

October 9
Liber No. 78
p. 382

but accompanied it with an ungracious Observation, that your furnishing it was to be imputed to Condescension, not a Sense of Duty. However, the Result of the Enquiry evinced the Necessity of making it; for it appeared you had actually fallen into the Error we apprehended, from whence an Argument might be deduced, that "the Intendant's being bound by an Oath, his being obliged to give Bond and Security for the due Execution of his Office, and his being responsible for his Conduct, to the Legislature of a free Republic," are not Restraints sufficient to prevent his doing very considerable Injury to the State; for, had he gone on in the Exercise of this Power, what might have been the Consequence? Surely neither he nor his Friends will deny, that he had the same Right of compounding with all the Purchasers of Confiscated Property, for one Half of the Purchase Money, that he had to compound with Rawlings. The same Motive which prompted the Enquiry, induced our Interference in the other Case. We knew the Assembly had solemnly appropriated by Act £20,000 Specifics for the Payment of distressed Creditors and others who had advanced Money to the State on Promises of speedy Payment. A Letter of yours was laid before us, wherein you declared your Intention of remitting £50,000 to Congress, before you paid those Creditors, altho' you were sensible the whole Specifics would not raise the Sum. This Conduct we thought contrary to Law, a Violation of the Faith of the State, and injurious to Individuals; and we therefore pointed out the Law to you, and advised and required you to govern yourself by it: and altho' you continue to deny our Right of doing this, we must do you the Justice to confess that your Practice has not been correspondent to your Theory, for you have given up all Idea of remitting the £50,000 to Congress, without reserving enough to pay the Creditors, and in no Instance since our Interference, have you refused to pay a Creditor who came under the Act, and we trust you will not, notwithstanding your Declarations.

Thus having stated our Motive for requiring Information from you, and directing you in the Execution of your Duty, we will now endeavour to convince you of our Right.

You observe there is no such Idea in our Constitution as a general discretionary superintending Power in the Executive, where the Law is silent. We presume to be of a different Opinion. It would be no unreasonable Position should we assert that the very Word Executive conveys the Idea of superintending the Execution of Laws, but there is little Occasion to insist on this Doctrine, as we derive the Authority in Question from that Article in the Constitution, which expressly empowers us to suspend or remove any Civil Officer not holding a Commission during good Behaviour. For what Purpose was the Power given? does it not most forcibly and necessarily imply a Right to enquire into and be informed of the Conduct of the Officer subject