TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance.....$1 50
Six months.....75
Three months.....50
A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

	1 insertion.	2 do.	3 do.
Four lines or less,	$ 25	$ 37½	$ 50
One square, (12 lines,)	50	75	1 00
Two squares,	1 00	1 50	2 00
Three squares,	1 50	2 25	3 00

Over three week and less than three months, 25 cents per square for each insertion.

	3 months.	6 months.	12 months.
Six lines or less,	$1 50	$3 00	$5 00
One square,	3 00	5 00	7 00
Two squares,	5 00	8 00	10 00
Three squares,	7 00	10 00	15 00
Four squares,	9 00	13 00	20 00
Half a column,	12 00	16 00	24 00
One column,	20 00	30 00	40 00

Professional and Business Cards not exceeding four lines, one year.....$3 00
Administrators' and Executors' Notices.....$1 75
Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired, will be continued till forbid and charged according to these terms.

The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS, Editor and Proprietor. —PERSEVERE.— TERMS, $1,50 a year in advance.

VOL. XIX. HUNTINGDON, PA., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1863. NO. 7.

President Lincoln on Arbitrary Arrests.

The President, the Democracy, and Mr. Vallandigham.

The President of the United States, in answer to a memorial of the meeting held at Albany on the 16th to protest, against the seizure and confinement of Mr. Vallandigham, has addressed a remarkable letter to Hon. Erastus Corning and other representatives of the meeting. The resolutions of this meeting declare that Democrats are determined, in spite of adverse and disheartening circumstances, to devote every energy to sustain the cause of Union, and to secure peace through victory, but demand that the Administration shall be true to the Constitution, and everywhere outside of the lines of necessary military occupation, exert all its powers to maintain the supremacy of civil over military law. The President's reply, characterized by his well known sincerity, answers the question of the necessity, constitutionality, and patriotism of his acts:

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, WASHINGTON, June 12, '63.

Hon. Erastus Corning and others:

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of May 18, inclosing the resolutions of a public meeting held in Albany New York, on the 16th of the same month, was received several days ago.

The resolutions as I understand them are resolvable into two propositions—first, the expression of a purpose to sustain the cause of the Union, to secure peace through victory, and support the Administration in every constitutional and lawful measure to suppress the rebellion; and secondly a declaration of censure upon the administration for supposed unconstitutional action, such as the making of military arrests. And from the two propositions, a third is deduced, which is that the gentleman composing the meeting are resolved on doing their part to maintain our common Government and country, despite the folly or wickedness, as they may conceive, of any administration. This position is eminently patriotic, and as such, I thank the meeting, and congratulate the nation for it. My own purpose is the same, so that the meeting and myself have a common object, and can have no difference, except in the choice of means or measures for effecting that object.

And here I ought to close this paper, and would close it, if there were no apprehension that more injurious consequences than any merely personal to myself might follow the censures systematically cast upon me for doing what, in my view of duty, I could not forbear. The resolutions promise to support me in every constitutional and lawful measure to suppress the rebellion; and I have not knowingly employed, nor shall knowingly employ, any other. But the meeting by their resolutions, assert, and argue that certain military arrests, and proceedings following them, for which I am ultimately responsible, are unconstitutional. I think they are not. The resolutions quote from the Constitution the definition of treason, and also the limiting safeguards and guarantees therein provided for the citizen on trials for treason, and on his being held to answer for capital or otherwise infamous crimes, and in criminal prosecutions, his right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury. They proceed to resolve "that these safeguards to the rights of the citizen against the pretensions of arbitrary power were intended more especially for his protection in civil commotions." And, apparently to demonstrate the proposition, the resolutions proceed: "They were secured substantially to the English people after years of protracted civil war, and were adopted into our Constitution at the close of the Revolution." Would not the demonstration have been better if it could have been truly said that these safeguards had been adopted and applied during the civil wars and during the Revolution, instead of after the one and at the close of the other? I, too, am devotedly for them after civil war and before civil war, and at all times, "except in cases of rebellion and invasion, the public safety may require their suspension." The resolutions proceed to tell us that these safeguards "have stood the test of seventy-six years of trial, under our republican system, under circumstances which show that, while they constitute the foundation of all free government, they are the elements of the enduring stability of the Republic." No one denies that that they have so stood the test up to the beginning of the present rebellion, if we except a certain occurrence at New Orleans; nor does any one question that they will stand the same test much longer after the rebellion closes. But these provisions of the Constitution have no application to the case we have in hand, because the arrests complained of were not made for treason; that is not for *the* treason defined in the Constitution, and upon the conviction of which, the punishment is death; nor yet were they made to hold persons for any capital or otherwise infamous crimes; nor were the proceedings following, in any constitutional or legal sense, "criminal prosecutions." The arrests were made on totally different grounds, and the proceedings following accorded with the grounds of the arrests. Let us consider the real case with which we are dealing, and apply to it the parts of the Constitution plainly made for such cases.

