office. He thought no qualification should be required other than those of an elector—he offered this as a compromise. He tho't the resolution would retard the settlement of the country—motion lost.

Mr. WAYMIRE moved to make the term of office of Governor four years instead of two, The reason he said was apparent.

Mr. SMITH favored the motion. We, in common with the rest of the world were governed too much. We had elections too frequently, and had too much legislation of a local character. Statutes were enacted one season to be repealed the next. If we only had biennial sessions of the legislature, let the Governor be elected for two terms. His salary would be small, and he had already been required to reside at the seat of government. If elected from abroad with the salary he would get, he could not afford to remove for two years.

Mr. MARPLE thought two years enough. He believed four years would be objectionable to the people, and that they would vote against the constitution. He was in for annual elections and annual sessions of the legislature; in this country where we had nothing done, and everything to do, annual sessions were necessary.

Mr. WAYMIRE said there was no State in which the Governor did not hold over two sessions of the legislature. And he ought to hold over two here.

The motion was adopted as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Brattain, of Linn, Bristow, Brattain, of Lane, Babcock, Boise, Burch, Cox, of Marion, Crooks, Coyle, Cox, of Lane, Campbell, of Clackamas, Duncan, Elkins, Fitzhugh, Grover, Holt, Kelsay, Kinney, Moores, Matzger, McCormick, Nichols, Newcomb, Olney, Peebles, Prim, Packwood, Robbins, Smith, Shields, Starkweather, Waymire, Williams, Watts, Watkins, Whitted and Mr. President—38.

Nays—Messrs. Kelly, Marple, Shannon, Short, Shattuck, Scott, White—7.

On motion of Mr. KELLY, the article was amended so as to render the Governor ineligible for more than four in any period of eight years.

Mr. PEEBLES moved moved to strike out eight years, removing the restriction—lost; ayes 17, nays 28.

Mr. WAYMIRE moved to substitute eight for four years—adopted.

Mr. PACKWOOD moved to strike out eight and insert twelve, so that the Governor would not be eligible more than eight years out of any twelve—adopted.

Mr. DUNCAN moved to amend so as to require the Governor to reside at the seat of government.

Mr. KELLY said that had already been inserted in the administrative article, and he thought it more properly belonged there.

Mr. SMITH was opposed to the provision anywhere. He thought the Governor ought to be permitted to reside where he chose. He would be here when any important business was to be transacted, and that was all that was necessary. But if you were going to require him to break up his business, and reside at the capital, build him a residence, and give him money to feed people with, for he would have it to do.—He could better discharge the duties of Governor with a salary of $1200 and reside at his home, than for $2000 and reside at the capital. He was opposed to making him treasurer also—the union was unnatural, and nothing would be saved by it, for if you made him treasurer you had got to pay him the treasurer's salary. This way of saving would be found expensive in the end.

Mr. DUNCAN was in favor of incorporating this provision somewhere in the constitution. Men coming from the extremes of the Territory to see the Governor, wanted to know where to find him.

Mr. PRIM was in favor of the motion—it was necessary to enable person residing at a great distance from the capitol to accept the office of Governor.

The motion was lost, and the article ordered to a third reading.

Administrative article was taken up.

Mr. SMITH opposed the amendment of committee of the whole making the Governor treasurer for three years. He thought it would not result in any saving of expense. The theory of our government was that the purse and sword should be kept separate. The character of your Governor would not furnish an absolute guaranty against improper conduct. The greatest defaulters, and the greatest criminals of recent years had been men of unblemished reputation—men who stood high in church and State. If you wished to impose other than gubernatorial duties upon him, make him superintendent of public instruction.

Mr. MARPLE was opposed to blending these offices—the Governor had sufficient duties of his own.

Mr. KELLY thought the people would look with distrust at this union. It was no rhetorical flourish that the purse should not be united with the sword. It meant something in a republican government. Besides, nothing was saved. If we made the Governor treasurer, it was expected that his salary would be increased. The people expected we were to have a treasurer. Every State in the Union had such an officer.

Mr. WAYMIRE thought there was practically no union of purse and sword, for with the empty treasury we should have no purse. As soon as a dollar was paid into the treasury there would be somebody to draw it out, and doubtless there would not be cash enough to pay the demands. If the Governor had to use the sword it was more likely he would have to use it to compel the legislature to increase the taxes that there might be enough in the purse to meet the demands upon it. He thought there would be a great saving, for what would pay a treasurer would pay the Governor and treasurer united, and we would get the Governor for nothing. His figures for Governor were $2,000. But if he was not to be made treasurer he would not give him one dollar over $600. It would not interfere with the duties of Governor.

