



D. W. MOORE, Editor and Proprietor.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS:—\$2 00 Per Annum, if paid in advance

VOL. XXXVI.—WHOLE NO. 1859.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1865.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—NO. 45.

GENERAL NEWS ITEMS.

The heir to the Russian crown is dead.

The one-year men in the army will be mustered out before those having longer terms.

A national cemetery is to be established in Annapolis. Maryland has appropriated \$100,000 for the purpose.

The colors of the Empire of Mexico are to be green, red and white. The Perals have captured Saltillo, Monterey and Victoria.

A boy in Ashley Falls, Mass., the other night snatched 30 eggs for a wagen, and offered to take down another dozen for a dollar, but could find no takers.

President Johnson has issued a proclamation declaring rebel cruisers to be pirates after they shall have notice of his proclamation.

The first man killed in this war was Daniel Howe, of New York, at Fort Sumter, in 1861, by the premature discharge of a gun.

Gov. Curtin has changed the day of legislation in Pennsylvania to June 1st, so as to conform to President Johnson's proclamation.

The rumor of a plot to burn Philadelphia is now said to have been gotten up by some prize fighters, to divert the attention of the police from a projected fight.

The new military establishment of the United States will be an army of 150,000 men, divided into four corps; one of regulars, one of white volunteers, and two of negroes.

Mr. John Bama, of Schenectady, drove his mare, "Lady Fisher," from Albany to Schenectady in the short space of fifty-eight minutes—distance six miles—on a wagen of \$200.

A number of unemployed generals will be mustered out of the service in a week or two, if they do not take the hint and resign. It is intended to retain only about fifteen major-generals, sixty brigadiers, and one hundred and fifty colonels.

The tax of 5 per cent. on goods sent to the South has been abolished. The President has issued a proclamation removing all restrictions on Southern trade, except such as are necessary to prevent the introduction of contraband goods.

Boast Butler is to have a military trial, with a view, we are told, "to have justice done him." We should think he'd be like the Irishman, who, when told by a learned judge that they would do him justice, exclaimed, "Jabers, and that's what I'm afraid of!"

Much excitement exists in Pittsburgh about a house on Pennsylvania Avenue in that city, which is said to be haunted. Several columns of marvellous things are published in relation to it, enough to make any person believe that he saw a ghost himself every dark night, through the terror of reading of such dark horrors.

They tell a good story of a Hoosier officer, who on receiving a note from a lady requesting the "pleasure of his company," at a party to be given at her house, on the evening designated took his volunteers and marched them to the lady's residence. When it was explained to him that it was himself who had been invited, an "I thot'thady wanted to see all my boys."

A young girl, fifteen years of age, residing at Bethlehem South, a few evenings since, while going up stairs with a lighted coal oil lamp in her hand, accidentally let it fall, when it broke. The flaming oil caught her clothes, and she ran into the street. Some neighbors, in attempting to extinguish the flames, were severely burned. The poor girl was almost burned to a crisp, and died the same night.—*Allegheny Democrat.*

A SIGNIFICANT LETTER FROM GEN. SHERMAN.—His course in the Negotiations.—A letter from General Sherman was rec'd here to-day, in which he says that the war now being over, he expected to be at home in a few days.—He refers to the peace conference with Johnson and states that when the facts are officially promulgated, his course will be sustained by the country. The party who received the letter, being familiar with Sherman's policy, as instructed by the late President Lincoln, asserts that the agreement with Johnson was only that which Mr. Lincoln forbade to General Sherman at the meeting at City Point. The hasty and gratuitous conduct of Halleck and Stanton in censuring Sherman, it is predicted, will react upon these gentlemen with tenfold severity. Mrs. General Sherman is here, and will remain in Cincinnati until the arrival of her husband.—*Cincinnati Gazette, May 2.*

A BLUNDER.—The following occurrence, the unhappy result of a blunder on the part of an express agent took place in this city recently. A young lady in delicate health, daughter of a prominent and highly esteemed citizen, was sent to a water cure establishment in Wisconsin, where it was hoped that her health would improve. They, however, were disappointed, and the girl died, and her remains were forwarded to this city by express for burial. When the afflicted family were about to take a last look at the face of the deceased, and the lid of the coffin was raised, they were shocked and mortified to discover that the corpse was the body of a man, which by some unfortunate blunder, had been sent to them instead of the lady intended. Investigation showed that the coffins had been exchanged in Chicago and each sent in the wrong direction.

