

# AMERICAN CITIZEN.

"Let us have Faith that Right makes Might; and in that Faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it"—A. LINCOLN.

VOLUME 1.

BUTLER, BUTLER COUNTY, PA., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1864.

NUMBER 41.

## Address of the Union State Central Committee

To the People of Pennsylvania:

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The result of the recent election on the amendment to the Constitution of the State, allowing soldiers in the field to vote, is gratifying, inasmuch as it shows that the great heart of the Commonwealth is right, in the fearful and bloody struggle going on to preserve the great republic, and that these brave men are worthy to help govern the country for which they make so many sacrifices and suffer so many privations.

The friends of the Union have brought about this result, while the opposition have used their powerful organization to prevent it, with the evident object of weakening the Union armies by disfranchising the soldier, and thereby strengthening themselves at the approaching Presidential election; and in connection with this election let us reason together.

The campaign of 1864 is now fairly opened. The issue upon which the campaign is to be made is clearly indicated. The enemies of the government have publicly and authoritatively declared their purpose in the contest. That declaration places the duty of patriots in a light as broad and clear as that of noon. There is no mistake either the spirit or the object of our opponents; it is the same that impelled the chiefs of armed treason to attempt the overthrow of free government on this continent in 1860-61. Neither time nor reflection, nor regard for the peace of society in the loyal States, nor the desolations which have devoured the prosperity of the south in the grip of war, have wrought any modification of their hatred for a government founded upon the opinions of the people expressed through the ballot box.

It is the part of wisdom to anticipate evil, and to prepare to destroy it before it grows too formidable to overthrow. The attitude of the parties to the Presidential contest gives rise to a serious question—the most serious of any which can engage the attention of the true patriot and good citizen. That question is briefly stated:—Shall we have lasting peace, through a vigorous prosecution of this war for national life, or interminable war, through a peace based upon disunion?

The issue is sharply defined. The utterances of the Baltimore Convention decisively declare for peace through effective war; the utterances of the Chicago Convention as decisively pronounce for the alternative presented in the question stated. They mean that, or they are without meaning. The opposition to Mr. Lincoln contemplates disunion as a cure for the ills under which we lie. His defeat would divide the continent into factious States. Nor is this mere assertion. The political history of the country for the last four years is a mass of overwhelming evidence in support of its entire, its disgraceful truth.

And first, in evidence of its truth, we have the declaration, informal but not less weighty, (because reiterated and unvarying) of the rebel chiefs, that the South will not treat for peace save upon the basis of a recognition of its independence. The press of the South omits no opportunity to impress upon us and the world that peace can only come through recognition. Recognition is but another name for separation. And finally, every European nation has come to regard the result of this war as certain to be one of two things—either subjugation or disunion. It is the clear conviction which truth brings to every rational, enlightened mind. It is, therefore, entitled to great weight, second only to the resultant fact.

It is due to the opponents of Mr. Lincoln to state that they pretend to believe in the probability of peace and Union through some compromise, the terms of which are not clearly stated.

It will be easy to show the futility of such hopes, if it has not already been done. It will not be a difficult task to show that such a belief does not take root in conviction. The leaders of the opposition are men of great ability and more than ordinary sagacity. They cannot, therefore, be ignorant of the facts which are of public record. Those facts effectually preclude the possibility of peace and Union through any compromise, unless the terms involve recognition; and that would be disunion.

But let us thoroughly consider this question of peace through compromise. It is reasonable to suppose that the chiefs of the rebellion would have accepted terms at the outset if at all. It is alleged by our opponents that Mr. Lincoln hurried the nation into war, not only without constitutional warrant, but even against the wishes of the rebel chiefs themselves. They reproach the Congress then in session with having refused to adopt the Crittenden Compromise measure, and thus forced the south into rebellion in exercise

of the right of self-defence and self-preservation. It is unnecessary to pause to show that all this transpired while the reins of power were held by southern men, most of whom are now in arms against the government. Let that pass. The question hinges upon the responsibility of the rejection of the Crittenden Compromise. It was rejected. By whom?

