

rounds for  
rintendent  
t the mat-  
a rehear-  
barrassing  
usly in the  
a govern-  
embarrass-  
ry point of  
ferred to  
or attempt-  
e elements  
itself. To  
barrassing  
ment was  
as he (Mr.  
matter by  
e under the  
s; and as  
mmissioners  
ole keepers  
o presume  
mproper an  
would have  
ty, against  
rintendent,  
as appears  
the House,  
nd another  
(Mr. B.)  
ph, and Dr.  
ort of their  
ad they ta-  
such mon-  
He (Mr.  
times better  
and discuss,  
r so doing,  
e Lunatics  
mpromised.  
tlemen had  
could have  
who had no  
lose. He  
a proof that  
anywhere.  
n treated as  
according to  
en appoint-  
the case,  
have said,

"Well, I am your servant, appointed by you, and I can't help the servants of the Institution being drunk, and having a jolly spree, &c., if you choose to have it so." But this was not the case, Dr. Park was appointed independently by the government, and was answerable, not to the Commissioners but to the government and the country, not only for what he did, but for all wrongs which he allowed to exist, or corruptly assented to. And Dr. Park had a right to expect support from the government, this house and the people in resisting such monstrous abuses as existed in the Asylum. Even had Dr. Park been appointed by the Commissioners, he (Mr. B.) could not say he should make himself a willing party to their violation of official duty. The following facts are revealed; he (Mr. B.) would read them to the House:

"Your Petitioner further represents, that the said Commissioners consented to the request of Assistant Steward Cronyn, of the Branch, to be allowed to absent himself daily from his duties, for as many hours as might be needed, for his attending the Medical Lectures at the University, if your Petitioner would consent thereto in writing. Whereupon, your Petitioner respectfully represented to the Board, that such consent on his part would be 'an unwarrantable interference on his part with an attendant, whose time belongs wholly to the institution, and whose absence would impose increased labor on the other attendants, whose duties already were sufficiently onerous.'" Would the hon. and learned Attorney General say that such a fraud upon the Institution was to be endured, or such an abstraction of the safe-guards provided for the Lunatics? Would it have become Dr. Park to consent to this corrupt proposition? Had he not done honor to himself and to the government who had appointed him, by politely negating it? It is out of all governmental propriety (if propriety can be held to belong to modern governments at all) to require a physician, who has a professional and moral character to sustain, to be a party

to the official delinquencies of others; and, as in the case of Dr. Park, should his honesty expose and irritate Commissioners, he was to be turned over to their tender mercies and even prompted to demand his dismissal—"hon. men who could be supposed to do Dr. Park no wrong!" and the government exonerate themselves by saying, "oh, the Commissioners demand it?" (Here the hon. member was for a short time interrupted by a message from the Legislative Council.) He proceeded to observe that the hon. and learned gentleman who had preceded him had spoken of the Commissioners as a dispassionate body, and that the government had recognized their right of dealing with the case of Dr. Park. He (Mr. B.) could not see on what principle of justice they had the right to do so. It was admitted by government that nothing was imputed against the character of that gentleman. It was true that Dr. Park, might have shown some warmth, but then was it unlikely that he should do so, when he was treated by the Commissioners like a common menial servant—that when called into their room he was left standing, and when he had listened to their questions, he was told "now sir, you may retire." He (Mr. B.) asked if this were the way, a gentleman standing in the position that Dr. Park did to the Commissioners, ought to be treated, he having been as well as themselves, appointed by the Crown, and answerable to the Crown, and not to the Commissioners for what he did? Here were matters of dispute between the respective parties; and considering the late conflict in which they were engaged, he (Mr. B.) considered it too much to refer the question back to the Commissioners to be adjudicated upon by them. The government did not desire to have a quarrel with the Commissioners, who, as he had said, were their friends, Dr. Park was also their friend—and the question might be, would it be better to disoblige one friend or several? The government in their report of the