SPEECH OF ANDREW JOHNSON OF TENNESSEE,

In the United States Senate, Dec. 12, 1859, on the resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the facts attending the attack upon Harper's Ferry, in the fall of 1859—commonly known as the "John Brown Raid."

[Continued.]

So much for giving a literal construction to the Declaration of Independence. So much as to getting at what the Republican party would do who claim sovereign power over the Territories: you talk about a freeman, and yet this man who is free and equal, according to your idea of the subject, is not permitted to come into a court of justice as a competent witness against a white man, is not permitted to stand in the ranks as a man fit to muster, is not permitted to marry with a white, is not permitted to vote. What, then, does constitute a freeman? Oh, yes, I suppose he enjoys liberty. Liberty? Deprived of every privilege, he yet enjoys liberty! He is a freeman, and yet can exercise no franchise that pertains to a freeman! He is a worse slave, in fact, than the African who is in the South and in bondage; a great deal worse, for by these restraints and restrictions he is made a slave; he enjoys the shadow and the name of being a freeman, but is stripped of all the franchises that constitute a freeman. He is a slave, in fact, without a master, and I think his is a great deal worse condition than that of a slave who has a master.

In connection with this point, the Senator has thrown out another idea which I do not know whether I clearly apprehend or not. Of course that is my fault and not his. He says, in another portion of his speech:

"We will perpetuate free government, by continuing the principles that have created it. But, sir, what beyond that? How has it come, from a gentleman upon this side of the House, to tell us we must not call ourselves Democrats, when they assume to call themselves Democrats?—Democrats! And the destruction of your principle, democracy, is the supremacy of an aristocracy of slaveholders in this country. Any man can be a member of the Democratic party who will adopt your creed on the subject of the spread of slavery, and the upholding of slaveholding institutions in this country, which concern directly not one man in sixty of the population of this Union. That is the party that has arrogated to itself the name of 'Democrat,' and that reproaches us for calling ourselves Republicans. Permeate! A party that legislates for the interest of one out of sixty; forgetting the interest of four-fifths of the families of the South to promote that of one-fifth—free white men!"

If I understand him correctly, he proceeds upon the idea that any one can be a Democrat who is in favor of the spread or the maintenance of slavery; he means to say that down as an essential or *raison d'être* of being a Democrat. Now, when we come to look at the broad principles of the Democratic party, we find that, so far as the institution of slavery is concerned, it constitutes a very small portion of the basis and principles on which they intend and expect to administer this Government, and have administered it heretofore; but the Democratic party assume to be a national party; the Democratic party assume to maintain the Constitution and all its guarantees as it is. They assume that this Constitution was made and handed down to us by our forefathers guarantees the institution of slavery wherever found within the United States. They, in advocating the Constitution of the country as it is, stand by this institution called slavery, it being recognized by the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees that it shall not be disturbed. Then the Democratic party stand on the Constitution of the country. They propose no innovation. They have made no advance on the North. They propose the introduction of no new institution, so far as the northern States are concerned; but they are disposed to stand by the Constitution of the country, as it has been handed down to them, willing and anxious to abide by its guarantees. Because a man in the North, who agrees that the institution is constitutional, who agrees that the southern States have constitutional guarantees, stands by an individual in the South maintaining these great constitutional rights, does that argue that he is in favor of the spread of African slavery; that he is for continuing it any more than the Constitution contains it? It seems to me not; and what the Senator says down as the touchstone of the Democratic party, is not the basis of that party. It is a question now before the country, and has been one among other questions for a considerable length of time; and the time has well nigh arrived, I think, when Senators, North and South, East and West, had better begin to look into it, and see where it is driving us.

In the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, which I just now quoted, there is another idea thrown out, seemingly not only to affect the people outside the slaveholding States, but to affect those inside the slaveholding States. It is said that the legislation of the South is for the benefit of one out of twenty of the southern people. We deny it. We say our legislation is in accordance with the Constitution and for the country, and not for one out of twenty or one out of sixty of the people. I have heard that idea suggested before. It is intended to have its influence in the southern States: It is based on the old idea that a man who owns one hundred slaves stands equal to sixty white persons in political rights, by reason of the three-fifths clause of the Constitution. How does this matter really stand? Why will you not look at it

on its true basis? Let us get at this legislation under the Constitution of the United States, and we will show that the Senator's argument is sophistry—pardon me for calling it by that name—that is not sound in logic, that it is not sound in the premises, and, of course, not in the conclusion.

