New York, March 26, 1852

Hon. S.A. Douglas
Dear Sir:

Your favor, enclosing a copy of the bill relative to land warrants, has come to hand, the meaning of the clause therein I am greatly obliged. I am informed that the regulations require the appointment to be taken before Judge of a Court of record, justice of the peace or a commissioner of deeds, and not before a Notary Public.

Will you please inform me of the Commissioners of the General Land Office as to any regulations that are inconsistent with the laws of Congress, and whether the law of September 7, 1830, of which I forwarded an extract, has been repealed, or is still in force.

In the City, the Commissioners of deeds are generally occupied all day in Court and the Justices of Peace and Judges of Court are so few it is very difficult to serve them in their office, and another trouble and expense is incurred by proving the County Clerk's certificate which is often my inconvenience to the purchasers. If the knowledge were not taken before a Notary, it will save considerable expense and trouble as these hearing require them to be at their office.
Extract from the Act of March 1, 1831:

"...that the sheriffs of the several counties of the State shall, before they execute upon any person in a county, an order of attachment or a writ of the like nature, cause the same to be acknowledged in writing by the party against whom the same is issued, under oath, under the hand and seal of the sheriff, or by another person, if the sheriff is prevented from doing so, and the same to be signed by the person so acknowledging the same, and returned to the sheriff..."

"...and that the sheriff, or other person acknowledging the same, shall deliver the same, with the acknowledgment, to the sheriff, who shall return the same to the court of common pleas, with the acknowledgment, to the party from whom the same is obtained..."

"...and that the person acknowledging the same shall be liable to the party from whom the same is obtained for the amount of any judgment recovered by the party from whom the same is obtained, and for all costs and expenses incurred in the recovery thereof...

Act for the County - I trust you to manage this matter before Congress and have it done promptly, and that such a shape that it can be understood by all. People.

Joseph Schumack
Washington D. C., March 26, 1852.

Sir,

I am forming a private collection of the autographs of distinguished Americans, and am desirous of obtaining yours as a valuable addition thereto. If you will gratify me so much an early reply with the most acceptable to you most ob. servant.

Jos. Reed,
U. S. Coast Survey.

U. S. Senator.
Office Indian Affairs,
March 27th, 1852.

My esteemed friend,
I had the pleasure some ten days ago, to forward you a letter for your perusal, addressed to me by our mutual friend, Rev. Wm. J. Polk, on my note transmitting it. I desired it might be returned to me by mail. As I am anxious to reply, I have to beg the favor that my request may be complied with.

Very truly yours,
Geo. M. Robison.

Hon. J. Q. Douglas,
U. S. Senate.
Bath, Me March 27, 1852

Sir,

As I am about making a collection of autographs of distinguished men of this county, you would confer a favor upon me by sending me yours.

Your at last,

J. C. Shaw.

Hon. S. A. Douglas,

U. S. Senator

P.S. Please send me your speeches for if you have quite a number of them and will send them to me I will get them bound so as to preserve them, if you have more than five which you send to Mr. H. D. Huse, of this place you will oblige

J. C. Shaw,

Hon. S. A. Douglas.

P.S. Those five which you sent to Mr. Huse, are your speech at the Annual Fair on the Territorial question and at the Democratic Convention in reply to Mr. Soule and on the Measures of adjustment.
Bath March 2, 1852

Hon. Sir,

I received your speeches with much pleasure, and also your autograph, and if you have some more speeches, and if it would not be too much trouble to you I would be much obliged to you for them; for I like these speeches like yours; they have such sound sense and if I could get enough I should have them bound.

Very respectfully,

Yrs. B

Y. H. Dwight

P.S. Please send me some of the other senate speeches.

Hon. S. A. Douglas
Washington D.C.
R. H. Parkes
28 M. 1857
Ann
Nelly Humpsey
March 28, 1837

Sir,

Presuming on a slight acquaintance gained at Washington in 1845 and an admiration of your character in general as well as your mean, manning devotion to the great and humane principles of democracy, I take the liberty of addressing you this letter.
When speaking of you as a probable candidate for the Presidency may I represent as sustained in the cause of our Party on the subject of internal improvements. Also may I represent you as decidedly opposed to any alteration made either on amendment of the Organic Laws of 1850.

I refer you to the Hon. A. B. Brown of the State if you wish to make inquiries before answering. Will you send me some copies of your speech made in Chicago in 1850, and of your speech on the Fugitive Slave Law in December last?

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]
La Salle March 29 1852

Dear Sir,

Yours have been duly received for which I accept my thanks; however, I have forgotten the name instead of E. B. Shrewsbury I should receive them on arrival. We had a large Democratic meeting the proceedings are published.

