The Pittsburgh Gazette.

VOL. LXXXV. PITTSBURGH, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1870. NO. 85.

THE DAILY GAZETTE:
PUBLISHED BY
PENNIMAN, REED & CO.,
Cor. Sixth avenue and Smithfield street.
F. N. PENNIMAN, JOSIAH KING,
T. P. HOUSTON, N. P. REED,
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

TERMS OF THE DAILY:
By mail, per year.....$ 8.00
Delivered by carriers, per week.....10

The Pittsburgh Gazette.

PERSONAL.

THALBERG, the pianist, has retired with a fortune of half a million.

A HOME for aged and indigent Jewesses is to be established in New York.

THE *Spectator* says "no class of men seem to draw rather or hastier inferences than men of science."

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN is lame in one arm, very deaf and in great danger of losing his eye-sight.

THE Auburn (N. Y.) *Bulletin* is in want of a "beautiful snow" poet. He is warranted abundant occupation in that vicinity.

ANNA HAYES, a twelve year old girl, has a colored school of twenty scholars at Morgantown, W. Va., the age of her pupils ranging from 15 to 35.

THE Sandwich Islanders, after having killed Captain Cook and eaten his body, are about erecting a monument to the memory of the great navigator.

JAS. TURNER, the man who shot and killed Bill Poole, in New York city, several years ago, is at present a patient in the County Hospital in San Francisco.

IN answer to a charge that carpet-baggers fill the Florida Legislature, the Jacksonville *Union* says that out of seventy-eight members *only ten are Northern men.*

MISS MATTIE JOHNSON, implicated in the mysterious movement with the New York minister, Horace Cooke, last winter, is growing from a robust, healthy girl, to a wan consumptive.

IT is reported that Henry Ward Beecher has accepted an invitation to address the divinity scholars at Harvard at the approaching commencement, and that he will give the same address at Princeton.

TERRIS C. CLARIN, the Wall street brokerage firm, writes to a New York paper about the Chicago grocery bill she has just been ordered by a court to pay, and says that all just debts she settles; "all others I fight." Chignon waving.

WHEN Philip Steinmetz, who was to have been hung at Toledo on Friday, was informed that the sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life, he exclaimed, "Well, that's ten times better than hanging." Preparations had been made to attempt a resuscitation of the body by aid of a galvanic battery.

THE President has nominated J. C. Root as Minister to the Hague in place of Gen. High Ewing. Mr. Root is a resident of Kansas, and at present Senator Pomeroy's clerk, at whose solicitation he was appointed. He is unknown, and is said to lack that liberal education and knowledge of the world necessary to fill the position. His confirmation is doubtful.

CONNER, the Democratic M. C. from Texas, is described as a very young, boyish-looking fellow, apparently hardly beyond his teens, with light hair, no beard, but a sharp, reckless expression, with a general singed-cat appearance. He is about twenty-five years of age, of small figure, self-confident in manner, and smarter, though probably not any better than he looks.

A SUSCEPTIBLE British youth, of barely seventy-four summers, arrived lately in the St. Louis Agricultural and Mechanical Association, at the opening of its next Fair, October 5d.

ONE of the passengers on the Golden City at the time she was wrecked on the coast of California, has sued the Pacific Mail Steamship Company for $10,000 for the privations he endured in consequence of the disaster.

THE latest amusement at Columbus, Georgia, was a foot race between an Alabama gentleman sixty years old, weighing 190 pounds, and a young Georgian twenty-one years old, weight 125 pounds; distance 200 yards—Alabama to run 150 while his opponent, Georgia, made the 200. Judges were selected, and $100 a side put up. Alabama won the race in twenty-six seconds, his opponent being only about five paces in advance when he reached the 150 yard stake.

THE Laramie (Wyoming) *Sentinel* of March 26th says: "A little circumstance connected with the late term of Court comes to our knowledge, which we are inclined to make public, even at the risk of betraying confidence. During the long and tedious Hewie murder trial, the jury (of whom one-half were ladies) were not permitted to separate and go to their homes, but were, under the charge of bailiffs (one lady and one gentleman) taken to the hotel for their meals, and lodging was provided for them in the adjoining parlors, each under the charge of their bailiff. And here, every morning during the trial, upon arising from their beds, these ladies kneeled together, and like the child Solomon, asked wisdom of God to enable them to properly and wisely discharge their new and arduous duties. While their male associates were engaged in boisterous mirth and trifling levity, they, with the full consciousness of the responsibility resting upon them, were seeking aid at the throne of the All Wise."