The Constitution of the United States provides for apportioning representation in the other House among the States, and declares that all the free population shall be included, Indians excepted; an embrace three-fifths of the slaves, who are to be added to the whole number of white persons. From this originates the idea that the man holding a hundred slaves stands equal to sixty white men at home. That is the argument, and it is intended to have a prejudice on the public mind. How does the matter stand? Is that the basis and is it the manner in which the thing operates practically in the States? Not at all. Under the Constitution of the United States, once in ten years the census is taken. That being done, laying down the basis that I have just stated, embracing three-fifths of the slaves, Representatives are to be apportioned to whom? Among the slaveholders? No. Where does the Representation go? I want to be understood. Is it given to the slaveholders individually, or where does it go? Away with this sophistry, wrapped around with deception. The Representatives are to be apportioned among the several States, not among the individuals. You have fixed your basis of representation, and in the apportionment of representation it is to be apportioned among the several States. States are not known here in detail, and especially so in apportioning the representation to the States—the sovereignty; and the sovereignty gets the benefit of the representation, and then it is that the Legislature is to prescribe the mode of electing those Representatives. What because of your idea of sixty to one? How many of the States used to elect their Representatives by general ticket, every qualified voter standing upon an equal footing? But, moreover, all the citizens of the States stand on an equal footing as to the benefit that their State has derived under the Constitution of the United States in this additional representation. The man that does not own a slave is permitted to come forward and participate in this additional representation as much as the slaveholder. Do you understand that? What then becomes of your idea of twenty or sixty to one.

To not Illinois and all the other non-slaveholding States get the benefit of their free colored population in apportioning representation? After getting the benefit of your free colored population in representation, do you let them vote? Do you admit them into your courts as competent witnesses? Do you permit them to muster? No. Where, then, is this great injustice? Notwithstanding your clamor about all men being created equal, what is your practice? Your theory is one thing, and your practice is another. Suppose all the slaves in the southern States were free, how would the representation be?

We are told that we have a representation for three-fifths of our negroes. Do not you get representation for all your negroes—all your slaves without masters? I mean the free negroes who are shorn of every franchise that constitutes a freeman. You get a full representation for all your free negroes, and yet you complain. How would the matter operate if all the negroes in the South were free? How would that affect this matter of representation? We only get three-fifths of our negroes represented now, according to the Constitution of the United States. Suppose you were to emancipate them all and make them all free, when you came to apportion the representation among the South how would it be? Would it be three-fifths or five-fifths? What is three-fifths of four million, assuming the slaves to be four million in number? The three-fifths is two million four hundred thousand. What would two-fifths be? One million six hundred thousand. Then, if your ratio were one hundred thousand, we have sixteen Representatives on the other floor less than we should have if all our negroes were free men of color. We can understand that. Instead of getting twenty-four Representatives for the blacks we should have forty Representatives—sixteen more than we now have.

Where, then, is this great hardship to you; where is the wrong in the Constitution to you? You get a full representation for your negroes, who, I think, are slaves without masters, for they are deprived of all that constitutes freedom. Our slaves enjoy all the rights of freemen, with one or two exceptions; and to be deprived of these is an advantage to them in the relation which they occupy. Slavery, instead of being an element of political power to the South, is an element of political weakness in the national councils. Is not that easily seen and understood? Then, why try to poison the minds of your people? Why try to deceive them? Why not tell them that if all the slaves were free, instead of the power of the South being diminished in the Congress of the United States, she would have sixteen more Representatives? Why not tell them the truth? What becomes of all your sympathetic appeals, based upon the equality of black men and white men, when everybody sees and knows that the condition of a free colored man in the North is infinitely worse than that of the slave in the South? What, then, becomes of your argument of equality? There is nothing in it. Why can we not as brothers in the same great Confederacy, approach each other with a disposition to understand our Constitution as it is, and with a view to get an advantage of the argument on the popular ad captivum slang which may be thrown out up-

on the country? Let us divest our minds of all prejudice, look at things as they are, and see the truth as it is. It is the want of understanding which gives rise to the question which causes argument. Let us understand the principle embraced in the Constitution as they are, and then we can approach each other as brothers of the same great family, and stand by our bond of union as it is. If the Constitution is wrong, and experience and time have proved it to be so, proceed in the revision or amend it in the instrument to let us do it by stealth and indirection. I must notice one other paragraph in the speech of the honorable Senator from Illinois.