Respectfully yours,

E. B. Chumways

[Signature]
Waukegan, March 29, 1852

Sir,

There is a great dearth here for news, and particularly Congressional, if you will be kind enough to remember me in the distribution of speeches and documents you will ever so favor and very much oblige your friend.

J.B. Gorham

P.S.

I see good omens in the political field, which if the Baltimore Convention does not upset or rather if they nominate the man who is believed to be the People's Choice, I have no doubt but we shall succeed.

Your Old Forty

As. A. Douglas

U.S.

Washington
Corkport March 29, 1852

I have re-read your speech upon the compromises; but it does not suit a large portion of our Union Democrats alas! Nor men; but Douglas's speech upon the Compromise resolutions of Tooke would tell well—send me some of them.

Your speech is rather much in accordance with Calhounism: the one idea, principle, that the whole of Democracy and of State rights consist in the single idea, that it is the Primium Mobile in which revolve all rights. This is a damnable heresy; Calhoun was never a true Democrat, nor was he a states rights man; for from first to last he was a Bank man, i.e. he was a bank man so long as the bank could kick—witness his proposition to elongate the bank charter after the veto in 1818

Twelve years, and this was only after Mr. Clay had proposed to elongate the charter six years; thus, outbidding Mr. Clay—a man he had at all times been an internal improvement man; and about the year 1818 he was an advocate for a grand national road from Buffalo, N.Y. to New Orleans & even at that time Mr. McCulloch, the mere index of Mr. C. Calhoun wrote & published a pamphlet over the signature of "One of the People" in which he refused to let the road pass that he dominated the same C. McCulloch said "but for this thing called State Rights, this would be one of the most splendid national governments before the face of the earth." Such men are not the Democrats nor states rights men.
I will admit that at all times Wilcohalhoun and his peculiar admirers were always calumniators—Have you forgotten that Mr. Calhoun from '31 to '37 was the most bitter denouncer of Democracy—that filthy thing crawling in its slime, that the Bank was, backed a greater amount for the publication of his speeches, that it did forbid, or we listened?—Still farther back—have you forgotten that in 1832 Mr. Calhoun promoted and caused a personal antagonism between Gen. Jackson & Wm. H. Crawford, and used his influence to destroy Wm. H. Crawford thro' Ninian Edwards, by attempting to bolster that fact that vile fool in his false charges vs. Wm. H. Crawford the Demo. nominee for President—did not Mr. Calhoun in 1832 tell Gen. Jackson that in 1824, in Calhoun was independent of all who were elected. Indeed has not Mr. Calhoun and his peculiar followers been on every side of every great question which agitates our land except Abolition? And upon this black question he has been rising at political de-sac with the most violent of that dark tribe?—To conclude does not secession as a constitutional remedy smack of the Higher Law doctrine?—They are both damnable heresies and let them both go to hell, unexecpt I un cared for they and their advocates—If you are on social terms with Douglas, show him this, as well as the accompanying DOC, and tell him to send me some of his Speeches on Tariff & Resolutions—Douglas is not my first choice for Pres. only for the reason that some older one had the Vantage ground, but Douglas of any Democrat is better than any Whig
To the Editor of the N. M. Union—

Dear Sir: Some time since I saw a series of questions, in your paper, addressed to the citizens of New England, which I was pleased to answer, in the following manner—

Quotations.

1. Do you believe that the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution (U. S.) were free independent sovereign States? If so, did they part with all their sovereignty by ratifying the Constitution, and entering the Union?

I presume that the author of those questions meant separate States, then I answer, that the States were not sovereign in their individual capacity as States, i. e. as Corporations.

Every effort at sovereignty, or at independence, was a crime, as the following brief extract from the history of the past will show.

1619—The first conference of the united colonies of New England, which continues for some 40 years.

1622—Similar Congress at Albany,—at 1634, at same place, delegates: H. H. H., H. W., R. C., E. L. P., J. N., Y. P., P. M., and Maryland, required unanimously, that a Union of the colonies was necessary for their preservation, and that they agreed in all proposals for a division of the Colonies into separate confederacies, and adopted a plan of Federal Government drawn up by J. Franklin, giving to the proposed Congress power to lay imposts and taxes on all of the Colonies to be included; but the people were not ripe for it.

1701—The Colonies were discovered, and at that time dissipated the hope of an immediate union, which existed in the Colonies, was impracticable, unless it was forced upon them by the most grievous tyranny and oppression, which the Government of Great Britain shortly after exercised.

1763—Another Congress met at Philadelphia, at which another step was taken toward a more permanent Union.

