The Press.

MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 1857.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR GOVERNOR,
WILLIAM F. PACKER,
OF LYCOMING COUNTY.

FOR JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT,
WILLIAM STRONG,
OF BERKS COUNTY.
JAMES THOMPSON,
OF ERIE COUNTY.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
NIMROD STRICKLAND,
OF CHESTER COUNTY.

☞ We have been compelled to throw several of our leading editorials on the outside.

A WORD OF THANKS.

It is so easy and so common a thing for new journals to boast of their prosperity, that when there is a great success, it must speak for itself rather than through the pen of the editor. But at the risk of falling in with the custom, and of being accused of a little of the self-glorification pardonable in a "new beginner," we cannot refrain the expression of our grateful surprise at the manner in which THE PRESS has been received, not only here, but everywhere else, in and out of the State, so far as we have heard. We expected a hearty Pennsylvania welcome. We asked only for a fair trial and a patient hearing. We appealed for support in the profession to which we have been reared with no aggressive purposes upon others, and with a consciousness that the world is wide enough for all. In return, we have been greeted with an outburst of popular feelings that cannot be mistaken. It comes from the heart of a generous people. It speaks the language of confidence and of encouragement. Subscribers have poured in upon us from all parts of the city and country, and from all parties too. Our advertising columns, filled with voluntary offerings, tell their own story. We should be as cold as a statue if these demonstrations did not excite the liveliest emotions of gratitude. THE PRESS is no longer an experiment. It is an institution.

☞ The reader of a public print may differ from the editor, but if he is provided with a good medium of news, and a fair share of useful information and interesting selections, such a difference will be rather agreeable than otherwise. Acting upon this assumption, we shall candidly speak our own thoughts in our own department, while we shall carefully attend to the wants of the public in other respects.

THE QUESTION OF KANSAS—SHALL THE MAJORITY RULE?

When the Nebraska-Kansas bill was under discussion in Congress, Mr. BUCHANAN was quietly discharging his duties as American Minister to the British government. He could not, with propriety, have expressed an opinion as to the merits of the controversy, or the expediency of introducing the bill obliterating the Missouri line. But he was always a careful observer of public events. He had read the debates, and had watched the progress of the excitement before the Nebraska bill became a law. A statesman so accustomed to public affairs, and so long identified with the legislation of Congress on the subject of slavery, was peculiarly competent to distinguish the true path of duty on the new question which had grown out of the old one. The people, instinctively appreciating Mr. BUCHANAN's attitude, and recalling his long life of fidelity to the Constitution, and his safe, solid, and conservative character, soon pointed to him as the only man who could deliver the country from the calamity of a geographical administration of the government. It is true a decided effort was made to arrest the popular current; and, among the reasons suggested against the nomination, was the one that he was *not sound* on the Nebraska question; but the voice of the majority prevailed, and Mr. BUCHANAN became the Democratic candidate for President. The Nebraska principle came at once in issue. The South—however some of its politicians may have opposed his nomination, soon discovered that if the Union was to be rescued from sectionalism, and the just requirements of the Constitution enforced, the only way to secure these essential results was to elect Mr. BUCHANAN. In his letter of acceptance, dated at Wheatland, June 16, 1856, he stated his views on the subject of the Nebraska bill in language so clear, that it was immediately approved in every part of the country. We copy from that letter as follows:

"The recent legislation of Congress respecting domestic slavery, *derived, as it has been, from the original and pure fountain of political power*, THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY, promises ere long to allay the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded upon principles as ancient as free government itself, and in accordance with them, has simply declared that the people of a territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves, whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits."

And now observe his luminous exposition of the true principle of the Nebraska bill, in the paragraph immediately following the above:

"*This Nebraska-Kansas act does no more than give the force of law to* THIS ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT, declaring it to be the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their own institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. *This principle will surely not be misrepresented by any individual of any party professing devotion to popular government.*"

To show how closely Mr. BUCHANAN followed the example of the National Convention which placed him in nomination, the subjoined extract from the platform of that Convention is full of importance:

Resolved; That we recognize the right of the people of all the territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, ACTING THROUGH THE LEGALLY AND FAIRLY EXPRESSED WILL OF A MAJORITY OF ACTUAL RESIDENTS, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Here again we find the great principle of THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY, clearly, pointedly and expressly asserted and endorsed in the resolution which bears directly upon the Kansas question.

