SHERWOOD REJOINS

Anent the Criticism of His Statements Regarding the Death of Col. Mervin Clarke.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: My attention has been called to a communication of Corporal Spohr denying the exactness of my account of the death of Lieut.-Col. Mervin Clarke on the battlefield of Franklin, Nov. 30, 1864. As my original statement is correct, I feel called upon to reply to Corporal Spohr and to submit some evidence bearing upon the question.

I said that Lieut.-Col. Mervin Clarke was killed in the rear of the battle-line of the 111th Ohio. Corporal Spohr denies this, and claims Col. Clarke fell on the parapet, in the front line, and that his regiment did not fall back, and that he (Corporal Spohr) carried him off the field.

I have now a number of valuable witnesses, all of whom participated in the battle of Franklin, and who are now prominent citizens in their respective sections.

My first witness is Capt. Wesley S. Thurston, of Toledo, a veteran of the war, a prominent member of the Grand Army and the Loyal Legion, and one of the best known and most prominent citizens of Toledo, O., well known to the Editor of THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE. I quote from Capt. Thurston's letter, dated Toledo, Sept. 12, 1894:

"The 183d Ohio was placed on the left of our line at Franklin, and fell back with the balance of the center, where Capt. Dowling, of the brigade staff, brought them up behind the 111th Ohio to reoccupy the abandoned works. The moment he left them they went flat on their faces, and there remained until the firing ceased. I personally called on those nearest to us to pass up their cartridges and some of their guns, with which to supply the loss by our men (111th Ohio) of guns broken in the hand-to-hand conflict over the works. Lieut. Bennett, of Co. G, 111th Ohio, was killed while standing at the flank of the 183d regiment, exhorting the men to come forward to the works, as was their own Lieutenant-Colonel, Mervin Clarke. I saw them both fall at the same time.

"In the official war records Col. Orlando H. Morris's report, as commander of the Second Brigade, Second Division, Twenty-third Corps, made eight days after the fight, says he put a company of the 183d in line to fill a gap between the 23d Mich. and 129th Ind.; and that this company ran away, while all the rest of his brigade remained in place. He says that his brigade never flinched, although the 111th Ohio was flanked by the rebels, driving out of line the troops to their left.

"Col. Spaulding, who commanded the 23d Mich., of the same brigade, says, in his official report, the 183d Ohio retreated from his line, and that he filled the gap with two companies of the 80th Ind. (See Vol. 45, Part 1, pages 378 and 386, Official War Records.)

"Col. Strickland, commanding the brigade of which the 183d formed a part, in a report made seven days after the battle, shows that the 50th Ohio and the 72d Ill. formed his front line-of-battle, and the 183d Ohio and the 44th Mo. his rear line, or reserve. Col. Strickland admits that his front line gave way.

"Col. E. L. Hayes, of the 100th Ohio, who was next on the left to Col. Strickland, says, in his official report: 'The troops on my right fell back, and the enemy occupied that part of the line. I was exposed to a murderous enfilading fire from our works on the right of the road (Franklin pike), which was held by the enemy.'

"'I have the 183d down in history as the regiment which should have gone in on our left, but which threw itself on the ground immediately in our rear and did not go into the main line, first or last, or any other time, to the extent of a single man. The 183d, now represented by a Corporal, is probably trying to build itself a monument, forgetting that, though many of the actors are dead, the records and orders and reports, made at the time, are immortal. Yours respectfully, W. S. THURSTON."

It will be seen from the above that Corp'l Spohr's statement that Lieut.-Col. Mervin Clarke fell on the parapet cannot be true, as his regiment at no time during the battle was on the front line. The official report of Col. Strickland, who commanded the brigade, shows this, and the same official report shows that his lines were broken, so that Corp'l Spohr's statement that they were not cannot be true.

The statement of Corp'l Spohr that Lieut.-Col. Clarke was shot on the parapet behind which his regiment was fighting is an improbable statement. Even standing without contradiction, because this would place him between the guns of his own men and that of the enemy.

But there are other and uncalled-for statements in Corp'l Spohr's contribution that are not only untrue, but they reflect upon the veterans who fought successfully the terrific battle of Franklin, and do rank injustice to many of the living soldiers of that conflict.

It is now 30 years since the battle of Franklin was fought, and as the present generation are not familiar with the struggle I will submit a few authentic statements and official documents that will show how much Corp'l Spohr is mistaken. As the battle of Franklin was the fiercest and deadliest contest of the entire war, these documents may have interest and value to the student of war history.

Franklin and Nashville were the last great battles fought west of the Allegany Mountains, and as the fight at Franklin decimated Hood's army and made the victory of Nashville comparatively easy, Franklin has a tremendous interest.

Corp'l Spohr says he never heard of Col. Sherwood during the battle of Franklin, and that his regiment, the 111th Ohio, were not located where the fighting was the thickest and most desperate, but that he (Corp'l Spohr) was where the fighting was the fiercest. He also says that Col. Sherwood did not command a brigade, as he was only a Lieutenant-Colonel.

