

Oct. 17th 1864.

Referring to yours of June 11th 1864 in reply to mine of May 31st I beg leave to say the managers of the line are disappointed. Among them are those most ready to aid the Govt. in making the tariff of March 3^d, 1862 and are still among the most anxious to comply strictly and literally with its terms, though their expenses for doing the business have increased from 20 to 200 per cent. can you not consistently so modify that decision as to allow according to distance, say 236 miles, in the future. We confidently ask to be recognized on the basis of the shortest "practicable" 236 miles on freight.

Respectfully & truly yrs.

G. Twichell

Brig. Gen. M. C. Meigs

2. M. Gen. U.S.A.

KING. (HORATIO). Postmaster-General under Buchanan, 1861; etc. A VERY FINE full A.L.S. "HORATIO KING", 2 FULL PAGES, 4 TO a., "Washington, Dec. 5th 1864". - A very long and a VERY FINE LETTER; interesting... \$1.00

1864.

Dear Sir: The above is a copy omitted from the papers you sent me, and the one commencing "The Norwich line have transported", &c., the date of which you give as the 19th, is dated the 17th of Oct. I have waited till to-day before presenting my letter, in hopes that you would answer mine of the 28th ult., because

Oct. 17th 1864.

Referring to yours of June 11th 1864 in
reply to mine of May 31st I beg leave to
say the managers of the line are disap-
pointed. Among them are those most ready
to aid the Govt. in making the tariff of
March 3^d, 1862 and are still among the most
anxious to comply strictly and literally with
its terms, though their expenses for doing the
business have increased from 20 to 200 per
cent. can you not consistently so modify
that decision as to allow according to dis-
tance, say 236 miles, in the future. We
confidently ask ~~to~~ be recognized on the
basis of the shortest "practicable" 236 miles
on freight.

Respectfully Submitting

LG Twitchell

Prof. Gen. M. C. Meys

2. In Gen. U.S.A.

Washington, Dec. 5, 1864.

Dear Sir: The above is a copy omitted ⁱⁿ from the papers you sent me, and the one commencing "The Norwich line have transported," &c., the date of which you give as the 19th, is dated the 17th. of Oct. I have waited till to day before presenting my letter, in hopes that you would answer mine of the 28th ult., because

I am not clear as to whether you still contend for pay on passengers for 236 miles by the land route, or not. I would infer from the last sentence of your above letter that you do not because you say "on freight" simply.

I inclose copy of my letter to Gen. May Jr, from which you will see that I leave that question open. Had I been certain, either way, I would have made my point all clear, as this I consider very important to a favorable consideration. Indeed, Col. Parsons' Pr. Clk. who was also Col. Dana's Pr. Clk., was anxious to have me prepare a clear statement of the case, for he was evidently somewhat confused from not comprehending how all the lines run. I doubt whether the question of allowing as for 236 miles on freight, either by your land route or the Sound lines has ever yet been carefully considered.

Yours very truly,
Noah C. King

G. Twichell Esq.

Boston, Mass.

P.S. I have presented my letter and they think by your above protest that you yield the point as regards passengers, & are willing to consider accept pay for 229 miles, therefore on the New Haven line. If so, please inform me, as it may make the case somewhat easier.