Such was the "case stated" to the people in all the Presidential campaign of 1856. The Republicans asserted that Mr. BUCHANAN favored the raid of the Missourians into Kansas, and that his election would give that territory over to the slave-holders by means of physical force and false ballots; the Democrats fell back upon the declarations of their Convention and their candidate, and were thus impregnably fortified. In the South there was no objection made to the letter of acceptance, because it was harmonious with the platform of the Cincinnati Convention, *which platform was adopted before Mr. Buchanan was nominated, and was most ardently supported by the Southern delegates.* Upon the issue thus distinctly presented, Mr. BUCHANAN was triumphantly chosen President.

He assumed his "high office" on the 4th of March, 1857, and in the presence of his assembled countrymen, on that day, in his inaugural address, declared, anew, his firm adherence to the great principle THAT THE MAJORITY SHALL RULE. We copy from the inaugural as follows:

"What a happy conception, then, was it for Congress to apply this simple rule—THAT THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY SHALL GOVERN—to the settlement of the question of domestic slavery in the Territories! Congress is neither to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; *but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate* their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. As a natural consequence, Congress has also prescribed, that when the Territory of Kansas shall be admitted as a State, it shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission." * * * * * *

"But to this as it may, it is the imperative and indispensable duty of the Government of the United States *to secure to every resident inhabitant the free and independent expression of his opinion by his vote.* This sacred right of each individual must be preserved. That being accomplished, nothing can be fairer than to leave the people of a territory free from all foreign interference, to decide their own destiny for themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Was ever a record more complete? Is there to be found in the whole range of politics a more consistent and straight-forward adherence to principle?

So much for the declarations of Mr. BUCHANAN. Now for his *actions*. He found Kansas a prey to difficulties and dissensions of the most serious character. He had seen three Northern men sent thither as Governors by a former administration, and the last in the first and second, had failed to adjust these troubles. He selected a statesman for the post of Governor of Kansas, who, though born in Pennsylvania, had distinguished himself in Congress, and in the Cabinet, as the representative of the extreme Southern State of Mississippi, by his marvellous devotion and ability to measures deemed most essential to Southern security and prosperity. We need only allude to Mr. WALKER's signal and successful support of the annexation of Texas and the Tariff of 1846—though his whole career is crowded with evidences of his fidelity and courage against the enemies of the South. The selection of Mr. WALKER was hailed by thousands as the best that could be made, and his acceptance of the delicate trust was no where more heartily applauded than in the South. Previous to departing to the scene of his labors, the President instructed him as follows—still keeping in view the great principle that THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY of the voters of Kansas should be conclusive. We quote from Gov. WALKER's own address to the people of Kansas:

"My instructions from the President, through the Secretary of State, under date of the 20th of March last, sustain '*the regular Legislature of the Territory*' in '*assembling a convention to form a Constitution*,' and they express the opinion of the President, that '*when such a Constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Territory they must be protected in the exercise of their right of voting for or against that instrument; and the fair expression of the popular will must not be interrupted by fraud or violence.*"

Various allegations are made against Governor WALKER by the extreme press, North and South. The first declare that he recognizes the laws of the pro-slavery Legislature of the Territory; the second that he has intervened beyond the line of his duty in the matter of advising the submission of the Constitution to a vote of the people. Now, however absurd many of the laws of that Legislature may be, all fair men must see that they were regularly passed by a Legislature chosen under the forms of the organic act. Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WALKER found them on the statute book: they were not responsible for them, and they could not repeal them. So fair and so just is this view of this part of the charge upon Mr. WALKER, that the late attempt of the fanatics of Lawrence to resist these laws, against Governor WALKER, utterly broke down, on account of divisions among themselves as to the policy of such a revolt.

