

H. L. Swinton said, in Hawaiian: I am not going to speak in the English language, because the haoles all think as I do. It has been said that this meeting is called to incite to kill the Hawaiians. I have always been called a rebel. This is because I am not afraid to speak my mind, and my mind is firm and clear that the Government is false and corrupt. My advice is to stand by the resolution for a new constitution, and let us not be satisfied with promises by the King. Let us not be satisfied when the King tells us he has turned out the cabinet, what more do you want. Let us follow the lead of Thurston, and demand a new constitution.

Mr. Alexander Young, who represented the Honolulu Iron Works, said he was proud to stand upon the platform and look so many honest men in the face. They were men who not only looked what they meant, but meant what they looked. He was no speaker, but a thinker. He came here twenty-three years ago, and at one time, when traveling, he was proud of living here. Lately he had done some traveling, and had to hide his face when he found this flag stinking abroad. He represented a large class of men not only in this country, but all over the world. The class he represented were the horny-handed sons of toil, who earned their honest dollar and could lie down and sleep without it burning them. He was ready to shoulder a musket to defend Kalakaua, and not a knave. Some had counseled them to wait; but he said wait not, strike the iron while it is hot. Kalakaua had had a great many years to let us see whether he was a man or not. The tension about our hearts had long been strained, and to-day the strings had broken, and we must express ourselves. He was not a lawyer, and could not tell whether we could have a constitution in five minutes; but necessity was the mother of invention, and we must get it as soon as possible. There was not a coward in that assembly—not one, though it was not always wise to rush into mischief. If the King would not do what was wanted, he must be made to do it. Let us exercise patience and put the matter in the hands of people able to deal with it. Let us have a new constitution, and if it is not legal, the same power would make another.

Dr. Tucker said that when he came to this country there were mutterings of discontent, and it was all Walter Murray Gibson. We arraign the King. He does not know that this assembly—largely composed of men who think that kings are not of much account anyway—he does not know that if it was not for the wise counsel of men in this movement his head would have been off before this. They could not wait any longer for reform. The King had better be a saint while he is well, as well as when he is sick.

Mr. L. C. Ables, who represented the clerks, said that he had come here to seek his fortune, but had not seen it. He was an American; the stars and stripes was his flag, but the Hawaiian flag would suit him as well, and he was going to stay by it. The class whom he represented wanted a new constitution, and they were going to have it. He was not a lawyer, but he had been told by lawyers that the constitution was promulgated by a king. It could be done again. Some would ask, "Are you going to get it?" In illustration of his determination to have it, he related an anecdote about a certain youth who had evinced an indomitable determination in hunting for a woodchuck wherewith to regale the appetite of a hungry Methodist preacher. The boy chased the woodchuck into his hole. A man came along and asked the boy if he could get him, "Mister," said the boy, "I've got to get him;" and for the constitution, we've got to have it!

Hon. Cecil Brown said, in Hawaiian: "Perhaps you ask, why is this meeting of citizens? Perhaps the thought may enter that it is to propose to do evil to Hawaiians. Not so. I am an Hawaiian, and was born under this flag, and under it my bones shall be buried. Has there been good government in the past few years? No. Has the legislative right been respected? No. We want, then, a new constitution. We want the King to think of the public good, not of personal ends. We have just seen the jubilee of Queen Victoria, and if Kalakaua would follow her example, he might reign as long. But if Queen Victoria were to act as badly as Kalakaua, she would not live an hour. Let us, then, go for a new constitution.

Mr. E. M. Walsh, manager of the Paia plantation, Maui, said that he represented the planters, who, he felt sure, would indorse the sentiments so ably expressed. In 1882 a deputation representing the plantations on the other islands waited on the King to petition His Majesty to give them honest government. The result was they were snubbed. The King afterwards went to North Kona, and with the assistance of his soldiers defeated Pilipo in the election. They did not want to use threats, but to-day they were prepared, and would not be again insulted. He believed it would be wise to change the constitution. He did not know the best way of doing it, but in view of the consummate skill which had brought this movement forward, he was ready to leave it to the thirteen gentlemen to see that it was done right. It seemed to him, however, that this was a time to have the voice of the people. From Maui all were with them. In 1882, as he had said, the King let them go with false promises. They took his word then. Now, let us prepare a constitution and say this is what we want and what we must have. (Applause.)

Mr. J. M. Vivas then read the resolutions in Portuguese, and made a speech which evidently went to the hearts of his countrymen.

Mr. J. G. Tucker said they had heard talk about this flag and that flag, but they had gone into this thing as people of all nationalities merged into Hawaiians. They had come and meant to stay till they got what they wanted.

Mr. W. H. Rice, of Kauai, spoke in the native language, as follows:

Hawaiian citizens, from Hawaii to Nihau; from northwest to southeast; we want to clean up the Government. Has the Government been clean? No! The roads are wasting and groaning from one end to another of the land. Where is the money for the roads? Sent on an exploration with the Kaimiloa. If we go asking for bread, shall we be satisfied with stones? Some one asked me to-day if I had my gun? Well, yes; I am a cattle-drover, and I need one. It has been well said that the ship of this movement has been launched, the anchor is weighed, the sails set, now let us take the helm and steer.

Lieut. C. W. Ashford was the last speaker. He appeared upon the platform in uniform, and armed with a rifle and belt of cartridges. He stated that he was under military orders, and had been commanded by his superior officer not to indulge in a political speech. He had not had the privilege of listening to all the speeches, but from reports which had been carried to the corps outside, he understood that a gentleman representing vast moneyed interests here had counselled the meeting to wait another year for a new constitution.

Here the rifle company marched round the outer edge of the building and took up their position inside to hear the speech of their comrade, and as they did so, three rousing cheers and a tiger were given for the "boys."

Lieut. Ashford, resuming, acknowledged the compliment on behalf of the corps. He had joined it three years ago in anticipation of trouble such as they saw that day. Returning to Mr. Isenberg's remark, he said that gentleman, in view of his position, would naturally have an aversion to anything having a tendency to disturbance. He (the speaker) did not want to fight, but by heaven if we did—, If we set about getting reform under the present constitution we might wait till our grandchildren were gray. He felt sure Mr. Isenberg did not express the sentiments of that meeting, certainly not those of the Honolulu Rifles. At the same time he had the greatest respect for the great nation that gentleman represented. He thought that Germans were pretty well decided not to submit to dictation abroad, however much they might at home.

The German heart is strong and true,
The German arm is strong,
The German foot goes seldom back
Where armed foemen throng.

If armed foemen should throng here, he did not think the German foot would go back. He wished to say a few words on the merits of a new constitution. It has been objected that we could not have it at once, because such a thing would be unconstitutional and illegal. He would show the fallacy of that argument. In 1864, when Kamehameha V convoked his legislature, it was thought that a new constitution was wanted. After some weeks they failed to agree upon one satisfactory to His Majesty. The Legislature was arbitrarily dismissed, and the King, without even saying "By your leave," forced upon them a new constitution. That was the constitution we were living under to-day, and some people had the gall to say we were living under a constitutional government. He held that nothing was constitutional which was forced upon the people without their consent. The present constitution did not adequately protect personal rights, and it gave the King power which no monarch in a civilized country in the present day possessed. Who had ever heard of an absolute veto by the monarch anywhere in recent years? King Kalakaua had a great many very pleasant qualities, and many which were not so pleasant. Personally, he had behaved in a very friendly manner to the speaker when he came here, and perhaps would still if he were to truckle to him as some did. Cries of "Time" being heard, he concluded by urging upon all not to let the matter drop until some sensible and concerted action was taken. (Applause.)

Hon. W. R. Castle moved the adoption of the resolutions, seconded by Dr. Emerson and many others. On being put to the meeting they were carried unanimously, there being a roar of ayes, and dead silence when Mr. Jones put the question: "Contrary minded!"

The chairman stated, as the meeting was dispersing, that he had been requested to say that Mr. Gibson had sent for a squad of the Honolulu Rifles to go down to his house and protect him against the Hawaiians.

The committee immediately waited on the King, who stated that he was willing to give an answer offhand; but the committee informed him that they would leave the documents in his hands, and expect a reply in writing.

The meeting was thoroughly orderly throughout, but it was strong and determined.

After the meeting the committee of thirteen proceeded to the palace and presented the resolutions to the King, requesting a reply.

The next day the King called a meeting composed of the American minister, W. H. Merrill; the British commissioner, James Hay Wodehouse; the French commissioner, Henri Feer, and the Portuguese commissioner, A. de Souza Canavarro, to whom he offered to transfer the powers vested in him as King. These gentlemen refused to accept the trust, but advised the King to lose no time in forming a new cabinet and signing a new constitution, which would meet the demands of the people. Accordingly, in the afternoon, the following reply was forwarded to the citizen's committee:

THE KING'S REPLY.

To Honorable Paul Isenberg and the gentlemen composing the committee of a meeting of subjects and citizens.

GENTLEMEN: In acknowledging the receipt of the resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held yesterday and presented to us by you, we are pleased to convey through you to our loyal subjects as well as to the citizens of Honolulu our expression of good will and our gratification that our people have taken the usual constitutional step in presenting their grievances.

To the first proposition contained in the resolutions passed by the meeting, whose action you represent, we reply that it has been substantially complied with by the formal resignation of the ministry, which took place on the 28th day of June, and was accepted on that date, and that we had already requested the Hon. W. L. Green to form a new cabinet on the day succeeding the resignation of the cabinet.

To the second proposition we reply that Mr. Walter M. Gibson has severed all his connections with the Hawaiian Government by resignation.

To the third proposition we reply that we do not admit the truth of the matter stated therein, but will submit the whole subject to our new cabinet, and will gladly act according to their advice, and will cause restitution to be made by the parties found responsible.

To the fourth proposition we reply that at our command Mr. Junius Kaa resigned the office of registrar of conveyance on the 28th day of June, and his successor has been appointed.

To the fifth proposition we reply that the specific pledges required of us are each severally acceded to.