"Mr. President, I am satisfied that I am not understood by the Senator from Alabama. I say that the negro has the same natural right that I have; and now I say it is not a crime, under all circumstances, to hold a negro in slavery."

Why does not the Senator, in the State of Illinois, place the negro, he being a freeman, on the same equal ground with himself?

The Assassination of Mr. Seward—Their Personal Appearance.

[From a correspondent of the N. Y. Times.]

The stranger visitor is naturally curious to see and contemplate the countenance of the prisoners, and his eyes rapidly pass from all other objects in search of the accused. There sits a row of fifteen men against the west wall, on the platform behind the railing. Which is Payne? Which is Harold? The visitor rapidly asks himself, and he mentally answers as rapidly: Surely Payne cannot be there; I see no one that answers his description. That man may be Harold; that other may be Dr. Mudd, but I don't see any such man as the would-be assassin of Mr. Seward is represented to be. You begin with the man on the extreme left, and next to the door leading to the cells. Here is a man apparently about 41 or 42 years old, say five feet ten inches in height, slender, red or sandy hair of this growth, pale oval face, somewhat intelligent, medium size, blue eyes, high forehead, rather prominent nose, thin lips, and a red tuff of hair on the chin. He does not seem to be distressed, but is interested in the trial. He is dressed gentry in black, and wears slippers. The movements of his limbs are somewhat restricted, for a small chain surrounds each wrist and extends from arm to arm, a like chain is about his ankles and confines his legs. This man is Dr. Mudd, against whom it was first supposed but little if anything of guilt could be shown, but against whom now the testimony thus far seems fearfully pointing.

You look further to the right, passing over the alternate man, who is an officer, and you observe, sitting beside the latter, a little fellow dressed in a faded blue suit, whom you would scarce call a man; he seems but nineteen or so, about five feet four inches high, dusky black neglected hair, lively dark hazel eye, slight tufts of beard along the chin and jaws and faintly surrounding the mouth, rather round face, full but not prominent nose, full lips, foolish, weak, boyish, confiding countenance, indicating but little intelligence, and not the faintest trace of ferocity. And this is the poor creature who seemed to live but in the smile of the assassin, who devotedly followed him in his flight, sharing his privations, perils and capture. This boy is Harold.

Looking again to the right, and omitting the alternate guard, we came to one of the most remarkable faces in the group; a face which once seen, may never be forgotten; one whose moral statue is readily determined by a survey of his face. This man is clothed sparingly; he is in his shirt sleeves—a sort of steel-mixed woolen shirt his pantaloons are dark blue common cloth; neckband and shirt collar unbuttoned; he is fully six feet high, slender, bony, angular form, square and narrow across the shoulders, hollow-breasted; hair black, straight irregular cut, and hanging indifferently about his forehead, which is rather low and narrow; blue eyes, large, staring and at times wild; returns your look steadily and significantly; square face, angular nose, thin at the top, but expanding abruptly at the nostrils; thin lips and slightly twisted mouth, curved unsymmetrically a little to the left of the middle line of the face; a wild, savage looking man, bearing no semblance of culture or refinement—the most perfect type of the ingrain, hardened criminal. The reader who has read newspaper descriptions of this man will not guess his name—the very opposite of my picture is a truthful pen likeness and just estimate of Lewis Payne, who has been represented in appearance as almost the reverse of what I have here stated. Those who look upon the criminal will agree with me that he is almost monstrous homeliness.

Again, looking to the right, we come to Spangler, the carpenter of Ford's Theatre, who is believed to have been Booth's accomplice in preparing the means of escape from the theatre. As yet no proofs have been offered against him, and he is, on that account and upon other, not worthy of special description here. The poor man seems to have left only enough sensibility to understand that he has got into a very uncomfortable situation somehow or other. He is of a short, thick stature, full face, bearing indications of excessive drink, dull gray eyes, unsymmetrical head, and light hair closely cut.

The next of the accused to the right is O'Laughlin, against whom, as yet, the proofs have not developed anything. He is a small man, weighing about 130 pounds, about 5 feet 5 inches high, bushy

black hair of luxuriant growth, pale face, black eyes, slight black whiskers, delicate silky moustache and thin goatee. His countenance is eminently Spanish, tolerably intelligent, with no special indications of any kind.

