

explanations is perfectly clear, and there can be no limitation whatever to the extent of the disclosures which may be made except that which the public weal may require. It is true that no disclosures can be made without permission, but whenever a difference arises between the Head of the Government and his Ministers, Parliament and the public have a right to the fullest information. What is the object of making explanations at all? That the public may be able to judge whether the retiring Ministry have acted right or wrong. They are the parties upon trial, and they have a right to expect permission *to state every thing necessary for their complete justification*. It would be as unprecedented as it would be useless for the Sovereign or his Representative *to limit the explanations* of Ministers, because any attempt to do so would invariably be met, as Mr. Baldwin declared in the House he would have met it, viz. by a refusal to say one word until the required permission should be granted. No new Ministry would venture to assume the responsibility of such a refusal. But on the other hand no man or set of men would be borne out by Parliament or the Country in asking permission, or using it when given to make disclosures unconnected with the subject of difference. We contend that the late Ministry made no allusions whatever, during the debates arising out of their resignation, that had not a direct and palpable bearing on the question at issue, and *that were not necessary for their vindication*. Although many insinuations have been made that they violated their oaths, no specific case has been adduced in which they stated anything unconnected with the cause of their resignation. As to the mode of making the explanations, that we believe it is admitted was in accordance with all *precedent*. The *verbal* permission has been cavilled at, and it has been said that it should have been in writing. On this point we are unwilling to speak with much confidence, but we are tolerably certain that precedents could be given for both modes. It was only during last Session, a few weeks before the resignation, that a Member of the administration had resigned on another point. His permission to explain, if we mistake not, was a *verbal* one. In our view of the question, and we feel convinced that we are correct, it can be of no consequence whatever, whether the permission is a verbal or written one. In either case it must be *full, and unrestricted* or it will not be accepted at all. The explanations are invariably made in presence of a Responsible Minister, whose duty it is to take care that facts are correctly stated. We admit that one cause of difficulty on the occasion of the late resignation, was the inability of the Governor's only responsible adviser to attend the sittings of the House. Undoubtedly the best course would have been, to have put off all explanations as well as all public business until the new Ministry had been formed. It was not, however, the fault of the Ex-Ministers that a new Ministry was not formed, and we may remark en passant that we wonder it has never occurred to a man so fond of "precedents" as Mr. Viger, that a provisional Ministry is both a new and dangerous experiment. There are precedents perhaps, but then the circumstances are as widely different as are those which led to the late resignation in Canada, from those which caused Sir Robert Peel to refuse office in 1839. When the late Ministry applied in the usual way for full permission to make such explanations as were necessary for their vindication, it was frankly ac-