Reference to page 409, part first of the *Congressional Globe* of the second session of the Thirty-sixth Congress, will place the responsibility for the rejection of that Compromise where it properly belongs.—It will be seen that the Crittenden Compromise was defeated by the substitution (in effect) of what is known as the "Clark Amendment." The record shows that the vote on the motion to the substitute was—yeas 25, nays 30. The vote on the adoption of the Clark proposition, taken directly afterward, was—yeas 25, nays 23. The presumption would be naturally, that if the south had votes enough to reject the substitute, it would also have enough to reject the proposition when offered independently. There was a falling off in the negative vote on the proposition, as compared with that on the first motion to substitute, of seven votes. This is accounted for by the fact that Senators Benjamin and Slidell, of Louisiana; Wigfall and Hemphill, of Texas; Iverson, of Ga., and Johnson, of Arkansas—six Southern Senators—sat in their seats and refused to vote. Had these six southern men voted "no," the Clark proposition would have been defeated by a majority of four votes, and the Crittenden Compromise could have been taken up and carried by the same majority. It appears of record, then, that the Crittenden Compromise was rejected because six of the leading Senators from the south virtually refused to vote for it.

A motion to reconsider was carried some weeks later, and a direct vote upon the Compromise was taken. The proposition was lost by a single vote. But one of the six Senators referred to voted on that occasion nearly all of them having withdrawn on the secession of their respective States. Had they remained to vote for the Compromise, it would have been adopted.

The chief object in alluding to this matter is to show that when, before the overt act of war was committed, the south had the election of compromise or war, she, through her highest dignitaries, deliberately chose war.

The south would not have compromise then. Is it reasonable to suppose that it would accept such an accommodation now? Her rulers have the southern masses by the throat, and can mould them to their imperious will. They are playing for a great stake. They could not withdraw from the contest now unless forced into withdrawal. Pride, love of power—both inbred and fostered by the institutions of slavery—would force them to elect, as they declare they do elect, extermination rather than submission and union.

Early in the struggle—before the government had taken the aggressive—President Lincoln offered peace in most liberal terms. The terms were, briefly, the laying down of arms, and the abandonment of their hostile attitude. The world knows how those terms were met. It need not be repeated here. The desolation of southern fields; and the vacant scale in thousands upon thousands of homes, both north and south, bear the record. Still later, amnesty and pardon have been offered by the President; still the chiefs of rebellion abate not a tittle of their energy to maintain themselves in their wrong.—They demand recognition and independence of a government they hate. Intimate knowledge of the directing minds of the rebellion teaches that they will never abandon their wicked scheme until obliged to do so by the sheer force of such iron circumstances as control the results of war.

There is no ground, then, for the hope of peace through compromise; no hope of permanent peace. There is no such discharge in this war. These who go before the country upon such vicious pretenses, are not deceived themselves, however much they may deceive the ignorant and unsuspecting. To charge self-deception upon them in a matter so unmistakably clear, would be equivalent to charging them with imbecility. They do not deceive themselves. The pretext of seeking the defeat of Mr. Lincoln that peace may return to our borders covers a sinister purpose. If they wish peace they can have it but in two ways—in a cowardly abandonment of the struggle, followed by disunion, or by a more vigorous (if possible) prosecution of the war.

Thus the true issue upon which the campaign is to be made becomes sharply defined. None can deprecate the horrors of war or desire the return of peace more than do the warmest supporters of the Na-

tional Union nominees. But they ask for and will acquiesce in no peace that is not founded upon the integrity of the Union and established upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence. They recognize greater evils than war, such as this is in which the nation is plunged. Divide the nation geographically and to what end do we inevitably gravitate? With the precedent and justice of secession established, who can presume to say that we shall not repeat the humiliating history of Mexico and South American States? United, the common danger was, and would continue to be, our common security.—Divided, the land would groan with the breaking out of individual vengeance.—Divided, the torch and brand would never be idle along the line of division. The country would at last awake to the bitter knowledge that open, vigorous war, prosecuted with a high purpose, is a thousand times less to be dreaded than an armed peace.

