

The National Intelligencer,

A N D

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. I. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, NEW-JERSEY AVENUE, NEAR THE CAPITOL. No. CXXII.

Five Dollars per Ann.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 14th, 1861.

PAID IN ADVANCE.

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT.
 AS it appears to me in the highest degree conducive to the welfare of a republic that the people should be well informed, I propose offering a few remarks additional to those which have been already made on some recent appointments by the President. From the tendency of error to multiply to accumulate, and to be emboldened by impunity, it is of great moment to the cause of truth, to eradicate, as far as discernible, its first germs. It is certainly true that public satisfaction has arisen at the removal of the managers of the administration; it is true that the whole of it, when proposed to its sources, will be found to originate either in a spirit of pre-determined criminality or in a disposition of personal ambition. Yet, left unattended, unworthy as even these are, should, under the mark of patriotism, seduce one honest mind, I will without further preface, explain the justifiable grounds, on which the removal of certain officials has been made.

My preceding remarks must have convinced the reader, that the change of Marshals and Attorneys, which has taken place, was effected by prompt and that the public good absolutely required it.

The removal, which I am about to notice, will also appear to have proceeded altogether from a regard to the general independence of personal and political prejudices. They are chiefly confined to certain Revenue officers, who have been removed, in the opinion of the writer, on one or other, or all of the following grounds: 1. Inattention in the payment of monies actually received, or which ought to have been received; or a failure to account to the Treasury.

2. Gross immorality of character.
3. Incompetency to discharge official duties.
4. Negligent attention to the discharge of duties.
5. Settled hostility and active enmity to republican principles.

One or all of these charges will be found to apply to this class of removals. How far they are just grounds of removal will appear, if any elucidation be required, by the following observations.

1. Inattention in the payment of monies actually received, or which ought to have been received; or a failure to account to the Treasury.
 The expense of our revolutions is frugally, and the occurrence of full-grown evils, have been viewed to a considerable magnitude, the taxes imposed by the government. As this people, who pay them, contribute them for their own good, they have a right to demand their regular and faithful devotion to that exclusive purpose. As all times they pass it this right; but at the present time, the right appears affected with uncommon vigour. A belief, well founded or not, exists, that taxes have been needlessly multiplied; and that public treasure has been thoughtlessly lavished, not to promote the public good, but to enrich individuals, and to increase, in an unconditional way, the fortune of the executive. This conviction is so indelibly associated with respect to the removal by the people of the late administration. Under such circumstances, the people have a right to expect from their new rulers the application to subordinate officers of a rigid principle of justice. As, therefore, the President values the good will of his constituents, must his solicitude be to prevent, as well as to remove, all such existing or probable grounds of complaint. Under such impressions he will remove, first of all, 1. either withheld from the public monies actually collected; 2. or who have neglected, thru partiality or negligence, to enforce the payment of public monies; 3. or who, from their partial conduct, prove that in a season of temptation, when appointments professed, they were guilty of such acts, however exempt from them they may be, under the fear of being rigidly called to account; 4. or, 4. men who fail to render, at prescribed periods, their accounts, without which it is impossible to ascertain their fidelity.

2. Gross immorality of character.
 In a republic, no man can be respectable in public, who is odious in a private, station. However fit an instrument vice may be in States of society, corrupt, and under governments despotic, where the public good is scarcely the pretext of governors, we believe, and it is hoped our practice will continue to illustrate the belief, that vice is even more essential in public than in private life. It is not only consistent with in either; but that, as in the former, the sphere of influence and the temptation to misconduct are greater, so in the individuals thus situated, hold public a heavier penalty.

Among those immoralities, which are the most disgraceful to ourselves, as well as the most pernicious to society, is intemperance. Do not all men, and all nations, then the drunkards, even in the relations of private life? If such a man posses property, is it not a proverb that he will follow it? Yet how many a man, who is expected that a nation will trust its concerns to him? Would not the continuance of such a man in either a post of profit or honor, be a dishonor to the government that continues him? Would not the continuance of such a man in either a post of profit or honor, be a dishonor to the government that continues him? Would not the continuance of such a man in either a post of profit or honor, be a dishonor to the government that continues him?