1774—At Philadelphia, a still holier step was taken by the Congress then assembled. They adopted non-importation and non-exportation resolutions, which were adopted cheerfully by all of the delegates except by South Carolina; these insisted that such a resolution would export Rice into India. This act on the part of the S. Carolina delegates suspended the action of the Congress for several days, and the more partial delegates compromised with the S. Carolina, and peremptorily S. Carolina to export Rice. This Congress seems to be the first to form a plan of government, which continued to 1781.

In 1777, Congress by the delegates (except Ga.) assembled at Philadelphia. In July the Ga. delegates attended.

1778, 4th July, Congress proclaimed an armistice of 90 days.


Del. and 1781 M. d., signed, at which time the article of Confederation became active, to keep the confederate States in the line of their duty. The people have at all times, the undoubted right peaceably to assemble and discuss all matters and to keep themselves to be represented in Conventions, there to discuss grievances and to contract and enter into agreements, and to form alliances and to organize such systems as they may judge best to correct any abuses by the Government; but the States, as corporations are inhabited by the Constitution of the U. S., Art. I., Sec. 10, to the latter part, says, "No State shall within the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war, in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." &c.

This will also answer the third question, and the 4th question is answered, except the clause is the same, which authorizes the Government of the United States to compel each State to respect the laws and integrity of the Union; this will be seen by reference to Art. I., Sec. 8, that the States shall have power," &c., enumerating some 18 specific grants of powers, among the rest—"To provide for calling forth such men as may be necessary to execute the laws of the Union against transgressions and repel invasions."

Que. 5.—If South Carolina should secede, would you give your aid and counsels to the Federal Government to subdue and subject her? or would you give your aid and counsels to S. C., in resisting the Federal Government?—I think it would not be proper for the Federal Government to send military force to subdue her, would you aid the Federal Government or the State of Mississippi?

Now that is quite out of the line of fair inquiry. I might say to the querist, that "equivalent unto the day, is the hour in which we had better meet, and be able to catch links. If S. C. should attempt to secede, for existing causes, I should not hesitate one moment in my duty, both as a citizen of the United States, and as an active member of the republican party to resist the resolution of power to be exercised by the S. C. legislature, and the good people of the States control their respective legislatures thereto; the States Constitutions, except S. C., there the legislature controls the people; and it may be this which has caused the S. C. politicians to be so restful under rule, having ruled the people of the United States, they seem to think that they were born to rule, even the people of the Union or to ruin this Government—the fairest fabric of human wisdom.

Que. 6.—Do you, or not, regard your allegiance to the State of Miss., paramount to your allegiance to the Federal Government?

As a citizen, my allegiance to both are equally binding; but if there be any difference it inclines in favor of the Government of the Union, for if any State attempts to have a Government anti-Republic., I have the guarantee that the Government of the U. S. will cause it to become Republican, and I should have any State attempt to secede and destroy the Union, the Congress has the right and the power, and I hope they will always have the will to keep the confederate States in the line of their duty. The people have at all times, the undoubted right peaceably to assemble and discuss all matters and to keep themselves to be represented in Conventions, there to discuss grievances and to contract and enter into agreements, and to form alliances and to organize such systems as they may judge best, to correct any abuses by the Government; but the STATES, as corporations are inhabited by the Constitution of the U. S., Art. I., Sec. 10, the latter part says, "No State shall without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war, in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." &c.

Eastport, Miss., Sept. 25, 1851.
Marengo 30 of March 1852

Dear Sir,

I have never had any personal acquaintance with your Honor but I am acquainted with you politically and otherwise so I hope you will excuse me for taking the liberty of addressing myself to your Honor. I have applied to my Government for arrearage pension now my dear sir I wish you to use your aid and influence in my behalf in the case. I will give you a short history when the war commenced between the United States and Great Britain in 1812 I volunteered for three months, I served through the campaign of 1812 and 1813 and 1814 in November the 5th day we were March out of the General Yard and on the next day I was ordered by Gen. T. B. Taliaferro to get the sick and wounded from the beach of the Lake to the hospital the horses fell with me and broke one of my legs I also had two wounds on the 17 of Sept 1814 while storming the batteries at Fort Erie. This took place while retaking Gen. Taliaferro out of the hands of British. Everybody knows this that has had history.
Now sir as long as I was able to earn my living I did so I am old and decided on more union as a soldier and now call the General government to assist me my wife is old and quite feeble and like a flickering taper all most gone but my wife I left at home to take care of large family of children whilst I was fighting the battles of country to defend the soil That yields for food and to maintain and defend those rights and liberties we now enjoy I wish you to call on the Hon. R. H. Milory he has got in his possesions my papers and he will give you some information on the subject. Famlly my oldest son went to Texas about 12 years since my other two sons have gone to California whether they ever will return is quite uncertain and I have my wife mother to support and she 81 years old and I am poor and with little help from my government if your Honorable body thinks I am entitled to the service here I have rendered with much respect truly yours
P.S. Douglas
Silas Chatfield
Mrs. & Mrs. regiment was New York Volunteers Col. Lew W. Dobbin was our
Washington, 30 March 1813.