The allegation that Governor WALKER has intervened beyond the line of his duty in advocating the reference of the Constitution of the Territory to the people thereof, we are disposed to regard as more unjust than that of the Abolitionists in reference to the laws of the Territorial Legislature. He had a perilous duty to discharge. He was surrounded with factions. He could not act without large discretionary powers in the midst of such a community. We believe he did his best, and we stand ready to approve his course. He could not hope to satisfy every ultraist. He saw the ample, positive, and comprehensive instructions of the Executive, and he acted upon them. It is reasonable to suppose that the best judges of Governor WALKER's sincerity and patriotism are those immediately interested—viz: the people of the territory; and accordingly we see that at a Convention of Democrats, called to nominate a delegate to Congress, and attended by the leading pro-slavery men of the territory, Governor WALKER's course has been approved, and the project of submitting the Constitution shortly to be formed to the vote of the people, strongly endorsed. If such men as STRINGFELLOW, ISAACS, and others, prominent in all the conflicts with the free-state men in Kansas, are content that Governor WALKER has done his best, they having been witnesses of his action, why should those of the South complain, who are strangers to the facts? The best evidence that his mission did succeed, however, is to be found in this: that his policy is heartily approved by the mass of the people, as well in as out of the territory, and that men of all parties are daily bearing testimony to his impartial, heroic, and indefatigable statesmanship. Although a few violent men in the North may denounce Governor WALKER because he has ignored the farce of the Topeka Convention, and a scarcely larger class of men in the South may oppose him on the allegation that he has intervened beyond the letter of his instructions, yet we rejoice that between these two extremes, widely separated in appearance, and yet unconsciously converging to the same end—there is a vast and irresistible middle majority of practical and patriotic men—a class at this moment larger and more controlling than at any former period of our history. It is not made up of Democrats and Old Line Whigs alone, but includes many who last year voted for FILLMORE and FREMONT. All these citizens have been reared in obedience to the will of the majority. They have been accustomed to respect and to venerate it, and whatever may be, or may have been, their prejudices on this Kansas question, they cannot refuse their approval to the same great principle, and especially so, when it comes to them as a peace offering from a territory so long the theatre of unhappy dissensions.

It is scarcely necessary for us to show how many Constitutions have been submitted to the people for ratification. To take ground against a practice which has prevailed, with few exceptions, North and South, is unworthy of any liberal mind; and to refuse to the people of Kansas an advantage which the people of all the States of the Union, but six or eight, have enjoyed, would be a disgraceful comment upon the boasted theory of popular sovereignty.

While we regret that any portion of our countrymen should array themselves against the attitude of the President in this crisis, we cannot doubt that the statesmen of the South—those who so well understand the Constitution, and who are so justly sensitive on the subject of the rights of the States, will find that Mr. BUCHANAN has taken the only course he could pursue, in justice to himself, and the expectations of the country. Already has a large and controlling portion of the Southern press spoken out in support of his policy, and every day's discussion and inquiry will confirm the ground he has assumed. Indeed, up to this moment, most of the Southern complaints have been directed rather against the expedients to which Governor WALKER has resorted in the midst of the extraordinary excitement which surrounded him, than against the principle asserted in the Nebraska bill, and reiterated in the President's instructions. This principle is as sacred and as old as free government itself; and we predict that the energy and determination of Mr. BUCHANAN, as well as the sagacity and courage of Governor WALKER, through all these grave difficulties, in support of this principle, will be sustained by an immense majority of the American people, North and South.

THE DEFENCES OF PHILADELPHIA.

