

"The Why" of a Blush.
Two maps by the cottage porch
Green crimson in the sunset light;
Was it their love's red glow
Which made her perfect face so bright?

I led her gently down the steps,
And down the pathway's flickering shade,
But still her tender cheek and lips
The same deep radiance warmly played.

"Enough, oh sweet!" I whispered low;
"That heart is mine I yearned to win;
No sunset blush, but mine the glow,
Breaks from the kindled soul within."

FRED. KURTZ, Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. VIII. CENTRE HALL, CENTRE CO., PA., THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1875. NO. 15.

The Voyage.
O weary days and nights, so still, so still—
The endless watch and longings still and slow,
We pine and ache, and sigh, and sigh,
In vain we wait for change to come,
Is not for us, we hear the strong winds
blow
And free as in the east, we see
Great ships and small go sliding fast and free.

ARRIVE.
O fearful days and nights so dark and cold—
The swift waves mock and leap on every
side
No rudder steers; no mast nor spar can hold;
We think no ear could hear us if we cried;
We think no eye could see us if we died;
We feel forgotten, but we know we are
seen;
We wait our eyes and do not even pray.

ON SHORE.
O peaceful days and peaceful nights whose
peace
Cannot be uttered! O green shores of life
Beyond the bill! Shall we ever cease
To smile that through such hot and sultry
sifts
We see? That doubts and fears could grow
so rare?
That we could fail to see God's good hand
Our anchorages and our driftings planned?

THE WAR IN CUBA.
The Story of a Conflict as Told by a Volunteer.
To gain an idea of Cuban warfare one may follow to advantage the life of an adventurer who volunteers to take part in the struggle. He is called a volunteer. One morning he is ordered to arms, and the sound of firing coming from a distant hill. The noise was as if a thousand muskets were being fired at once. Soon crowds of mounted men appear on the hills, and with the aid of field-glasses their movements are watched. They wear dresses of white canvas and hold in their hands sporting guns and priming spears. A body of them surrounds a hatched hut, over the roof of which a white banner, bearing a strange device, a silver star on a square of republican red, is floating. The volunteers move toward the hut, but find it deserted, with the exception of a decrepit half-naked negro, who is made a prisoner of war. The banner is taken from the roof and borne off in triumph by the volunteers. Around two more prisoners of war are made in the shape of a couple of runaway negroes.

Natural History in Our Public Schools.
Professor Tenney, of Williams College, publishes an interesting article on the importance of teaching natural history in public schools. From it we extract the following:
No language is so generally exaggerated in the importance of natural history studies, and the importance of teaching the elements of this science, is to be seen in children in the primary schools, as well as to those in the schools of higher grades. And I have not alluded, by name, to the fact that the great problems relative to supplying the world with glass and iron—lead and tin and copper—with gold and silver and precious stones—with grain for bread—with food from the stream and from the field, with the flesh of our animals, with the flesh of fowl and of cattle—are connected to-day, most intimately, with natural history studies, and with the study of every increasing year, with every added million to the population of the earth, and with every real or imaginary physical and moral problem.

WOMEN IN ENGLISH WORKHOUSES.
How the English Factory Law—Hemlock—The task of ascertaining what women do in workhouses, says the London News, appears suddenly narrowed on entering of the four rooms at Marylebone workhouse, and discovering what class of women it is that chiefly populate these metropolitan houses of refuge. The room in addition to being long, is lofty, well lighted, apparently well ventilated, and certainly very warm. Hanging through three-quarters of its length of the room, by either wall, are rows of little beds, forty in all, and in the far corner is visible an old lady far advanced in the preliminary preparations for retiring to rest, albeit it is only half-past four o'clock. But the majority of the occupants of the room are seated on the floor, and are engaged in some kind of work, which is done in a room, and by which a great fire is burning in a bright stove. Not one is over sixty years of age, many are under thirty, and there are some who have passed their four-score years and ten. It is evident that these workhouse women, who are not allowed to be idle, and who are not allowed to do anything that might come under a record of active life. It seems that the women are engaged in some kind of work, and are sitting in the freight waiting to be called for, and are, in the meantime, drinking as much warm tea as they can get, and are, in the meantime, drinking as much warm tea as they can get, and are, in the meantime, drinking as much warm tea as they can get.

The Last Gold Ring.
The history of Wall Street presents no exact parallel to the gold pool which has lately controlled the market. There are no exact parallels to the gold pool which has lately controlled the market. There are no exact parallels to the gold pool which has lately controlled the market.