He also says that his command, the 183d Ohio, did not fall back, and that their battle-line was not broken. Without words, let the official records speak on these vital points.

In Whitelaw Reid's history of "Ohio in the War," page 838, in discussing the gallant Col. Opdycke at Franklin, the historian says:

"The rebels massed in front of Carter's Hill, and in the afternoon they captured the fortifications. As soon as the Colonel (Opdycke) saw this, he shouted with all his power, 'First Brigade, forward to the works!' The regiment charged grandly. The contest was short; the rebels were driven back; eight cannon were retaken; 400 rebels and 10 flags were captured. The rebel Gen. Carter fell, mortally wounded, and Gen. Pat Cleburne fell dead, his horse resting on the National breastworks."

Now this break occurred just where Corp'l Spohr says he was located, and that this break did occur is as well established in war history as that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States at the time.

Now when this break occurred, which Corp'l Spohr denies did occur, the 111th Ohio, on the immediate right, did not break, but held their line-of-battle intact. Corp'l Spohr says the 111th Ohio was not at the immediate right of Carter Hill, but some 2,000 feet farther to the right. This is an absolute mistake, and I will proceed to prove it such.

I quote from the official report of the battle as given by Col. Orlando H. Moore, who was in command of the Second Brigade, Second Division, Twenty-third Corps. After congratulating all the regiments of the brigade for their magnificent valor, he said: (I quote a paragraph from the official order.)

HEADQUARTERS SECOND BRIGADE, SECOND DIVISION, TWENTY-THIRD CORPS, NASHVILLE, Dec. 2, 1864.

General Order, No. 7.

* * * The heroic spirit which inspired the command was forcibly illustrated by the gallant conduct of the 111th Ohio (Col. Sherwood commanding), on the left flank of the brigade. When the enemy carried the works on their left, they stood firm and crossed bayonets, holding their ground.

By command of Col. Orlando H. Moore, commanding Second Brigade.

H. H. HALE, Adjutant-General.

Now, let us see from the official records what troops restored the line and saved the day. It was the brigade of the immortal Col. Opdycke (now dead), of Ohio.

Col. Oydycke was made a Brevet Major-General for his magnificent conduct at Franklin. He restored the broken line. Now let us see what happened to your humble correspondent, that Corp'l Spohr never heard of at Franklin, and who could not have been in command of the line, says Spohr, because he was only a Lieutenant-Colonel. In fact, Corp'l Spohr doubts if I was in command of anybody at Franklin. I quote from Waggoner's War History of Northwestern Ohio Soldiers, page 199:

"In the Atlanta campaign, in which his regiment (111th Ohio) was 90 days under fire, Col. Sherwood was never absent from his regiment, which bore a conspicuous part in those forest battles. In the battle of Franklin, Nov. 30, 1864, his command was on the right of the Franklin pike, near the Carter House, on the left flank of his brigade. His men fired two rounds of ammunition, and many of their guns were made worthless from long-continued firing. The lines on the left of the regiment broke, and their trenches were occupied by Hood's advance. During the closing hours of the engagement Col. Sherwood was in command of the brigade"—the battle-line.

The well-known war correspondent, Lumas, writing from Columbia, Tenn., Dec. 24, after the battle of Nashville, and seven days after he had reoccupied Franklin, said, when he had gone over that portion of the battlefield of Franklin, where the 111th Ohio stood and held the line on the 30th day of November:

"I have seen a great many bloody battlefields, have participated in some said to be the hardest, or among the hardest, battles of the war, but never saw evidences of so terrible a conflict as can be seen in front of the line occupied by the 111th Ohio. I counted 12 locust trees in one cluster, the size of a man's thigh, that were literally shot off with musket-balls. In a grove covering about one-half the regimental front I think there were not less than 200 such trees shot down. How men could ever be prevailed upon to charge and recharge so repeatedly against such a wall of fire is strange to me. And that our men stood the shock so repeatedly, and this too after our left had given away, is equally as strange."

The National Cyclopedia of American Biography says:

"After the battle of Franklin, Nov. 30, 1864, one of the decisive engagements of the war, the officers of the Second Division, Twenty-third Corps, forwarded a recommendation to the Secretary of War asking Col. Sherwood's promotion to Brigadier-General for 'long and distinguished service and special gallantry at the battle of Franklin.' President Lincoln accordingly conferred upon him that rank."

This seems to indicate that the officer unknown to Corporal Spohn was pretty well known in the army and the War Office in Washington, as no other Lieutenant-Colonel of Gen. Schofield's army at the battle of Franklin was brevetted a Brigadier-General for services in that battle.