Although Philadelphia is not so immediately on the sea as New York, yet she would possess no immunity from the assault of a maritime power, if the channel of the tranquil and gentle Delaware should be undefended or unobstructed. The latter means of defence—that of cutting off all communication with the sea—might be in harmony with the nature of an inert and sluggish power like the great Russian Empire, but could never be the true policy of an active people like ours, full of resources, and as happy as they are ready in practical expedients to meet the most unexpected emergencies. A channel of no great intricacy, of less than a hundred miles in extent, winds its way from the Capes, so familiar to the lovers of a plunge in the surf, up the middle of the broad bay of the Delaware, turning Stony Point, passing Reedy Island, where the Bay and River repeatedly, though imperceptibly, change into one another; then opening to the right and left as it approaches the Pea Patch Island, a name identified with legal arguments of the highest acumen, that will be appreciated as long as common law reports are quoted, and the busy scene for the last ten years of the operations of the United States Engineers in building the water battery and castle called Fort Delaware; it comes together soon again before it passes the quiet and lovely town of New Castle, which was the first Christian village to grace the banks of the Delaware, to continue on its serpentine and more river-like course to our own city of many comforts, if of but few pretensions. The Pea Patch Island, which is about half way from the city to the Capes, lies in midriver not over a mile and a quarter from either shore, and is peculiarly well situated to command the double channel running on either side of it. The gallant and patriotic little State of Delaware ceded, in 1813, this island to the Federal Government for the express purpose of having a fortress erected upon it for the defence of the passage up the river. The island at the time was but a mud bank covered at every high tide. The first work was to reclaim it from this constant overflow; shortly after the Peace of 1815, the construction of a regular work was commenced, which was finished and garrisoned, probably as early as 1825. Many of our older inhabitants will, doubtless, recollect its star-shaped form. The art of construction then had not reached the high order it now claims for itself. The soil being only a compressable mud, the foundations proved insecure, and the walls consequently settled and cracked. There was also too large a combination of wood introduced into the structure, which led it to the inevitable fate to which all similar works are destined, that of a conflagration, turning its garrison literally adrift in the hard mid-winter of 1830. The old walls were razed to the ground. Claimants under the State of New Jersey setting up about this time an opposing title to that the United States held under Delaware, Congress, in 1888, directed that all works in constructing a fort on this island should be suspended until the title was settled and fixed in the United States. The matter was eventually referred, by the mutual consent of both parties, that of the United States given under a special act of Congress, to the arbitration of that distinguished jurist and irreproachable lawyer, the late John SERGEANT, who, after listening to learned argument, hearing testimony, and making the closest scrutiny into Colonial records, grants and charters, decided in favor of the right of Delaware to dispose of the island; a decision so truly and deeply founded in law, reason and justice, that there was no one left to contest it. The earlier appropriations for the works which were condemned to the fate narrated, resulted, however, in at least giving the basis of the substantial dike or embankment which still serves to reclaim the surface of the island from the overflow of the high tides of the river. We learn that, independent and exclusive of them, later appropriations, amounting fully to two-thirds of a million of dollars, have already been expended in building the work now constructing; and that it will most likely take altogether a million and a quarter of dollars to finish and complete it. Warned by the fate of the first work, great care and many precautions have been taken in securing the foundations of the new one. In fact, we understand that through the piling of the foundation, the new works have penetrated as far beneath the plane of low water as the battlements are destined to tower above it. The policy which would expedite the completion of a work so indispensable to the defence of our city, shall meet our zealous support, and we shall also be found equally ready to advocate, when the appropriate time comes, the construction of such additional batteries on either shore, as will best serve to give the most efficacious cross-fires, for closing the passage and ascent of the Delaware against the largest fleet of the most powerful steamers that the jealousy or rivalry of the maritime powers of monarchical Europe may ever send, in the vain attempt to crush the growing power, which they so much dread, of this free and happy country. We must here take occasion to to say that we will never yield to any narrow policy that would ask for our own neighborhood a protection that we would not see extended to any other port of importance, whether north or south, east or west, on the Atlantic, on the Lakes, on the Gulf, or on the Pacific. Against a foreign foe this Union of States is, and we trust ever shall be, to every true and loyal American, but one common country, of which no part can be touched without all rising to resent the injury and redress the wrong.

In advocating the making of all necessary preparations for the defence of our city and its trade, we shall not deem our full duty discharged, and forget the great claims of the commerce of our State upon the fostering care and protection of the Federal Government. Governments are instituted to look after such material interests of the people as cannot safely be left to the care of individual watchfulness. A Federal Government like ours stands in a similar aspect to the people of the States, and should be kept ever active in the full exercise of all its legitimate functions. We shall be disposed to class among these functions such indispensible National works as neither individual enterprise nor separate State action can effect. The commerce of Pennsylvania carried in vessels beyond its borders by water, along natural channels of navigation, from its three principal outlets, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Erie, is in our estimation fully entitled to all the fostering care that the government, empowered to regulate it, can legitimately extend to it. But we shall most certainly never seek its development through any of those minor confederacies of several States, which some among us have seemed disposed to suggest and advocate, but which would more likely serve, according to our notions, as nestlings of secession and disunion, than lead to any useful end.

A WORD ABOUT THE WESTERN MAIL.

Change not always Reform.

There has been much talk lately about improving the mail service between Philadelphia and the principal commercial points in the "Great West," and we learn that the discussion of the subject has induced the Post-office Department to project some new schedules for the mail trains departing in that direction. The changes proposed are intended to embrace the mails going west from New York and Baltimore, as well as those from this city. It seems to be the design of the Post-office Department to arrange such hours of departure from Philadelphia, New York and Baltimore, respectively, as will insure a junction of all three lines at Columbus, Ohio, at one hour, the mails from the three cities to go forward from that point by the same train. If this design is carefully executed, it will, doubtless, be a great improvement upon all existing arrangements; but, on the other hand, if due precaution is not used, the change may prove it to be anything else than a reform. For instance, it is alleged that it is in contemplation to despatch our great western mail by the fast train, at 12.55-P. M.