Prior to my installation here it had been inculcated that any State had a lawful right to secede from the national Union, and that it would be expedient to exercise the right whenever the devotees of the doctrine should fail to elect a President to their own liking. I was elected contrary to their liking; and, accordingly, so far as it was legally possible, they had taken seven States out of the Union, had seized many of the United States forts, and had fired upon the United States flag, all before I was inaugurated, and, of course, before I had done any official act whatever. The rebellion thus begun soon ran into the present civil war; and, in certain respects, it began on very unequal terms between the parties. The insurgents had been preparing for it more than thirty years, while the Government had taken no steps to resist them. The former had carefully considered all the means which could be turned to their account. It was undoubtedly a well pondered reliance with them that in their own unrestricted efforts to destroy Union, Constitution, and law, all together, the Government would, in a great degree, be restrained by the same Constitution and law from arresting their progress. Their sympathysers pervaded all departments of the Government and nearly all communities of the people. From this material, under cover of "liberty of speech, liberty of the press, and habeas corpus," they hoped to keep on foot amongst us a most efficient corps of spies, informers, suppliers and aiders and abettors of their cause in a thousand ways. They knew that in times such as they were inaugurating by the Constitution itself, the habeas corpus might be suspended; but they also knew that they had friends who would make a question as to who would suspend it; meanwhile their spies and others might remain at large to help on their cause. Or if, as has happened, the Executive should suspend the writ, without ruinous waste of time, instances of arresting innocent persons might occur, as are always likely to occur in such cases; and then a clamor could be raised in regard to this, which might be, at least of some service to the insurgent cause. Instances needed no very keen perception to discover this part of the enemy's programme, so soon as by open hostilities their machinery was fairly put in motion. Yet, thoroughly imbued with a reverence for the guaranteed rights of individuals, I was slow to adopt the strong measures which by degrees I have been forced to regard as being within the exceptions of the Constitution, and as indispensible to public safety. Nothing is better known to history than that courts of justice are utterly incompetent to such cases. Civil courts are organized chiefly for trials of individuals, or, at most, a few individuals acting in concert, and this in quiet times, and on charges of crimes well defined in the law. Even in times of peace bands of horse thieves and robbers frequently grow too numerous and powerful for the ordinary courts of justice. But what comparison in numbers have such bands ever borne to the insurgent sympathisers, even in many of the loyal States? Again, a jury too frequently has at least one member more ready to hang the panel than to hang the traitor. And yet, again, he who dissuades one man from volunteering, or induces one soldier to desert, weakens the Union cause as much as he who kills a Union soldier in battle. Yet this dissuasion or inducement may be so conducted as to be no defined crime of which any civil court would take cognizance.