Again to the right of this man is one whom, it would appear from the testimony thus far adduced, was to have performed a very important act in the terrible plot. Atzeroth is pointed at as the person to whom was intrusted the assassination of President Johnson, in the Kirkwood House. This criminal is a man of small stature, Dutch face, sallow complexion, dull, dark blue eye, rather light colored hair, bushy and neglected; looks rather unconcerned on, and at no time evinces a high sensibility of his almost inevitable doom.

The last of the male prisoners on trial sits upon the extreme end of the platform, at a window looking out to the north. This is Arnold against whom, also, as yet, no testimony has been introduced, and we do not now understand his status in the tragical drama. He is a young man of very decent and respectable appearance, clad well and cleanly, about thirty years old, five feet eight inches in height, dark hair and eyes, slight beard, clear light complexion, intelligent countenance, and one in which we could look in vain for evidence or capacity of guilt.

Another, and the last and most prominent of the accused, is Mrs. Surratt, who sits apart from the other prisoners, at the west end of the reporter's table, and near her counsel. This woman is dressed in full mourning; she wears her bonnet and veil during the sessions of the commission. Her age is probably fifty. She is a large, Amazonian class of woman, square built, masculine hands, rather full face, dark, gray, lifeless eye, hair not decidedly dark, complexion swarthy; altogether, her face denotes more than ordinary intelligence. She seems too strong to be weighed down by the crushing testimony against her, and whilst conclusive evidence was being rendered, which, if true, makes her part in the horrible tragedy of the most cold-blooded, heartless character, she but once seemed disturbed. Her eye is rather soft in expression and strangely at variance with the general harshness of her other features. She seems a woman of undaunted metal, and fitted for Macbeth's injunction to "bring forth men children only"; and yet she does not appear as Lady Macbeth prayed to be, "from crown to toe top full of direst cruelty." This unfortunate woman, like other prisoners, is in irons. A bar of about 10 inches in length passes from one ankle to the other, and is there attached to an iron band that encircles each leg. Her hands are free.

All other prisoners except Dr. Mudd are heavily ironed. Their feet shackles are ironed as in the case of Mrs. Surratt, and attached to each leg is a chain about six feet long, to which is appended a ball weighing fifty pounds. Besides this bar and bands like these about the feet confine their arms. When the prisoners heavily ironed are required to move about, the officer in attendance upon him carries the ball. Nearly all the accused are required to wear a peculiar cap, when they return from the court to their rooms.

This cap is constructed of cotton cloth, padded, and covers, helmet like, the entire head and nearly all the face. It was suggested some weeks ago by the attempt of Payne to take his life by butting his head against the prison walls.

OUTRAGES BY NEGROES.—Within a few weeks past the deportment of the negroes in our midst towards the white population has reached a point almost beyond endurance, and it is high time something were done to remedy the evil. Below may be found two cases, the particulars of which are correct beyond all question. A few nights since a married lady wife of a very respectable gentleman in the western section of the city, was returning to her home about nine o'clock P. M., and when on Charles street, near Fayette, observed a negro man approaching, who accosted her in the most familiar manner. She indignantly ordered him to be off threatening to call an officer. The fellow desisted for a short time, but she had gone but a short distance when he again overtook and entered into conversation with her. She summoned a policeman, and the negro was taken to the station house, where he was released on bail to keep the peace. Severe punishment most truly.

Another case of similar character came to our knowledge yesterday. About 9 o'clock on Saturday night, a married lady residing on Holiday street, was passing along Saratoga street, within a half square of the police station a huge negro stepped upon her dress, and upon her turning toward the brute, the fellow clasped her in his arms, and would perhaps have committed further outrages but for the approach of some citizens, when he beat a hasty retreat.—*Baltimore Gazette.*

CAPTURE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS.

HIS POSTMASTER GENERAL, FAMILY, AND STAFF CAPTURED.

[OFFICIAL GAZETTE.]
Washington, May 13, 1865.

Maj-Gen. Dix:
The following despatch has just been received from General Wilson, announcing the surprise and capture of Jeff. Davis and his staff by Col. Pritchard and the Michigan Cavalry, on the morning of the 10th inst. at Irwinesville, in Irwin county, Georgia.