Now, this at first sight appears to be an improvement, but a moment's thought will show that it is not. The mail, by this arrangement, would close about 11 A. M., an hour so early that the day's business is scarcely commenced. Correspondence therefore can only refer to the transactions of the day before, and thus a business day is lost at our end of the line. But trace it further, and, we find that the mail departing at such an undesirable hour, must reach Cincinnati and St. Louis at hours still worse, making a loss at that end also. For example, a letter advising of Monday's transactions, will be written at 9 or 10 A. M. on Tuesday—leave about 1 on that day—reach Cincinnati late on Wednesday afternoon, and be read on Thursday morning. The same drawbacks would attend letters sent by that line from Philadelphia to St. Louis, as they would arrive at the latter city at so late an hour on Thursday, that very few indeed would be delivered until Friday.

It requires but a glance to see that this would be advancing "like a crab." The right time of departure for a great mail train is *after the business of the day is done*, and the precise hour should be regulated by the time at which it is desirable to have the mail *arrive at its destination*. Mail time does not always begin and end at the time of departure and arrival of the train. It commences rather at the close of the day to which the correspondence relates, and terminates at the *business hour* when the letter is first read. Changes that are not governed by these considerations will run great risk of failure. Indeed, unless the running time of the mail trains between Philadelphia, Cincinnati and St. Louis is greatly increased in speed, our merchants and people had better "let well enough alone." At present, a letter from Philadelphia to Cincinnati, detailing all the transactions of Monday, is delivered in Cincinnati in time for action on Wednesday morning. It leaves our city after business is over, and reaches the other just before it begins. The same advantages are now given to letters between Philadelphia and St. Louis. By direction of Postmaster WESTCOTT, the mails to St. Louis now take a route which insures them a degree of dispatch that the proposed arrangement can scarcely improve, and may damage very much. The mail to St. Louis which closes here at 9, P. M. to-day, is delivered in the counting-houses of St. Louis early on Thursday morning—losing no *business hours* at either end of the line. It departs at a convenient hour, and arrives at destination a the hour of greatest advantage, and this, as we have already remarked, is the true standard by which to judge all proposed changes of the mails. Will some of our Cincinnati and St. Louis houses favor us with their views?

STATE POLITICS.

We give below the recent correspondence on the subject of introducing into this State a new system of conducting campaigns, and invite attention to the reasons given by the State Committee for rejecting it. The proposed innovation is repudiated with boldness and distinctness.

The Committee truly assert that the Democratic party of our State has never formally approved the *system* of campaigning before mass meetings by Executive candidates. The addresses of Governor BIGLER, in 1851, were induced by the course of the opposing candidate, and were made with a protest by him against the propriety of the practice upon original grounds.

If this were a campaign like that of last year, when the public mind was greatly excited, and when National issues were involved, or if the same necessities existed that made the contests of 1851 and 1854 so memorable, the case would be very different. Now, however, we are at peace among ourselves. The Democrats and old-line Whigs, and all conservative men, rally around General PACKER, as the leader of the Constitutional party of our State; and nothing could result from the meeting of the candidates in this campaign but a revival of animosities, by which no one would be benefitted but the man and the men whose only hope in politics is to keep alive the unhappy dissensions growing out of the slavery question:

GENERAL PACKER TO THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE.

WILLIAMSPORT, July 18, 1857

HON. C. R. BUCKALEW, *Chairman of State Committee—Dear Sir*: I have received the enclosed letter from one of the opposing candidates for the Gubernatorial office, and inasmuch as it proposes a plan for the conduct of the campaign which has never before been practised in Pennsylvania, and as the success of other candidates, besides myself, is involved in the election, I have thought it my duty to submit the communication to the judgment of the State Committee representing the Democratic party. If it is thought to be a proper mode of conducting the canvass, I shall cheerfully accede to the proposition.

Respectfully yours,
WM. F. PACKER.

REPLY OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STATE COMMITTEE.

PHILADELPHIA, July 25th, 1857.

HON. WM. F. PACKER—*Dear Sir*: I have laid before the State Committee the letter signed D. Wilmot, dated the 14th instant, and am authorized to say to you that in the opinion of the Committee you ought not to accede to the proposition it contains. The reasons for this opinion I will proceed briefly to state.

The slavery question, which it is probable your opponent proposes to discuss, has very recently been thoroughly considered and passed upon by the people of this Commonwealth. The late Presidential canvass involved the whole subject so far as it was proper for consideration by our people, and we can perceive no utility in its re-discussion at this time; nor any other good reason for reopening debate upon it. The position of our party is well understood, and requires no vindication by any extraordinary proceeding like that proposed.

