THE PITTSBURGH GAZETTE

BY KRAMER BROOKS & Co.

PITTSBURGH:
TUESDAY MORNING, OCT. 5, 1847.

☞ The Pittsburgh Daily Gazette is published daily, Tri-Weekly, and Weekly—The Daily is Seven Dollars per annum, the Tri-Weekly is Five Dollars per annum, the Weekly is Two Dollars per annum strictly in advance.

Notice to Advertisers.

☞ Advertisements, to secure insertion, should be handed in before the hour of publication in the afternoon. A caution to that one the part of our customers, would be productive of mutual benefit.

FOR GOVERNOR,
GEN. JAMES IRVIN,
(OF CENTRE COUNTY.)

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
JOSEPH W. PATTON,
(OF CUMBERLAND COUNTY.)

FOR SENATOR,
GEORGE DARSIE, of Allegheny City.

FOR ASSEMBLY,
LEWIS C. S. NOBLE, of Indiana Tp.
CORNELIUS SIVELY, of Wilkins Tp.
MARSHALL SWARTZWELDER, Pittsburgh.
HENRY LARUE, of Mifflin Tp.

FOR COUNTY TREASURER,
F. W. BAXTER, of Pittsburgh.

FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONER,
THOMAS PERKINS, of Lower St. Clair Tp.

FOR AUDITOR,
WILLIAM GAVEN, of Versailles Tp.

STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

THOMAS S. FRANKLIN, Lancaster City.
JOHN C. KUNKEL, Dauphin County.
THOMAS DUNCAN, " "
JAMES MARTIN, " "
THOMAS C. HAMBLY, York.
WILLIAM M. WATTS, Cumberland.
DANIEL SMYSER, Adams.
JOHN F. WETHERILL, Philadelphia City.
JOHN S. CHANDLER, " "
ROBERT T. CONRAD, " "
THOMAS McKEAN, Philadelphia County.
MILLER LUTHER, Berks.
ROBERT M. BARD, Franklin.
JOHN M. P. MUHLENNAN, Washington.
ANDREW J. DILL, Somerset.
JAMES M. DUNN, Allegheny.
RICHARD IRWIN, Vernon.
ROBERT H. KUNKE, Westmoreland.
J. BALLIET, Schuylkill.
H. D. MAXWELL, Northampton.
J. B. SALISBURY, Susquehanna.
J. BLANCHARD, Ft. Wayne.
SAMUEL A. PURVIANCE, Butler.
HENRY S. EVANS, Chester.
JACOB L. YOTER, Montgomery.

☞ We have Commercial Intelligence, Domestic Marriages, News Items, Money Market, &c., on last page.

☞ See Sixth Page for 31 articles in one Foreign News.

MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH

AT MARSHFIELD.

The Springfield Republican, of Thursday morning, brings us the following sketch of Mr. Webster's remarks at the Whig State Convention held in that town on Wednesday.

At the re-assembling of the Convention in the afternoon, the President introduced the Hon. David Webster, who was greeted with hearty and prolonged applause.

The distinguished Senator then commenced an able, argumentative and unusually interesting and important speech, which was of an hour and an half's duration. He defined his position upon the subject, the questions growing out of it, with distinctness, boldness and firmness.

After some statesmanlike comments upon the character of Governments, the duty of allegiance, the Constitution so far as it relates to the war-making power, and the call for a firm discharge of his duty which the present nomination of our National officers, makes upon every patriot, he proceeded to the War topic. The crisis now at hand needs consideration, calmness and consistent national action. But the deprecated violent movements of Violent counsels are weak counsels. Violent language weak language. Our boldest resolutions must recommend themselves by their strength, firmness, dignity and respect. It is not the loud waters that are the deepest. Nor is it the spirit which is inclined to overpower the most certain to withstand them when they speak.

Mr. Webster held the Mexican war to be unjustifiable in its origin, and founded on pretences. The laws of nations divide motives for war into those which are good and those which are vicious. Those which are commenced and carried on for renown, conquest, and similar objects, are vicious. There may be sufficient cause for a War between two nations, but no good motive for War. Causes require something else; motives, good motives, are requisite. The character of the war against Mexico is vicious; it is a war of pretexts. The real motive of it is not distinctly avowed.

There are three pretexts—all of them unfound—on which this war is sought to be placed by its advocates and defenders. The President, in his Message to Congress, May 11, 1846, puts it on the fact that the Mexicans have invaded American territory, and shed American blood. In my opinion, this is not correct. As early as January, 1845, a war army was advanced beyond the Mexican frontier of Texas, and upon the left bank of the Rio Grande occurred the first shedding of American and Mexican blood. Was this the invasion of American territory, and the spilling of American blood on such territory? It was said claimed by the United States Executive—not by Congress—and also claimed by the Mexican government as such a part of her territory as the Capital itself, and it was, moreover, in her actual possession. Our troops were marched into a country claimed and occupied by the Mexicans—not this, war on our part? The President's statement is not correct in point of fact, and cannot be made so. This is a pretext. Other causes were brought forward after the war commenced. One was that Mexico would not receive our Minister, Plenipotentiary. Is that cause of war—if an Executive war? Congress would not declare war on such grounds. At any rate, it was not a circumstance that called for such speedy action that the Executive could not lay it before Congress when before him. It is but another of the pretexts and pretexts on which the war is sought to be defended.