We are pleased to assure the members of the committee and our loyal subjects that we are, and shall at all times be, anxious and ready to cooperate with our councillors and advisers, as well as with our intelligent and patriotic citizens in all matters touching the honor, welfare, and prosperity of our Kingdom.

Given at our palace this first day of July, A. D. 1887, and the fourteenth year of our reign.

KALAKAUA, REX.

The new cabinet, consisting of Messrs. W. L. Green, finance; Godfrey Brown, foreign affairs; Lorrin A. Thurston, interior, and C. W. Ashford, attorney-general, were sworn in the same day, and the revolution was practically over. It only remained to sign the new constitution. This document was prepared with great care, a large number of the members of the Hawaiian league being present and taking part in the debates. The document was ready on Wednesday, July 6, received the King's signature at 6.15 p. m. of that day, and was duly proclaimed on the next, copies being sent forward to the other islands.

Without the organization known as the Hawaiian league, this revolution could never have taken place. The moment that the members were called upon they were ready and well armed. Without the assistance of Major V. V. Ashford, who had command of the Honolulu rifles, order could not have been kept. To the gentlemen who form that corps the citizens of Honolulu owe a deep debt of gratitude. For two days Honolulu was under martial law, and yet the most perfect order was kept, the banks and business places were open, and there was perfect security to both life and property. It was the most peaceful and most complete of revolutions, but it was so because the power was there to sustain it.

A word or two about Mr. Gibson. He was arrested by the military on the morning of July 1, and was handed over to the civil authorities on a charge of embezzlement on the evening of the Saturday. He was permitted to remain in his house under guard, but on July 5 was removed to the prison. When brought before the police court the attorney-general entered a nolle pro., and Mr. Gibson quietly got on board the brigantine *John D. Spreckels*, which was leaving that same day, and sailed for California. Thus bringing one of the most unpleasant episodes in Hawaiian history to a conclusion.

THE TWO CONSTITUTIONS.

Constitution of 1864.

Granted by His Majesty Kamehameha V., by the grace of God, King of the Hawaiian Islands, on the twentieth day of August, A. D. 1864.

ARTICLE 1. God hath endowed all men with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the right of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

ARTICLE 2. All men are free to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; but this sacred privilege hereby secured shall not be so construed as to justify acts of licentiousness, or practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the Kingdom.

ARTICLE 3. All men may freely speak, write, and publish their sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right, and no law shall be enacted to restrain the liberty of speech or of the press, except such laws as may be necessary for the protection of His Majesty the King and the royal family.

ARTICLE 4. All men shall have the right, in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble, without arms, to consult upon the common good, and to petition the King or Legislative assembly for redress of grievances.

ARTICLE 5. The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* belongs to all men, and shall not be suspended, unless by the King, when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety shall require its suspension.

ARTICLE 6. No person shall be subject to punishment for any offense, except on due and legal conviction thereof in a court having jurisdiction of the case.

ARTICLE 7. No person shall be held to answer for any crime or offense (except in cases of impeachment, or for offenses within the jurisdiction of a police or district justice, or in summary proceedings for contempt), unless upon indictment, fully and plainly describing such crime or offense, and he shall have the right to meet the witnesses who are pro-

Constitution of 1857.

WHEREAS, the constitution of this Kingdom, heretofore in force, contains many provisions subversive of civil rights and incompatible with enlightened constitutional government.

AND WHEREAS, it has become imperative, in order to restore order and tranquility and the confidence necessary to a further maintenance of the present Government, that a new constitution should be at once promulgated:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands, in my capacity as sovereign of this Kingdom, and as the representative of the people hereunto by them duly authorized and empowered, do annul and abrogate the constitution promulgated by Kamehameha the Fifth, on the 20th day of August, A. D. 1864, and do proclaim and promulgate this constitution.

ARTICLE 1. God hath endowed all men with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the right of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

ARTICLE 2. All men are free to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; but this sacred privilege hereby secured shall not be so construed as to justify acts of licentiousness, or practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the Kingdom.

ARTICLE 3. All men may freely speak, write, and publish their sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right, and no law shall be enacted to restrain the liberty of speech or of the press.

ARTICLE 4. All men shall have the right, in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble, without arms, to consult upon the common good, and to petition the King or Legislature for redress of grievances.

ARTICLE 5. The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* belongs to all men, and shall not be suspended, unless by the King, when, in case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety shall require its suspension.

ARTICLE 6. No person shall be subject to punishment for any offense, except on due and legal conviction thereof, in a court having jurisdiction of the case.

ARTICLE 7. No person shall be held to answer for any crime or offense (except in cases of impeachment, or for offenses within the jurisdiction of a police or district justice, or in summary proceedings for contempt), unless upon indictment, fully and plainly describing such crime or offense, and he shall have the right to meet the witnesses who are produced

duced against him face to face; to produce witnesses and proofs in his own favor; and by himself, or his counsel, at his election, to examine the witnesses produced by himself, and cross-examine those produced against him, and to be fully heard in his defence. In all cases in which the right of trial by jury has been heretofore used, it shall be held inviolable forever, except in actions of debt or assumpsit in which the amount claimed is less than fifty dollars.

ARTICLE 8. No person shall be required to answer again for any offence of which he has been duly convicted, or of which he has been duly acquitted upon a good and sufficient indictment.

ARTICLE 9. No person shall be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

ARTICLE 10. No person shall sit as a judge or juror, in any case in which his relative is interested, either as plaintiff or defendant, or in the issue of which the said judge or juror may have, either directly or through a relative, any pecuniary interest.

ARTICLE 11. Involuntary servitude, except for crime, is forever prohibited in this Kingdom; whenever a slave shall enter Hawaiian territory he shall be free.

ARTICLE 12. Every person has the right to be secure from all unreasonable searches and seizures of his person, his house, his papers, and effects; and no warrants shall issue, but on probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE 13. The King conducts his Government for the common good, and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men among his subjects.

ARTICLE 14. Each member of society has a right to be protected by it, in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and property, according to law; and, therefore, he shall be obliged to contribute his proportional share to the expense of this protection, and to give his personal services, or an equivalent when necessary; but no part of the property of any individual shall be taken from him or applied to public uses without his own consent or the enactment of the legislative assembly, except the same shall be necessary for the military operations of the Kingdom in time of war or insurrection; and whenever the public exigencies may require that the property of any individual should be appropriated to public uses he shall receive a reasonable compensation therefor.

ARTICLE 15. No subsidy, duty, or tax of any description shall be established or levied without the consent of the legis-

against him face to face; to produce witnesses and proof in his own favor; and by himself or his counsel, at his election, to examine the witnesses produced by himself, and cross-examine those produced against him, and to be fully heard in his own defence. In all cases in which the right of trial by jury has been heretofore used, it shall be held inviolable forever, except in actions of debt or assumpsit in which the amount claimed is less than fifty dollars.

ARTICLE 8. No person shall be required to answer again for an offence of which he has been duly convicted, or of which he has been duly acquitted.

ARTICLE 9. No person shall be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

ARTICLE 10. No person shall sit as a judge or juror, in any case in which his relative, by affinity, or by consanguinity within the third degree, is interested, either as plaintiff or defendant, or in the issue of which the said judge or juror may have, either directly or through such relative, any pecuniary interest.

ARTICLE 11. Involuntary servitude, except for crime, is forever prohibited in this Kingdom. Whenever a slave shall enter Hawaiian territory he shall be free.

ARTICLE 12. Every person has the right to be secure from all unreasonable searches and seizures of his person, his house, his papers, and effects; and no warrants shall issue, except on probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE 13. The Government is conducted for the common good, and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men.

ARTICLE 14. Each member of society has a right to be protected in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and property, according to law; and, therefore, he shall be obliged to contribute his proportional share to the expense of this protection, and to give his personal services, or an equivalent, when necessary. Private property may be taken for public use, but only upon due process of law and just compensation.

ARTICLE 15. No subsidy, duty, or tax of any description shall be established or levied without the consent of the Leg-

lative assembly; nor shall any money be drawn from the public treasury without such consent, except when between the sessions of the legislative assembly the emergencies of war, invasion, rebellion, pestilence, or other public disaster shall arise, and then not without the concurrence of all the cabinet and of a majority of the whole privy council; and the minister of finance shall render a detailed account of such expenditure to the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE 16. No retrospective laws shall ever be enacted.

ARTICLE 17. The military shall always be subject to the laws of the land, and no soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by the Legislature.

ARTICLE 18. Every elector shall be privileged from arrest on election days during his attendance at election, and in going to and returning therefrom, except in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace.

ARTICLE 19. No elector shall be so obliged to perform military duty, on the day of election, as to prevent his voting, except in time of war or public danger.

ARTICLE 20. The supreme power of the Kingdom in its exercise is divided into the executive, legislative, and judicial; these shall always be preserved distinct, and no judge of a court of record shall ever be a member of the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE 21. The Government of this Kingdom is that of a constitutional monarchy, under His Majesty Kamehameha V, his heirs and successors.

ARTICLE 22. The Crown is hereby permanently confirmed to His Majesty Kamehameha V, and to the heirs of his body lawfully begotten, and to their lawful descendants in a direct line; failing whom, the Crown shall descend to Her Royal Highness the Princess Victoria Kaiulani, and the heirs of her body lawfully begotten, and their descendants in a direct line. The succession shall be to the senior male child, and to the heirs of his body; failing a male child, the succession shall be to the senior female child, and to the heirs of her body. In case there is no heir as above provided, then the successor shall be the person whom the Sovereign shall appoint with the consent of the nobles, and publicly proclaim as such during the King's life,

nor shall any money be drawn from the public treasury without such consent, except when the sessions of the Legislature, the emergencies of war, invasion, rebellion, pestilence, or other public disaster shall arise, and then not without the concurrence of all the cabinet and of a majority of the whole privy council; and the minister of finance shall render a detailed account of such expenditure to the Legislature.

ARTICLE 16. No retrospective laws shall ever be enacted.

ARTICLE 17. The military shall always be subject to the laws of the land, and no soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner prescribed by the Legislature.