E. M. STANTON,
Secretary of War.
Macon, Georgia, May 12.

Gen. U. S. Grant, and Hon. Sec'y of War, Washington, D. C.
I have the honor to report that at daylight on the 10th inst. Col. Pritchard, commanding the 4th Michigan Cavalry, captured Jeff. Davis and family, with Regan, the Postmaster General; Col. Harrison, his private secretary; Col. Johnson, A. D. C.; Col. Morris, Col. Lubbock, Lieut. Hathaway, and others.

Col. Pritchard surprised their camp, at Irwinesville, in Irwin county, Georgia, 75 miles east of this place.
They will be here to-morrow night, and will be delayed under a strong guard, without delay. I will send further particulars at once.
J. H. WILSON,
Brevet-Maj-Gen.

PARTICULARS OF THE CAPTURE.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 14, '65.

Maj-Gen. Dix, New York:
The following details of the capture of Jefferson Davis, while attempting to make his escape in his wife's clothes, have been received from Gen. Wilson.
E. M. STANTON, Sec. of War.
Macon, Georgia, May 12.

Hon. E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War:
The following despatch, announcing the capture of Jeff. Davis has just been handed me by Col. Minty, com'dg 2nd division.
Hicksville, Ga., May 11, '65.

To Capt. T. W. Scott, A. G. Second Division, Cumberlandville, Ga., May 11, '65.
Sir—I have the honor to report that at daylight yesterday, at Irwinesville, I surprised and captured Jeff. Davis and family, together with his wife, sisters and brother, his Postmaster General, Regan, his private secretary, Colonel Harris, Col. Johnson, A. D. C., on Davis' staff, Col. Morris, Lubbock and Lieutenant Hathaway; also several important names, and a train of five wagons and three ambulances—making a perfect success, had not a most painful mistake occurred by which the 4th Michigan and 1st Wisconsin collided, which cost us two killed, and Lieutenant Boutelle wounded through the arm, in the 4th Michigan; and four men wounded in the 1st Wisconsin. This occurred just at daylight, after we had captured the camp, by the advance of the 1st Wisconsin. They were mistaken for the enemy.

I returned to this point last night and shall move right on to Macon without awaiting orders from you as directed, feeling that the whole object of the expedition is accomplished. It will take me at least three days to reach Macon as we are seventy-five miles out and our stock is much exhausted. I hope to reach Hawkinsville to night. I have the honor, etc.
(Signed) D. B. PRITCHARD,
Lieut. Col. 4th Michigan Cavalry.

The 1st Wisconsin belongs to Lagrange's brigade, McCook's division and had been sent due east by General Croxton via Dublin. Colonel Mintz had distributed his command all along the south bank of the Ocmulgee and Altamaha. This accounts for the collision between parts of the First and Second divisions, and shows the zeal of the command in pursuit. I have directed increased vigilance on the part of the command in the hope of catching the other assassins. Our dispositions are good, and so far none of the rebel chiefs have been able to get through.

Breckinridge's son was captured last night before last, eleven miles south from here. I will send further details as soon as received.
(Signed) J. H. WILSON,
Brevet Major-General,
Macon, Ga., 9:30 A. M., May 13.

Hon. E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War:
Lt. Colonel Marden, commanding 1st Wisconsin, has just arrived at Irwinesville. He struck Davis' trail at Dublin, Laurens county, on the evening of the 7th, and followed him closely night and day through the pine wilderness of Alligator Creek and Green Swamp, via Cumberlandville to Irwinesville. At Cumberlandville, Colonel Marden met Colonel Pritchard with 150 picked men and horses of the 4th Michigan. Marden followed the trail directly south, while Pritchard having fresh horses, pushed down the Ocmulgee towards Hopewell, and thence by House creek to Irwinesville, arriving there at midnight of the 9th. Jeff. Davis had not arrived. From citizens Pritchard learned that his party were encamped two miles from town. He made his dispositions and surrounded the camp before day. Marden had encamped at 8 P. M., within two miles, as he afterwards learned from Davis.

The trail being too indistinct to follow, he pushed on at 3 A. M., and had gone but little more than one mile when his advance were fired upon by men of the 4th Michigan. A fight ensued both parties exhibiting the greatest determination. Fifteen minutes elapsed before the mistake was discovered. The firing in this skirmish was the first warning Davis received. The captors reported that he hastily put on one of his wife's dresses, and started for the woods, closely followed by our men, who at first thought him a woman, but seeing his boots while running, suspected his sex at once. The firing was a short one, and the rebel Prestre was a short one, and the rebel Prestre