A WISH.

Your eyes, my love, are brightly blue,
And brightly golden are your tresses,
Your very looks are *billet-doux*,
That go at once to their addresses.
Your temper is a sunny sky,
Where clouds may very rarely mingle;
You've laid a heap of money by—
I only wish that I was single.

'Twould be a happy task, methinks,
To court you, out of town or in it;
Let Cupid weave his thickest links,
And I could wear them in a minute.
For in a street or in a square,
Or in a dell or in a dingle,
'Twere bliss to kneel, and sigh, and swear,
I only wish that I were single.

My wife is plain and forty-five—
In talents I am far above her;
'Tis not so easy to contrive
To think I rather think I love her:
I simply honor and obey,
Because my wedded ears may tingle
If ever she should hear me say,
I only wish that I were single.

The Democratic Party as a Retrenchment Party.

The Republican Legislature of 1868 passed an act, still on the statute books, fixing the number and compensation of the officers of each branch of the Legislature. The number of officers of the Senate was fixed at 1 chief clerk, 2 assistants, 4 transcribing clerks, 1 librarian, 1 sergeant-at-arms and 2 assistants, 1 messenger and 2 assistants, 1 superintendent of the folding room and 6 pasters and folders, 1 doorkeeper of the rotunda, 1 postmaster, 1 fireman, and 5 pages—32 in all.

The Republican Senate of 1869 was organized in strict compliance with this law, the Republican members presenting a resolution for the election of candidates for the places above named, no more and no less. But, before their election took place, the Democratic members, to show their conviction that this was providing more offices than the Senate really needed, put forward Mr. Burnett and Mr. M'Candless to offer an amendment to the resolution, for the election of a *smaller number* of officers, to wit: by leaving out one of the assistant messengers, the postmaster, and *all* the pasters and folders. For this amendment all the Democratic Senators voted, the vote standing 15 to 18.

The Democratic Senators, when in the minority, thus placed themselves on the record as believing that this was all the Senate needed in the way of officers, that the act of 1868 was in fact too liberal.

In 1871 the Democrats had, accidentally, a majority in the Senate. Did they carry out, then, their programme of 1869? Let us see.

They put themselves on record in 1869 as thinking that the Senate needed *no* pasters and folders, and that that body could get along with less officers than the law allowed; but the moment they came into power, they proceeded to elect not only *all* the officers authorized by the law of 1868, but more than the legal number, although the act positively prohibits the election of any greater number of officers by either branch. As, for instance:

The law of 1868 allows two assistant clerks; the Democratic Senate had three; the law allows only four transcribing clerks, they had five; the law authorizes two assistant doorkeepers, they had three; the law provides for six pasters and folders, they had eight; they had also three firemen, where the law allows but one; and one watchman, one janitor, one laborer, and one assistant librarian, for none of which was there any provision of law, to say nothing of nine pages, where they legally could employ but five.

We thus find 15 Democratic Senators voting in 1869 that the Senate needed no pasters and folders, and 17 Democratic Senators in 1871 voting to employ and pay nine of these useless officers. The same 15 Senators declared in 1869 that the law of 1868 was too liberal, and allowed more officers than the Senate needed; whilst the 17 Senators voted the number altogether too small, and proceeded to multiply new officers without stint. The difference is, the 15 were in the minority; the 17 were in the majority. It is a very retrenching and economical party when it is out of power, but a very expensive one when it gets in.

The law of 1868 authorizes the Senate to elect or employ 32 officers, including every subordinate; the Democratic Senate of 1871 elected or employed 49 officers—17 more than the law allowed, and 26 more than the Senate really needed, themselves being judges, as is evidenced by their votes for Burnett's resolution in 1869.

But this is not all. The act of 1868 fixed the compensation of all these officers, and enacted that under no circumstances should they be permitted to draw more pay or receive any extra allowance. This wholesome provision of law was totally disregarded by these Democratic retrenchers. The pay of nearly all the officers is fixed by that law at $600 each; but the 49 officers employed by the Democratic Senate have already been paid $47,004 50—or an average of nearly a thousand dollars each.

Look, people of Pennsylvania, at these figures. The pay of the officers of the Republican Senate of 1870 was $26,466 05, and the total cost of the session was $92,260 85. The pay of the officers of the Democratic Senate of 1871 was $47,904 50, *nearly double that of the previous session*, and the total expenses of the session thus far paid are $140,757 68. As there are probably over $10,000 of claims under this head yet unpaid, it is perfectly safe to put down the total cost of the late Democratic Senate at $150,757 68—an increase over the expenses of the previous Republican Senate of $58,497 83.

This is a fair illustration of Democratic precept and practice. That party is profuse in economical professions when out of power; but invariably, when in power, plunges into extravagance; witness New York and the Democratic Senate of 1871.

Who would care to be Queen of England? Who would rule that unruly and scandal-hatching race, the British? The latest gossip concerning royalty does'nt, it is true, accuse her of maintaining improper relations with her footman; but it is averred that she has become an absolute miser, and has fears of coming speedily to the almshouse. Her servants' table, it is added, is so miserably spread that the royal retainers are in danger of starvation.

"I'm not used to begging," said a little girl to a lady of whom she had asked alms, "'cause only two weeks ago my father was a merchant!" "Why, child how could he be reduced to poverty so soon?" "My father took a bad two dollar bill at his peanut stand, and it ruined him," sobbed the child.

The editor of a county paper says: "Wednesday's post brought us a letter addressed 'Rev.,' another 'The Hon.,' another 'Col.,' and the last 'Esq.' On the way to dinner we accidently stepped on a woman's trail, and she addressed us thus—'You brute.' Who among the lot is right?"

A WRITER in the Boston *Transcript* tells how one morning she remonstrated with her colored servant, for abusing his wife, unbraiding him after this manner: "Jack, what a pretty, little smart wife you have. If I were you, I would try to make myself more agreeable to her. I would fill the coal-scuttles, feed the pig, gather the vegetables for her, and—and—I wouldn't strike her." The only answer from Jack was: "Why! I'se done married Lou; I isn't courting her!"

A country girl rode into New Albany, Indiana, to do some shopping, when the clerk asked if there was anything else he could do for her: he was amazed by the reply. "Oh! no, sir, unless you will be kind enough to go out and milk the old mare, for I rode her from home without her colt."