ARTICLE 18. Every elector shall be privileged from arrest on election days during his attendance at election, and in going to and returning therefrom, except in case of treason, felony, or breach of the peace.

ARTICLE 19. No elector shall be so obliged to perform military duty, on the day of election, as to prevent his voting, except in time of war or public danger.

ARTICLE 20. The supreme power of the Kingdom in its exercise is divided into the executive, legislative, and judicial; these shall always be preserved distinct, and no executive or judicial officers, or any contractor or employee of the Government, or any person in the receipt of salary or emolument from the Government, shall be eligible to election to the Legislature of the Hawaiian Kingdom, or to hold the position of an elective member of the same. And no member of the Legislature shall, during the time for which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the Government, except that of a member of the Cabinet.

ARTICLE 21. The Government of this Kingdom is that of a constitutional monarchy, under His Majesty Kalakaua, his heirs and successors.

ARTICLE 22. The Crown is hereby permanently confirmed to His Majesty Kalakaua, and to the heirs of his body lawfully begotten, and to their lawful descendants in a direct line; failing whom the Crown shall descend to Her Royal Highness the Princess Liliuokalani, and heirs of her body lawfully begotten, and their lawful descendants in a direct line. The succession shall be to the senior male child, and to the heirs of his body; failing a male child, the succession shall be to the senior female child, and to the heirs of her body. In case there is no heir as above provided, the successor shall be the person whom the Sovereign shall appoint with the consent of the nobles, and publicly proclaim during the Sovereign's life; but should there be no

but should there be no such appointment; and proclamation, and the throne should become vacant, then the Cabinet Council, immediately after the occurring of such vacancy, shall cause a meeting of the legislative assembly, who shall elect by ballot some native Alii of the Kingdom as successor to the throne; and the successor so elected shall become a new *Stirps* for a royal family; and the succession from the Sovereign thus elected, shall be regulated by the same law as the present royal family of Hawaii.

ARTICLE 23. It shall not be lawful for any member of the royal family of Hawaii who may by law succeed to the throne, to contract marriage without the consent of the reigning sovereign. Every marriage so contracted shall be void, and the person so contracting a marriage may, by the proclamation of the reigning Sovereign be declared to have forfeited his or her right to the throne, and after such proclamation, the right of succession shall vest in the next heir as though such offender were *dead*.

ARTICLE 24. His Majesty Kamehameha V will, and his successors upon coming to the throne shall, take the following oath: I solemnly swear, in the presence of Almighty God, to maintain the constitution of the Kingdom whole and inviolate, and to govern in conformity therewith.

ARTICLE 25. No person shall ever sit upon the throne who has been convicted of any infamous crime, or who is insane or an idiot.

ARTICLE 26. The King is the commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and of all other military forces of the Kingdom, by sea and land; and has full power by himself, or by any officer or officers he may appoint, to train and govern such forces as he may judge best for the defense and safety of the Kingdom. But he shall never proclaim war without the consent of the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE 27. The King, by and with the consent of his privy council, has the power to grant reprieves and pardons, after conviction, for all offences, except in cases of impeachment.

ARTICLE 28. The King, by and with the consent of his privy council, convenes the legislative assembly at the seat of Government, or at a different place, if that should become dangerous from an enemy or any dangerous disorder; and in case of disagreement between His Majesty and the legislative assembly, he adjourns, prorogues, or dissolves it, but not beyond the next ordinary session; under any great emergency, he may convene the legislative assembly to extraordinary sessions.

such appointment and proclamation, and the throne should become vacant, then the Cabinet immediately after the occurring of such vacancy shall cause a meeting of the Legislature, who shall elect by ballot some native Alii of the Kingdom as successor to the throne; and the successor so elected shall become a new *Stirps* for a royal family; and the succession from the Sovereign thus elected shall be regulated by the same law as the present royal family of Hawaii.

ARTICLE 23. It shall not be lawful for any member of the royal family of Hawaii who may by law succeed to the throne, to contract marriage without the consent of the reigning Sovereign. Every marriage so contracted shall be void, and the person so contracting a marriage may, by the proclamation of the reigning Sovereign, be declared to have forfeited his or her right to the throne, and after such proclamation, the right of succession shall vest in the next heir as though such offender were *dead*.

ARTICLE 24. His Majesty Kalakana will, and his successors shall, take the following oath: I solemnly swear, in the presence of Almighty God, to maintain the constitution of the Kingdom whole and inviolate, and to govern in conformity therewith.

ARTICLE 25. No person shall sit upon the throne who has been convicted of any infamous crime, or who is insane, or an idiot.

ARTICLE 26. The King is the commander-in-chief of the army and navy and of all other military forces of the Kingdom, by sea and land. But he shall never proclaim war without the consent of the Legislature; and no military or naval force shall be organized except by the authority of the Legislature.

ARTICLE 27. The King, by and with the advice of his privy council, and with the consent of the Cabinet, has the power to grant reprieves and pardons, after conviction, for all offenses, except in case of impeachment.

ARTICLE 28. The King convenes the Legislature at the seat of Government, or at a different place, if that should become insecure from an enemy or any dangerous disorder, and prorogues the same; and in any great emergency he may, with the advice of the privy council, convene the Legislature in extraordinary session.

ARTICLE 29. The King has the power to make treaties. Treaties involving changes in the tariff or in any law of the Kingdom shall be referred for approval to the legislative assembly. The King appoints public ministers, who shall be commissioned, accredited, and instructed agreeably to the usage and law of nations.

ARTICLE 30. It is the King's prerogative to receive and acknowledge public ministers; to inform the legislative assembly by royal message, from time to time, of the state of the Kingdom, and to recommend to its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

ARTICLE 31. The person of the King is inviolable and sacred. His ministers are responsible. To the King belongs the executive power. All laws that have passed the legislative assembly shall require His Majesty's signature, in order to their validity.

ARTICLE 32. Whenever, upon the decease of the reigning sovereign, the heir shall be less than 18 years of age, the royal power shall be exercised by a regent or council of regency, as hereinafter provided.

ARTICLE 33. It shall be lawful for the King at any time when he may be about to absent himself from the Kingdom, to appoint a regent or council of regency, who shall administer the Government in his name; and likewise the King may, by his last will and testament, appoint a regent or council of regency to administer the Government during the minority of any heir to the throne; and should a sovereign decease, leaving a minor heir, and having made no last will and testament, the cabinet council at the time of such decease shall be a council of regency until the legislative assembly, which shall be called immediately, may be assembled, and the legislative assembly immediately that it is assembled shall proceed to choose by ballot a regent or council of regency, who shall administer the Government in the name of the King, and exercise all the powers which are constitutionally vested in the King, until he shall have attained the age of 18 years, which age is declared to be the legal majority of such sovereign.

ARTICLE 34. The King is sovereign of all the chiefs and of all the people; the Kingdom is his.

ARTICLE 35. All titles of honor, orders, and other distinctions emanate from the King.

ARTICLE 36. The King coins money and regulates the currency by law.

ARTICLE 37. The King, in case of invasion or rebellion, can place the whole Kingdom or any part of it under martial law.

ARTICLE 29. The King has the power to make treaties. Treaties involving changes in the tariff or in any law of the Kingdom, shall be referred for approval to the Legislature. The King appoints public ministers, who shall be commissioned, accredited, and instructed agreeably to the usage and law of nations.

ARTICLE 30. It is the King's prerogative to receive and acknowledge public ministers; to inform the Legislature by royal message, from time to time, of the state of the Kingdom, and to recommend to its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

ARTICLE 31. The person of the King is inviolable and sacred. His ministers are responsible. To the King and the cabinet belongs the executive power. All laws that have passed the Legislature shall require His Majesty's signature, in order to their validity, except as provided in article 48.

ARTICLE 32. Whenever, upon the decease of the reigning sovereign, the heir shall be less than 18 years of age, the royal power shall be exercised by a regent or council of regency, as hereinafter provided.

ARTICLE 33. It shall be lawful for the King at any time when he may be about to absent himself from the Kingdom, to appoint a regent or council of regency, who shall administer the Government in his name; and likewise the King may, by his last will and testament, appoint a regent or council of regency to administer the Government during the minority of any heir to the throne; and should a sovereign decease, leaving a minor heir, and having made no last will and testament, the cabinet at the time of such decease shall be a council of regency until the Legislature, which shall be called immediately, be assembled, and the Legislature immediately that it is assembled shall proceed to choose by ballot a regent or council of regency, who shall administer the Government in the name of the King, and exercise all the powers which are vested in the King, until such heir shall have attained the age of 18 years, which age is declared to be the legal majority of such sovereign.

ARTICLE 34. The King is sovereign of all the chiefs and of all the people.

ARTICLE 35. All titles of honor, orders, and other distinctions emanate from the King.

ARTICLE 36. The King coins money and regulates the currency by law.

ARTICLE 37. The King, in case of invasion or rebellion, can place the whole Kingdom or any part of it under martial law.

ARTICLE 38. The national ensign shall not be changed, except by act of the Legislature.

ARTICLE 39. The King's private lands and other property are inviolable.

ARTICLE 40. The King can not be sued or held to account in any court or tribunal of the realm.

ARTICLE 41. There shall continue to be a council of state for advising the King in all matters for the good of the state, wherein he may require its advice, and for assisting him in administering the executive affairs of the Government in such manner as he may direct, which council shall be called the King's privy council of state, and the members thereof shall be appointed by the King to hold office during His Majesty's pleasure.

ARTICLE 42. The King's cabinet shall consist of the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the interior, the minister of finance, and the attorney-general of the Kingdom, and these shall be His Majesty's special advisers in the executive affairs of the Kingdom; and they shall be *ex officio* members of His Majesty's privy council of state. They shall be appointed and commissioned by the King, and hold office during His Majesty's pleasure, subject to impeachment. No act of the King shall have any effect unless it be countersigned by a minister, who, by that signature, makes himself responsible.

ARTICLE 43. Each member of the King's cabinet shall keep an office at the seat of Government, and shall be accountable for the conduct of his deputies and clerks. The ministry hold seats *ex officio* as nobles in the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE 44. The minister of finance shall present to the legislative assembly, in the name of the Government, on the first day of the meeting of the Legislature, the financial budget, in the Hawaiian and English languages.