Stage-Struck Girls.
Two girls, aged about sixteen and eighteen years respectively, were arrested in the western section of Baltimore. The arrests were kept quiet for some time by the police in consequence of the desire of the girls' parents, who live in Philadelphia, to have their names withheld. It seems that a few weeks ago these girls left their homes in Philadelphia in the morning to attend the normal school, where they were pupils. Their parents became anxious about them and made inquiries, which elicited the fact that they had not been present at the school session that day. This was the most remarkable as they were among the most regularly attending and furthest advanced scholars. Late in the evening the father of one of the girls, a prominent clergyman, received a note from his daughter stating that she and her companion had fled with the intention of going on the stage. She said they had become tired of the humdrum monotony of school life and wanted to see the world and to be successful and to be a good living, thereby relieving their parents of a heavy burden. The father of the other girl, who is a wealthy retired liquor dealer, was informed, and the matter was placed in the hands of the police. The girls were arrested on a charge of running away from home for a year or more shown great aptitude in singing and declamation, and were quite prepossessing in appearance. From the first they were very cooperative, and their straight story, as well as their appearance, disarmed suspicion. The girls were taken to the police station, and the girls were taken to the police station, and the girls were taken to the police station.

The Two Friends.
There was once a bear, says Paul Fort, in *St. Nicholas*, who was very lonely (La Fontaine tells about him in his fables) but he grew older and he began to feel that his solitary lot was too much for him to bear. He had no wife, no children, no passions. The larger animals generally avoided him, and as for the smaller creatures, such as rabbits and little pigs, they would have nothing whatever to do with him if they could help it. He had
No one to love, none to care for,
And he grew sadder day by day.
Not many miles from the mountain on which he dwelt, there was a little town, and in that town there was a man who was in very much the same condition. He had a comfortable home, with gardens and shade-trees, and pillars of marble, and a fine view of the sea, and Jupiter and the rest of the heathen gods, and in all this man was ever so much better off than the bear, who had almost nothing at all; but he was not happy. He, too, had no wife, or child, or parents. He longed for companionship with some one, but he could not find it. His sorrows and his joys, some one on whose heart he could rely. He was lonely, but he was not alone. He was lonely, but he was not alone. He was lonely, but he was not alone.

BLINCH'S WEDDING.
Rugged, saturnine and cynical as to appearance; crabbed, miserly and reticent as to disposition; such was Blinck and Co., general merchandise brokers and proprietors of a store in the city. Blinck and Company also, the latter attachment of the firm being purely fictitious, and designed possibly for euphony—perhaps to give distinction to the firm title.
Blinck lived in a ramshackle, tumble-down old rookery in Pearl street, an establishment which had come to him strictly in the way of business, having fallen into his clutches through the foreclosure of a mortgage, by which process an estimable but unfortunate family were summarily ejected into the street on the 15th of November, after which each party of them vanished out of man's cognizance.
As there could be found no tenant for the rookery Blinck moved into it himself, being the only one of the family who had any money left. Blinck was as universally disliked and detested as a man could be for a man to be. His hardness at driving a bargain, his want of charity—either for family or for neighbor—his absolute disregard for the customary amenities of life; these peculiarities caused him to be shunned by all who were not driven to intercourse with him by some special exigencies. Of those latter, however, there were very many, and his line of trade was so successful in its competition with the retail business, that Blinck had amassed no inconsiderable amount of property, which was securely invested in the best possible securities at profitable rates of interest.
There was, however, in regard to Blinck one single redeeming feature; he had a daughter—Polly—who, by her characteristics were in such marked contrast to those of her father that they shed a halo of reflected brightness and beauty over the whole family. Polly was the early meanness of Blinck seen less obnoxious when she was by.
Polly was by this time twenty years old, and as sweet and kind as one would wish to see. Her charms of disposition seemed to have given a special loveliness to her every expression, and she was so kind and generous, and in the estimate of those who knew both to atone for the rugged and unkindness peculiarities of her father, which caused Blinck to be so disliked.
Of course Polly had many admirers; for though she was not permitted to see any company whatever under the displeasure of her father, she was a desirable prospect for a young man, and she did reflect upon her father's interest in the important question, her spirits were so bright and cheerful, and she was so kind and generous, and in the estimate of those who knew both to atone for the rugged and unkindness peculiarities of her father, which caused Blinck to be so disliked.

THE CROPS OF 1874.
Mr. R. Dodge, the statistician of the United States bureau of agriculture, gives the footings of his forthcoming statement of the crops of 1874, as follows:
On the 1st of January, 1874, the number of acres of grain in the United States aggregated 110,000,000, as deduced from returns of county correspondents, of which 71,000,000 were in wheat, 29,000,000 in corn, and 10,000,000 in other grains. In September last reports were received showing the comparative numbers and condition of the crops in the various States, and just now the crops of 1874 are in a good state of maturity. In the wheat States, the crops are in a good state of maturity, and in the corn States, the crops are in a good state of maturity. In the wheat States, the crops are in a good state of maturity, and in the corn States, the crops are in a good state of maturity.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system. The uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.

COOKED OR UNCOOKED FOOD.
It has been practically demonstrated that food, when cooked and fed for the purpose of fattening an animal, will make more flesh than uncooked food. For the reason that it is easier digested and also is more readily assimilated into the system; but there is this difference between the two, that the uncooked food is not so readily digested, and it is not so readily assimilated into the system.