WEST AND SOUTH.

REUBEN MILLER, of Springfield, Ills., 75 years of age, has kept a diary in verse for fifty years, and it now contains over 18,000 items.

AT Vinton, on the 21st ult., Mrs. Geo. Sherwood presented her husband with a pair of twins whose aggregate weight was twenty pounds.

THE belle of Way Key, Florida, is sixteen years of age, and she is the heiress of 10,000 head of cattle. She has a large number of admirers—of the stock.

IN Cabell county, West Virginia, is a family, the progenitors of which are aged respectively 103 and 105 years. Their descendants number more than three hundred.

THE La Crosse *Leader*, telling of a family who passed through that place recently, says the parents have been married eleven years, and have twenty-two living children.

HORACE GREELEY has accepted an invitation to deliver an annual address before the St. Louis Agricultural and Mechanical Association, at the opening of its next Fair, October 5d.

ONE of the passengers on the Golden City at the time she was wrecked on the coast of California, has sued the Pacific Mail Steamship Company for $10,000 for the privations he endured in consequence of the disaster.

THE latest amusement at Columbus, Georgia, was a foot race between an Alabama gentleman sixty years old, weighing 190 pounds, and a young Georgian twenty-one years old, weight 125 pounds; distance 200 yards—Alabama to run 150 while his opponent, Georgia, made the 200. Judges were selected, and $100 a side put up. Alabama won the race in twenty-six seconds, his opponent being only about five paces in advance when he reached the 150 yard stake.

THE Laramie (Wyoming) *Sentinel* of March 26th says: "A little circumstance connected with the late term of Court comes to our knowledge, which we are inclined to make public, even at the risk of betraying confidence. During the long and tedious Hewie murder trial, the jury (of whom one-half were ladies) were not permitted to separate and go to their homes, but were, under the charge of bailiffs (one lady and one gentleman) taken to the hotel for their meals, and lodging was provided for them in the adjoining parlors, each under the charge of their bailiff. And here, every morning during the trial, upon arising from their beds, these ladies kneeled together, and like the child Solomon, asked wisdom of God to enable them to properly and wisely discharge their new and arduous duties. While their male associates were engaged in boisterous mirth and trifling levity, they, with the full consciousness of the responsibility resting upon them, were seeking aid at the throne of the All Wise."

FIRST EDITION.

MIDNIGHT.

NEWS BY CABLE.

Conviction of Fenians and Ribbonmen—Fate of the City of Boston—Grand Military Review at Paris—Rumor of Napoleon's Health—Roman Amphitheatre Unearthed—Serious Riot of Iron Operatives—Conscription Troubles in Spain.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

GREAT BRITAIN.

DUBLIN, April 8.—Twenty alleged Fenians and Ribbonmen have been sentenced at the Monaghan assizes to from three to six months' imprisonment. The Judge said that the jail was not large enough to accommodate all the prisoners that had been sentenced at the assizes.

The arrest of parties having arms in their possession has been commenced, under the peace preservation act.

LONDON, April 8.—The *Pall Mall Gazette* says, as matters now stand, the Erie shareholders are unlikely to rescue their property or vindicate their principles. The only hope is that American conscience and feeling may assert themselves are it is too late.

The underwriters ask twenty guineas premium on the City of Brussels steamer. She is believed to be safe, as she has plenty of canvass.

Mr. Inman publishes a communication in Mitchell's *Maritime Register*, in which he strongly disbelieves the Inman City of Boston foundered in a gale. He says she and the City of Antwerp were twin boats and they both encountered the same gale, the latter without damage or serious difficulty. All things considered he thinks the Boston collided with one of the icebergs so numerous in the northeast of Cape Race and sunk when only two or three days out.

It is said that a dispatch from Peru, sent by way of the Suez Canal has been returned to India from Huddersfield as yarn in forty five days. The time usually required by Cape of Good Hope is ninety days.

FRANCE.

PARIS, April 8.—A grand military review was contemplated yesterday, but at a late hour it was postponed until to-day. To-day the streets are full of troops and people. The troops are now (2 P. M.) passing the Emperor, who, with his attendants, is stationed in Place du Carousel near the Tuilleries.

Antiquarians are profoundly interested in the discovery of a great Roman amphitheatre in the excavations now going on at Mount St. Genevieve in this city.

A serious riot has broken out among the operatives of iron smelting furnaces and forges at Fourchambault, near Nevers. The troops there have been consigned to the barracks.