ARTICLE 45. The legislative power of the three estates of this Kingdom is vested in the King, and the legislative assembly, which assembly shall consist of the nobles, appointed by the King, and of the representatives of the people, sitting together.

ARTICLE 38. The national ensign shall not be changed, except by act of the Legislature.

ARTICLE 39. The King can not be sued or held to account in any court or tribunal of the Kingdom.

ARTICLE 40. There shall continue to be a council of state for advising the King in all matters for the good of the state, wherein he may require its advice, which council shall be called the King's privy council of state, and the members thereof shall be appointed by the King to hold office during His Majesty's pleasure, and which council shall have and exercise only such powers as are given to it by the constitution.

ARTICLE 41. The cabinet shall consist of the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the interior, the minister of finance, and the attorney-general, and they shall be His Majesty's special advisers in the executive affairs of the Kingdom; and they shall be *ex officio* members of His Majesty's privy council of state. They shall be appointed and commissioned by the King, and shall be removed by him only upon a vote of want of confidence passed by a majority of all the elective members of the Legislature, or upon conviction of felony, and shall be subject to impeachment. No act of the King shall have any effect unless it be countersigned by a member of the cabinet, who, by that signature, makes himself responsible.

ARTICLE 42. Each member of the cabinet shall keep an office at the seat of Government, and shall be accountable for the conduct of his deputies and clerks. The cabinet hold seats *ex officio* in the Legislature, with the right to vote, except on a question of want of confidence in them.

ARTICLE 43. The minister of finance shall present to the Legislature, in the name of the Government, on the first day of each biennial session, the financial budget, in the Hawaiian and English languages.

ARTICLE 44. The legislative power of the Kingdom is vested in the King and the Legislature, which shall consist of the nobles and representatives sitting together.

ARTICLE 45. The legislative body shall be styled the Legislature of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and shall assemble, biennially, in the month of May. The first regular session shall be held in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and eighty-eight.

ARTICLE 46. The legislative body shall assemble biennially, in the month of April, and at such other time as the King may judge necessary, for the purpose of seeking the welfare of the nation. This body shall be styled the Legislature of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

ARTICLE 47. Every member of the legislative assembly shall take the following oath: I most solemnly swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that I will faithfully support the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and conscientiously and impartially discharge my duties as a member of this Assembly.

ARTICLE 48. The Legislature has full power and authority to amend the constitution as hereinafter provided; and from time to time to make all manner of wholesome laws not repugnant to the provisions of the constitution.

ARTICLE 49. The King shall signify his approval of any bill or resolution which shall have passed the legislative assembly, by signing the same previous to the final rising of the Legislature. But if he shall object to the passing of such bill or resolution he will return it to the legislative assembly, who shall enter the fact of such return on its journal, and such bill or resolution shall not be brought forward thereafter during the same session.

ARTICLE 50. The legislative assembly shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own members, and a majority shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as the assembly may provide.

ARTICLE 51. The legislative assembly shall choose its own officers and determine the rules of its own proceedings.

ARTICLE 46. Every member of the Legislature shall take the following oath: I solemnly swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that I will faithfully support the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and conscientiously and impartially discharge my duties as a member of the Legislature.

ARTICLE 47. The Legislature has full power and authority to amend the Constitution as hereinafter provided; and from time to time to make all manner of wholesome laws not repugnant to the constitution.

ARTICLE 48. Every bill which shall have passed the Legislature shall, before it becomes law, be presented to the King. If he approve he shall sign it and it shall thereby become a law, but if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to the Legislature, which shall enter the objections at large on their journal and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration it shall be approved by a two-thirds vote of all the elective members of the Legislature it shall become a law. In all such cases the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of the Legislature. If any bill shall not be returned by the King within ten days (Sunday excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Legislature by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

ARTICLE 49. The Legislature shall be the judge of the qualifications of its own members, except as may hereafter be provided by law, and a majority shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as the Legislature may provide.

ARTICLE 50. The Legislature shall choose its own officers and determine the rules of its own proceedings.

ARTICLE 51. The Legislature shall have authority to punish by imprisonment, not exceeding thirty days, every person, not a member, who shall be guilty of disrespect to the Legislature by any disorderly or contemptuous behavior in its presence; or who, during the time of its sitting,

ARTICLE 52. The legislative assembly shall have authority to punish by imprisonment, not exceeding thirty days, every person, not a member, who shall be guilty of disrespect to the assembly, by any disorderly or contemptuous behavior in its presence; or who, during the time of its sitting, shall publish any false report of its proceedings, or insulting comments upon the same; or who shall threaten harm to the body or estate of any of its members, for anything said or done in the assembly; or who shall assault any of them therefor, or who shall assault or arrest any witness, or other person ordered to attend the assembly, in his way going or returning; or who shall rescue any person arrested by order of the assembly.

ARTICLE 53. The legislative assembly may punish its own members for disorderly behavior.

ARTICLE 54. The legislative assembly shall keep a journal of its proceedings; and the yeas and nays of the members on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

ARTICLE 55. The members of the legislative assembly shall, in all cases, except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the sessions of the Legislature, and in going to and returning from the same; and they shall not be held to answer for any speech or debate made in the assembly, in any court or place whatsoever.

ARTICLE 56. The representatives shall receive for their services a compensation to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the public treasury, but no increase of compensation shall take effect during the year in which it shall have been made; and no law shall be passed increasing the compensation of said representatives beyond the sum of one hundred and fifty

shall publish any false report of its proceedings, or insulting comments upon the same; or who shall threaten harm to the body or estate of any of its members for anything said or done in the Legislature; or who shall assault any of them therefor; or who shall assault or arrest any witness, or other person ordered to attend the Legislature, on his way going or returning; or who shall rescue any person arrested by order of the Legislature.

ARTICLE 52. The Legislature may punish its own members for disorderly behavior.

ARTICLE 53. The Legislature shall keep a journal of its proceedings; and the yeas and nays of the members, on any question, shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

ARTICLE 54. The members of the Legislature shall, in all cases, except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the sessions of the Legislature, and in going to and returning from the same; provided such privilege as to going and returning shall not cover a period of over twenty days; and they shall not be held to answer for any speech or debate made in the Legislature, in any court or place whatsoever.

ARTICLE 55. The representatives shall receive for their services a compensation to be determined by law, and paid out of the public treasury, but no increase of compensation shall take effect during the biennial term in which it shall have been made; and no law shall be passed increasing the compensation of representatives beyond the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars each for each biennial term.

ARTICLE 56. A noble shall be a subject of the Kingdom, who shall have attained the age of twenty-five years, and resided in the Kingdom three years, and shall be the owner of taxable property in this Kingdom of the value of three thousand dollars over and above all encumbrances, or in receipt of an income of not less than six hundred dollars per annum.

ARTICLE 57. The King appoints the nobles, who shall hold their appointments during life, subject to the provisions of Article 53; but their number shall not exceed twenty.

ARTICLE 58. No person shall be appointed a noble who shall not have attained the age of twenty-one years and resided in the Kingdom five years.

ARTICLE 59. The nobles shall be a court with full and sole authority to hear and determine all impeachments made by the representatives, as the grand inquest of the Kingdom, against any officers of the Kingdom, for misconduct or maladministration in their offices; but previous to the trial of every impeachment the nobles shall respectively be sworn, truly and impartially to try and determine the charge in question, according to evidence and the law. Their judgment, however, shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold or enjoy any place of honor, trust, or profit, under this Government; but the party so convicted, shall be, nevertheless, liable to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to the laws of the land. No Minister shall sit as a noble on the trial of any impeachment.

ARTICLE 57. The nobles shall be a court, with full and sole authority to hear and determine all impeachments made by the representatives, as the grand inquest of the Kingdom, against any officers of the Kingdom, for misconduct or maladministration in their offices; but previous to the trial of every impeachment the nobles shall respectively be sworn, truly and impartially to try and determine the charge in question, according to evidence and law. Their judgment, however, shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold or enjoy any place of honor, trust, or profit under this Government; but the party so convicted shall be, nevertheless, liable to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment according to the laws of the land.

ARTICLE 58. Twenty-four nobles shall be elected, as follows: Six from the island of Hawaii; six from the islands of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai; nine from the island of Oahu, and three from the islands of Kauai and Niihau. At the first election held under this constitution the nobles shall be elected to serve until the general election to the Legislature for the year of our Lord 1890, at which election, and thereafter, the nobles shall be elected at the same time and places as the representatives. At the election for the year of our Lord 1890 one-third of the nobles from each of the divisions aforesaid shall be elected for two years, and one-third for four years, and one-third for six years, and the electors shall ballot for them for such terms, respectively; and at all subsequent general elections they shall be elected for six years. The nobles shall serve without pay.

ARTICLE 59. Every male resident of the Hawaiian Islands, of Hawaiian, American, or European birth or descent, who shall have attained the age of twenty years, and shall have paid his taxes, and shall have caused his name to be entered on the list of voters for nobles for his district, shall be an elector of nobles, and shall be entitled to vote at any election of nobles; provided,

First. That he shall have resided in the country not less than three years, and in the district in which he offers to vote not less than three months, immediately preceding the election at which he offers to vote.

Second. That he shall own and be possessed, in his own right, of taxable property in this country of the value of not less than three thousand dollars over and above all encumbrances, or shall have actually received an income of not less than six hundred dollars during the year next preceding his registration for such election.

Third. That he shall be able to read and comprehend an ordinary newspaper printed in either the Hawaiian, English, or some European language.

Fourth. That he shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution and laws, such oath to be administered by any person authorized to administer oaths or by any inspector of elections.

Provided, however, that the requirements of a three years' residence and of ability to read and comprehend an ordinary newspaper, printed either in the Hawaiian, English, or some European language, shall not apply to persons residing in the Kingdom at the time of the promulgation of this constitution, if they shall register and vote at the first election which shall be held under this constitution.