Dear Sir,

Mr. James Holman is quite anxious that you should state your knowledge of his character to the Department before which he is about to become an applicant for promotion for a short period of service in the Revolution, and his friend has again requested me to ask at your hands a short letter pertaining thereto. I conform to the request by addressing you these few lines and asking of you such a letter as your own discretion may suggest.

I mentioned to you that I have some difficulty in placing my name to be concerned in his application, and therefore I enclose your previous letter to me, with the suggestion that its excellent substance embodie in the address to the Com. of Pension, would be of much avail. Excuse me for troubling you in regard to this matter as I wish to leave an old holden act I am to feel confidence you will take the greatest pleasure and pride in doing the same. The noise.
thing. I shall enclose your letter from Mr. Marsh, the Rep. from that district, to
the House of the old man in order to be read with the papers to the dept.

In trust,

[Signature]

[Signature]

Hon. S. R. Douglas,

[Signature]
From Henry Washington

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas
U.S. Washington D.C.

Dear Sir,

I am collecting the autographs of the members of Congress and would as young Democrat of the old school be proud to possess yours.

Let me hear from as soon as convenience and college agree.

All Servant,

Robert W. Lincoln
Page of Senate
Columbus

Hon. S. A. Douglas, (Ohio)
Robert W. Lenox
Columbus
30th Dec. Anno
Armington & Taywell Co. III. March 31st 1852

To Hon. Stephen A. Douglas Dear Sir,

I have the honor to address you a few lines, and request you to accept our community and myself in a matter relating to that route No. 4357. I will here lay all the circumstances which have come within my knowledge which are briefly as follows—About the 10th of July last, the Chicago & Springfield route beginning at Peoria, through Tremont, Dixon, to Belvidere, was altered, & now runs from Peoria by Rockford to Belvidere, leaving Dillon entirely off of that route. Route 4357 runs from Wayneville via Mt. Hope. Armington to Dillon 30 miles—at the last mention—point intersected the Chicago & Springfield route. The alteration left route 4357 without any communication whatever at its West End, & all the mail matter arriving at Dillon, Armington & Mt. Hope came through that way. Leaving us entirely without any mail, the P.M., at Rockford, Dillon & myself, agreed with Mr. Allen, contractor on 4357, to go to Rockford & get the mail matter that was accumulating there, that belonged to the offices along the route, he performed that service from the 17th of July to this time. The department was immediately informed of the deficiency of the mail route, and requested to have immediate action on the subject, but so far as I can learn no satisfactory information has been received on the subject till since Congress has been in session recently, I learn that an order has been issued extending 4357 from Belvidere to Peoria. I think the extension was made by an act of Congress in their session 1848-9. The route advertised
for letting Mr. Allen above and to return his bid for to carry the mail.

Thursday, August 14, 1864.

Dear Sir,

I wish to let you know that the order of the department has been to discontinue the service of Mr. Allen.

Mr. Allen has been very prompt and faithful. He is very sorry to lose our mail facilities at any time, more particularly at the present crisis of affairs.

Yours respectfully,

Charles L. Child
New York, March 31, 1852

Dear Sir—Before leaving Washington we were enabled, through the kindly influence of yourself and others, to make a contract for delivering at Pinaeado a considerable amount of coal from our mine at Cananita. We are now anxious to make a contract for supplying Mr. Sard’s line of steamers at New Orleans. We have talked with Mr. Crossell, one of the proprietors of the line, and he expresses a warm desire that Mr. Sard should make an arrangement for a full experiment with our coal in order to test its qualities. We know that it is most admirably and peculiarly adapted to the use of steamers, and, if a trial be made, we have no apprehensions as to the result. Will you be so good as to use your influence with Mr. Low to induce him to send, say two or three thousand tons of our coal to New Orleans, which will be sufficient for a thorough experiment. He should certainly give him a better and a cheaper article from the Anthracite that he is now using. If we can be of service to Mr. Sard in any way, he may reckon upon us.

We hereby express your Kindness, and...
Now you are President, we shall give you administration fair play. In all but politics, we are not strong enough men.

Your friends,
E. H. Stanton

S. A. Douglas.
Elizabethtown, Harris County, S March 21, 1857

Judge Douglas

Dear Sir,

Please send me a copy of the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and also a copy of your late address.

Yours Respectfully,

A. J. Ramsay.