PARIS, April 8, *Evening.*—The journals to-day report the Emperor had a slight attack of gout yesterday, which prevented him from attending the review, but is soon passed away. The Emperor visited the public exhibition of horses to-day, and appeared quite well.

The question of submitting the plebiscitum to the Chambers before it is voted on by the people is not settled.

It is rumored the Emperor Napoleon had a long fainting fit last evening after attending the review at Place de Carousel, but rallied after some hours of rest. Rumors were nominally expressed to the rumor.

SPAIN.

MADRID, April 8—Fighting continues in the neighborhood of Barcelona between the rebels and the Government troops aided by the volunteers. The rebels are burning bridges, raising barricades, and cutting the telegraph wires. The Captain General is awaiting reinforcements from Valentia, Madrid and Saragossa.

Advices to day represent the country quiet.

The Duke of Montpensier was examined yesterday in regard to the late duel and admitted he shot Prince Henri. The Duke is under arrest at his house and it is understood he will be brought to trial on a civil not criminal process.

GERMANY.

BERLIN, April 8.—Bancroft gave a grand banquet last evening to L. J. M. Leary Brown and the Chinese Embassy.

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

LONDON, April 8—*Eve.*—Consols: money 93⅝; on account, 93⅞. American securities steady: '62s, 81½; '65s, 90¾; '67s, 89⅝; 10-40s, 86⅝; Eries, 11; I. C., 114; Atlantic and Western, 28½. Stocks steady.

LONDON, April 8—Tallow firm at 46s. Sperm Oil 92s@93s. Sugar dull at 39s 3d. Whale Oil 40s. Linseed firmer at 50s. Turpentine dull. Rosin and Cake firmer at 26 6d. Linseed Oil 32s 10d.

PARIS, April 8—Bourse firm at 72f 85c.

FRANKFORT, April 8—United States bonds quiet at 95¼.

HAVRE, April 8—Cotton firm but quiet.

ANTWERP, April 8—Petroleum declining at 52¼f.

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS.

Funeral Ceremonies at Troy Yesterday.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

TROY, April 8.—The obsequies of General Thomas took place to-day. The weather was fine, but the city wore a sombre aspect. Public and private buildings were draped in mourning; the streets were filled with people all morning; martial men marched to and fro to the beating of muffled drums taking places in line of the funeral *cortege*. The President, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, General Sherman, Congressional delegation, representatives of the army, Governor and Legislature of the State, citizens and dignitaries of all ranks in life, were present to testify the nation's sense of the irreparable loss. St. Paul's church, where the exercises took place, was draped with American flags bordered with crape, and emblems of grief met the eye in every part of the edifice. Bishop Doane read the service and Professor Gay presided at the organ. The musical portion of the service consisted of the hymn "Brief is life," and the solo "I know that my Redeemer liveth." The procession then formed in the following order and marched to solemn music to the Cemetery:

Troops of the National guard S. N. Y. and independent military organizations.

Escort, composed of two companies of engineer troops, four of the First United States Artillery and two of General Service Infantry.

Officiating clergy.

Body.

Pall bearers—Major Generals Meade, Rosecrans, Schofield, Hooker, Granger, Newton, Hazen, and Brigadier General Mackay.

President of the United States, Secretary of War, General of the Army.

Two bands of music.

Committee of the Senate of the United States.

Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Governor of the State of New York and staff.

Legislature of the State of New York.

Judiciary of New York.

Committee representing the State of Indiana.

The clergy.

Secretary of the Army of the Cumberland.

Officers of the army, navy and marine corps.

Volunteers of the war.

Corporate authorities of the city of Albany.

Corporate authorities of Schenectady.

Corporate authorities of Troy.

Posts of G. A. R.

Civic associations.

When the cemetery was reached the Episcopal Committant service was read by Bishop Doane, when the procession returned to the church and was dismissed.

THE GREAT RAILROAD BILL.

Governor's Veto Message.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
HARRISBURG, April 7, 1870.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

GENTLEMEN: Senate bill No. 1070, entitled "An act to facilitate and secure the construction of an additional railway connection between the waters of the Susquehanna and the great lakes of Canada and the northwestern States, by extending the aid and credit of certain corporations to the Jersey Shore, Pine Creek and Buffalo Railway Company, and in like manner to aid the construction of the Pittsburgh, Virginia and Charleston Railway, the Clearfield and Buffalo Railway, and the Erie and Allegheny Railway," was only presented for executive approval on yesterday, the 6th inst.