ARTICLE 60. The representation of the people shall be based upon the principal of equality, and shall be regulated and apportioned by the legislature according to the population, to be ascertained, from time to time, by the official census. The representatives shall not be less in number than twenty-four, nor more than forty, who shall be elected biennially.

ARTICLE 60. There shall be twenty-four representatives of the people elected biennially, except those first elected under this constitution, who shall serve until the general election for the year of our Lord 1890. The representation shall be based upon the principles of equality, and shall be regulated and apportioned by the Legislature according to the population to be ascertained, from time to time, by the official census. But until such apportionment by the Legislature, the apportionment now established by law shall remain in force, with the following exceptions, namely, there shall be but two representatives for the districts of Hilo and Puna, on the island of Hawaii; but one for the districts of Lahaina and Kaanapali, on the island of Maui; and but one for the districts of Koolauloa and Waialua, on the island of Oahu.

ARTICLE 61. No person shall be eligible for a representative of the people who is insane or an idiot, nor unless he be a male subject of the Kingdom, who shall have arrived at the full age of twenty-one years, who shall know how to read and write, who shall understand accounts and shall have been domiciled in the Kingdom for at least three years—the last of which shall be the year immediately preceding his election—and who shall own real estate within the Kingdom of a clear value, over and above all encumbrances, of at least five hundred dollars, or who shall have an annual income of at least two hundred and fifty dollars, derived from any property or some lawful employment.

ARTICLE 61. No person shall be eligible as a representative of the people unless he be a male subject of the Kingdom who shall have arrived at the full age of twenty-one years, who shall know how to read and write either the Hawaiian, English, or some European language, who shall understand accounts, who shall have been domiciled in the Kingdom for at least three years—the last of which shall be the year immediately preceding his election—and who shall own real estate within the Kingdom of a clear value, over and above all encumbrances, of at least five hundred dollars, or who shall have an annual income of at least two hundred and fifty dollars, derived from any property or some lawful employment.

ARTICLE 62. Every male subject of the Kingdom, who shall have paid his taxes, who shall have attained the age of twenty years, and shall have been domiciled in the Kingdom for one year immediately preceding the election, and shall be possessed of real property in the Kingdom, to the value, over and above all encumbrances, of one hundred and fifty dollars, or of a leasehold property on which the rent is twenty-five dollars per year, or of an income of not less than seventy-five dollars per year, derived from any property or some lawful employment; and shall know how to read and

ARTICLE 62. Every male resident of the Kingdom, of Hawaiian, American, or European birth or descent, who shall have taken an oath to support the constitution and laws in the manner provided for electors of nobles, who shall have paid his taxes, who shall have attained the age of twenty years, and shall have been domiciled in the Kingdom for one year immediately preceding the election, and shall know how to read and write either the Hawaiian, English, or some European language (if born since the year 1840), and shall have caused his name to be entered on the list of voters

write, if born since the year 1840, and shall have caused his name to be entered on the list of voters of his district as may be provided by law, shall be entitled to one vote for the representative or representatives of that district: *Provided, however,* That no insane or idiotic person, nor any person who shall have been convicted of any infamous crime within this Kingdom, unless he shall have been pardoned by the King, and by the terms of such pardon have been restored to all the rights of a subject, shall be allowed to vote.

ARTICLE 63. The property qualification of the representatives of the people, and of the electors, may be increased by law.

ARTICLE 64. The judicial power of the Kingdom shall be vested in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as the Legislature may, from time to time, establish.

ARTICLE 65. The supreme court shall consist of a chief justice and not less than two associate justices, any of whom may hold the court. The justices of the supreme court shall hold their offices during good behavior, subject to removal upon impeachment, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office: *Provided, however,* That any judge of the supreme court or any other court of record may be removed from office, on a resolution passed by two-thirds of the legislative assembly, for good cause shown to the satisfaction of the King. The judge against whom the legislative assembly may be about to proceed shall receive due notice thereof, accompanied by a copy of the causes alleged for his removal, at least ten days before the day on which the legislative assembly shall act thereon. He shall be heard before the legislative assembly.

ARTICLE 66. The judicial power shall be divided among the supreme court and the several inferior courts of the Kingdom in such manner as the legislature may, from time to time, prescribe, and the tenure of office in the inferior courts of the Kingdom shall be such as may be defined by the law creating them.

ARTICLE 67. The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under the constitution and laws of this Kingdom, and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority, to all cases affecting public ministers and consuls, and to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

of his district as may be provided by law, shall be entitled to one vote for the representative or representatives of that district: *Provided, however,* That the requirements of being domiciled in the Kingdom for one year immediately preceding the election, and of knowing how to read and write, either the Hawaiian, English, or some European language, shall not apply to persons residing in this Kingdom at the time of the promulgation of this constitution if they shall register and vote at the first election which shall be held under this constitution.

ARTICLE 63. No person shall sit as a noble or representative in the Legislature unless elected under, and in conformity with, the provisions of this constitution. The property or income qualification of representatives, of nobles, and of electors of nobles may be increased by law; and a property or income qualification of electors of representatives may be created and altered by law.

ARTICLE 64. The judiciary power of the Kingdom shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Legislature may, from time to time, establish.

ARTICLE 65. The supreme court shall consist of a chief justice, and not less than two associate justices, any one of whom may hold the court. The justices of the supreme court shall hold their offices during good behavior, subject to removal upon impeachment, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office: *Provided, however,* That any judge of the supreme court or any other court of record may be removed from office on a resolution passed by two-thirds of all the members of the Legislature, for good cause shown to the satisfaction of the King. The judge against whom the Legislature may be about to proceed shall receive notice thereof, accompanied by a copy of the causes alleged for his removal, at least ten days before the day on which the Legislature shall act thereon. He shall be heard before the Legislature.

ARTICLE 66. The judicial power shall be divided among the supreme court and the several inferior courts of the Kingdom, in such manner as the Legislature may, from time to time, prescribe, and the tenure of office in the inferior courts of the Kingdom shall be such as may be defined by the law creating them.

ARTICLE 67. The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under the constitution and laws of this Kingdom, and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority, to all cases affecting public ministers and consuls, and to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 68. The chief justice of the supreme court shall be the chancellor of the Kingdom. He shall be *ex officio* president of the nobles in all cases of impeachment, unless when impeached himself, and exercise such jurisdiction in equity or other cases as the law may confer upon him; his decisions being subject, however, to the revision of the supreme court on appeal. Should the chief justice ever be impeached, some person specially commissioned by the King shall be president of the court of impeachment during such trial.

ARTICLE 69. The decisions of the supreme court, when made by a majority of the justices thereof, shall be final and conclusive upon all parties.

ARTICLE 70. The King, his cabinet, and the legislative assembly shall have authority to require the opinions of the justices of the supreme court upon important questions of law and upon solemn occasions.

ARTICLE 71. The King appoints the justices of the supreme court and all other judges of courts of record. Their salaries are fixed by law.

ARTICLE 72. No judge or magistrate can sit alone on an appeal or new trial in any case on which he may have given a previous judgment.

ARTICLE 73. No person shall ever hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of the Hawaiian Islands who shall, in due course of law, have been convicted of theft, bribery, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, or other high crime or misdemeanor, unless he shall have been pardoned by the King and restored to his civil rights, and by the express terms of his pardon declared to be appointable to offices of trust, honor, and profit.

ARTICLE 74. No officer of this Government shall hold any office or receive any salary from any other government or power whatever.

ARTICLE 75. The Legislature votes the appropriations biennially, after due consideration of the revenue and expenditure for the two preceding years, and the estimates of the revenue and expenditure of the two succeeding years, which shall be submitted to them by the minister of finance.

ARTICLE 76. The enacting style in making and passing all acts and laws shall be: "Be it enacted by the King and the legislative assembly of the Hawaiian Islands, in the Legislature of the Kingdom assembled."

ARTICLE 68. The chief justice of the supreme court shall be the chancellor of the Kingdom. He shall be *ex officio* president of the nobles in all cases of impeachment, unless when impeached himself, and shall exercise such jurisdiction in equity or other cases as the law may confer upon him; his decisions being subject, however, to the revision of the supreme court on appeal. Should the chief justice ever be impeached, some person specially commissioned by the King shall be president of the court of impeachment during such trial.

ARTICLE 69. The decisions of the supreme court, when made by a majority of the justices thereof, shall be final and conclusive upon all parties.

ARTICLE 70. The King, his cabinet, and the Legislature shall have authority to require the opinions of the justices of the supreme court upon important questions of law and upon solemn occasions.

ARTICLE 71. The King appoints the justices of the supreme court and all other judges of the courts of record. Their salaries are fixed by law.

ARTICLE 72. No judge or magistrate shall sit all alone on an appeal or new trial in any case on which he may have given a previous judgment.

ARTICLE 73. The following persons shall not be permitted to register for voting, to vote, or to hold office under any department of the Government, or to sit in the Legislature, namely: Any person who is insane or an idiot, or any person who shall have been convicted of any of the following-named offenses, viz: Arson, barratry, bribery, burglary, counterfeiting, embezzlement, felonious branding of cattle, forgery, gross cheat, incest, kidnapping, larceny, malicious burning, manslaughter in the first degree, murder, perjury, rape, robbery, sodomy, treason, subornation of perjury, and false witness in office, unless he shall have been pardoned by the King and restored to his civil rights, and by the express terms of his pardon declared to be eligible to offices of trust, honor, and profit.

ARTICLE 74. No officer of this Government shall hold any office or receive any salary from any other government or power whatever.

ARTICLE 75. The Legislature votes the appropriation biennially, after due consideration of the revenue and expenditure for the two preceding years, and the estimates of the revenue and expenditure of the two succeeding years, which shall be submitted to them by the minister of finance.

ARTICLE 76. The enacting style in making and passing all acts and laws shall be: "Be it enacted by the King and the Legislature of the Hawaiian Kingdom."

ARTICLE 77. To avoid improper influences which may result from intermixing in one and the same act such things as have no proper relation to each other, every law shall embrace but one object, and that shall be expressed in its title.

ARTICLE 78. All laws now in force in this Kingdom shall continue and remain in full effect until altered or repealed by the Legislature, such parts only excepted as are repugnant to this constitution. All laws heretofore enacted, or that may hereafter be enacted, which are contrary to this constitution shall be null and void.

ARTICLE 79. This constitution shall be in force from the twentieth day of August, in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, but that there may be no failure of justice or inconvenience to the Kingdom from any change, all officers of this Kingdom at the time this constitution shall take effect shall have, hold, and exercise all the power to them granted, until other persons shall be appointed in their stead.

ARTICLE 80. Any amendment or amendments to this constitution may be proposed in the legislative assembly, and if the same shall be agreed to by a majority of members thereof such proposed amendment or amendments shall be entered on its journal, with the yeas and nays taken thereon, and referred to the next Legislature; which proposed amendment or amendments shall be published for three months previous to the next election of representatives; and if in the next Legislature such proposed amendment or amendments shall be agreed to by two-thirds of all the members of the legislative assembly, and be approved by the King, such amendment or amendments shall become part of the constitution of this country.

KAMEHAMEHA R.

ARTICLE 77. To avoid improper influences which may result from intermixing in one and the same act such things as have no proper relation to each other, every law shall embrace but one object, and that shall be expressed in its title.

ARTICLE 78. Wherever by this constitution any act is to be done or performed by the King or the Sovereign, it shall, unless otherwise expressed, mean that such act shall be done and performed by the Sovereign by and with the advice and consent of the cabinet.

ARTICLE 79. All laws now in force in this Kingdom shall continue and remain in full effect until altered or repealed by the Legislature, such parts only excepted as are repugnant to this constitution. All laws heretofore enacted, or that may hereafter be enacted, which are contrary to this constitution shall be null and void.

ARTICLE 80. The cabinet shall have power to make and publish all necessary rules and regulations for the holding of any election or elections under this constitution, prior to the passage by the Legislature of appropriate laws for such purpose, and to provide for administering to officials, subjects, and residents the oath to support this constitution. The first election hereunder shall be held within ninety days after the promulgation of this constitution, and the Legislature then elected may be convened at Honolulu, upon the call of the cabinet council, in extraordinary session at such time as the cabinet council may deem necessary, thirty days' notice thereof being previously given.

ARTICLE 81. This constitution shall be in force from the 7th day of July, A. D. 1887; but that there may be no failure of justice or convenience to the Kingdom from any change, all officers of this Kingdom, at the time this constitution shall take effect, shall have, hold, and exercise all the power to them granted. Such officers shall take an oath to support this constitution within sixty days after the promulgation thereof.

ARTICLE 82. Any amendment or amendments to this constitution may be proposed in the Legislature, and if the same shall be agreed to by a majority of the members thereof, such proposed amendment or amendments shall be entered on its journal, with the yeas and nays taken thereon, and referred to next Legislature; which proposed amendment or amendments shall be published for three months previous to the next election of representatives and nobles; and if in the next Legislature such proposed amend-

ment or amendments shall be agreed to by two-thirds of all the members of the Legislature, such amendment or amendments shall become part of the constitution of this Kingdom.

KALAKAUA REX.

By the King:

W. L. GREEN,

Minister of Finance.

HONOLULU, OAHU, ss.

I, Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands, in the presence of Almighty God, do solemnly swear to maintain this constitution whole and inviolate, and to govern in conformity therewith.

KALAKAUA REX.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this sixth day of July, A. D. 1887.

A. F. JUDD,

*Chief Justice of the Supreme Court,
and Chancellor of the Kingdom.*

No. 24.

Statement of Charles T. Gulick.

AGENCY OF UNITED STATES MINISTER STEVENS AND CAPT. WILTSE, COMMANDING U. S. S. BOSTON, IN THE OVERTHROW OF THE HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT, WHICH WAS EFFECTED JANUARY 17, 1893.

When Mr. Stevens presented his credentials to His Majesty, Kalakaua, as United States minister resident near the Hawaiian court, he gave the King a lecture on his duties as a sovereign, and at the same time hinted, in an ambiguous way, at the possibilities of the future. The subject matter of the address, and the manner of Mr. Stevens, were so offensive as to very nearly produce disagreeable consequences, as the King was on the point of abruptly terminating the interview and demanding the recall of Mr. Stevens. The unpleasant episode passed, however, without subsequent notice.

Col. G. W. Macfarlane and Dr. G. Trousseau will confirm the foregoing. On the occasion of the Fourth of July celebration in 1891, Mr. Stevens delivered an oration at the music hall in which he took the opportunity to show his very thinly veiled contempt for the Sovereign and Government to which he was accredited. His sentiments were more distinctly emphasized in his speech on Memorial Day, 1892, leaving no room for doubt with regard to his real meaning. In October, 1892, the Daily Bulletin, a newspaper published in Honolulu, contained a criticism on Mr. Stevens' tardiness in causing a search for a missing boat's crew (supposed to be somewhere to windward of the island of Hawaii) belonging to an American vessel which had burned at sea.

Mr. Stevens called in a rage at the foreign office and in his interview with the minister of foreign affairs endeavored to fasten on the cabinet responsibility for the comments in the Bulletin and demanded, as he termed it, "full satisfaction." His manner and language were in the highest degree undiplomatic and offensive, and he would accept no explanation. He immediately followed up the insult by demanding an audience with the Queen *without* the usual formality of the presence

of the minister of foreign affairs. The audience was accorded, and, trembling with passion, he reiterated his demand for "satisfaction," leaving it somewhat vague as to the form or kind of "satisfaction" he desired. The impression left by him in both interviews was that it was not so much "satisfaction" that he was after as it was an opportunity to pick a quarrel with, and embarrass, the cabinet who were then under fire in the legislative assembly.

Hon. Samuel Parker, Hon. Paul Neumann, and Maj. J. W. Robertson can give more fully the details of the foregoing.

Very shortly after Mr. Stevens' arrival in the Kingdom he made it generally known that he considered annexation to the United States as not only the ultimate or "manifest" destiny of the little country, but that it would be just as well to hasten the event, and the American legation immediately became the rendezvous or headquarters of the annexation leaders, such as Hartwell, Judd (the chief justice), Thurston, Dole, Castle, Smith, and others, who frequently met there for the purpose of discussing plans for bringing about the desired end.

On one occasion M. d'Anglade, the then French commissioner, and M. Canavarro, the present Portuguese chargé d'affairs, were invited to dinner at the American legation, and much to their surprise found several of the above-named gentlemen present, and as the dinner proceeded were not a little annoyed to find that they had been invited for the express purpose of being sounded with regard to annexation.

Señhor Canavarro and Dr. Trousseau, the latter being an intimate friend of M. d'Anglade, the French commissioner (who is not now in the Kingdom), can throw light on the above if they will submit to an interview.

During August, 1892, the tension became so great in the Legislature that the cabinet was voted out, and a new one was appointed on the 12th day of September. A vote of "want of confidence" in the new cabinet was immediately introduced, and the speeches of Thurston, Smith, Ashford, and their associates on the motion showed that the meetings at the legation were beginning to bear fruit. Mr. Stevens was present during a part of the debate on the motion, also Capt. Wiltse, who just after one of Mr. Thurston's speeches called at the interior office and took occasion to inform the then minister of the interior (C. T. Gulick) that he considered Mr. Thurston a "very able man," and that his "views on the situation, and particularly those on the monarchy, were very sound." It may be observed that Thurston had very plainly shown in his speech supporting the motion that he and his supporters would leave no stone unturned in order to destroy the monarchy and get the reins of power into their own hands.

As Thurston and his party were known to be annexationists, his expressions seemed to please Capt. Wiltse very much. About this time (September, 1892) it was a matter frequently spoken of that any move for the overthrow of the Government would receive the official recognition of Mr. Stevens and the material aid of Capt. Wiltse. Annexation was so freely discussed in public that T. T. Williams, of the San Francisco Examiner, polled the Legislature on the subject, and when they found that their views were likely to be published they denounced annexation to a man.

The meetings at the legation continued, and Stevens and Wiltse (the latter more particularly) called frequently at Hartwell's office during the day. Wiltse told people that he kept himself thoroughly posted with regard to affairs, as he "was constantly in communication

with Hartwell, who was the best informed man in the Kingdom on the situation."

The *Boston's* troops were landed at about 5 o'clock p. m. on Monday, the 16th day of January, A. D. 1893, and were quartered at Arion Hall, a position which practically commanded the Government building and the palace. The Hawaiian Government protested against their presence. The foreign diplomatic representatives called at the legation and entered their protest against the procedure as being wholly unnecessary. The town was perfectly quiet. Mr. Stevens's excuse was that the troops were ashore for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of Americans. They were quartered, however, on property belonging to an Englishman (at that time occupied by an Englishman and the Japanese inspector of immigrants under leases), and was surrounded by property belonging to the Hawaiian Government and native Hawaiians.

During the forenoon of Tuesday, the 17th day of January, 1893, it was freely remarked and frequently repeated on the streets that a move for deposing the Queen and overturning the Government would be made during the day, and that "*it was all right, as Stevens had promised to support the movement.*"

Thirteen men, calling themselves a committee of public safety (*all foreigners* and some of *brief residence* in the country), proceeded from the office of W. O. Smith up Merchant street to the front of the Government building, and Cooper, the leader, at about 2:40 o'clock p. m., read a proclamation deposing the Queen and establishing a "Provisional Government." Just before the arrival of the committee at the building, Charles L. Carter rode up hastily on horseback to Arion Hall and delivered a letter to Capt. Wiltse, who was himself in charge of the American troops. Wiltse was seen to tear open the envelope and read the letter, nodding his satisfaction to Carter, who then withdrew. As the committee turned the corner of the Music Hall on their road up, Mr. Cooper hastened forward to Arion Hall and delivered a letter to an officer (who apparently stood in readiness to receive it) and rejoined the committee.

At this time, *i. e.*, before the proclamation was read, the American troops were under arms, strong picked guards were posted at the corner of the Music Hall on King street and at other points around their quarters; the Gatling guns were placed in commanding positions and the crews were to attention or handy by.

