

14th Oct., wound up by recommending both parties to bury their troubles, and expressing confidence in both of them. The Commissioners spurned the advice of the government. They showed exceedingly great warmth and made use of language that would be odious when applied to anybody—the language of common Billingsgate was not the language which should have been made use of on such an occasion by them. The course the government had adopted had precluded Dr. Park from taking action against anybody. If the Commissioners had been appointed under the Act, and they had turned out Dr. Park, he would have had the right of appealing from their decision to the government. The government should have said to the Commissioners, “we have given you advice which if you don’t like to follow, why we are obliged to you for what you have done, but we must accept your resignations however reluctantly, rather than perpetrate a wrong against a public officer, equally as yourselves, entitled to our just and unpolitical consideration.” Instead of taking this course, they suffered themselves to be dragooned by the Commissioners, and Dr. Park was left without any other remedy than the one he now sought. In his present position the Commissioners of the new Institution could not entertain his application, they would say “No Sir, we can have nothing to do with you, you have been dismissed from the office you held, in the last Institution, and we must presume your guilt, as the government have dismissed you summarily without inquiry, and even refused it.” He (Mr. B.) could not agree with the hon. and learned Attorney General that the *general superintendence* of the Asylum was in the Commissioners, because the by-laws passed by the Commissioners, and sanctioned by the government, voted the *general superintendence* in the Medical Superintendent, while the *general supervision* (which was a very different thing) belonged to the Commissioners, and was

expressly reserved for themselves. How could Dr. Park be *Superintendent* and not *superintend*? Why call him Superintendent, and by By-laws make him Superintendent, and then say, the Commissioners are the Superintendents? If there was anything wrong in the superintendence of the Asylum, Dr. Park as Medical Superintendent would be blamed. His hon. and learned friend had said “of what use is it to appoint Commissioners if you have no confidence in them.” But does it follow because they were appointed from having confidence in them, that they are to be sustained when they have proved themselves unworthy of it? It was as much the duty of the government to dismiss bad Commissioners as it was to appoint good ones, and far more was it a duty to sustain a faithful Medical Superintendent, than to sustain from any motives of expediency, corrupt Commissioners. But sending Dr. Park back to those in question, and inviting them to demand his dismissal, was like sending the lamb to the wolf. These gentlemen had libelled anonymously Dr. Park in a newspaper—had charged him with false entries—had held an odious, disgraceful secret inquiry against him, telling the very government itself, that they had closed the door upon the accused, desiring the inquiry, merely because they did not like him. And to those very same Commissioners, the government dragooned by them, had left the decision of Dr. Park’s case and fate. He had been left to his enemies, instead of receiving the ordinary protection even of his official and professional character, by the government who appointed him. The House too, had received, and printed, and distributed all the false, scandalous, and malicious communications of the Commissioners—and can the House refuse in fairness an inquiry, due to the reputation of Dr. Park, which they had thus injured? All that he (Mr. B.) desired was to give him an opportunity of clearing himself.