Ours is a case of rebellion—so called by the resolutions before me—in fact, a clear, flagrant, and gigantic case of rebellion; and the provision of the Constitution that "the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when, in case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it," is *the* provision which specially applies to our present case. This provision plainly attests the understanding of those who made the Constitution, that ordinary courts of justice are inadequate to "cases of rebellion;" attests their purpose that, in such cases, may be held in custody whom the courts, acting on ordinary rules, would discharge. Habeas corpus does not discharge men who are proved to be guilty of defined crime; and its suspension is allowed by the Constitution on purpose that men may be arrested and held who cannot be proved to be guilty of defined crime, "when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it." This is precisely our present case, a case of rebellion, wherein the public safety does require the suspension. Indeed, arrests by process of courts, and arrests in cases of rebellion, do not proceed altogether upon the same basis. The former is directed at the small percentage of ordinary and continuous perpetration of crime, while the latter is directed at sudden and extensive uprisings against the Government, which, at most, will succeed or fail in no great length of time. In the latter case, arrests are made, not so much for what has been done, as for what probably would be done. The latter is more for the preventive and less for the vindictive than the former. In such cases the purposes of men are much more easily understood than in cases of ordinary crime. The man who stands by and says nothing when the peril of his Government is discussed, cannot be misunderstood. If not hindered, he is sure to help the enemy; much more, if he talks ambiguously, talks for his country with "buts" and "ifs" and "ands." Of how little value the constitutional provisions I have quoted will be rendered, if arrests shall never be made until defined crimes shall have been committed, may be illustrated by a few notable examples. Gen. John C. Breckinridge, Gen. Robt. E. Lee, Gen. Joseph D. Johnston, Gen. John B. Magruder, Gen. William B. Preston, Gen. Simon B. Buckner, and Commodore Franklin Buchanan, now occupying the very highest places in the rebel war service, were all within the power of the Government since the rebellion began, and were nearly as well known to be traitors as now. Unquestionably, if we had seized and held them, the insurgent cause would be much weaker. But no one of them had committed any crime defined in the law. Every one of them, if arrested, would have been discharged on habeas corpus were the writ allowed to operate. In view of these and similar cases, I think the time not unlikely to come when I shall be blamed for having made too few arrests rather than too many.

By the third resolution the meeting indicate their opinion that military arrests may be constitutional in localities where rebellion actually exists, but that such arrests are unconstitutional in localities where rebellion or insurrections do not actually exist. They insist that such arrests shall not be made "outside the lines of necessary military occupation, and the scenes of insurrection." Inasmuch, however, as the Constitution itself makes no distinction. *I am unable to believe* that there is any such constitutional distinction. I conceede that the class of arrests complained of can be constitutional only when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require them; and I insist that in such cases, they are constitutional wherever the public safety does require them; as well in places to which they may prevent the rebellion extending, as in those where it may be already prevailing; as well where they may restrain mischievous interference with the raising and supplying of armies to suppress the rebellion, as where the rebellion may actually be; as well where they may restrain the enticing men out of the army, as where they would prevent mutiny in the army, equally constitutional in all places where they will conduce to the public safety, as against the dangers of rebellion or invasion. Take the particular case mentioned by the meeting. It is asserted, in substance, that Mr. Vallandigham was, by a military commander, seized and tried, "for no other reason than words addressed to a public meeting, in criticism of the course of the Administration, and in condemnation of the military orders of the General." Now, if there be no mistake about this; if this assertion is the truth and the whole truth; if there was no other reason for the arrest, then I concede that the arrest was wrong. But the arrest, as I understand, was made for a very different reason. Mr. Vallandigham avows his hostility to the war on the part of the Union; and his arrest was made because he was laboring, with some effect, to prevent the raising of troops; to encourage desertions from the army, and to leave the rebellion without an adequate military force to suppress it. He was not arrested because he was damaging the political prospects of the Administration, or the personal interests of the commanding General, but because he was damaging the army, upon the existence and vigor of which the life of the nation depends. He was warring upon the military, and this gave the military *constitutional jurisdiction* to lay hands on him. If Mr. Vallandigham was not damaging the military power of the country, then his arrest was made on mistake of fact, which I would be glad to correct on reasonably satisfactory evidence.

I understand the meeting, whose resolutions I am considering, to be in favor of suppressing the rebellion by military force—by armies. Long experience has shown that armies can not be maintained unless desertion shall be punished by the severe penalty of death. The case requires, and the law and the Constitution sanction this punishment. Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wily agitator who induces him to desert? This is none the less injurious when affected by getting a father, or brother, or friend, into a public meeting, and there working upon his feelings till he is persuaded to write the soldier boy, that he is fighting in a bad cause, for a wicked Administration of a contemptible Government, too weak to arrest and punish him if he shall desert. I think that in such a case, to silence the agitator and save the boy is not only constitutional, but withal a great mercy.