The position of the American troops and their attitude, also the delivery of the letters above mentioned, can be verified by several different people, each one seeing different parts of the procedure. Dr. G. Trousseau, T. A. Lloyd, H. F. Poor, Norie, Pond, de Voll, and others were eyewitnesses of the matter above referred to.

By half past 3 o'clock it was generally reported on the streets that Stevens had recognized the Provisional Government and had assured the Queen's cabinet that he would support their action with the troops of the *Boston*.

The police department in charge of the marshal of the Kingdom was surrendered at dusk—lamps were lighted indoors, but there was still daylight on the streets; it was probably about 7 o'clock in the evening, *i. e.*, some three and a half to four hours after Stevens's action was generally known to the public. The barracks were not surrendered till near night of the following day.

CHAS. T. GULICK.

HONOLULU, *May 12, 1893.*

Interview with Fred. H. Hayselden, Lanai, April 11, 1893.

Q. What is your occupation?

A. I am a stock raiser.

Q. How much land have you?

A. I control about 100,000 acres.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. It is my wife's property left in trust to my children.

Q. How many whites on that island?

A. Only my family and four white men.

Q. How many natives?

A. About 250.

Q. What is the disposition down there towards the revolution—towards the new Government?

A. The natives are entirely opposed to it.

Q. What is the reason of that opposition?

A. Simply personal, I believe.

Q. Don't like the people?

A. No; because they feel that they are shut out in everything.

Q. Are you well acquainted in Honolulu?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the feeling here towards the present Government?

A. I should imagine among a majority of the whites it is in favor of the Provisional Government, for the sake of business.

Q. Are there any whites here opposed to the existing Government?

A. A great many.

Q. How many would you suppose?

A. I should suppose there are one-third of the whites.

Q. Do you include in that estimate Portuguese or Japanese?

A. No.

Q. You mean people of American descent?

A. American, English, German, and French.

Q. What type of people are they—people of education and means?

A. Yes; all of them.

Q. What does their opposition consist in?

A. They are opposed because they think they are run by a coterie. That is one reason.

Q. Any other?

A. The other reason is that they want to force annexation on this country and to put them down to the position of serfs.

Q. Do you mean by that that they meant to deprive them of suffrage?

A. Yes.

Q. Are there many of the natives here who have signed petitions for annexation?

A. I have heard that there are quite a considerable number of those who have been forced to do so by storekeepers and others—for bread and butter. I have asked them why they signed. They said: "On account of our food." I said: "Do you really mean that?" They said: "Heart is here—mouth is there."

Q. You were not here at the time of the revolution?

A. No. I was in Lanai; was sheriff there at the time. I had the honor of being the first one selected for dismissal.

Q. They dismissed you on account of your political views?

A. Yes. I came down to W. O. Smith's office and asked why I was dismissed. He said: "Simply because you are a friend of the Queen. You and the circuit judge are looked upon as enemies to our arrangement and we do not think it right to have two prominent officials against us." I asked him: "Do you want a republic here?" He said: "No." I said: "Are you quite sure of what you are saying? I have heard it reported on the street that you do." He said: "I give you my word of honor I do not." He said: "We want annexation." I said: "Do you want it pure and simple?" He asked what I meant. I said: "To give the natives franchise." He said: "Oh, no; we could not do that." I said: "You will never get it unless you do. I could go out and get 1,000 signatures for annexation if I could guarantee the franchise. You could not get one."

Q. As a matter of fact are they not getting signatures?

A. There is no question about that. My personal interests would be advanced 100 per cent by annexation.

Q. How?

A. Because we only get 10 cents a pound for our wool. If we had annexation we would get 20 in California. We have to send it to London and ship it through the United States.

Q. What do you think were the causes of the revolution?

A. Simply 2 cents a pound on sugar—to get some treaty or some arrangement with America. They did not see their way clear to get it in the face of the McKinley bill. They thought Harrison would be reëlected and the Republican policy would be continued.

Q. But at the time of the revolution Harrison had been defeated?

A. Yes; but this thing was marked up long before that. They wanted to force it upon the Harrison administration, if they could, before the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Col. Blount.

(Mr. Blount didn't care to have this certified.—E. M.)

No. 26.

Statement of C. M. Hyde.

HONOLULU, April 3, 1833.

Hon. J. S. BLOUNT,
Commissioner, etc.:

Since I saw you at your residence last Saturday afternoon, it has occurred to me that it might be advisable for me, occupying such a position as I do at the islands, as the only resident missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., to write out for your information and consideration such a statement of facts as might assist you in arriving at just conclusions in regard to the political and social condition of affairs, and the proper course for the United States Government to take at this juncture.

I have no occasion and certainly no desire to appear as either advocate or assailant of any persons or parties here. Nor have I any authority to act as the representative of the American board in matters outside of my special province as principal of the training school of

Hawaiian pastors and missionaries, except so far as it has its bearings on my instructions "to induce in the Hawaiians more of the sentiments of personal independence and self-reliance, and to develop that strength of character which shall enable them to withstand the unfavorable influences that have hitherto depressed them, and still exist from their contact with so large a foreign population."

You will pardon me in what I have to say if I introduce more of the personal element than you would meet in ordinary diplomatic correspondence. It is this very element that throws upon any such question those side lights that give the aspect of vitality and reality to what else might be only abstract discussion of abstruse principles of government and social order.

When I arrived here June 1, 1877, and began to study the situation, I found that I must first disabuse myself of the notion that it was Hawaiian civilization and a Hawaiian government under which I was to live. Such nomenclature was right and proper, but the church and state, nominally Hawaiian, was really managed by the few foreigners who had the direction of affairs. Not that the foreigners were exercising an usurped authority and the natives simply subject to their beck and call, but rather this, that the management of affairs of church and state was under the direction of the missionaries in the one case, and trusted advisers in the other; and that without such direction, not to say control, both churches and government would disintegrate speedily because of utter lack of the needful ability to maintain an independent organic existence.

The number of superannuated missionaries has constantly diminished till now there are only three surviving, only one of these an ordained preacher. The management of the churches has fallen entirely into the hands of the native pastors, with no direct continuous personal supervision. What I can do by correspondence or by chance visits and what Mr. Emerson can do by similar means (only in his case these are official and in some places semiannual,)—this constitutes all that we two workers can well do for the 57 Hawaiian evangelical churches, with their membership of 5,427 communicants out of a total population (native) of 34,436, with only one foreign pastor (Rev. H. H. Parker, of Kawaiajao Church, Honolulu) among the whole number (34) of pastors. The native churches are growing poorer and feebler each year, less able and willing to support the native pastorate.

One reason for this growing unwillingness is the demoralization of our churches under the influence of the native sovereign Kalakaua. It was his custom to appoint natives to office without regard to fitness, but rather because of social position among their own people and subserviency personally to himself. In this way, as our church members are among the better class of Hawaiians, they were selected as officials, but made to feel that their tenure of office depended upon his own pleasure. As there were not offices enough to give to all jealousies arose, and removals were necessary to make places for some whom it was the necessity of the moment to placate. In this way a greed for office-holding was introduced and fostered, till in perversion of the native translation of 1 Corinthians, 12 31, office seeking was made to seem the duty of every church member (seek the "highest offices for yourselves").

Another means of demoralizing the native churches was the idea instilled assiduously by the King, that a State church was the desirable religious establishment for Hawaii. He was to be the head, and

each pastor was to receive his salary from the Government treasury promptly, and amply sufficient for all his needs.

It is this same element of personal rule which the King cherished and constantly pushed forward in politics. In this he was helped by the style of political management which was introduced under the sugar-planting interests. Soon after I arrived there occurred the first advance made by the King in this direction. The Haiku Sugar Company had succeeded in building a canal to bring water from the windward side of Maui down to Kiamakuapoko to irrigate their cane fields there. Another company wanted to build a canal higher up, of course cutting off the water supply of the upper gulches that fed the Haiku ditch. The cabinet refused them a charter.

A loan to the King of \$40,000 was effected, and at this place that cabinet was dismissed at midnight and a ministry more favorable to the other party appointed, and the influence of money rather than principle became paramount. From that time onward the King pushed his schemes of personal aggrandizement as fast and as far as he dared. In Mr. Gibson he found a willing tool, who, for the sake of retaining his official position, did the King's bidding, and put through one iniquitous and ruinous measure after another. The foreign community remonstrated and yielded, remonstrated, opposed, and yielded, till finally forbearance ceased to be a virtue, and the situation became so embarrassing, perilous to all business, social, moral, and political interest, that an uprising of the sensible and intelligent and respectable part of the community (commonly stigmatized as the missionary element) led to the promulgation of the constitution of 1887, which abridged the power of the King, and was intended to make the cabinet, appointed by approval of the Legislature, the responsible organ of legislative and executive authority.

I refused to join the league under whose management this constitution was secured because it was a secret organization, whose leaders might initiate measures to which I could not consent. I published in the newspapers over my own name, however, the first and only public complaint that was thus openly made of the conduct and character of the King, and asked for a public meeting to formulate demands that would secure good government for the benefit of the community and end the misrule which was ruining the natives and scandalizing the foreign community. The common talk at that time was about shooting the King at sight, but I could not be convinced that a stable government would ever be secured by assassination.

The special occasion for the very vindictive feeling at that time was the conduct of the King in getting an opium license passed by the majority of the Legislature, then under his personal control, selling the license to one Chinaman without delivering it, but pocketing the money (\$75,000 or thereabouts), selling it afterwards to another Chinaman, who was shrewd enough to secure first the delivery of the license. All this was supported by sworn affidavits published in the newspapers, to which the King made no reply.

Another fact that incensed the community was the revelation about that time of the King's use of old superstitious practices and abominable orgies to degrade the Hawaiian people and make them the more ready tools to accomplish his purposes. In seeking a charter for the secret society he had formed (the Hale Nana, a mixture of Free Masonry, Mormonism, and diabolism) the character of that institution came to be quite generally known. You can obtain information about it from reliable sources. Suffice it for me to say that part of the exercise was the

worship of the King as divine. It was affirmed that as a god he could do no wrong, and by a curious Hawaiian perversion of logical reasoning he did various things that no one would hesitate to call vile as well as wrong to prove that he was a god.