A joint canvass by candidates for the Gubernatorial office has never been conducted in this State, nor, I believe, in any other Northern one, and may well be questioned on grounds of public policy. If the practice be once adopted, it will doubtless continue, and party nominations be uniformly made with reference to it. No party will venture to select a candidate for this office who is not qualified for the stump; and aptitude for debate will hence come to be preferred to administrative ability. In short, the result will be to confine nominations to the class of talkers, and to exclude all others. A rule of party action which would prevent such men as Benjamin Franklin, Simon Snyder and Francis R. Shunk from filling the Executive chair of this State, must be a bad one, and deserves to be denounced rather than adopted.

We believe there is a considerable public opinion against the propriety of executive candidates appearing at all before popular meetings to solicit votes. This was first practised by Wm. F. Johnston in 1848, and has been to some extent followed by candidates since. The good results of it are not obvious. It did not originate with the Democratic party, nor has it ever received any formal popular or party sanction. It may therefore be considered an open question in future practice, and at all events as forming no part of the *duty* of a candidate imposed upon him by his nomination.

While your opponent holds the office of President Judge, there is a special objection to the acceptance of his project. The propriety of law judges taking part in the political meetings is denied by our party, and is opposed by sound public opinion. By no act whatever ought we to sanction or encourage participation in a prostitution of the judicial character. Nor will a resignation now made altogether remove this objection. Your opponent has intentionally held his office until within three months of the election, (rendering it impossible to elect a successor the present year,) and if a resignation should now take place, it would obviously be with the intention of resuming the office after defeat for the post to which he aspires.

The proposed mode of conducting campaigns may possibly be suited to some of the Southern and South-western States, where it has been practiced, and where population and political conditions differ from ours; but its introduction here would be against solid objections, and without any conceivable good. It is, therefore, a proposed "southern aggression" upon the practices and policy of parties in Pennsylvania, which cannot be at all accepted or permitted.

It is well that this question has arisen when we have a candidate capable and fit for any discussion before the people, and when the decision can be placed, without embarrassment, upon the public grounds which control it.

I am very respectfully, your obed't servant,
C. R. BUCKALEW, Chairman.

GEN. PACKER TO JUDGE WILMOT.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., July 27, 1857.

HON. D. WILMOT.—*Dear Sir*:—Your letter of the 14th inst, was duly received; and as it proposed to plan for conducting the Gubernatorial Campaign which had never hitherto been adopted in Pennsylvania, and as it proposes a plan for the conduct of the campaign which has never before been practised in Pennsylvania, and as the success of other candidates, besides myself, is involved in the election, I have thought it my duty to submit the communication to the judgment of the State Committee representing the Democratic party. If it is thought to be a proper mode of conducting the canvass, I shall cheerfully accede to the proposition.

Respectfully yours,
WM. F. PACKER.

REPLY OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STATE COMMITTEE.

PHILADELPHIA, July 25th, 1857.

HON. WM. F. PACKER—*Dear Sir*: I have laid before the State Committee the letter signed D. Wilmot, dated the 14th instant, and am authorized to say to you that in the opinion of the Committee you ought not to accede to the proposition it contains. The reasons for this opinion I will proceed briefly to state.

The Committee truly assert that the Democratic party of our State has never formally approved the *system* of campaigning before mass meetings by Executive candidates. The addresses of Governor BIGLER, in 1851, were induced by the course of the opposing candidate, and were made with a protest by him against the propriety of the practice upon original grounds.

If this were a campaign like that of last year, when the public mind was greatly excited, and when National issues were involved, or if the same necessities existed that made the contests of 1851 and 1854 so memorable, the case would be very different. Now, however, we are at peace among ourselves. The Democrats and old-line Whigs, and all conservative men, rally around General PACKER, as the leader of the Constitutional party of our State; and nothing could result from the meeting of the candidates in this campaign but a revival of animosities, by which no one would be benefitted but the man and the men whose only hope in politics is to keep alive the unhappy dissensions growing out of the slavery question:

GENERAL PACKER TO THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE.

WILLIAMSPORT, July 18, 1857

HON. C. R. BUCKALEW, *Chairman of State Committee—Dear Sir*: I have received the enclosed letter from one of the opposing candidates for the Gubernatorial office, and inasmuch