Mr. BOISE was in favor of the union.—The treasurer was not employed one month in a year in the transaction of his duties.—The phrase, union of purse and sword originated in England, and had no applicability here. The Governor could no more use the public funds if treasurer than if not. He could not pay out a dollar except in accordance with law, and if he did, his bondsmen would be liable. The idea here was a phantom. We had neither purse or sword. It was said that such union had never taken place in any other State. No other State had been situated like this. Few States had gone into the Union with as sparse a population as we have. To create separate offices, was to give them to a set of leeches who would always hang about a seat of government, wherever it was—Salem, Corvallis, Eugene, or elsewhere, for you could not give such salaries as would enable persons from abroad to take them. We would be more likely to find an honest and responsible treasurer in the person of the Governor. It would be a saving also.

Mr. SHATTUCK should oppose the amendment; it was an innovation, and before innovations were entered upon, they should be seen to be clearly necessary. It was said it would be matter of economy.—He looked upon it as a regular tin-peddler arrangement—it had not a business face about it. In case of resignation or death of Governor, the Secretary of State became Governor, and as he was auditor, you had auditor and treasurer united in one person.

Mr. WATKINS was opposed to experimenting in this constitution. He was in favor of a cheap and simple government, but would not go about experimenting. To unite the office of treasurer and governor was to create opportunities for fraud and speculation. He was opposed to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS thought the union of Governor and auditor was more natural than that of treasurer, though he did not conceive that there were any substantial objections to the union of either. One argument in favor of union was that it would be followed by a respectable salary. He would not give a Governor $600. He had better maul rails—it was just as respectable and more lucrative. He would be ashamed of a constitution with a $600 Governor. It would be laughed at abroad. It was no objection to this union that it was an innovation; it was no objection to a good measure that it was new. Neither was it an objection that it was old. He saw no danger of defalcation or fraud. There would be little or nothing in the treasury. He should support the motion.

Mr. SMITH said to get a Governor as a treasurer, because we can't pay a Governor as such, is to plead the baby act in advance. If we can't afford to have a Governor, let us adjourn and go home, and tell the people they are not able to support a State government. That they have anticipated the time. He was for a Gov'nor and a treasurer, and he would give a Governor $1,500. He would have no $600 Governor. It was assumed that we were to have nothing in the treasury—that it was to be paid out as soon as it was paid in. Was it to be said that this State was to have no public funds?—Are the people inhabiting this land of gold—a people possessing more wealth to the head than any other in the world, to have nothing in their State treasury? The people of this country were not bankrupt, and they did not wish us to try dangerous experiments to save picayunes, and not unlikely lose thousands in the experiment. It was said that the treasurer's duties could be performed in a month. So it could, and in less time, if the money was all paid in and out, at one time. But it was paid in at various times during the year, and required him to be at all times in his office. If we can't afford to have the necessary officers of a State and pay them respectable salaries (not extravagant ones) let us remain as we are.

Mr. KELLY said the duties of Governor and treasurer were different. The first wanted to be a statesman—a man of general knowledge of the wants of the State and of enlarged views of public policy. The latter was simply required to be a good accountant. If we united the two, we should in electing a Governor, have to institute an inquiry as to whether or not he was a good book-keeper.

Mr. WAYMIRE was opposed to making offices and paying officers to keep up appearances—keeping up appearances had ruined more men and sent more souls to perdition than all other causes combined. He did not care what people abroad thought.

Mr. KELSAY was opposed to the consolidation of offices, and opposed to uniting these. The principle had worked badly in our government. He did not endorse the doctrine that the people of Oregon were poor; they were richer than any people he ever laid eyes upon, and he had travelled over some of the States. Our country was full of the resources of wealth, and some day would develop all the riches of the great Empire State. He did not like the one-horse system in government. If we were not able to have a State with officers like other States, let us remain as we are. If we had to consolidate offices which ought to be separate to have a State, he was opposed to a State.

Mr. OLNEY thought the consolidation wrong, and that it would result in evil consequences.

The amendment to consolidate was lost, as follows;

Yeas—Bristow, Brattain, of Lane, Babcock, Boise, Cox, of Marion, Cox, of Lane, Campbell, of Lane, Duncan, Fitzhugh, Holt, Moores, Matzger, Nichols, Newcomb, Robbins, Starkweather, Waymire, Williams and Mr. President—19.

