

the State of Oregon \$18,000, while for conducting exactly the same departments in the State of Washington it costs \$90,000 per year. Why does Mr. Chamberlain not compare the cost of the administration of Oregon with that of other states? Simply because he knows that the size of his figures and amounts would dwindle by comparison.

HIS RECORD AS ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

But possibly the most remarkable statement made by Mr. Chamberlain is that which he refers to his record as Attorney-General. No one had attacked his official record, and I am disposed to believe that he was unfortunate in bringing it forward. He tells the people that he conducted his office for the salary, and without any additional cost to the state; that he instituted suits against counties for taxes owing the state and made them all pay. Now, this will be a surprise to all who have been members of the Legislature for the last several sessions, for they will all remember the claim of Mr. John Hall, attorney-at-law, of Portland, for \$6000 fees due him for prosecuting the suit of the State of Oregon against Multnomah County to collect back taxes. That bill was there several sessions, and was only paid at the last session, and then not paid in full. I have here a copy of a letter written by Mr. Chamberlain certifying that Mr. Hall had assisted him in the prosecution of this case. The original of this letter is on file in the State-house, and can be seen by any one who wishes. It was written and filed to enable Mr. Hall to secure his pay.

Mr. Chamberlain also states in his Baker City speech, and I understand is generally stating that as Attorney-General he instituted actions against the Southern Pacific Company and the Union Pacific Company to compel them to conform to the rates fixed by the Railway Commission, thus, in his own language, "establishing the important proposition to the people of this state that these great corporations were measurably subject to legislative control." Remarkable statement this is, in view of the facts. Now, the truth is, that these actions were both instituted by Mr. Bingham, the Republican District Attorney for the district including Marion County, the actions both having been instituted by Mr. Bingham in the Circuit Court for the County of Marion, and by him prosecuted to final determination. Why did Mr. Chamberlain not give Mr. Bingham credit for that work if he deemed it a work of great importance? Simply because, in the first place, Mr. Bingham is a Republican, and, in the second place, Mr. Chamberlain wishes to arrogate to himself credit for a work which he did not perform.

But, perhaps the most discreditable argument advanced, if argument it may be called, by Mr. Chamberlain, is that wherein he attacks the character of his opponent, Mr. Furnish. It seems to me it would have been in better taste had Mr. Chamberlain left this work, if it must be done, to others. But no, he tells you, that "this is to be a campaign of boodie"; that Mr. Furnish has made a great deal of money as a banker; that first he made money as Deputy United States Marshal and as Sheriff, which, he seeks to leave the impression, was made in some improper manner. What call was there, what possible excuse was there, for Mr. Chamberlain to resort to insinuations and attacks of this character? Do you consider it a manly, gentlemanly campaign on his part? Now, I believed Mr. Furnish was at one time a Deputy United States Marshal. He got such fees as are allowed by the laws of the United States for such duties as he performed as such deputy. He informs me that he made about \$100 a month, never more, as such deputy, but, be that as it may, whatever he made it is certain that he honestly earned, as the United States does not pay for services not performed. Is there anything more discreditable in Mr. Furnish having been a Sheriff or a Deputy United States Marshal than in Mr. Chamberlain's having been an Attorney-General or a District Attorney?