

ographers of his office aggregates but \$11,300 per year, paid by the state. I do not speak of the compensation he derives from fees paid by private parties for services rendered. Nor is it true that the compensation of the Governor and the expenses of his office aggregate \$2000. The truth is that they are less than \$400. And then, mark you, the peculiar language employed by Mr. Chamberlain when speaking of the compensation of the Governor and the Secretary of State and the Judges of the Supreme Court. He says that their compensation has been increased beyond the constitutional limit until it amounts to 50 and 50, seeking to impress upon your minds that the sums mentioned are paid to them as salaries in excess of the constitutional salaries.

Understand me, I am not, nor is the Republican party, opposed to flat salaries instead of fees for all state officers. On the contrary, the Republican party has declared in favor, and was the first to declare in favor, of flat salaries. I am simply showing, in what I have said relative to salaries, how shamefully Mr. Chamberlain has misstated and misrepresented the facts for the purpose of gaining partisan advantage.

Nor, when I state that the salary of the Secretary of State is but \$2850 do I include such fees as he receives from private parties for copies of records or filing documents, etc. There is no record required to be kept of such fees; and therefore I do not know, nor does Mr. Chamberlain know, how much they aggregate annually, but I am informed that salary and fees combined do not amount to \$10,000 a year. But mind you, Mr. Chamberlain was not talking of fees, but of salaries, that which the state pays, for which you have to pay taxes; his language is: "Salary and expenses of his office." But neither the Governor nor State Treasurer receive any fees whatever, so he cannot have had in mind "fees" when he deliberately misrepresented the amount of their salaries.

CHAMBERLAIN'S OFFICIAL DUTIES.

Mr. Chamberlain is District Attorney for Multnomah County. His salary is \$4000 per annum. He has two deputies who are paid \$3500 a year, and these salaries are fixed by law. Would it be fair for me to speak of the salary of Mr. Chamberlain and expense of his office amounting to \$7000? And yet that is what Mr. Chamberlain and his deputies get—fully one-third more than the Governor of the State of Oregon, and his clerks, receive. And I observe, by the way, that Mr. Chamberlain has not resigned the office of District Attorney. He still draws his salary of \$4000 per year, paid him by the people of this state, while he is travelling around the state telling the people why they should elect him Governor of the state.

If Mr. Chamberlain were so earnestly wedded to economy in public office as he would have you believe, he might set a very forcible example by resigning his \$4000-a-year office until the present campaign is over. Doubtless the Governor would agree to reappoint him at the end of that period, for the state would save several hundred dollars in the meantime, and it is certain that Mr. Chamberlain will want the office of District Attorney after the campaign is over.

But I called your attention a while ago to the fact that Mr. Chamberlain complains that the salaries of the Governor and other state officials have been increased beyond the constitutional limit. He did not particularly find fault with the salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Governor, but he criticised the Republican party for having increased them "beyond the constitutional limit." Now that sounds very well, standing by itself, but taken in connection with the other portion of Mr. Chamberlain's speech, it sounds at least funny. After he has covered considerable other ground in his speech, I find him saying this:

"I have no doubt that the Legislature has the power to place each and all of the constitutional offices on flat salaries, notwithstanding an apparent limitation contained in the constitution itself." You will observe that this time he em-