Regarding it as the most important ever submitted for consideration, both in the principles it involves and the consequences of my action thereon, I have examined it with as much care as was possible in the short time allowed, and the pressure of other duties at this late stage of the session. For those reasons it would have been desirable that the views about to be announced should have been the subject of more mature reflection. Entertaining, however, firm convictions that the proposed measure is not only in conflict with the Constitution, but at war with the best interests and true policy of the State, it is deemed an imperative duty to guard against all possible misconstruction by returning the bill promptly to the Senate, in which it originated, with the following statement of the reasons for withholding my approval:

There are in the sinking fund of the State interest on school and other bonds, viz: lates ($9,000,000) in railroad bonds, viz: $6,000,000 in bonds of the Pennsylvania railroad company, and $3,000,000 of the bonds of the Allegheny Valley railroad company, the payment of the latter guaranteed by the Philadelphia and Erie railroad company, the Northern Central railway company and by the Pennsylvania railroad company. These $6,000,000 are a part of the proceeds of the sales of the main line of the public works, sold in 1857; and the $3,500,000 are bonds substituted for a like amount of bonds which were proceeds of the sale of other portions of the public works, made subsequent to 1857. The whole $9,500,000, therefore, are proceeds of the sales of public improvements formerly owned by the State; and the bill under consideration, if approved, will take this entire sum out of the sinking fund and distribute it among the four railroad companies named in the bill, in the proportions therein related.

In the consideration of this most important subject two questions naturally arise:

First. Has the Legislature the constitutional power to enact this law? and

Second. If the power exists, is it expedient to exercise it?

If the first question be answered in the negative, the bill should not be approved. If in the affirmative, then the second question assumes a grave importance. What then are the written constitutional provisions bearing upon this subject? The 24th section of the 25th section of the first article of the Constitution declares that:

"No law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation."

The eighth section of the eleventh article is as follows:

"No bill shall be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject, which shall be expressed in the title, except appropriation bills."

The proposed act is not an appropriation bill within the recognized meaning of this section of the fundamental law. Every one familiar with the history of our State Constitution knows the objects for which these clauses were inserted and adopted. Our State had been cursed with omnibus legislation, enacted by what in common parlance was known as the system of log rolling. Measures which alone could not stand upon their specific merits, and which often had no merits on which to stand, were fastened together in one bill, and by the influence combinations of local interests, the most incongruous, and sometimes iniquitous provisions were forced through in the same act. Executive judgment was conflicting, and even rival and hostile interests and parties, who could agree upon nothing else, were thus induced to join in a common raid upon the Treasury of the State. This evil became in time so intolerable that the people were at last compelled to protect themselves against it; and they did so, by these plain constitutional prohibitions. The people spoke in their sovereign capacity, and wrote it in their Constitution, that "no bill should be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject," and that "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation."

It is contended, and with some show of plausibility, that the bill under consideration embraces but one subject—that of railroads, and this, and this alone, is expressed in the title; and that the act does not create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation. Technically this may be so; but we are considering grave questions of constitutional power, where difficult rules of construction must prevail, and judged by these it is clear that the provisions of the act are in manifest violation of the letter, spirit, intent and object of these plain constitutional provisions. In the case of the Commonwealth, ex rel. Clark, Wats and Serg's. Rep., 127) the late Chief Justice Gibson in delivering the unanimous opinion of our Supreme Court, said:

"A constitution is not to receive a technical interpretation like a common law instrument or statute. *It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them.*"

Apply this authoritative, sensible and well established principle of constitutional construction to the case in hand. The Constitution declares, in substance, that omnibus legislation and log rolling enactments shall cease; and to that end, "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation," and "no bill shall be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject." The bill returned includes four different railroad companies as principals, and nine others as guarantors, and by a liberal construction assumes that they all constitute but one subject. By this omnibus system the proposed act combines the interests, local rivalries and cupidity of nearly every section of the State, from the Delaware to the Lakes, and has thereby secured its passage. The several corporations, it is true, are not, technically, *created* by this law, but were first incorporated by other bills, with the manifest intent, to be followed by this act, which artfully combines the local interests of all the other beneficiary companies, breathes into them the breath of life by the appropriation of the public moneys, and secures the very identical ends prohibited by the Constitution. Thus, by a liberal construction of the act, and a narrow and technical interpretation of the Constitution, the sound rules and principles applicable to both are reversed and misapplied, and the effort made to reconcile the statute with the prohibition. The attempt is a failure. The Constitution cannot be evaded or nullified in any such manner. As ruled by Chief Justice Gibson, it must "be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them."

But there are other provisions of the Constitution prohibiting such legislation.