Nays—Brattain, of Linn, Burch, Crooks, Coyle, Campbell, of Clackamas, Elkins, Grover, Henderson, Kelsay, Kinney, Kelly, Marple, McBride, McCormick, Meigs, Olney, Peebles, Prim, Short Shannon, Smith, Shields, Shattuck, Scott, White, Watkins, Watts and Whitted—26.

Adjourned.

Afternoon Session, Sept. 1.

Mr. GROVER called up the resolution ordering the printing of 300 copies of the journal of the convention. It was a matter of indifference to him what disposition was made of it—he merely wanted it definitely disposed of. The resolution was lost.

The article on Corporations and Internal Improvements was taken up.

Mr. BOISE moved to strike out general assembly and insert legislature as the name of the legislature of Oregon.

Mr. WILLIAMS preferred general assembly to legislature. In making speeches legislator was sometimes confounded with legislature.

Mr. MARPLE thought legislature was the most modern. There were several religious denominations in the country which held what was called general assemblies.—He loved religion and he loved the bible, but he wanted to keep the terms distinct.

Mr. BOISE had made this motion because he supposed the convention had so determined. He preferred general assembly himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS did not understand that the convention had settled this name.

Mr. KELLY thought it had. He was for legislature—it meant something. There were religious bodies in the country, as had been said, which held general assemblies.

Mr. DEADY preferred legislative assembly as that was the name used in the organic law, and in our statutes. We had got used to it, it was euphonious, and descriptive. He moved legislative assembly. Mr. Boise accepted the amendment.

Mr. OLNEY was for legislative assembly—it had become a part of the language of the country.

Mr. WATKINS preferred legislature—that was the word they used down east, where he come from.

Mr. KELLY moved legislature.

Mr PACKWOOD had been looking over the constitutions and found most of them had general assembly, particularly that of Indiana. Now he had proposed several little amendments at various times, and they had all been voted down because they did not conform to the standard—Indiana.—(Laughter.) He should take pleasure in voting for legislature just because it was different from the Indiana constitution.

Mr. GROVER saw no reason for changing the term found in our statutes, and the term with which we were familiar. He preferred legislative assembly.

Mr. McBRIDE preferred legislature as it was the term commonly employed in designating the body it is applied to.

Legislature was lost, 16 yeas, 32 nays.

Legislative assembly was adopted.

Mr. KELLY moved to amend so that the legislature could not repeal a corporation law so as to effect any vested corporate laws.

Committee rose and the convention adjourned.

Wednesday, a. m., Sept. 2, 1857.

The convention went into committee of the whole, Mr Smith in the Chair, and took up the article on Corporations and Internal Improvements.

Mr. MARPLE moved to strike out the clause making stockholders in incorporated companies individually liable without limit, and have all claims for labor performed to become liens upon the property of the company. The provision he said would forever prohibit the investment of foreign capital in internal improvements, if it did not likewise forbid investment of home capital. The mechanic or laborer performing service had ample security in his lien upon the property of the company.

Mr. GROVER hoped the amendment would not prevail—it was crude. He tho't some amendment necessary, but more appropriate language could be used.

Mr. KELLY moved to amend by making stockholders liable for the debts of the corporation, to twice the amount of his stock—withdrawn.

Mr. KELSAY went for individual liability without limit, for the debts of the company of every kind. He would have them responsible to the last dollar they possessed. He would give the legislature power to limit.

Mr. MARPLE requested Mr. Grover to change the language of his amendment, which was done and accepted by Mr. Marple.

Mr. BOISE hoped the amendment would be voted down, it meant nothing and it provided for nothing.

The amendment was lost.

Mr. PACKWOOD moved to make stockholders liable to the amount of their stock.

Mr. McCORMICK was for the substance of Mr. Packwood's amendment but thought he had it in more definite language.

Mr. KELLY thought there should be some limit to the liability of stockholders—he would fix it at twice the amount of stock. If there was not some security of this kind, no prudent man would ever invest his capital in corporations. If he could be bankrupted by the folly or recklessness of associates, whose acts he was powerless to control, of course no intelligent man would take the risk.

Mr. WATKINS would amend so as to place all creditors on an equal footing, and make stockholders liable for the amount of their stock for all debts alike. He saw no reason for prefering the claims for labor.

Mr. DEADY thought there was no reason for the distinction between debts for labor performed, or incurred in any other way. What was the difference between the man who worked for a corporation directly, or the one who should go into the woods, cut timber, saw it, and sell the lumber to the company? Was the one debt more sacred than the other? He was not especially friendly to enterprises of this kind, but they were common to this age, and we had got to deal with them as an existing fact. How were these companies usualy formed? Some smart, shrewd men in the country, men who