Yet such men have been removed, and for the removal of such men, Mr. Jefferson is entitled to the credit of a statesman. Party clamor condemn the removals, blame the charges, and triumphantly alledge Washington of Adams have appeared drunkards! But how few are the friends of such a man, who are appointed drunkards. We are advised, that neither of those gentlemen would knowingly have committed such an act. We further believe that neither of them actually did so. That we believe and know, that men, thus appointed, became to alter their appointments. Certificates to this effect are in existence.

3. Incompetency to discharge official duties.
 A man may be appointed to a particular office under a full impression of competency to a discharge of its duties, and yet the mode in which its duties that be discharged may convince the appointing power of his incompetency. Notwithstanding a want of qualification for a particular place, he may in general be well informed, and he may be thrifty virtuous. We all of us know that in this country the influence of party has been so dominant, that in many cases the necessary profits to appointment, has not been, what are a man's talents, but what are his politics; what is the weight of his interest with the people? Appointments, dictated by such motives, cannot be supposed, in all instances, to have been made from an unbiased regard to the qualifications of individuals. In some cases, citizens, scarcely able to write grammatically or intelligibly, have been entrusted with the superintendance of extensive and involved accounts.

When we consider the President, as we must in all cases consider him, as answerable for all the injury accruing to the public from the continuance of an incompetent officer, first of all, the office himself, agree that it is his duty to remove in all cases where a man's talents are unequal to the faithful discharge of duties assigned him.

4. Negligent attention to the discharge of duties.

As an individual, who undertakes to discharge duties, to the performance of which it is unequal, ought not to expect a continuance in office, to enable him to expect a continuance, who, with competent talents, either entirely neglected to perform, or devotes on others which his performance. The truth which his performance is made. If, where he is to be employed, such compensation allowed, it is not in his clerk—it is his discretion, not the discretion of a clerk, that is confided in. It is for his time and his talents. That in general, a liberal compensation is made. If, where he is to be employed, such compensation allowed, it is not in his clerk—it is his discretion, not the discretion of a clerk, that is confided in. It is for his time and his talents. That in general, a liberal compensation is made.

he should himself with more correct conduct, it follows that an additional expense is created beyond that contemplated by law, and the fealty for a faithful and able discharge of duty deflected or destroyed. Under our government there are two descriptions of office. The first embraces those of the higher order, whose chief duties are the general superintendance of subordinate officers, and the obtaining in order to Congress, and the Executive, correct and comprehensive statements of the results of particular laws, and the manner in which they are executed. In the necessary discharge of these duties, a large share of attention is involved. A fidelity of the best means requires, in many cases, extensive general information, and laborious reflection. From such officers, therefore, to require the duties of a clerk, would be to hazard the great interests of the country. Such duties, of course, are not expected. But the second class embraces officers chiefly ministerial, who legitimately have little or no duty to perform, and are rationally be expected a personal devotion to all the duties of office, and in many instances no other than the duties of a clerk are required to be performed.

With such a class, instead of attending themselves to official duties, pass their time in indolent inactivity, or in an attention to private or political pursuits entirely distinct from the nature of their office. From such officers may rationally be expected a personal devotion to all the duties of office, and in many instances no other than the duties of a clerk are required to be performed.

To give an illustrating example of these remarks, it is only necessary to advert to the case of Henry Miller, removed from the office of Supervisor of Pennsylvania. Mr. Miller, when appointed to this office resided in York county, where his political influence was indubitably to be great. The office of Supervisor was held in 1798, in Philadelphia, and as the office, from its constitution, is a superintending one, under which the whole internal revenue of Pennsylvania is collected, it would seem more than other offices, to require the presence of the principal.