The Nashville daily *Times* of Dec. 3, 1864, in discussing the conspicuous regiments that participated in the battle of Franklin, said:

"This fine regiment (111th Ohio) was exposed to the shock of the rebel charges at Franklin and sustained them with signal valor. Its losses were very severe, being 25 killed and 50 wounded; of its officers, Lieut. Bennett and Serg't-Maj. Curtiss were killed. Capts. Southworth and Dowling were severely wounded; also Lieuts. Baker and Kintigh. This regiment was where many instances of bayonet fighting occurred. The rebel loss at this point was frightful. An officer informs us that many of the rebel wounded were actually trampled to death by their own men in the furious charges, while their cries and groans were most appalling."

The Ohio Military Agent, Daniel R. Taylor, forwarding from the front the casualties of the Ohio regiments at Franklin, said:

"Our men have done nobly. The 111th is reported as having occupied one of the hottest positions."

Corp'l Spohr says the 111th Ohio was 2,000 feet to the right of the point where the fiercest fighting took place. I need not add any further proof that Corp'l Spohr is mistaken. He also says the 24th Mo. was not at Franklin—not in the West. A detachment of the 24th Mo. was at Franklin, under command of a Captain, just as I stated in my former article.

And now comes Corp'l Spohr, who served in the army five months before the war ended, and whose first battle was Franklin. Some 30 years have elapsed, and a new generation of men and women are on the stage of life. He seeks to cast discredit upon the veterans, most of whom are dead, who fought the battle of Franklin. The Corporal claims he stood amid the fiercest of the conflict, and that the line stood firm.

Fortunately for truth and history, Ohio has prepared a record of all her soldiers. In the Official Roster of Ohio, where every individual soldier's record is printed, and the casualties of every company, I find the battle record of Corp'l Spohr's company—Vol. 9, p. 721—and I find by this record that Corp'l Spohr's company, which is Co. K, 183d Ohio, had 129 men, including those transferred from other regiments; that it took the field Nov. 19, 1864, and served until Gen. Johnston's surrender, near Raleigh, on the 26th of April, 1865, when the war was over, a period of five months and seven days. I find that the casualty list of his company from battles for its entire war service is one killed and four wounded, and that its list of casualties at Franklin was one killed and three wounded. In other words, its loss at Franklin, as officially reported, was less than 3 per cent., while the loss of the 111th Ohio, that the Corporal says was not where the fighting was the thickest, is 25 per cent.

These statistics need no comment.

This is the first time since the war that I have ever discussed the battle of Franklin in public, but in justice to the brave men who won immortality on that desperate field, I cannot remain silent when an attempt is made to belittle their services. In conclusion, let me say that I have the official casualty list of Franklin, which proves that the 111th Ohio lost more men killed at Franklin than any other regiment of the entire army, and no man of my regiment fell with his back to the enemy.

Furthermore, the per cent. of loss of the 111th Ohio at Franklin was the greatest of any regiment engaged. Our loss in killed alone was over 12 per cent., according to published reports of the total loss in killed of the entire army engaged.—ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, Canton, O.

LOST IN THE ROCKIES.

A Comrade's Adventure During the Powder River Expedition.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: A detachment of the 11th Ohio Cav., in command of Gen. Conner, was camped on Powder River after the fight we had with the Sioux Indians in the Fall of 1865. One day I with some others concluded to go hunting. We asked Gen. Conner for permission, and he said we could go; not to take our own horses, but the Indian ponies we had captured a few days before.

We left camp at daylight, crossed the river, and soon came in sight of antelope. Tom Simpson and I were together; he thought we ought to separate so we could get at them better.

I went off by myself, and soon saw a buffalo calf, which I followed and killed.

I only took the liver, thinking I would go back to camp and get some of the boys to return with me, but when I started I could not find my way back. I kept going in the direction I thought the camp was, and about noon climbed a big hill to see if there were any signs of camp or water, but all I could see were mountains all round about me.

Then I began to realize my situation—lost in the Rocky Mountains, away from my comrades, and no idea which way to go, and suffering for water. I prayed to God to direct me, for I was helpless.

After awhile I saw a smoke, as I supposed, some miles away. My heart gave a joyful bound, and I urged my pony in that direction. While passing through a canyon, I came across a young buffalo that had been recently killed. I could not rid myself of the feeling that I was not traveling in the right direction, and again prayed for guidance.

Starting again, the next thing I discovered was a lot of Indians camped among the mountains. Turning in short order, I put spurs to the pony until some distance away from the redskins, afraid to look back, as I fancied they were right behind me. When I did muster courage to look back, instead of Indians, saw a pack of 50 or 60 wolves after me. I was sure I was done for then. I had thought Indians enough to contend against, but when it came to Indians and wolves, how could anyone hope to escape?

Chancing to think of the buffalo liver on my saddle, I threw it to the wolves, and under other circumstances it would have been amusing to see them fight over it. By the time they got through I was some distance ahead of them, but a lot more had joined them, and no one who ever heard wolves will wonder that my hair stood up as they again started after me. My pony fell down and died from exhaustion. The wolves stopped and looked at me, as much as to say: "We have a sure thing on you now, old fellow."