The 4th, 5th and 6th sections of the XI article are as follows:

"SEC. IV. To provide for the payment of the present debt, and any additional debt contracted as aforesaid, the Legislature shall, at its first session after the adoption of this amendment, create a sinking fund, which shall be sufficient to pay the accruing interest on such debt, and annually to reduce the principal thereof by a sum not less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which sinking fund shall consist of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same or any* part thereof, and of the income or proceeds of sale of stocks owned by the State, together with other funds or resources that may be designated by law. The said sinking fund may be increased from time to time, by assigning to it any part of the taxes, or revenues of the State, not required for the ordinary and current expenses of Government, *and unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, no part of the said sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt* until the amount of such debt is reduced below the sum of five millions of dollars.

"SEC. V. *The credit of the Commonwealth shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association;* nor shall the Commonwealth hereafter become a joint owner or stockholder in any company, association or corporation."

"SEC. VI. *The Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, or of any corporation or association;* unless such debt shall have been contracted to enable the State to repel invasion, suppress domestic insurrection, defend itself in time of war, or to assist the State in the discharge of any portion of its present indebtedness."

These three sections are part of the Constitutional amendments adopted by a vote of the people in 1857. They speak for themselves, and in no doubtful language. The 4th section requires the Legislature to create a sinking fund, to consist, among other things, "of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same;*" and declares further that, "unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, *no part of the sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt.*" How is it possible to reconcile these plain declarations of the Constitution with the provisions of the bill under consideration? These nine and a half million of bonds are the proceeds of the sales of the public works, and they are in the sinking fund created by the act of 23d April, 1858, in compliance with this same section of the fundamental law. The Constitution declares in plain language and clear that the fund shall be pledged or loaned to any company, corporation or association, nor shall it be used or applied *otherwise than in extinguishment of the public debt.* This bill proposes not to apply the whole of the nine and one half millions to the construction of sundry enumerated railroads, but to pledge or loan to them the credit of the Commonwealth *shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association.* This bill proposes, not incidentally a loan or pledge of credit, but more; it proposes to pay the money outright to the railroads for these corporations. How can this be done consistently with the constitutional prohibition? Does not the proposition include the loan? In principle, or substance, how does this thing authorized differ from the thing prohibited, except that the Constitution not only forbids the loan or pledge of credit, and the other appropriates the money to pay for the same, viz: the taking of the proceeds of the sale of the public works out of the sinking fund and appropriating them to the construction of railroads.

The VIth section declares that "the Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, *or of any corporation or association.*"

Technically, the bill under consideration may not authorize the assumption of the debts of these railroad companies, but it does more. It actually provides a certain fund, and takes from the State treasury the necessary means with which to do it. These are all clear violations of the very letter of the Constitution. An effort is made to escape from these conclusions, under the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company (6 Wright, 457), which seems to assume that these *bonds* in the sinking fund are not the *proceeds* of the sale of the public works. But the court in that case justifies its opinion on the ground that the act of Assembly authorized the sinking fund Commissioners to exchange depreciated securities for those of more value. Here the attempt is to authorize the exchange of securities confessedly good for others of most questionable value. In this regard as a material and important distinction. Every one familiar with the history of our State Constitution knows the objects for which these clauses were inserted and adopted. Our State had been cursed with omnibus legislation, enacted by what in common parlance was known as the system of log rolling. Measures which alone could not stand upon their specific merits, and which often had no merits on which to stand, were fastened together in one bill, and by the influence combinations of local interests, the most incongruous, and sometimes iniquitous provisions were forced through in the same act. Executive judgment was conflicting, and even rival and hostile interests and parties, who could agree upon nothing else, were thus induced to join in a common raid upon the Treasury of the State. This evil became in time so intolerable that the people were at last compelled to protect themselves against it; and they did so, by these plain constitutional prohibitions. The people spoke in their sovereign capacity, and wrote it in their Constitution, that "no bill should be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject," and that "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation."

Technically this may be so; but we are considering grave questions of constitutional power, where difficult rules of construction must prevail, and judged by these it is clear that the provisions of the act are in manifest violation of the letter, spirit, intent and object of these plain constitutional provisions. In the case of the Commonwealth, ex rel. Clark, Wats and Serg's. Rep., 127) the late Chief Justice Gibson in delivering the unanimous opinion of our Supreme Court, said:

"A constitution is not to receive a technical interpretation like a common law instrument or statute. *It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them.*"

Apply this authoritative, sensible and well established principle of constitutional construction to the case in hand. The Constitution declares, in substance, that omnibus legislation and log rolling enactments shall cease; and to that end, "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation" and "no bill shall be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject." The bill returned includes four different railroad companies as principals, and nine others as guarantors, and by a liberal construction assumes that they all constitute but one subject. By this omnibus system the proposed act combines the interests, local rivalries and cupidity of nearly every section of the State, from the Delaware to the Lakes, and has thereby secured its passage. The several corporations, it is true, are not, technically, *created* by this law, but were first incorporated by other bills, with the manifest intent, to be followed by this act, which artfully combines the local interests of all the other beneficiary companies, breathes into them the breath of life by the appropriation of the public moneys, and secures the very identical ends prohibited by the Constitution. Thus, by a liberal construction of the act, and a narrow and technical interpretation of the Constitution, the sound rules and principles applicable to both are reversed and misapplied, and the effort made to reconcile the statute with the prohibition. The attempt is a failure. The Constitution cannot be evaded or nullified in any such manner. As ruled by Chief Justice Gibson, it must "be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them."

But there are other provisions of the Constitution prohibiting such legislation.

The 4th, 5th and 6th sections of the XI article are as follows:

"SEC. IV. To provide for the payment of the present debt, and any additional debt contracted as aforesaid, the Legislature shall, at its first session after the adoption of this amendment, create a sinking fund, which shall be sufficient to pay the accruing interest on such debt, and annually to reduce the principal thereof by a sum not less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which sinking fund shall consist of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same or any* part thereof, and of the income or proceeds of sale of stocks owned by the State, together with other funds or resources that may be designated by law. The said sinking fund may be increased from time to time, by assigning to it any part of the taxes, or revenues of the State, not required for the ordinary and current expenses of Government, *and unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, no part of the said sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt* until the amount of such debt is reduced below the sum of five millions of dollars.

"SEC. V. *The credit of the Commonwealth shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association;* nor shall the Commonwealth hereafter become a joint owner or stockholder in any company, association or corporation."

"SEC. VI. *The Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, or of any corporation or association;* unless such debt shall have been contracted to enable the State to repel invasion, suppress domestic insurrection, defend itself in time of war, or to assist the State in the discharge of any portion of its present indebtedness."

These three sections are part of the Constitutional amendments adopted by a vote of the people in 1857. They speak for themselves, and in no doubtful language. The 4th section requires the Legislature to create a sinking fund, to consist, among other things, "of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same;*" and declares further that, "unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, *no part of the sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt.*" How is it possible to reconcile these plain declarations of the Constitution with the provisions of the bill under consideration? These nine and a half million of bonds are the proceeds of the sales of the public works, and they are in the sinking fund created by the act of 23d April, 1858, in compliance with this same section of the fundamental law. The Constitution declares in plain language and clear that the fund shall be pledged or loaned to any company, corporation or association; nor shall it be used or applied *otherwise than in extinguishment of the public debt.* This bill proposes not to apply the whole of the nine and one half millions to the construction of sundry enumerated railroads, but to pledge or loan to them the credit of the Commonwealth *shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association.* This bill proposes, not incidentally a loan or pledge of credit, but more; it proposes to pay the money outright to the railroads for these corporations. How can this be done consistently with the constitutional prohibition? Does not the proposition include the loan? In principle, or substance, how does this thing authorized differ from the thing prohibited, except that the Constitution not only forbids the loan or pledge of credit, and the other appropriates the money to pay for the same, viz: the taking of the proceeds of the sale of the public works out of the sinking fund and appropriating them to the construction of railroads.

The VIth section declares that "the Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, *or of any corporation or association.*"

Technically, the bill under consideration may not authorize the assumption of the debts of these railroad companies, but it does more. It actually provides a certain fund, and takes from the State treasury the necessary means with which to do it. These are all clear violations of the very letter of the Constitution. An effort is made to escape from these conclusions, under the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company (6 Wright, 457), which seems to assume that these *bonds* in the sinking fund are not the *proceeds* of the sale of the public works. But the court in that case justifies its opinion on the ground that the act of Assembly authorized the sinking fund Commissioners to exchange depreciated securities for those of more value. Here the attempt is to authorize the exchange of securities confessedly good for others of most questionable value. In this regard as a material and important distinction. Every one familiar with the history of our State Constitution knows the objects for which these clauses were inserted and adopted. Our State had been cursed with omnibus legislation, enacted by what in common parlance was known as the system of log rolling. Measures which alone could not stand upon their specific merits, and which often had no merits on which to stand, were fastened together in one bill, and by the influence combinations of local interests, the most incongruous, and sometimes iniquitous provisions were forced through in the same act. Executive judgment was conflicting, and even rival and hostile interests and parties, who could agree upon nothing else, were thus induced to join in a common raid upon the Treasury of the State. This evil became in time so intolerable that the people were at last compelled to protect themselves against it; and they did so, by these plain constitutional prohibitions. The people spoke in their sovereign capacity, and wrote it in their Constitution, that "no bill should be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject," and that "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation."

