THE SITUATION.

The question whether the Cabinet resolutions of February 16th, authorizing the expenditure of certain moneys under the Loan Act, were constitutional or not, rests solely on the legal interpretation of that document.

We confess our inability to arrive at a clear comprehension of the Loan Act, but as this is the document by which the Ministry must be tried, it is a question for the lawyers, and not for us, to decide.

These Cabinet resolutions were passed on the information of the Minister of Finance. He reported $360.000 to the credit of the Loan Fund. The Minister was in error, but it was upon this statement that these resolutions were adopted. There was no such sum to the credit of the Loan Fund at that time, and we are unable to comprehend how Minister Kapena, after an examination of the books of his department, should have fallen into this extraordinary error. Now how far is the Cabinet responsible for resolutions based upon such a strange ignorance of the status of that Fund? The whole matter resolves itself into the question, were the Ministers, under the Loan Act, authorized to make these expenditures? This we claim is a question which can be settled by the lawyers alone, and the method in which the Loan Act is drawn up makes it a mighty knotty proposition for those gentlemen to decide. To the lawyers and the legislature we leave its discussion, but if there has been any straining of the Constitution, then the Ministry must be held responsible, and should suffer the consequences of their indiscretion.

We believe Mr. Gibson, withal, to be an honest, energetic and capable official. No charge of dishonesty, no evidence of using those public moneys for his own benefit, have been proved against him. But we do say that if he has gone to an extent, totally unwarranted and full of danger to the correct administration of public finances—he has established a bad precedent which if allowed to pass might, under a dishonest Ministry, give rise to the most serious abuses. The Constitution is the only safe guide, and no Ministry, no matter how much confidence the public may have in its integrity, should be allowed to violate its slightest provision without being called to an account for their proceedings.

The books in the Interior Department have been kept in a loose and unbusiness like manner, more especially the immigration accounts. For this the Minister of the Interior is responsible. It should have been his care to see that this important department of the Government was conducted in strict accordance with business principles, that his subordinates were competent and careful, and that the affairs of his department were systematically administered. There has been no system in the accounts of the department, for which the neglect or incompetency of its officers are deserving of the severest censure.

But while the Ministers are open to blame for their loose methods of conducting this Government, we must remember that they have been most active in the promotion of public improvements. Though these funds may not have been administered in strict accordance with the letter of the law, the expenditures were not wasteful or unnecessary. They all went towards the prosperity of the country, the encouragement of immigration, and at a time when the planters were sorely pressed for labor; the building of roads and bridges, when the freshets had rendered many of the most important highways impassable, and, in fine, the general welfare of the community. But with all this, if the Cabinet exceeded its authority, its members must understand that no trespass on the methods laid down for the disposition of those funds will be tolerated without reproof, not alone as a censure to the present Ministry, but as a warning to those who may follow them.

The fight in the Legislature to oust Mr. Gibson and his colleagues has been a failure. The Ministry has the majority, and the Opposition knows it, and acknowledges its defeat. Perhaps, had there been less personal animus in the contest, had there been a more generous spirit displayed, and had Mr. Gibson not been made the target for all this gall and bitterness, the result might have been different. The slogan was not "let us have a better Cabinet," but "Gibson must go." It was the individual they attacked because he was Gibson, and not because they could prove dishonesty in his administration. They overdid the movement. They went to extremes, and the consequence is that men of independent thought, who owed allegiance neither to Mr. Gibson or the Opposition, declined to be mustered in the ranks with a regiment of soreheads, whose only object in all this clamor was to show Mr. Gibson the door. This assumes the appearance of a persecution, and nothing wins friends for its victim so rapidly as a systematic and malignant pursuit of this nature, as soon as the motive becomes apparent. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has had all this to contend with. He has been deprived of financial support at the time when it was to the vital interests of the country that the Government should receive it. He has stood up under a shower of opprobrium and abuse. He has been stigmatized as a defaulter, a schemer, a self-interested man, whose only object in holding office was to feather his nest at the expense of the public. But not a single charge, beyond the assumed irregularity we have referred to in dealing with the appropriations, has been substantiated. We are no apologist for Mr. Gibson, but we are for fair play, and we admire the Minister's pluck which sustained him in this fight, where not only his own acts were criticised, but he had to shoulder the alleged faults of some of his colleagues. We have recognized much of good honest motive in the Opposition, and have separated it from the sorehead element which has endeavored to use this honesty for its own purpose. This element crops out in the newspapers, in public meetings on the streets, wherever it can obtain a hearing. It is as objectionable to the respectable members of the Anti-Government party, as it is to us; but it has fastened itself to them, and until they can shake it off, until they can disclaim all sympathy with disappointed office-holders and malignant assassins of personal charrcter, until they can show that this unwelcome addition to their ranks is not of their seeking, and those leaders are not of their choice, the independent fair-minded members of this community will hold aloof from the contest.

POLITICAL SOREHEADS.

When a man once learns the agreeable business of serving a Government—Monarchial or Republican—the ordinary outside avocations of life become distasteful to him. Possibly because all Governments treat their servants kindly and allow them a wide latitude in complying with the rule of a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. But when the Government servant puts off his livery and makes room for his successor, he rarely reconciles himself to falling into line with the majority, and earning his bread and butter in the old channels. He may have been a good fellow before he took office, and a good fellow while in office, but no sooner has the change taken place than he becomes what is technically known in the political vocabulary as a sorehead. This is a most malignant and incurable disease. It alters the entire nature of its unfortunate victim. He looks at the world through blurred glasses. He divides it into two portions, those who hold office, and those who do not, but his sympathies with the latter are wholly concentrated in himself. The irritation in his head grows and grows, and he finds temporary relief only in the vicinity of newspaper offices, and on the platform at public meetings. When he makes a speech, or instigates or writes a newspaper article directed at that portion of humanity which is responsible for the soreness of his head, he feels that his disease may not be altogether incurable, and that if he could keep on writing and speaking he might occasionally enjoy a good night's rest.

The sorehead is never without a following. He learns the knack of making others share his grievances, and although the following may have no expectation of office, the political invalid teaches them to consider that the world is all askew; that the country is going to the devil and that unless there is a shaking up all around, financial ruin, storms, epidemics and final destruction will be the inevitable result. The only permanent cure for this affliction is office. A single day at a Government desk is the effective plaster which heals the sorehead, lightens the landscape, and restores the country to prosperity.

THERE appears to be some misunderstanding as to the tenor of the concluding remarks of Mr. J. O. Carter's speech at the Lyceum, on Monday the 23rd ult. Mr. Carter's language was as follows: "A petition to His Majesty the King, is our last resource. We assemble here under a constitutional provision. We can take no other step. Anything beyond this means force and no one of us wishes to see force brought into play." Mr. Carter's character is an assurance that he could not under any circumstances, counsel an infringement of the laws, or use expressions which might induce his hearers to believe that an appeal to force would be necessary, no matter how strong political officers might be. We are in perfect accord with Mr. Carter in this matter. We have stated our opinion of the manner in which this contest should be conducted, and counselled moderation and discretion on the part of the public speakers. There is no necessity for any undue excitement, nor at the same time is there any reason why public meetings should not be held to discuss subjects of public interest. But there must be no talk of the necessity of violent proceedings, nor will there be, so long as speakers of Mr. Carter's temper and judgment occupy the platform.

ABOUT the most remarkable intelligence from the Coast is the fact of rains in June. The extent of the damage those unexpected showers caused cannot be accurately stated.

The hay-crop has come to be a very important one in California. After June, hay or dried grass is fed to cattle generally which are kept up. Sour and musty hay will be the result of the long rain storm. Perhaps one-half of the grass and grain to be converted into hay is still standing, or rather has not been cut. Much of it has fallen down, and in that condition it sours before it can be converted into hay.

The barley has suffered more than the wheat. It was headed out for the most part, and where the grain was heavy it has fallen flat, and can only be gathered now by the scythe and cradle. Last year a scorching norther occurred in June. Leaves curled up on the trees; more than one-third of the fruit, such as apples, pears, and plums fell to the ground; the wheat fields were shriveled in many places. Where twenty bushels of wheat were expected to the acre hardly so much as ten bushels were gathered.

The cherry crop of the coast counties is materially damaged. The crop is this year larger than usual. It was a short crop last year on account of the dessicating north winds in the Spring. The short crop and high prices turned the attention of many orchardists to this fruit. In some instances as high as two dollars each were paid for cherry trees last spring. The present cherry crop is a large one, especially in the coast counties where the greater part of the marketable cherries are produced. The recent rainstorm has damaged this crop materially.

WE are pleased to note that a large majority of the Legislature placed itself on record as being opposed to an exclusive franchise in the gas lighting matter. Exclusive franchises are dangerous things. They are the strongest weapons that can be placed in the hands of a monopoly. They mean that a community can be held at the mercy of a corporation, and must pay tribute to it for a certain term of years, being effectually its slaves, so far as their finances are concerned. Where there is no exclusive franchise a corporation is on its good behavior. It is not the servant of the people in name alone, but is compelled to render faithful service for fair remuneration, least another and more efficient substitute should be chosen. With the example of how San Francisco has suffered from exclusive franchises, we should be careful to steer clear of this danger.

THE ADVERTISER'S resume of the *Bulletin's* and *Gazette's* course in the present political struggle was a hard blow and brought blood. The *Bulletin* squeeled vehemently, and indulged in a lot of stupid personal abuse. It is the *Gazette's* turn next.

It is satisfactory to know that the Opposition is heartily disgusted with its self-constituted organs, and feels bitterly that its cause is hampered, and its respectability endangered by even the suspicion of affiliation with such a brace of cut-throat journals.

THE "abuse of a blackguard is always a compliment," says the *Bulletin* of last evening. And since the perusal of that anonymous circular, we feel the force of the remark. The best thing the honest members of the Opposition can do is to disclaim all connection with that nasty and vituperative little sheet.

THE departure of the *Swiftsure* and *Mutine* will be regretted by the friends of the pleasant, hospitable officers of those vessels. They go to Esquimault, where the weather is not quite so warm, and where dances, picnics, lawn tennis matches are an every-day occurrence. The young ladies of that region are devotedly attached to the navy, and many a young lieutenant has met his fate in the land of the fir. But it requires an extra dose of love to make marriage on a naval lieutenant's pay endurable after the wane of the honeymoon.

THE Bank Charter Bill sustained an ignominious defeat in the House Thursday afternoon. Only the gentleman responsible for its introduction, together with a few retainers, voted for this obnoxious document. It had but few friends, and we honestly believe that those were ashamed of it. It was of so sweeping a nature, so thoroughly monopolistic that no one with a spark of independence could have supported it. And its suppression was such a foregone conclusion that the public had lost interest in it. Minister Kapena's National Bank Bill should make its appearance shortly.

THE *Hawaiian* is in error in its statement that Attorney-General Neumann openly expressed himself in favor of the Bank Charter. Mr. C. O. Berger and other gentlemen who were present at the conversation wherein this remark is alleged to have been made, have no recollection of such an observation on the part of the Attorney-General. Moreover, Mr. Neumann has expressed himself to the editor of this journal as opposed to the Bank Charter, and stated frankly that he would vote against it.

THE *Bulletin* extended the hand of friendship to Judge Widemann. That was enough. The Judge immediately asked for and obtained indefinite leave of absence from the Legislature.

Mr. Gibson's Reply.