I felt that my time indeed was short. I was afraid to fire among the wolves, lest sneaking Indians might be near; so I walked away as fast as possible and soon came to the river. After ducking my head a few times I took a drink, and that was the best drink I ever had. The wolves were having a good feast on my poor pony, and feeling sure that when they got through they would want to use me for dessert, I decided not to try to travel on, but stay near the river till morning.

While these thoughts were passing through my mind, I heard a shot and a ball whistle past me. I got behind a tree, when another ball struck the tree. I drew my revolver and fired twice, when I heard someone asking who was there. I knew it was the voice of a white man, and began to hope that deliverance had come. He proved to be one of our company on his way back to camp, John Lee.

To make my story short, we got to camp safely about 10 p. m., and after a good feed of slapjacks, antelope, and hot coffee (the best meal I ever ate), went and reported to Gen. Conner.

If any of old Co. K, 11th Ohio Cav., should see this, I hope they will write to the old company bugler.—C. R. A. Bolton, Toronto, Ontario, Can.

CEDAR CREEK.

A Parting Shot in the Skirmish Over the Behavior of the Different Corps There.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The comrades of the Eighth and Nineteenth Corps are very sore when anything is said about the Cedar Creek battle, and they do not take time to look up facts.

Comrade Turner, of the Eighth Corps, hits the nail on the head when he asks if there was not a screw loose somewhere. I claim that if the lines of the Eighth Corps had been properly picketed the surprise could not have taken place. Somebody was responsible.

I am not personally acquainted with Comrade Wright, 75th N. Y. However, I do know his regiment, and its record is A No. 1, and amongst my G.A.R. friends former members of the 75th are nearest to me. In answer to Comrade Wright I claim the Sixth Corps was not driven back. It had thrice repulsed the most desperate charges of the whole rebel army and twice made counter-charges, driving the Johnnies into the creek. When the corps was outflanked it was necessary to interpose an organized force, and there were no organized troops except the cavalry. I am well aware numerous writers and so-called historians claim the whole army was driven pell-mell six miles to the rear. Some even claim we were driven to Winchester. In fact, we took position about two miles in the rear of the position held by the Second Division (Getty's) of our corps early in the morning, a single regiment (the 2d Vt.) holding the position vacated. It is claimed that Early's army numbered about 30,000, although Early says he had about 9,000 muskets. We know the latter is not true, as Sheridan held receipt for about 13,000 prisoners. I saw an ex-Confederate Major at Winchester two years ago, and he informed me Early's army numbered over 35,000.

The comrade will remember the rebs did not go camp-hunting in the early part of the battle. The strength of the three corps at Cedar Creek, with their losses, I gave in the issue of Feb. 1, from Sheridan's official report. Paste it in your hats, comrades.

The comrades make a great mistake in this: They claim certain things as facts, and write them up as such, when, if they would take the trouble to look up the official reports no misstatements could be made.

There is no question but what the Nineteenth Corps was in a trying situation, the Johnnies firing on one side and the Eighth Corps running through their ranks. Nothing else could be expected. It was different with us in the old Sixth Corps. We were not recruits. We started in under "Little Mac"; were in all the big "scraps"; never were "knocked out"; were doubled up a little in the Wilderness—that is, the Third Division was, who were not original Sixth Corps troops; however, we drove the Johnnies back and got our line again without any outside help. Had we been in the position of the Eighth Corps at Cedar Creek you other fellows could have finished your sleep. We should not have waited for them to wake us up in our tents.—W. E. WEBSTER, 1st N. Y. Ind'p't battery (Cowan's), Auburn, N. Y.

They Will Not Be Disappointed.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: I see that you propose to publish the history of Mink's battery soon.

Maj. Mink is a member of my Post (Guilford D. Bailey, 200), and enlisted from Lowville; also, the Colonel and the Lieutenant-Colonel (Henry E. Turner) were officers of the regiment to which Mink's battery belonged. Turner is now the Commander of our Post, and there are two or three more of the battery who are members of the Post. So that you see there is quite an interest in the forthcoming history.—L. H. CARTER, Lowville, N. Y.

"NO QUORUM."

Gen. Banks Had Orders to Prevent Maryland Seceding.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The recent death of Gen. Banks revived in my memory an incident wherein he played an important part, and for which I looked in vain among the numerous paragraphs concerning him published immediately following his decease.

Gen. Banks performed an act which stands singly and alone in all the annals of the war. He prevented Maryland from seceding! To be sure, he was ordered to do so, but he had in charge the carrying out of the order.

Maryland was in a fever-heat of excitement, and impatiently awaiting the opportunity to take the necessary action. The Legislature of that State was due to convene on the 17th of September, 1861, just 33 years ago to-day. It was known that the members would, without delay, pass the act which would cut them asunder, theoretically, at least, from the Union.