In the month of June of that year, a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives for determining the compensation of the officers engaged in the internal revenue, whose incidental expenses, &c. had previously, by the direction of Congress, been laid before them. The subject was taken up by a member of the House, who observed by a member that the charge for clerk hire made by Mr. Miller was uncommonly great, and it was further remarked that this probably arose from the frequent absence of Mr. Miller, who was then in York county, instead of being at Philadelphia. Mr. Otis replied, with great animation, that in the present state of the country clerk hire was a *pretext consideration, infinitely outweighed by the services which the Supervisor of Pennsylvania had rendered, and was then rendering his country, by his absence from Philadelphia (the seat of office) and his patriotic employments in York county.*

What these employments were will fully appear from the existing circumstances of the times. The period of election in Pennsylvania was at hand. At this election were to be chosen thirteen members of the federal House of Representatives, and the members of the State legislatures. The Allen and Sedition bills, recently passed, had excited great indignation in Pennsylvania. In York county, heretofore devoted to Federalism, and considered as its stronghold, in that it is the people were so indignant that in one day petitions against those laws from 1600 persons were presented to Congress. The language of these petitions, and more especially the numbers by which they were signed, alarmed the Federal members. They knew their cause would be defeated, should Pennsylvania be lost to them. The influence of Mr. Miller was relied upon to calm the agitation of York, and he was immediately dispatched to arrest the progress of popular resentment. He, unfortunately for the enemies of republicanism, popular resent-

ment, though slow to anger, when once roused, by the remembrance of ruin, does not soon abate. The people do not soon forget their oppressors, and Mr. Miller has, since that period, had the mortification of labouring ineffectually against the tide of public opinion. It is fortunate, that in a contest between himself and the people, he should find himself on the weaker side.

It is not intended by the writer of these remarks, that the removal of Mr. Miller exclusively on his infidelity grounds, though most men will be in an abundant justification of the act. If any information, other than that which is official, should be relied upon, the late Supervisor of Pennsylvania has been removed not so much by the act of the Executive, who has given his commission to another, as by the force of the revenue laws that virtually make it the duty of the President to remove delinquent officers. It is fortunate, that the law, passed into the Treasury all monies received by him I had, he, at the legal periods, rendered his accounts.—Undoubtedly, he can prove these facts, they may well be believed.

5. Settled hostility and active enmity to republican principles.

Though in a republican government every officer should be suffered, without oppression or reproach to the people, to decide, and to declare what he thinks, it by no means follows that all men, whatever may be their opinions and declarations, have a right to be placed in places of profit and honor. The government has no obligation to the government by which it is protected, whereas the public officer is indebted by that government often with great advantage. If this influence is employed in depreciating republican principles, in overlooking and persecuting those who profess them, and in endangering the public peace, has not a republican government, itself the guardian of republican principles, a moral right to displace him? Would it not be a necessary to a political crime, if it did not displace him?

If in any individual shall have been actively engaged at New-York, and another that shall have been equally active at Philadelphia, in times that tried men's souls, when an invading enemy defoliated the country, and both shall have manifested no energy in their old convictions, shall the man, who, when the declaration of independence, be condemned for diluting their republicanism?

These are the grounds, it is presumed from the personal knowledge of the writer, on which most, if not all, of the recent removals have been made. They are grounds which are deemed substantial and conclusive. No man, unprejudiced by party feeling, can consider public monies as safe in the hands of a defaulter, of one who is grossly immoral, incompetent, or negligent.

But it may be enquired, if these charges exist and can be sustained, why are they not officers, displaced at the time of removal? To this question it may be replied, that to assign them would be unnecessarily to wound the character of the person removed. Were the act of removal dictated by malevolent feelings to the individual displaced, such feelings would find their highest gratification in giving publicity to his ignorance or misconduct. But no such vindictive passions being indulged, it must be the wish of the Executive rather to vindicate than to aggravate the impropriety of duty, which a regard to the public interest alone enforces. A man may be altogether unfit for a public, who may yet be well qualified for a private station. To proclaim his incompetency for the former, might blight his prospects in the latter. While, therefore, a respect to the public constrains his removal, a regard to him as a man recommends his being treated with leniency and forbearance.

He who has read the partial and empassioned statements of party, would, without other information, be apt to believe that every Federalist, every friend to the late administration, had removed. But how great will be his surprise when informed that out of ONE HUNDRED AND NINE TY-TWO Revenue Officers, not more than TEN have been displaced;—that