If I be wrong on this question of constitutional power, my error lies in believing that certain proceedings are constitutional, when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety requires them, which would not be constitutional when, in absense of rebellion or invasion, the public safety does not require them; in other words, that the Constitution is not, in its application in all respects the same, in cases of rebellion or invasion involving the public safety, as it is in times of profound peace and public security. The Constitution itself makes the distinction; and I can no more be persuaded that the Government can constitutionally take no strong measures in time of rebellion, because it can be shown that the same could not be lawfully taken in time of peace, than I can be persuaded that a particular drug is not good medicine for a sick man, because it can be shown to not be good food for a well one. Nor am I able to appreciate the danger apprehended by the meeting that the American people will by means of military arrests during the rebellion, lose the right of public discussion, the liberty of speech and the press, the law of evidence, trial by jury, and habeas corpus, throughout the indefinite peaceful future, which, I trust, lies before them, any more than I am able to believe that a man could contract so strong an appetite for emetics during temporary illness as to persist in feeding upon them the remainder of his healthful life.

In giving the resolutions that earnest consideration which you request of me, I cannot overlook the fact that the meeting speak as "Democrats." Nor can I, with full respect for their known intelligence, and the fairly-presumed deliberation with which they prepared their resolutions, be permitted to suppose that this occurred by accident, or in any other way than that they preferred to designate themselves "Democrats" rather than "American citizens." In this time of national peril, I would have preferred to meet you upon a level one step higher than any party platform; because I am sure that, from such more elevated positions, we could do better battle for the country we all love than we possibly can from those lower ones where, from the force of habit, the prejudices of the past, and selfish hopes of the future, we are sure to expend much of our ingenuity and strength in finding fault with, and aiming blows at, each other. But since you have denied me this, I will yet be thankful, for the country's sake, that not all Democrats have done so. He on whose discretionary judgment Mr. Vallandigham was arrested and tried is a Democrat, having no old party affinity with me, and the judge who rejected the constitutional view expressed in these resolutions, by refusing to discharge Mr. Vallandigham on habeas corpus, is a Democrat of better days than these, having received his judicial appointment at the hands of President Jackson. And still more, of all those Democrats who are nobly exposing their lives and shedding their blood on the battle-field, I have learned that many have approved the course taken with Mr. Vallandigham, while I have not heard of a single one condemning it. I cannot assert that there are none such. And the name of President Jackson recalls an instance of pertinent history. After the battle of New Orleans, and while the fact that the treaty of peace had been concluded was well known in the city, but before official knowledge of it had arrived, Gen. Jackson still maintained martial or military law. Now, that it could be said the war was over, the clamor against martial law, which had existed from the first, grew more furious. Among other things, a Mr. Louallier published a denunciatory newspaper article. Gen. Jackson arrested him. A lawyer by the name of Morel procured the United States Judge Hall to order a writ of habeas corpus to relieve Mr. Louallier. Gen. Jackson arrested both the lawyer and the Judge. A Mr. Hollander ventured to say of some part of the matter that "it was a dirty trick." Gen. Jackson arrested him. When the officer undertook to serve the writ of habeas corpus. Gen Jackson took it from him and sent away with a copy. Holding the judge in custody a few days the General sent him beyond the limits of the encampment, and set him at liberty, with an order to remain until the ratification of peace should be regularly announced, or until the British should have left the Southern coast. A day or two more elapsed, the ratification of the treaty of peace was regularly announced, and the judge and others were fully liberated. A few days more, and the judge called General Jackson into court and fined him a thousand dollars for having arrested him and others named. The General paid the fine, and there the matter rested for nearly thirty years, when Congress refunded principal and interest. The late Senator Douglas, then in the House of Representatives, took a leading part in the debates, in which the constitutional question was much discussed. I am not prepared to say whom the journals would show to have voted for the measure.

It may be remarked: first, that we had the same constitution then as now; secondly, that we then had a case of invasion, and now we have a case of rebellion: and thirdly, that the permanent wright of the people to public discussion, the liberty of speech and of the press, the trial by jury, the law of evidence, and the habeas corpus, suffered no detriment whatever by that conduct of General Jackson, or the subsequent approval by the American Congress.

And yet, let me say, that, in my own discretion, I do not know whether I would have ordered the arrest of Mr. Vallandigham. While I cannot shift the responsibility from myself, I hold that, as a general rule, the commander in the field is the better judge of the necessity in any particular case. Of course, I must practice a general directory and revisory power in the matter.

One of the resolutions expresses the opinion of the meeting that arbitrary arrests will have the effect to divide and distract those who should be united in suppressing the rebellion, and I am specifically called on to discharge Mr. Vallandigham. I regard this act as, at least, a fair appeal to me, on the expediency of exercising a constitutional power which I think exists. In response to such appeal I have only to say, it gave me pain when I learned that Mr. Vallandigham had been arrested—that it, I was pained that that there should have seemed to be a necessity for arrestsng him—and that it will afford me great pleasure to discharge him so soon as I can, by any means, believe the public safety will not suffer by it.