As an example, a little more than a year since, when Lee, with his rebel army, invaded Pennsylvania, and when the fate of the Republic was decided by the battle of Gettysburg, how prompt wicked and designing men were to inaugurate the insurrection in New York city, trusting in the hope that the Government was not able to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws. It will be long before the blackness of the crimes committed by that conspiracy will be obliterated.

As another example, take the recent conspiracy discovered in the northwest—the banding together in secret of a large number of men, the concentration of thirty thousand stand of arms and a large supply of ammunition. The papers of this conspiracy, which were seized, evidencing too clearly that their design was, and is, the overthrow of the Republic, trusting that division and anarchy would shield them from harm, but in utter disregard of the concomitant wrongs to the people—murder, robbery, arson—in a word, desolation for the time.

Now, fellow citizens, in both these examples the moving spirits are prominent men in the Opposition, and controlled the nomination and platform at Chicago.

Yet it is to such a peace as this that our opponents invite you. They ask your suffrages for a man who either is pledged to such a peace, if elected, or who is determined on a war grander in scale and bloodier in results than the world has yet witnessed. There can be but two issues out of the present difficulty. The intelligent freemen of Pennsylvania need not to be led like children. They will not fail to comprehend the nature of these issues, and to choose between them. In so choosing they choose for their children and their children's children. They can do nothing of a public nature in these pregnant times that shall not cause coming generations either to revere or despise them. The re-election of Mr. Lincoln, and the election of Andrew Johnson as his associate, will inflame to the chiefs of the rebellion that the war for Union and permanent peace must go on until those ends shall be attained. It will also signify to the nations of Europe that the people of the whole United States will, soon or late, become an united people and the government remain, as it has heretofore been, a star of hope to all the oppressed peoples of the civilized world, and an everlasting monument to the wisdom of the grand old heroes who conceived it. If we could basely afford to abandon the struggle now, the world, mankind, could not afford the sacrifice. If we could afford to bear the shame, and wear the shackles of defeat so cravenly invited, our children could not stand erect under the deathless reproach of our behavior. As men, as freemen, as patriots, we have no choice but to stand by the government as administered. The alternative presented by our opponents in disunion and dishonor, which is national death. If a man recognizes the existence of the principle of Eternal Justice he could not despair of the republic. There may be some in whom the principle of hope maintains but a feeble existence, unless stimulated by uninterrupted success. Such must be encouraged and sustained by the example of the more hopeful and enduring. They must be assured of what the philosophy of history and of events teaches, that danger lies in turning back, as security lies in pressing forward. The desolations, and bereavements, and burdens of war may be, nay, are terrible, but the tempest which ravages forest and field, destroying the increase of labor, and even human life, is also terrible. Yet it is inefficient. With unvarying calm the atmosphere would degenerate into putridity, and the earth would resolve in endless night. So war involves nations in its fearful vortex that social and political reprobation will follow. As a fire sweeping over the fields licks up the chaff and stub-

ble, yet affects not the solid earth, so the fiery trial which we are called upon to endure is consuming the notorious crimes of society. The nation will issue out of this struggle stronger and purer than before. Wrong, such as confronts us, cannot drive right into exile. Craft and villainy are not to be the subjugators of wisdom and virtue. And whatever crimes may have been, or may yet be, perpetrated in the name of civilization, it is not now to be proved either a farce or a failure. But these calamities are not to come upon the American people, for the reason that the masses are to remain true and steadfast in this great effort to establish their liberties upon a surer foundation than the anomalies upon which they have hitherto rested.

The victory is to be won by unremitting labor, and watchfulness that shall be proof against surprises planned by traitors at home or abroad. We are to look for no fortuitous happenings, no miraculous interpositions. The friends of the Government, working together, cannot be overthrown by any combination possible among their opponents. They may seek to divide and distract, as they have done, and they may partially succeed. But not if the people remain firm, calm and self-contained. United, we are invincible against us. Divided, we should invite defeat, and attach to ourselves the name of having rejected the counsels of experience and enlightened reason.