On the 11th Simon Cameron directed Gen. Banks to prevent the assembling of the Maryland Legislature. This was a war order, and nothing short of it. Gen. Banks and his Lieutenants were on hand, and as fast as a member made his appearance and could be got at he was summarily arrested on a charge of plotting against the Government and hastened away to some fort further north, or where Uncle Sam could hold him at all hazards.

Two days after the issue of the order a dozen or more were thus seized and hurried away, the day's catch including two editors of Secession papers, a Congressman, and the candidate for Governor. The people of Maryland, particularly of Frederick and Baltimore, were almost beside themselves at these acts, and no wonder.

The 17th, the day for the convening of the Legislature, arrived and went, and "no quorum." Such members assembled as had escaped the drag-net of Gen. Banks and looked anxiously all day for accessions enough to form a quorum, but in vain.

On the day following nearly all of those who had waited were arrested and conveyed away. This substantially fixed the case so effectually that it was useless to depend upon any Legislative act. The arrests of the 18th included the Speaker and the Clerk of the House, and in all, say, about 20.

Gen. Banks has never to my knowledge been given credit for this bold act. In this connection, I may be permitted to say that the non-secession of Maryland resulted in that State contributing troops to both sides. A remarkable practice, resulting from the above fact, was that in speaking during the war of either of the organizations from Maryland upon the Union side, the speaker added the word "loyal" to the designating name with a deal of emphasis.—D. ELDREDGE, Historian 3d N. H., Boston, Mass.

A SLAVE TWELVE YEARS.

One of the Characters of a Remarkable Piece of Fiction Still Alive.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The reference to "Solomon Northrup; or, Twelve Years a Slave," made by Comrade Chandler in your issue of 27th inst., rather excited my curiosity, owing, perhaps, to the fact that the parties all resided in this vicinity, and the principal actor is still living. It was my good fortune to possess one of the books, which I found in a second-hand book store. The comrade will notice that the principal kidnaper was known as Merrill Brown in the book. (This name was assumed, his proper name being Alexander Merrill. He now resides in this town; in fact has always lived here, as did his father before him. He is hale and hearty at 80 years, a man of good qualities and a good citizen.

My purpose in writing was to relate the story from Merrill's standpoint, as he has related it to me. Merrill was in the show business; Platt, or Northrup, was an expert on the violin, and so they became acquainted. The darky came to him one day and said he had a scheme by which they could both make some money; he went on to say that if Merrill would take him down South and sell him they would divide the money and after a time Platt would make his escape.

This Merrill agreed to, and in carrying out the plan they went to Alexandria, Va., Merrill says that the negro played his part to perfection. He professed a great deal of love for his old master and shed tears when they were about to part. He also asked as a favor that he might be permitted to play a parting tune on his violin. Merrill whistled this tune to me some years ago, and as I remember it, it was "Sweet By-and-By." Very appropriate, indeed, as it was many a long day before Platt regained his freedom. There was a long litigation over the affair in Saratoga County, of which I never knew the particulars. Whether Merrill's story is true I am unable to say. I know the book is very interesting. In fact, as a work of fiction I thought it ahead of "Uncle Tom's Cabin."—A. A. GARDNER, Co. D, 93d N. Y., Broadalbin, N. Y.

REMARKS TO THE POINT.

Serg't Breen on Several Statements of Comrade Davenport.

EDITOR NATIONAL TRIBUNE: I am not at all anxious for controversy, but must say in reply to Serg't Alfred Davenport, 5th N. Y., in the issue of Sept. 6, that it seems strange that a regiment of nine companies, side by side with his regiment for several months, should be known to him as consisting of but four.

Again, I would say in reply to his paragraph giving Sykes's Regulars the credit of 800 men at Manassas No. 1, that while there were eight companies in the battalion, it is no reason why the strength of the companies should be construed as 100 each. In those days the maximum was 84 men to the company; and, as we were of the old Army, we could not run up to 101, as was afterward allowed for the new regiments, 11th to 19th inclusive, in infantry.

As to the butting of the man in the neck with a musket when nearing the Rappahannock in going over to Fredericksburg, doubtless the act was a reminder to keep him in the middle of the road to the front, instead of allowing him to shirk to the rear, as probably he intended to do. The Sergeant knows very well that some men were always ready to evade duty, particularly that of the immediate battlefield just at the time looming up before them.

But, my dear comrade, as you have expressed the wish, let us drop the washing of any more dirty linen in THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE.—PATRICK BREEN, First Sergeant, Co. C, 2d U. S., Vincennes, Ind.

Comparisons Are Odious.