Technically this may be so; but we are considering grave questions of constitutional power, where difficult rules of construction must prevail, and judged by these it is clear that the provisions of the act are in manifest violation of the letter, spirit, intent and object of these plain constitutional provisions. In the case of the Commonwealth, ex rel. Clark, Wats and Serg's. Rep., 127) the late Chief Justice Gibson in delivering the unanimous opinion of our Supreme Court, said:

"A constitution is not to receive a technical interpretation like a common law instrument or statute. *It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them.*"

Apply this authoritative, sensible and well established principle of constitutional construction to the case in hand. The Constitution declares, in substance, that omnibus legislation and log rolling enactments shall cease; and to that end, "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation" and "no bill shall be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject." The bill returned includes four different railroad companies as principals, and nine others as guarantors, and by a liberal construction assumes that they all constitute but one subject. By this omnibus system the proposed act combines the interests, local rivalries and cupidity of nearly every section of the State, from the Delaware to the Lakes, and has thereby secured its passage. The several corporations, it is true, are not, technically, *created* by this law, but were first incorporated by other bills, with the manifest intent, to be followed by this act, which artfully combines the local interests of all the other beneficiary companies, breathes into them the breath of life by the appropriation of the public moneys, and secures the very identical ends prohibited by the Constitution. Thus, by a liberal construction of the act, and a narrow and technical interpretation of the Constitution, the sound rules and principles applicable to both are reversed and misapplied, and the effort made to reconcile the statute with the prohibition. The attempt is a failure. The Constitution cannot be evaded or nullified in any such manner. As ruled by Chief Justice Gibson, it must "be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them."

But there are other provisions of the Constitution prohibiting such legislation.

The 4th, 5th and 6th sections of the XI article are as follows:

"SEC. IV. To provide for the payment of the present debt, and any additional debt contracted as aforesaid, the Legislature shall, at its first session after the adoption of this amendment, create a sinking fund, which shall be sufficient to pay the accruing interest on such debt, and annually to reduce the principal thereof by a sum not less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which sinking fund shall consist of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same or any* part thereof, and of the income or proceeds of sale of stocks owned by the State, together with other funds or resources that may be designated by law. The said sinking fund may be increased from time to time, by assigning to it any part of the taxes, or revenues of the State, not required for the ordinary and current expenses of Government, *and unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, no part of the said sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt* until the amount of such debt is reduced below the sum of five millions of dollars.

"SEC. V. *The credit of the Commonwealth shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association;* nor shall the Commonwealth hereafter become a joint owner or stockholder in any company, association or corporation."

"SEC. VI. *The Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, or of any corporation or association;* unless such debt shall have been contracted to enable the State to repel invasion, suppress domestic insurrection, defend itself in time of war, or to assist the State in the discharge of any portion of its present indebtedness."

These three sections are part of the Constitutional amendments adopted by a vote of the people in 1857. They speak for themselves, and in no doubtful language. The 4th section requires the Legislature to create a sinking fund, to consist, among other things, "of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same;*" and declares further that, "unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, *no part of the sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt.*" How is it possible to reconcile these plain declarations of the Constitution with the provisions of the bill under consideration? These nine and a half million of bonds are the proceeds of the sales of the public works, and they are in the sinking fund created by the act of 23d April, 1858, in compliance with this same section of the fundamental law. The Constitution declares in plain language and clear that the fund shall be pledged or loaned to any company, corporation or association; nor shall it be used or applied *otherwise than in extinguishment of the public debt.* This bill proposes not to apply the whole of the nine and one half millions to the construction of sundry enumerated railroads, but to pledge or loan to them the credit of the Commonwealth *shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association.* This bill proposes, not incidentally a loan or pledge of credit, but more; it proposes to pay the money outright to the railroads for these corporations. How can this be done consistently with the constitutional prohibition? Does not the proposition include the loan? In principle, or substance, how does this thing authorized differ from the thing prohibited, except that the Constitution not only forbids the loan or pledge of credit, and the other appropriates the money to pay for the same, viz: the taking of the proceeds of the sale of the public works out of the sinking fund and appropriating them to the construction of railroads.

The VIth section declares that "the Commonwealth shall not assume the debt, or any part thereof, of any county, city, borough or township, *or of any corporation or association.*"

Technically, the bill under consideration may not authorize the assumption of the debts of these railroad companies, but it does more. It actually provides a certain fund, and takes from the State treasury the necessary means with which to do it. These are all clear violations of the very letter of the Constitution. An effort is made to escape from these conclusions, under the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company (6 Wright, 457), which seems to assume that these *bonds* in the sinking fund are not the *proceeds* of the sale of the public works. But the court in that case justifies its opinion on the ground that the act of Assembly authorized the sinking fund Commissioners to exchange depreciated securities for those of more value. Here the attempt is to authorize the exchange of securities confessedly good for others of most questionable value. In this regard as a material and important distinction. Every one familiar with the history of our State Constitution knows the objects for which these clauses were inserted and adopted. Our State had been cursed with omnibus legislation, enacted by what in common parlance was known as the system of log rolling. Measures which alone could not stand upon their specific merits, and which often had no merits on which to stand, were fastened together in one bill, and by the influence combinations of local interests, the most incongruous, and sometimes iniquitous provisions were forced through in the same act. Executive judgment was conflicting, and even rival and hostile interests and parties, who could agree upon nothing else, were thus induced to join in a common raid upon the Treasury of the State. This evil became in time so intolerable that the people were at last compelled to protect themselves against it; and they did so, by these plain constitutional prohibitions. The people spoke in their sovereign capacity, and wrote it in their Constitution, that "no bill should be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject," and that "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation."

Technically this may be so; but we are considering grave questions of constitutional power, where difficult rules of construction must prevail, and judged by these it is clear that the provisions of the act are in manifest violation of the letter, spirit, intent and object of these plain constitutional provisions. In the case of the Commonwealth, ex rel. Clark, Wats and Serg's. Rep., 127) the late Chief Justice Gibson in delivering the unanimous opinion of our Supreme Court, said:

"A constitution is not to receive a technical interpretation like a common law instrument or statute. *It is to be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them.*"

Apply this authoritative, sensible and well established principle of constitutional construction to the case in hand. The Constitution declares, in substance, that omnibus legislation and log rolling enactments shall cease; and to that end, "no law hereafter enacted shall create, renew or extend the charter of more than one corporation" and "no bill shall be passed by the Legislature containing more than one subject." The bill returned includes four different railroad companies as principals, and nine others as guarantors, and by a liberal construction assumes that they all constitute but one subject. By this omnibus system the proposed act combines the interests, local rivalries and cupidity of nearly every section of the State, from the Delaware to the Lakes, and has thereby secured its passage. The several corporations, it is true, are not, technically, *created* by this law, but were first incorporated by other bills, with the manifest intent, to be followed by this act, which artfully combines the local interests of all the other beneficiary companies, breathes into them the breath of life by the appropriation of the public moneys, and secures the very identical ends prohibited by the Constitution. Thus, by a liberal construction of the act, and a narrow and technical interpretation of the Constitution, the sound rules and principles applicable to both are reversed and misapplied, and the effort made to reconcile the statute with the prohibition. The attempt is a failure. The Constitution cannot be evaded or nullified in any such manner. As ruled by Chief Justice Gibson, it must "be interpreted so as to carry out the great principles of the Government, not to defeat them."

But there are other provisions of the Constitution prohibiting such legislation.

The 4th, 5th and 6th sections of the XI article are as follows:

"SEC. IV. To provide for the payment of the present debt, and any additional debt contracted as aforesaid, the Legislature shall, at its first session after the adoption of this amendment, create a sinking fund, which shall be sufficient to pay the accruing interest on such debt, and annually to reduce the principal thereof by a sum not less than two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which sinking fund shall consist of the net annual income of the public works, from time to time owned by the State, *or the proceeds of the sale of the same or any* part thereof, and of the income or proceeds of sale of stocks owned by the State, together with other funds or resources that may be designated by law. The said sinking fund may be increased from time to time, by assigning to it any part of the taxes, or revenues of the State, not required for the ordinary and current expenses of Government, *and unless in case of war, invasion or insurrection, no part of the said sinking fund shall be used or applied otherwise than in the extinguishment of the public debt* until the amount of such debt is reduced below the sum of five millions of dollars.

"SEC. V. *The credit of the Commonwealth shall not in any manner or event be pledged or loaned to any individual, company, corporation or association;* nor shall the Commonwealth hereafter become a jo