Our victorious armies are bravely doing their duty in the field. What is required of the loyal men of Pennsylvania is a great victory at the polls in October and November. It is not only essential that the Federal government and the policy required to crush rebellion should be endorsed by the re-election of Abraham Lincoln; but at the coming contest in October it is important that in the election of Congressmen and members of the Legislature, as many districts as possible should be carried by the loyal candidates now in and out in the field. We want the moral effect of overwhelming majorities as well as the prestige derived from military power and force. We expect to close the war as much by the influence of the ballot as the bullet. We hope to stop the effusion of blood by the unmistakable demonstration at the polls that the war is to be waged till the rebellion is ended. And that hostilities will not cease while there is an armed traitor in the field. Such a cessation of hostilities cannot be obtained by compromise or negotiation. It must be achieved by the stern influence of force—by the unmistakable, clear and well defined proofs of the ability of the government to cope with and conquer all or any of its foes.

Men of Pennsylvania, the issues are now before you for consideration and decision. You must abide the result as you establish it for good or evil. We ask you to support Abraham Lincoln, because we believe his re-election will fully vindicate the authority of the national government, and fully establish the fact that the free men of the loyal States are able to sustain the existence of the Union and the government against the hazard of opposition from abroad or at home. We ask you to assist not only in the re-election of Abraham Lincoln; but in the election of all loyal candidates for State and Federal offices, because their triumph will recognize our nationality—a result which must contribute to the maintenance of the national government. It needs no argument of our own to establish this position, because our political opponents now antagonize us to achieve entirely the opposite result.

Can we hesitate—can there be any trust or confidence in men placed in nomination by such men? Men of family, hesitate—men of property, hesitate—young men, who hope to enjoy both these blessings, hesitate before you cast your votes for nominees made by such agencies.

By order of the Union State Central Committee. SIMON CAMERON, President.

A. W. BENEDICT, } Secretaries.  
W. E. FORNEY, }

A GOOD OCCUPATION.—"Pete," a comical son of the Emerald Isle, who carried wood and water, built fires, etc., for the "boys" at Hamilton College, is as good a specimen of the genus Hibernian as ever toddled in a brogan. One of the students having occasion to reprove him one morning for delinquency, asked him where he expected to go to when he died.

"Expect to go to the hot place," said Pete, without wincing.

"And what do you expect will be your portion there?" asked the soph solemnly.

"Oh," growled the old fellow, as he brushed his ear lazily with his coat-tail, "bring wood and water for the boys."

## Disunion Avowed.

One of the leading supporters of Gen. McClellan in the city of New York, the *Sunday Mercury*, makes a curious revelation in regard to certain consultations which took place at Niagara before the meeting of the Chicago Convention, between rebel politicians in Canada and certain of the Opposition leaders. If we may believe the *Mercury*, which is pretty good authority, the success of the opposition would bring about a very singular state of things upon this continent; they are said to have agreed with the representatives of Jeff. Davis upon a new "compromise," which would secure to the rebels, in a sort of left handed way, but just as certainly as by direct action, all that they have demanded—the destruction of the Union by war; but with the help of the corrupt tricky politicians of Chicago he hopes yet to achieve his purpose by diplomatic intrigues.

The *Mercury* introduces its story with a paragraph of reflections upon the "impossibility" of restoring the Union. "Only a zany," it says, "would ever dream of its being restored." These Chicago politicians seem to forget that under Grant and Sherman and Farragut there are several hundred thousand such "zany," who are offering up their lives for just this "dream," and that these have left home a good many millions of relatives and friends who are dreaming the same dream. Here is the *Mercury's* article; we commend it to Union men who think there is no danger in supporting the Chicago platform:—