O. L. Allison, Corporal, Co. A, 12th W. Va., Knobnoster, Mo., writes: "In a recent issue I notice that Serg't W. E. Webster, in making a comparison between the Eighth and Sixth Corps, gets 'off his base.' He says Gen. Sigel, at the battle of Cloyd's Mountain, ordered two companies of the 12th W. Va. to support Carlin's battery, but to his surprise they would not advance nor move an inch. Now, Comrade Webster, the 12th W. Va. was never at Cloyd's Mountain, but four companies of the 12th supported a battery at the battle of New Market, and Gen. Sigel sat on his horse directly in the rear of our line, and when we had to leave there those guns went with us, with the exception of one piece. The horses were all killed. I have not a word to say against the Sixth, for it was a fighting corps. On the morning of Oct. 19, 1864, I noticed that some of the Sixth could do as tall traveling as the Eighth. This thing of one regiment or corps doing all the fighting is bosh."

PICKET SHOTS

About Gen. McClernand.

B. F. Boring, Co. D, 30th Ill., South Terre Haute, Ind., says: "Comrade William S. Bedford, like the generality of critics who have assailed my statements, does so through a misunderstanding of some kind. My allusion to the removal of Gen. McClernand from his command for insubordination was not made with the intention of insinuation upon the character of the Thirteenth Corps. I do not possess the ability to cast even a slight reflection upon that grand old body of brave, loyal, ever-present men. The Fourth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Twentieth, and Twenty-third Corps, who fought so nobly, shoulder to shoulder, under Grant and Sherman, in the West, are all the same kind of men, and the same to me as brothers, regardless of mere numerical designations. Although my home was in the Seventeenth, it is no more to me now than the Thirteenth or any other corps.

"It is a saying that as the teacher is, so is the school. Yet I regard Gen. John A. McClernand and the Thirteenth Corps as two very different objects; and what I said was about McClernand, and not his command. Hence all that Comrade Bedford said in defense of the Thirteenth Corps was uncalled for, as far as I am concerned.

"I was in McClernand's Brigade at Camp McClernand, Cairo, Ill., in '61, where and when he was superseded by Gen. Grant; the first command Gen. McClernand ever had above a regiment; and whatever might have been his abilities as a General, or his fighting qualities as a soldier, I always regarded him as a tyrant, and as regardless of the lives and rights of the men under him. He was a commander, limited to the literal meaning of that word. He never wore the pleasant face of McPherson, ready to look into your eyes with a smile, and to salute you. He never knew a soldier by name, as Logan did, nor was he the fatherly friend of the common soldier, as Thomas was. And I beg your pardon, Comrade Bedford, but must say that you are the first soldier I ever heard attempt to praise McClernand. And the fact that Gen. Grant removed him, or recommended his removal, to say nothing of his political standing or career since his dismissal from the army, is conclusive evidence to me that he did not deserve anything better than he received when he was required to turn over his command to Gen. Ord."

Homes for Settlers.

John W. Burton, Co. G, 46th Ohio, Chester, Tex., wishes to correspond with some comrade who lives in the West or Northwest who knows of any Government land open for settlement. Would prefer it on a small lake or river where it is good fishing and hunting. Will pay all expenses.

George L. Green, Wirth, Ark., writes: "Please allow me to say to all old soldiers desiring a home in a good, healthy country, where the climate is mild and land is cheap, that there is still Government land for homestead entry here in northern Arkansas."

Kenesaw Mountain.

Henry Coryell, Co. A, 34th Ill., Caldwell, Kan., was in the charge on Kenesaw, and has an ugly mark to show for it. His regiment was ordered to take the rifle-pits in its front, and when they started they got there so quickly the rebs did not have time to fire. The men sent a lot of prisoners to the rear. Then they were told to go for the main line of works.

"Away we went, and thought we could run over anything that got in our way. We went up to the works. But two or three rebs to one of us were behind them, so we lay down to wait for the brigade to come up. The ground that we charged over was in heavy timber outside of the rebel works; they had cut the timber so that all tops were towards our lines, and every limb they had sharpened, so we had to go slow or run against snags.

"The brigade (Second of the Second Division, Fourteenth Corps) got within 100 yards, when the rebs drove it back. My company lost about 20."

Cedar Creek.

S. A. Bendon, Co. A, 87th Pa., Portsmouth, Iowa, indorses the assertion that if it had not been for the Sixth Corps the Eighth and Nineteenth Corps would have fared worse than they did at Cedar Creek. He does not blame the men of the last two corps for running; they were placed in a position where they had to get out or be "gobbled."

Information.

H. Kruger, Rosston, Ind., writes that he would like the comrade who had an advertisement in THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE and offered some light returns for a home to communicate with him.

L. C. Mayer, Terre Haute, Ind., wants information as to present postoffice address of Martin Riepe, who was a soldier in the late war.

Almost Equal Loss.

Ervin Chamberlain, Co. E, 1st Me. H. A., La Crosse, Wis., says: "In a recent issue I saw the statement made that Co. I, 83d Pa., suffered greater loss in killed and wounded than any company of any regiment in the service during the rebellion. The loss of that company was 47 killed and died of wounds out of an enrollment of 193. The loss of Co. B, 1st Me. H. A., was 49 killed and died of wounds out of an enrollment of 198—almost an identical loss."

KING NO-TO-BAC AND HIS WORK IN AMERICA.

The Visit of a Monarch that Has Brought Health, Vigor and Money to Many Men.

Many of our readers no doubt noticed in the last issue the large announcement of King No-To-Bac. Less than five years ago he was unknown in America, and since that time he has been crowned and called King by hundreds of thousands of happy, vigorous men, who point to him with pride and hold him dear as the means of their deliverance from tobacco slavery.

Oftimes tobacco's victims look at the dying spark in the cigar stump, or at the big, masticated "chaw" of tobacco just expectorated, and with nerves nourished with nicotine mentally resolve, "Now, that is my last. I will never use it again. I know that it is injuring me physically and financially, and my nerves are becoming so irritated that I can't stand the least annoyance any more." What is the result? These good resolutions are generally made while the effect of the use of tobacco practically paralyzes the cravings of millions of irritated nerve centers, and just as soon as the effects commence to pass away these good resolutions weaken, showing conclusively that the use of tobacco is not a habit, but a disease of the nervous system caused by the education of the nerves to crave for the nicotine poisoning. What, then, is the easy, permanent, natural way to relieve yourself of the use of tobacco? Certainly not by discontinuing it and suffering the nervous reaction and prostrating effects and mental degeneracy sure to follow the long and continued use of tobacco. Does it not suggest itself to you that the natural thing to do is to take a remedy that is specifically prepared to eradicate the effects of the nicotine in the system and to overcome the nerve-craving effects and restore the tobacco-charged nerves to a normal and healthy condition. To this we all say, "Yes, where is the remedy?" You will find it in No-To-Bac. This is easily said, and we all naturally ask for proof. This is all answered in the simple statement that if No-To-Bac fails to cure the proprietors, The Sterling Remedy Company, of New York, Montreal and Chicago, have so much faith in their remedy that they positively guarantee to refund the money, and the concern being owned and operated by some of the most reputable business men of the East and West, is absolutely reliable, and we are glad to say able in every way to live up to its guarantee.

The sale of No-To-Bac within the past few years has assumed enormous proportions, almost entirely developed upon its merits and the recommendations of the cured. So great is the sale that it is hardly possible to go into any leading drug store without finding it on sale, and the druggist has nothing but words of praise to give it.

THEIR RECORDS.

Brief Sketches of the Services of Various Regiments.

[THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE has in hand several hundred requests for regimental histories. All such requests will be acceded to in due time, although those now received cannot be published for at least six months, owing to lack of space. Numerous sketches have already been published, and of these none can be found room for a second time.]

The 8th Iowa Cav.

The regiment was organized at Davenport, Iowa, Sept. 30, 1863, to serve three years. It was mustered out Aug. 13, 1865. Joseph B. Dorr was commissioned Colonel, and continued in command until his death at Macon, Ga., May 28, 1865. When mustered out H. G. Barner had been commissioned Colonel, and was awaiting muster. During the Winter of 1863, '64, the regiment was stationed in Tennessee doing guard duty, and saw little fighting until the Spring of 1864, when it started with Gen. Sherman on the famous march to the sea. In May, 1864, the regiment was assigned to the First Brigade, McCook's Division, and Col. Dorr was placed in command. Lieut.-Col. Barner then had charge of the regiment. On July 27, 1865, it started on a raid to Lovejoy to destroy the Macon Railroad. The track was torn up and much damage done to the railroad property, but when the force started to return it found that the enemy had a strong force between them and the Union lines. After much hard fighting most of the regiment were taken prisoners, except a few who escaped through the woods and reached the Union lines. Many officers and men were killed in this engagement. Col. Dorr was exchanged in the late Autumn. In March the regiment was at Chickasaw, Ala., and took part in the great cavalry movement in that State. During its three years' service the regiment was engaged in the following battles, besides many others of minor importance: Resaca, Cassville, Powder Springs, Kenesaw Mountain, Atlanta, Newnan, Raccoon Ford, Franklin, and Pleasant Ridge. Three officers and 37 men were killed in action or died of wounds, and 118 officers and men died of disease or in prison.

The 35th Iowa.

This regiment was organized in the State of Iowa-at-large in August, 1862, to serve three years. It was mustered out of service Aug. 10, 1865. Sylvester G. Hill was made Colonel, and James H. Rothrock was commissioned Lieutenant-Colonel. Col. Hill was brevetted Brigadier-General Dec. 15, 1864. He was killed in action at Nashville, Tenn., Dec. 15, 1864. Lieut.-Col. Rothrock resigned his commission Aug. 7, 1863. When the regiment was mustered out of service William B. Kellar, Brevet Colonel, was in command. In April, 1863, the regiment was assigned to the Third Brigade, Third Division, Fifteenth Corps, and was ordered to Vicksburg, where it participated in the severest fighting around that place. After the capitulation of Vicksburg the regiment went to Jackson. On July 20 it left for Mississippi with over 600 prisoners in charge. It engaged in the Red River campaign under Gen. Banks. In this expedition the brigade was commanded by Col. Hill, of the 35th Iowa. Lieut.-Col. Keeler commanded the regiment. At Pleasant Hill the regiment fought bravely, losing 64 officers and men killed and wounded. Early in 1865 the regiment was transferred to the South. It was then in Marshall's Brigade, McArthur's Division, Sixteenth Corps. Among the important battles in which the regiment took part are: Jackson, Middleton, Fort De Russy, Pleasant Hill, Yellow Bayou, Old River Lake, Tupelo, Nashville, and Spanish Fort. The loss in the service was five officers and 44 men in action or of wounds received therein, and three officers and 185 men of disease, in prison, or from other causes.

The 10th Wis. Battery.

This battery was organized at Milwaukee, Wis., Feb. 10, 1862, to serve three years. Capt. Yates V. Bebee, who recruited the battery, was elected Captain, and was with the organization throughout its entire service. He was brevetted Lieutenant-Colonel March 13, 1865. The battery arrived in St. Louis in March, 1863, and was stationed at Benton Barracks. It participated in the battles of Corinth and Iuka. On Aug. 12 it was transferred to the Army of the Tennessee, and was stationed near Nashville until Sept. 1, when it was ordered to Huntsville, Ala. In May, 1864, the battery was assigned to the Third Cavalry Division, Army of the Cumberland, and took part in all the movements of that organization. It was on the march to the sea, and at Lovejoy's Station and Bear Creek captured two guns from the enemy. At Monroe's Crossroads the battery lost 10 men, who were captured by the enemy. Among the other important battles in which the battery participated and suffered loss were Resaca, Lovejoy's Station, and Bentonville. It was engaged in many other battles and skirmishes, but escaped without loss. Twenty-eight men died in the service; three were killed in action.

The 5th Ohio Cav.

The 5th Ohio Cav. was organized by Col. Wm. H. H. Taylor, at Camp Dick Corwin, September to November, 1861, and was mustered in at that camp by Capt. Lew Wilson, 19th U. S. Inf., on Oct. 17, 1861, for three years' service. It proceeded to Camp Dennison and remained there until partially equipped. It received marching orders Feb. 26, 1862, left Camp Dennison March 1, 1862, embarked on transports at Cincinnati, over 1,200 strong, and proceeded to Paducah, Ky., joining Gen. W. T. Sherman's command. Thence they went up the Tennessee River to Pittsburg Landing, being the first of any United States troops to pitch tents in that locality. The camping place was alongside of Shiloh Church, about four and a half miles from the landing. Previous to the famous Shiloh battle, detachments of the regiment had sharp engagements with bodies of Gen. A. Sidney Johnston's army, then organizing at Corinth. These skirmishes occurred at Monterey, Black Jack, Forrest, and Purdy, Miss. It took a conspicuous part in the Shiloh Church and Pittsburg Landing engagements, April 6 and 7, 1862; also, at the siege of Corinth, Miss. Afterward in the more or less serious engagements at Metamora, Miss., October, 1862; Little Bear Creek, Dec. 9 to 12; Lexington, Tenn., Dec. 18, 1862; Davis Mill, Miss., Dec. 21, 1862, and at Moscow, Tenn.; Hernando, Miss. (two months' engagement); Cold Water, Miss. (at which gallant Maj. Hayes was killed); Rock Cross, Miss.; Guntown, Miss.; Rienzi, Miss.; Clear Creek, Ala.; Lebanon, Ala.; Red Oak, Ga.; Jonesboro, Ga.; Rocky Creek Church, Ga.; Fayetteville, N. C.; Averysboro, N. C.; Natchez, Miss.; Cane Creek Ala.; Horn Lake, Miss.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Jasper, Tenn.; Lookout Mountain, Mission Ridge, Tenn.; Tuscumbia, Ala.; Decatur, Ala.; Buck Head Creek, Ga.; Monroe Cross Roads, N. C.; Reynolds Plantation, Ga.; Savannah, Ga.; then through the Carolinas; Waynesboro, Ga.; Adairsville, Ga.; "Ninety-six," S. C.; Tiddler's Cross Roads, S. C.; Bentonville, N.C., etc., and at the surrender of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston. At Huntsville, Ala., March 16, 1864, the regiment was veteranized and proceeded to Cartersville, Ga., etc. July 28, 1865, McLaughlin's Squadron was consolidated with it. It is estimated that the regiment in its marches traversed over 15,000 miles, and during its existence enlisted over 2