I further say, that as the war progresses, it appears to me, opinion and action, which were in great confusion at first, take shape and fall into more regular channels, so that the necessity for strong dealing with them gradually decreases. I have every reason to desire that it should cease altogether, and far from the least is my regard for the opinions and wishes of those who, like the meeting at Albany, declare their purpose to sustain Government in every constitutional and lawful measure to suppress the rebellion. Still I must continue to do so much as may seem to be required by the public safety.

A. LINCOLN.

A Fighting Democrat on Vallandigham and the Copperhead Tribe.

Gen. John A. Logan, a well known Illinois Democrat, connected with the army, of General Grant, is home on a short visit to his friends. In passing through Cairo the people gathered around him, and he made a few impromtu remarks, which we give below. General Logan, it will be remembered, was strongly opposed to coercion. After the attack upon Sumter, and when there was a hope that the difficulties might be settled by compromise, he went to Richmond to talk to the leading politicians there on the subject. He was told that if the Administration would give them a sheet of white paper, and allow them to make their own terms, they would not accept the offer short of a dissolution of the Union. Logan then made up his mind that the Union could only be saved by war; he abandoned his anti-coercion ideas, came home and girded on the sword. He has since been serving his country in the army. This is the man who speaks as follows:

"It makes no difference whether you call me Democrat, Republican or *Abolitionist*—as some have of late named me. It does not change my feelings—does not alter my action. I am for my country *every* time—for my country first, last and always; and I am fighting for the right of that country to be numbered among the honored nations of the earth. Until that is brought about, and this rebellion crushed out, I am but an American citizen. When that right shall have been asserted, then, should we find that there is something wrong in the fabric that our fathers reared, something we desire to change, it will be time enough to come up and demand the change.—*Now* we have this accursed rebellion to root out. It must be rooted out. I am for using *every* means and ALL means for putting it to an end. If the people at the North would use the same force Jeff. Davis and his minions use—and were as unanimous as they are—for in the South force of arms *compels* every man to act as though he sanctioned the rebellion, whether he feels inclined or not—*this war would be successfully terminated in less than six months.*

"Every mother's son who is opposed to the war, should be compelled either to take up arms against us or for us. Then there would be no talk of peace here in the North, no talk of resistance, *no such men as Vallandigham, no such cowards as those who support all such men, and say these things.*

"Vallandigham says he has traveled over the *Confederacy*—using the term "Confederacy"—not the phrase "so-called Confederacy" (for I do not acknowledge the existance of any authority or government in America aside from that of the United States)—and has not met a man, woman or child who does not sustain the war, and who is not determined to fight it out to the death or the bitter *end.*—*Vallandigham here simply lies.* He tells what is not true, and he knows it. Vallandigham, aside from the leading men—Jeff. Davis, Toombs and Stephens—did not, I venture to say, speak with a dozen persons while taking his involuntary trip through Dixie. Had he done so, his report would have been of a different color.

"The *people* who are fighting against this Government—the poor whites composing the rank and file of the rebellion—nine-tenths of them do not know what they are fighting against. A majority of them do not know anything, and hundreds never saw the American flag in their lives until they saw it march into Vicksburg in triumph. They do not know the Fourth of July, or anything else that is good. But poor and ignorant as they are, let them express their own free minds, and they will, most to a man, demand a speedy termination of this war—would almost submit to anything rather than fight one day longer as they have been fighting. *It is only by the force of bayonets that their army is kept together.* Even that cannot prevent their deserters from flocking into Jackson by hundreds, to take the oath of allegiance or to join the Union ranks And I tell you what I know when I say that it will not be many days ere the entire States of Mississippi and Tennessee will be knocking loudly for re-admission to a Union which not long since they thought their puny efforts could quickly dissolve. They are *talking* of it even now.

"Speaking of being united, I tell you, by the Eternal God, there was never a more truthful sentence than that of Douglas: "Those who are not *with* us are *against* us." and I reiterate it and add that those who are *not* with us *should be hung or should be with their Southern brethren, fighting with them.*

"Let them either aid the Government or go where they can bolster up the tottering fortunes of rebeldom.—Better have a dozen foes in the field than one fighting us behind our backs.

"To all copperheads, peace men, agitators, anti-war men—be they Republicans or Democrats—for we have them here pretending to be both—I have a word to say on behalf of our brave soldiers. And you have undoubtedly been told that the war has its opposers in the ranks of the Union army. It is an accursed and foul aspersion upon the fair fame of men who are willing to spill their blood, give their lives for their country. They are for our Union. They fight for the people and their country, for the suppression of the rebellion. Let me say to all opposers of the war: The time *will* come when men composing this army will come to their homes. They have watched the progress of events with interest. They have had their eyes upon these unmitigated cowards, these opponents of the country and the Administration—(and the Administration I contend, *is* the country)—and when they return it will do the soul of every true loyal man good to see the summary manner in which *they will cause these sneaks and peace agitators to seek their holes.*"

For a few moments the crowd that gathered around was deeply absorbed in what their "fighting general," as many called him, said, and his remarks, though given on the spur of the moment, struck home to the hearts of all who listened. Could Logan make the leaders of our people feel as he speaks, this war could not last three months. It would be crushed out by force of numbers alone. After expressing himself somewhat warmly against copperheads and sneaks, General Logan concluded with the following characteristic apology:

"You will excuse me gentlemen, if, in saying what I have said, I have been rather profuse and heavy in the way of emphasis. Two years away from civilization, with my men, has made me rather emphatic in all my thoughts and words in regard to certain things. I speak emphatically because I emphatically feel that which my tongue finds to say."

Anecdotes of General Grant.

We find the following in the Detroit *Free Press:*

A gentleman of this city, who was an early friend of General Grant, furnishes the following reminiscences of the brave General who has so inseparably linked his name with the victories of the Western armies:

"General Grant is of a Methodist family, of Ohio, and married a daughter of a Methodist local preacher, and a grand-daughter of the pioneer of Methodistism in Western Pennsylvania, of the name of Wrenshall. When not much over twelve years of age he was at school, and had as a schoolfellow his own natural cousin, whose parents were British subjects of Canada. Young Grant was taught to forgive injuries, as a divine precept, and to do good not evil to others, and his father had impressed his mind with love of country and reverence for the name of Washington. The Canadian had been otherwise educated, and believed Washington to be a rebel. On one occasion a discussion arose between the boys as to love of country and duty to a king, when John said: "U. S. (Grant had been nicknamed U. S.) *your* Washington was a rebel and fought against the king."

"Grant replied: "Jack, you must stop that or I'll flog you. I can forgive you for abusing me, but if you abuse our Washington I'll off coat and fight, though you are cousin Jack, and mother may lick me for not forgiving!" The boys fought. Jack got the worse of it; but U. S. was about being whipped at home for fighting, when his father interposed and saved him, saying, "The boy who will fight for Washington will prove himself a man and a Christian, if God spares him for twenty years."

"Some few years ago, the boys, now men grown, met in Canada, and recuring to school days. Jack said: "U. S., do you remember the licking you gave me for calling Washington a rebel?"

"Yes, I do; and, Jack, I'll do it again under like provocation. Washington is my idol, and to me it is more insulting to speak disrespectfully of Washington or my country than to denounce myself. Mother's maxim does very well in private quarrels, but it don't apply where one's country is denounced, or its goods. Washington is first in the American pantheon, and I could not rest easy if I permitted any abuse of his name."

"Such was and is "Unconditional Surrender Grant."

THE TRUE PLAN.—A town meeting was held in Cape Elizabeth, Maine, to see if the town would vote three hundred dollars to each drafted man. Instead of doing this, the town voted to pay three hundred and fifty dollars to every man of the quota drafted from that town, not exempted by the conscription act, who goes to the war himself or procures a substitute, but not a dollar for a man to stay at home.

THE NATIONAL FINANCES.—$225,000,000 of the five-twenty loan, have already been subscribed. The loan has chiefly been taken by loyal Americans, who wish to insure the stability of the Republic.

THE GLOBE JOB PRINTING OFFICE.

THE "GLOBE JOB OFFICE" is the most complete of any in the county, and possesses the most *ample facilities* for promptly executing in the *best style*, every variety of Job Printing, such as

HAND BILLS,
PROGRAMMES,
BLANKS,
POSTERS,
CARDS,
CIRCULARS,
BALL TICKETS,
BILL HEADS,
LABELS, &C., &C., &C.