## THE OLD UNION IMPOSSIBLE.

"Talk as we may of the old Union, under which the nation attained such a degree of prosperity, and advanced at once to the front rank among the nationalities of the world, its restoration is an impossibility. Only a zany would ever dream of its being restored. There will, undoubtedly, be a reconstruction, but never a restoration of the Union. The question that is to be settled, the new condition of things consequent upon the disruption of the old, the changed relations of capital and labor, the increase of the quantity of power surrendered to the general government by the people, the relation of the states to the federal Union, the influence in the conduct of national affairs, which is sure to be accorded to the military element—all these considerations forbid the idea of our living under a Union such as that under which we lived and thrived from 1776 to 1861. This statement may appal the thousands of good people who live in the past and dream of days that are no more. These days are not only, but can be no more. He is wilfully or stupidly blind who does not see the changed condition of public affairs in this country. We may hurrah for the Union, but it is not the old Union for which we hurrah. The nation has entered upon an entirely new phase of its existence, whether we are willing or not to acknowledge it.

This grand fact was duly recognized by those who formed this convocation at Niagara Falls. The problem they set to work to solve was to reconstruct the Union on a plan satisfactory to all sections, and to convince the Democratic party of the necessity of adopting this plan or one of similar import. After long and earnest deliberation, in which Messrs. Clay, Holcombe and Sanders participated, the following general conclusion was reached, and was tacitly agreed to by the National Democratic Convention at Chicago.

## THE PLAN FOR RECONSTRUCTION.

"It was, that what was once the United States be divided into five separate confederacies, each independent of the other in the management of its local affairs, yet bound to each other in certain respects, of which I shall speak hereafter. These confederacies, as divided, were to consist of the following states:

1. The Cotton and South Atlantic states.
2. The Trans-Mississippi states.
3. The states of the great Northwest.
4. The Middle states.
5. The New England states.

In relation to the states comprised in this last division, there was no little debate as to the propriety or expediency of admitting to the general Union at all.—Whether justly or not, it cannot be disguised that they are no favorites with the majority of the people which comprised the old Union. The reasons for the hostility of feeling which the rebellious states bear to them is too apparent to need specification. What are known as the loyal states have many reasons for disliking their New England associates.

These "reasons" why the rebels and

the Chicago Convention dislike New England are recited. We omit them here, as they can be seen in most of the speeches of Vallandigham, Cox, Fernando Wood and other supporters of the Chicago nominee. The *Mercury* goes on:

"Such, in brief, are some of the considerations that influenced the deliberations of this convocation of politicians at Niagara Falls in leaving the question open whether New England should be admitted to the New Confederacy which they were planning. The merits or demerits of such a policy is not to the point. I am only narrating what was said and done, not what others may think ought to have been said and done.

"Another important feature of this proposed confederation is a provision for admitting to it, in case circumstances warrant it, the Provinces in British America and what is now the empire of Mexico. But this is an event so far in the future that it cannot claim more than a mere mention of its possibility. I therefore pass on to the conditions for the construction of this Union of the future.

## CONDITIONS OF THE NEW UNION.

"Leaving to the separate confederacies—I use the term in its generic sense—the right to manage their domestic affairs as they may choose, they are to be bound to each other by alliances offensive and defensive. Such questions as effect the interests of all are to be considered by a sort of general council, composed of representatives from each confederacy, more analogous to our present cabinet or Senate than the House of Representatives. There are to be no restrictions of any kind upon inter confederate trade or travel.—In a word, it would be one grand confederation of confederacies, bound to each other by bonds of commercial union, each independent of the other, yet having a share and an interest in the control of affairs affecting the common welfare of all.

"It will readily occur to the minds of your readers that this plan is nearly identical in its essential features with the well-known Zollverein of Customs Union of the German States.

## THE NEW CONFEDERACY AND THE DEMOCRACY.

"This project, I hardly need add, received the endorsement of the leaders of the Democratic party, and by them was interwoven with the action of the Chicago Convention. It is understood that Hon. August Belmont was the first to develop the plan; probably because of his intimate acquaintance with the government of the German States. At first it was received with surprise; but the more it was discussed, the more favor it obtained, until at last it was decided to incorporate the idea with the proceedings of the Democratic Convention. More than that, the plan is agreeable to the views of Jeff. Davis, though, for obvious reasons, he would refrain for the present from divulging it to the southern people. Anxious for peace, but opposed to the restoration of the old Union, the southern leaders to whom this project was broached at once assented to it, and are now desirous for the election of the Chicago candidate, in the hope that it may result in a reconstruction of the Union on a basis satisfactory and honorable alike to the North and the South.

