

tached to him by the Commissioners was a little hastiness of temper. He should support that gentleman because he had been completely exonerated, and because public officers were made targets for discontented persons of every class, who used the grossest charges without previously enquiring whether they could be in every degree borne out.

MR. MACDONALD (Kingston.) would be very sorry to send any person to the institution under Dr. Scott's care, after reading the exculpator's report in his favor. It was established that there was great neglect, and gross brutality; one insane person had been permitted to hang herself in the presence of another insane person,—perhaps by the time a dozen had committed suicide, the experience of Dr. Scott would be sufficient to prevent further mischief. Infamous language was made use of by him to persons of the highest respectability; numerous cases of misconduct in office were charged against him; yet an inquiry into the management of that institution was refused, apparently because he was the son-in-law of Dr. Roaf, while an inquiry was instituted into the management of the Penitentiary, as he must suppose, because the warden was the father of the member for Frontenac. Dr. Scott was proved guilty of peculation in a small way, and government turns the charge into ridicule, although the charge of peculating forage, made against the warden of the Penitentiary, was seriously inquired into, and although not proved, was stated by Mr. Leslie as one of the grounds of dismissal from office.

MR. H. SHERWOOD regretted that the government should refuse an inquiry, as such a course would have the most injurious effect on the Institution. No institution required so much close investigation as one, in which three or four hundred unfortunate beings deprived of reason were detained. The House was told that Dr. Scott was a hasty man, treated his patients harshly, and would they refuse a demand for inquiry? If so, then all confidence in it would be destroyed, and no one would be willing to trust their relatives under the care of a man so incompetent for the office of Superintendent.

HON. MR. HINCKS said that the twelve Commissioners who drew up the report

had the deepest interest in the welfare of the institution, and if they conceived that Dr. Scott was guilty of the charges preferred, they would most certainly have dismissed him, as they had the power to do so in their own hands. But they did not find that the charges were substantiated, and the Government were bound to sustain their report.

SOL.-GEN. McDONALD asked if the House was to be told that the Asylum must be inquired into, merely because the honorable member for Toronto said there should be an inquiry? He did not believe an inquiry was the real object of the hon. members opposite; but they had obtained what there could be no doubt was the real object, the delivery of an immense amount of vituperation against gentlemen who were not in a position to answer them.

MR. LYON could not see any use in appointing a committee to investigate this matter again as it had been investigated fully already by the Commissioners. What decision could the committee come to, other than the Board had come to? It would be impossible for them to rid the Institution of Dr. Scott. The whole responsibility was borne by the Government, and he was desirous that it should be borne by no other. He should therefore oppose the demand for an inquiry.

COL. PRINCE said that the report of the Board asserted merely that Dr. Scott was a gentleman of hasty temperament, and rather hasty in his language to the servants. Every other part of the debate fell to the ground, and the conclusion of the report, which stated that it was a matter of congratulation that he was in charge of the Asylum, ought to be quite sufficient to absolve him from this charge.

MR. RICHARDS contended that the report before the House was quite satisfactory, inasmuch as no suspicion could be thrown on the parties who framed it.

MR. SMITH, (Durham) was satisfied that a great blow was struck at the usefulness of the Asylum by the negative put on the motion for inquiry. There was no institution in the country which fixed the attention of the people so much as this, and if they found that it was mismanaged, it would necessarily follow that great dissatisfaction would be the result. Nothing could be worse than the infirmity of temper ascribed to