CALL AND EXAMINE SPECIMENS OF WORK, AT LEWIS' BOOK, STATIONERY & MUSIC STORE.

Sentiment of the Army.

The New York *Post* says:—The following is from a letter written by an officer in the regular military service, now in the field under General Meade. He is a descendant of one of the most distinguished of the founders of the Republic:

"Dear ———: You see by the above that we have crossed the Rubicon for the third time in my experience, and Heaven grant that it may be the last, for I am in hopes that this campaign will give the finishing stroke to the rebellion, and add a new victory to the glorious succession that has marked this memorable month of July, 1863.

"We were alarmed by rumors which were circulated in the army to the effect that the Administration had stopped the conscription on hearing of the opposition in New York. This cannot be true, as such a measure would be the proof of weakness that would soon result in the overthrow of not only the Administration, but of the Government it represents.

"I think by this time we have come down to the cold, calm view of the issues at stake, uncolored by excitement or the glorious romances of success that we all dreamed of before the war first broke out.

"The war has become a sort of monotonous background to the life of the people at home, and its existence is only brought to their minds by the few wounded soldiers, the military accoutrements in the shop windows, and the big letters in the newspapers. At first it was a splendid vision of glory and conquest; and now a long, deadening tax on their patience and pockets. It was an excitement which the politician laid hold of, like that of the Japanese, or the visit of the Prince of Wales. It was a novel sensation to find a spark of real patriotism in his selfish breast—rather pleasant than otherwise. He attended meetings, and voted resolutions; hung out a huge piece of bunting, and declared his intention to stand by the constitution of his forefathers. Of course it was not necessary to go and fight—his neighbor could do that, and he was not needed; and with a compound of false patriotism and genuine selfishness he awaited the result.

"But the result was very far off, and the excitement waned gradually away; thousands of brave fellows went to their long account, and their places must be filled—filled by a draft; and then the situation is changed. Every one is liable to go, and the wheel of the Provost Marshal, stern and inexorable as the wheel of Fate, may roll to every man's fireside and take him away; and then the politician comes out in his true colors, and says: "The people are their own rulers; the draft is unconstitutional, the people can carry on the war or not, just as they please." I have sometimes felt like saying, O! for a Napoleon, a Frederick, or a cromwell!—a man stern and strong—even unprincipled, if necessary—but still a tyrant—for we have come to that pass.

"We have come to that terrible reality, that we must fight for our NAME and NATIONALITY, as the stern old Netherlands fought the good fight, until the canals ran with red Dutch blood, which cemented the foundation of a free, brave, uncompromised people.

"We must learn that the man who shoulders his musket is doing a FAVOR to the country, as the volunteers seem to think—but OBEYING A RIGHT which the Government has, to sacrifice every drop of American blood, if necessary, and then *call for the women* when the husbands are dead. We must learn that other nations have done it before, in a far less glorious cause, and that the conscript is more the soldier in every sense of the word than the bravest volunteer that ever drew breath.

"I should like to have had a regiment of drafted men, for with proper treatment, and good organization, they can be brought on a par with even our regular army."

"Copperhead."

The following is extracted from a speech, as found in the report of the public meeting at Manchester, England, in relation to "War Ships for the Southern Confederacy:"

"I want to explain the meaning of the word "Copperhead," which I have used. You are aware that the lion, and the unicorn, and the rose, are the national symbols of England, as the thistle is of Scotland, etc., and that the spread eagle is the symbol of the Union and America. Now, South Carolina—the first State to secede, and which has always been the very hotbed of secession—when she hoisted her standard of rebellion, put upon it, as her symbol, a rattlesnake. It is an interesting fact in natural history, that this reptile, in sloughing its skin, is subject to temporary blindness, and in this state of helplessness, when it is unable to pursue its prey, it is helped by a friendly snake called a "copperhead," who kindly brings it food during the period of its blindness.

Now, the Democratic organization of the North have manifested much sympathy with the slave States (tho' I am glad to say that a very significant reaction has taken place,) and the Republicans of the North have given to the (such?) Democrats, who are peace-at-any-price men, and who would gladly compromise the principles of liberty in order to be restored to the South, the name of "copperheads."—Now, I think we have a good many "copperheads" in England."