"Of course, it was not deemed prudent to make all this apparent in the debates of the Convention, still less in the platform it adopted; but you may rely upon it that the leaders were well informed of it, and are pledged to carry it into execution in the event of the success of the Democratic party at the polls in November. Time and circumstances will doubtless cause certain changes in the minor details of the scheme, but they will not alter its important features."

Now, probably this story will be denied by the Opposition journals; it may be pronounced a preposterous and wicked invention. We leave them to deal with the *Sunday Mercury*, which has always supported the nominee of the Chicago Convention, and does yet, we believe. But we remind our readers that this plan for breaking up the Union, and forming several separate confederacies, is not new.—It was proposed and urged by Mr. Vallandigham in Congress in 1871. On the 7th of February in that year he introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution, which was to destroy the Union, and divide into four sections or confederacies, one to include all the seaboard free states and to be called "the North;" another to include all the states between the Alleghenies and Rocky Mts. north of the Ohio, to be called "the West;" a third, to include the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, and to be called "the Pacific;" and a fourth, to include all the slave states and the adjoining territories, to be called "the South." This was Mr. Vallandigham's plan more than

three years ago. His joint resolution evolved a project similar to the one now said to have been agreed upon at Niagara; and the acceptance of this by the opposition leaders at Chicago is perhaps the secret of Mr. Vallandigham's ready support of the Chicago nominee.

While the people are pondering these projects, let them remember the following:

"At a recent meeting of the Democratic association in Washington, Dr. Allen declared that he would make every proposition to the South to come back again, but if they failed he would not prosecute the war against a people who had a right to declare what form of government they would live under. Among Kendall, who was present, said 'that was just what our opponent would have us say—that we were willing to divide the Union, if a compromise could not be had. Let us first elect our men; write to put down this iniquitous administration, and then we can do this or any other thing that may be practicable.' The Boston Courier, in remarking upon the proceedings, said: 'Mr. Kendall gives the true key-note to the democratic music.'"

They are ready to promise anything for the Union now; and to do anything against it, if they gain the election.—*New York Post*.

## Mr. Fessenden's Policy.

It is now settled that Mr. Fessenden will run the Treasury on a three year 7 3-10 Treasury Note, with interest semi-annually, in currency.

These notes the holders can fund into a six per cent. gold bearing bond at the end of three years.

With gold at, say 200 as an average for the three years, what are the now outstanding gold-bearing bonds worth, as compared with the new 7 3-10 currency-interest notes at par?

The notes for the three years will yield \$21.90 in currency for every \$100.

The six per cent. gold bonds will yield for the same time \$18 in gold, which at 200 is \$36.

Now, as the holder of a hundred dollar gold bond is to realize \$14.10, during the three years, more than the holder, of a 7 3-10 currency note, it follows that the Sixes of 1881 are worth 114, and more, as they have earned interest; and the 10-40s, drawing \$15 gold interest during the three years (worth \$30 in currency with gold at 200), are worth 108.

If gold stands above 200, these bonds are worth more than we have estimated them at, but if gold falls below 200, then the bonds are worth as an investment, as compared with the new 7 3-10 notes, less just in proportion to the decline in gold.

With gold at 150, the 10-40s at par are a better investment, and the Sixes of 1881 are better at 105, than the new notes. Gold is now 150.

Gold must fall, or the gold-bearing bonds must rise, under the effect of Mr. Fessenden's policy.—*Thompson's Reporter*.

## The Climax.

A clergyman in Wisconsin, one Sunday, informed his hearers that he should divide his discourse into three parts—the first should be terrible, the second horrible, and the third should be tragic horrible. Assuming a dramatic tragic attitude, he exclaimed in a startling, agonizing tone:

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone:

"It's nothing but my little black dog; he won't bite anybody."

"What is that I see there?"

Still louder, "what is that I see there?"

Here a little old woman in black cried out, with a shrill treble tone: