

tration of the state. But Mr. Chamberlain was Attorney-General, for a part of a term by appointment and for a full term by election. Did he at any time file an opinion or register a protest with any department of the state against any of these alleged extravagances against which he now so loudly declaims? As I have shown, there were larger appropriations made during the time that Mr. Chamberlain was Attorney-General than at any other time in the history of the state, and the Secretary of State, State Treasurer and Governor were getting exactly the same fees and salaries that they are getting now. Why did not Mr. Chamberlain, as Attorney-General, take steps to prevent these alleged violations of the Constitution and payments of salaries beyond the limitation of the Constitution? Would he not stand in much better light before the people could he point to a single protest made by him as Attorney-General, when he was receiving an annual salary from the state, against what he is now pleased to denounce as unconstitutional salaries and extravagances in the way of appropriations? Did he not discover these things until after he had been nominated for Governor? For what was the State of Oregon paying him his salary as Attorney-General?

I shall go somewhat more into details. Mr. Chamberlain says: "The average state revenue for the past seven years has been, approximately, \$640,000, whilst the revenue required for the year 1902 is \$1,300,000, an increase in the annual state revenue required of \$660,000."

The facts are that the total revenue raised by taxation for the year 1902 was \$86,000 for general state purposes, and \$25,000 for the State Agricultural College. The following amounts were raised by taxation since 1821:

1822	\$ 758,500	1887	\$ 572,707
1883	1,121,845	1888	472,289
1884	722,782	1889	791,141
1885	451,138	1890	757,782
1886	693,338	1901	671,487

The population of the State of Oregon has increased from 313,000 in 1890 to 413,000 in 1900.

Mr. Chamberlain says the salary of the Governor and the expenses of his office have increased beyond the constitutional limit by Legislative acts to \$2850 per annum. The facts are the Governor is paid from the State Treasury the sum of \$4250 per annum. His private secretary receives the sum of \$1200 per annum, as private secretary, and \$900 per annum as secretary of the Asylum Board and Board of Public Building Commissioners. The stenographer receives the sum of \$900 per annum, making the total expense of the Executive Department \$6650 per annum.

The District Attorney of the Fourth Judicial District receives from the State of Oregon the sum of \$4000 per annum; is allowed two deputies at \$1800 per annum each; a total expense for that office of \$7600 per annum.

Mr. Chamberlain states that the compensation of the Secretary of State and the expenses of his office have been increased beyond the constitutional limit by one Legislature after another, until now it reaches the enormous sum of more than \$22,000—the inference being that this is the annual expense of his salary and office. The facts are that the salary allowed the Secretary of State by statute is \$2850; clerical aid, \$800, making a total expense of the office of Secretary of State of \$11,210 per annum.

The state of Washington appropriates for clerical assistance in the office of Secretary of State and State Auditor the sum of \$12,000 per annum.

Mr. Chamberlain states that the compensation of State Treasurer and the expenses of his office have been increased until now it reaches the sum of \$8000 per annum. The facts are the Treasurer receives \$1400 per annum and is allowed \$2900 per annum for clerical aid.