ED. ADVERTISER—Sir: I regret that an unpleasant discussion between myself and the Hon. Godfrey Rhodes, commenced on the floor of the Assembly, should be continued in the newspapers; but my opponent seeks this arena of discussion, and I am sorry to say that in his attempted vindication in print he suppresses a most important statement of fact, vital to the correct understanding of the controversy. He calls attention alone to occurrences connected with the Board of Education, and to his resignation from the Board in July last, as being the occasion when we finally parted company; but he must remember perfectly well that we still continued officially associated together in the important Board of Immigration, and to some extent continued our former friendly relations, until the eventful 14th of September last, when, as has been said, the opposition against me was clamorous, and talk of public changes were rife on the streets; that Mr. Rhodes, conjointly with a colleague, addressed a letter in which he resigned his place in the Board of Immigration. Hence, it was at that time, and then only, that he finally severed his official association with me.

WALTER M. G[illegible]

"What shall we do [illegible] clothes?" asks a rural [illegible] keep them on till the [illegible]ates, and then, if y[illegible] without them, let [illegible] them off for plaster[illegible]

Minister Gibson to the Opposition.

Most potent, grave and scrutinous Opposition,
My very noble, and approved legislators,
That I have drawn upon the loan fund
For immigration, roads, bridges and such like
Perhaps is true. But bear in mind
I don't propose to take a back seat yet this summer,
And let any member of the Fort Street Church step into my shoes.
I am not rude in speech, by no means,
Though perhaps when I carried the standard of the Opposition
I laid it pretty heavy on to the other Ministry.
Now by your gracious presence
I will a round unvarnished tale deliver
Of my whole Ministerial course,
What conjuration, and what mighty magic
I used to run this Government.
Six years I've had the framing of your laws,
And when we met in conclave in these halls,
Nothing was dearer to this statesman's heart
Than, after long and vigorous debate,
To show the Ministry the pathway out.
I've railed at them, as Anthropophagi and men
Whose heads do grow beneath their shoulders,
To this my colleagues would seriously incline,
And when the voting came would calmly lift their hands
And say with me, "The Cabinet shall be bounced."
Thus step by step from herding Lanai flocks,
Have I arisen to my present place,
From which my good friends Dole, Smith, Godfrey Brown
And others of that ilk would fain behold
Your servant now incontinently fired.
I don't propose to go, but though I'm tough,
I cannot carry, like a plantation mule,
The sins of Gulick and Kapena
Without a kick. Therefore again I say,
Until ye prove that I have made away
With public moneys, given by the State,
That I have put into the Gibson pouch
The bullion to which Gibson had no claim,
My many friends, who burn to warm this seat
Must plod along without the gold-laced coat,
The hat, the plume, the sword, the breeche's band
Which came from distant Albion's friendly shores,
Consigned to Gibson. 'Tis pitiful, 'tis wondrous pitiful,
But still 'tis true that Gibson holds the trumps.

An Explanation.

On Sat., 22nd ult., Col. M. Thompson had some unpleasantness with Officer Fehlber, which resulted in the arrest of the former.

We learn from a reliable source that the facts, briefly stated, are substantially as follows, that is to say: Messrs. Hingley & Co., of this city, sued Reidell on a promissory note, summoned Thompson and others as garnishees, and the case was tried before Justice Bickerton in the Police Court last Thursday, when Thompson, as garnishee, answered and filed a full and complete "statement," under oath of said Reidell and himself, in regard to their transactions, and in regard to the identical property levied upon by said officer last Saturday, and upon that trial judgment was rendered in favor of Thompson, and he was discharged, the Court holding that it did not appear that Thompson had any of the goods or effects of the said Reidell in his possession, or that he owed Reidell anything, and the rational and legal effect of that decision is, as we understand, that Thompson had legal right to hold the identical property, under and by virtue of Reidell's mortgage to him, for money which it appeared upon the trial Reidell owed Thompson, and that it was not legally subject to such levy, nor liable for Reidell's debt, and that upon the trial the plaintiff endeavored, and had full and fair opportunity to prove fraud and usury in Thompson's transactions with Reidell, and failed. We understand there was no judgment or execution against Th[illegible], and that the officer was [illegible] not to levy [illegible] it wa[illegible]