Both on the—and the third—of these pretexts is that Mexico has declined to pay her debts due citizens of this country. This was not put forth in the act of Congress declaring war to exist. It is an after thought. This matter of debt was of long standing; many sessions of Congress had been held during the existence of the debt. Yet no war was declared on this ground. And if it was a cause for the war, it surely afforded no pretence for an executive war, as this is. It is a pretext, and nothing but a pretext.

We inquire, then, what was the object of the war?—I do not pretend to possess more, if no much, sagacity than other men; but to me the answer to this question is as plain as a turnpike, as visible as the sun that now shines upon us.

An eminent Statesman—perhaps the most eminent of the party of the administration; indeed he is so eminent that the wonder is, the administration does not belong to him, instead of he to the administration. This gentleman, I mean Mr. Calhoun, declared at the last session in Congress, that if there had been no annexation of Texas there would have been no War, and that the immediate cause of the War was the ordering by the Executive, he is remembered, of our troops to advance from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande. Hence this question is settled—no Annexation, no War.

I am no apologist for Mexico. I have a poor opinion of the Mexican government. I pity the people of the country; and should pity them the more if they knew the state they were in. It is the worst governed of any country in the world, that pretends to be civilized. It has been for 20 years the prey of every military upstart, who had money enough to get up a miserable army. From 1821, when first was the battle of San Jacinto, to 1842, Mexico had no authority over Texas, but just claim upon her territory. In 1841-2-3, Texas was an independent government, so nominally, so practically, so recognized by our own and other governments. Mexico had no ground of complaint in the transaction of Texas, we are the party to complain—we did not want Texas. But she did after almost she persisted in claiming Texas as her province, long as it had been an independent government, and broke off terms of amity with our government, calling home her Ministers, and refusing to receive our own. But this was not war—war for fresh is.

I contend that the precise object of the war was plainly this: Paredes became President in March, 1846. Santa Anna was exiled to Cuba, upon whose is called half-pay, in June of the same year. He was discontented with his residence there and I have strong suspicions that his half-pay was not paid. Through 1845, this state of things continued, matters between the two governments were unsettled and unsatisfactory. Mexico held back and was warlike in her tone. In January, 1846, the U. S. Army was ordered to advance to the Rio Grande; in order, says Mr. Buchanan, to repel an Congress should authorize in case of the rejection of Mr. Sildell, then in Mexico. At this time came forth rumors that Santa Anna was more favorable to peace, that is more willing to accommodate on the Annexation difficulty than Paredes; and the last very day in January, a message was sent by Com. Conner of the Gulf Squadron, saying that if Santa Anna came that way to let him pass Mexico. How came it to suppose that he was likely to come that way?

At the same time, Alexander Sildell, brother to our Minister to Mexico, was sent to Cuba by the Government. At this time, also a person named Gwin, was an agent of the United States in Mexico, was a member of political conversation in Mexico, and Santa Anna had been invited to return to Mexico by the U. S. authorities. The President, in his Message, says not a word of the way of Santa Anna's return, or of the way of Sildell's mission. The President's statement is not correct in point of fact, and cannot be made so. This is a pretext. Other causes were brought forward after the war commenced. One was that Mexico would not receive our Minister Plenipotentiary. Is that cause of war—if an Executive war? Congress would not declare war on such grounds. At any rate, it was not a circumstance that called for such speedy action that the Executive could not lay it before Congress when before him. It is but another of the pretexts and pretexts on which the war is sought to be defended.

Both of the—and the third—of these pretexts is that Mexico has declined to pay her debts due citizens of this country. This was not put forth in the act of Congress declaring war to exist. It is an after thought. This matter of debt was of long standing; many sessions of Congress had been held during the existence of the debt. Yet no war was declared on this ground. And if it was a cause for the war, it surely afforded no pretence for an executive war, as this is. It is a pretext, and nothing but a pretext.

We inquire, then, what was the object of the war?—I do not pretend to possess more, if no much, sagacity than other men; but to me the answer to this question is as plain as a turnpike, as visible as the sun that now shines upon us.

An eminent Statesman—perhaps the most eminent of the party of the administration; indeed he is so eminent that the wonder is, the administration does not belong to him, instead of he to the administration. This gentleman, I mean Mr. Calhoun, declared at the last session in Congress, that if there had been no annexation of Texas there would have been no War, and that the immediate cause of the War was the ordering by the Executive, he is remembered, of our troops to advance from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande. Hence this question is settled—no Annexation, no War.

I am no apologist for Mexico. I have a poor opinion of the Mexican government. I pity the people of the country; and should pity them the more if they knew the state they were in. It is the worst governed of any country in the world, that pretends to be civilized. It has been for 20 years the prey of every military upstart, who had money enough to get up a miserable army. From 1821, when first was the battle of San Jacinto, to 1842, Mexico had no authority over Texas, no