It was hoped that the new constitution would give us a change. But largely through various judicial decisions the royal prerogatives and not the constitutional limitation of Hawaiian sovereignty have been assigned the supremacy. It has been one series of disappointments after another. The late Queen was in England when the constitution of 1887 was promulgated. She was bitterly disappointed at what her brother had done. Taking advantage of the vexation felt by many in the community at the various developments of royal prerogative, she sent for R. W. Wilcox to head a revolution, with the idea that Kalakaua would be compelled to abdicate and she would be placed upon the throne. But this scheme failed.

When she became Queen the first act was one to disappoint those who were ready to support a constitutional monarchical government with a responsible ministry approved by the Legislature. She claimed the privilege of nominating her own cabinet. The point was yielded, but the Legislature prorogued January 14, 1893, was of such a complexion and so manipulated that there was constant friction between the Queen's adherents and the supporters of representative constitutional government. Yet forbearance was exercised again and again; hopes were cherished in spite of convictions to the contrary from evident tendencies and attempts. These culminated in the transactions of January 10-17, with which you are familiar from the published statements.

The point to which I wish to call your attention is this, that the political system under which thus far Hawaiian affairs have been managed is utterly unfitted for the present changed conditions. It answered fairly well under the Kamehamehas. But the last Kamehameha (though older than his brother Kamehameha IV and passed by in Kamehameha III's election of his successor, because of personal unfitness) was restive under constitutional limitations and arbitrarily set aside the constitution under which he was appointed. The native element in the population at that time was too dominant an element to be successfully resisted.

Now, business and commerce have brought to these islands so large a foreign element that their interests are virtually the controlling element, politically and socially. But while they are the controlling element, and that fact can not be gainsaid, there has not ever been, nor is there now, so far as I am able to judge, any disposition to do any injustice to the natives. The present movement has been under the management of those who are and always have been the best friends of the natives, and in seeking to secure and support their own rights they seek and secure the true rights and the highest interests of the native population.

The organization of a constitutional government originated in the desire of the chiefs for a more stable tenure of property titles than simply the pleasure of the sovereign. When attempts to secure from abroad competent persons for this work had repeatedly failed, the American missionaries were requested to aid in this work. Interested in all that concerned the welfare of the Hawaiian people, they consented, but first resigned their commissions as missionaries of the American Board. They sought no emoluments for themselves nor their families, and the records of those days show how faithfully, tirelessly, self-sacrificingly they discharged the duties of their new and responsible positions, which

no one then would have taken up with all their disabilities except those intent with all singleness of purpose in elevating and sustaining a Christian nation here.

In 1870 the American Board withdrew from all supervision of the work here. Other influences have come to the front with the opening of commerce from the Pacific coast States. How intimate those relations have come to be, the statistical reports will show. Permit me to allude, in closing, to the changed social condition of the Hawaiian people. It is often asserted that a fundamental mistake was made in mission work by not (from the very outset) instructing the people in the English language. But those who take that view are persons who do not stop to think under what different conditions mission work was begun seventy years ago. English text-books and teachers were impossibilities then; they are not yet the great success which had been hoped, when the experiment was begun in 1876 of making English the medium of instruction in the Government schools. There are no pure Hawaiians at this day, so far as I know, who have been instructed in these Government schools who would be considered promising candidates to be trained for a collegiate course.

In all my intercourse with young Hawaiians I have met only one whom I would call worthy the name of a student, capable of abstruse thought, the study of principles, the acquisition of scientific or philosophical methods. Hawaiian is still the language of the Legislature and the judiciary, and every biennial period the attempt is made to make the Hawaiian, not the English language, the authoritative language of the statute book. The Americanization of the islands will necessitate the use of the English language only as the language of business, of politics, of education, of church service; and open the wide field of English literature to a people who have only poorly edited newspapers and a meager number of very rudimentary manuals as their text-books in science, or their highest attainments in culture.

The desire for official position without proper fitness for it is an element to the great disadvantage of the Hawaiian. Money thus easily made is foolishly as well as quickly spent for momentary enjoyments. Young people ruin themselves, their lives, their property, their families, in sensual enjoyments, and it is almost impossible to train them to habits of industry, thrift, forethought under the temptations about them to vice, idleness, extravagance. When Rev. Mr. Kuanea was made minister of finance, with every bank note he signed, he delighted in saying "How rich I am making this country."

In changing the political system of the country there is no abandonment of the original idea of the American mission, nor any betrayal of its high aims. I came here at the expense of the American board. To kind friends among the foreign residents I am indebted for the comfortable—not luxurious—home their hospitality has provided for an overburdened worker interested in everything that concerns the welfare of the community.

I have shirked no responsibility nor any burden of toil and care in doing all I could for the Hawaiian people. They have at times misinterpreted my actions, but they have never doubted the sincerity of my purposes, nor withheld their expressions of appreciation and approval. They may have expected too much, but they have always been ready to listen to any words of advice or warning I have had occasion to utter. It is as natural for them to follow a leader whom they think they can trust as for an Anglo-Saxon to take his stand independently whether others come to his support or not. They have not yet learned

the rudimentary principles of government and independent citizenship. Their lawyers can not grasp the details nor the generalizations that are necessary for the successful advocate or judge. Their ministers in our Christian churches may know how to shepherd the flocks in pastures, fenced and barred; but to beat off cunning and fierce destroyers they need other qualifications than a kindly spirit and a devoted attachment. There is no educated physician of native race in practice of his profession at the islands. There is no artisan, nor mechanic, nor trader in business for himself. As masters of the smaller coasting craft they have risen higher above their fellows and done better for their employers than in any other line of business.

It will take time and patience and devotion to righteousness and truth as well as genuine sympathy to uplift and adopt and then to adapt American political system to this community, but I believe that the foregoing statement of facts will show that it is, in the line of past procedure, the only hopeful way out of present difficulties, a necessity and an urgency.

We, who have lived some length of time in the country, know the weaknesses of the Hawaiian race, as well as their many excellent characteristics. The evidences that have shown such weaknesses are cumulative. The incidents that have developed such weaknesses, have not often been made matters of record and so can not at a moment's notice be recalled to substantiate such statements as might be made in regard to the unfitness of the Hawaiians for such predominance, politically and socially, as has hitherto been accorded to them.

Here is one incident of recent occurrences: The acting pastor of a church on Maui found that the Sunday-school superintendent was drinking heavily of sweet-potato beer and was often drunk. He brought the case before the deacons, but they decided that they would do nothing about it, for two reasons assigned: (1) Sweet-potato beer was the common food of the people; (2) drunkenness was so common that it could not be treated as an offense. Thereupon the pastor on the succeeding Sunday proceeded to read a long proclamation after the fashion set by the Provincial Government, deposing the Sunday-school superintendent for reasons assigned, as unworthy of his official position.

The people of Kaunakapili church in this city who do not like the well-known opposition of their pastor to the late Queen and her misrule presented a petition for his removal. The chief reason assigned was that they had not paid him his salary in full for the last two years, and this violation of their contract they acknowledged and made it the basis of their petition that he should be removed from the pastorate.

You will find that such is the childishness of this people, only two generations removed from lowest barbarism and heathenism, that the working of the political system is utterly unreliable. If voting is their privilege, it is sufficient to pose as a special friend of Hawaiian prejudices to secure an overwhelming majority for any such partisan. No matter how many times he may have deceived them, any demagogue who will promise whatever they may foolishly desire at the moment is the one whom they will follow. In this desire to perpetuate what is Hawaiian, and make that predominant, they are easily led to go back to heathen practices and ideas. To break up this tendency, for their own best welfare I know nothing better than to Americanize the political system. They will then be free to choose what is for their best good, not bound to cling to what is old and effete.

Social regeneration is as necessary as individual regeneration to

Christianize a nation. The individual instances of Christian character have not had for the last twenty years the environment favorable for any legitimate and proper development; and this has been largely owing to the political system. Instead of simply saying that the King's advisers, not the King, would be held responsible for mistakes in political management, the old constitution positively asserted that the King is not amenable to law. It was too much like the old Hawaiian idea of autocratic rule, limited only by fear of assassination. To get rid of the spirit of submissiveness to despotic authority, and substitute for it the Christian principle of obedience to righteous rule, is absolutely essential to the proper development of the national and individual life.

The old system will not work in its want of adaptation to the present civilization of the country. We can not trust business interests to the decision of a Hawaiian jury. In the management of the Kamehameha estate, of which I speak from personal knowledge as one of the trustees under the will of the late Mrs. C. R. Bishop, we are forced to put up with an inefficient administration of much of the property, because no Hawaiian jury would be likely to give us a verdict according to the law and evidence. Take what occurred at the last session of the circuit court in Kau. A Hawaiian jury brought in a verdict standing 10 to 2. The judge said that it was proper; according to the law 9 to 3, would be accepted as valid. On the next case, when the jury came to a decision they were unanimous. But some sapient juror remarked that the judge had just said a verdict of 9 to 3 was valid, so they talked and talked till finally three jurors changed their votes, and then their verdict was reported to the judge.

In the change of the political system, that seems to me now unavoidable and imperative, I see no other first step than annexation. Then let other matters be made the subject of careful consideration. We can not go on any longer under the old political system. I had hoped that we could. I did not believe annexation was wise or expedient, and have always said so to Mr. Stevens, whose views of the situation here had convinced him of the immediate necessity of such a step. The Queen did not show out her true character fully until the last week of the last parliamentary session. The logic of events has forced me to the conclusion that the old political system can not be made to work satisfactorily or enduringly even any longer. In seeking for a political system that will meet the requirements of the case, I see nothing better than immediate annexation. That will settle forever many things that now militate against the stability of any political system for the islands as the people are now. Other political questions must be left for future deliberation.

I think that intelligent Hawaiians, who have at heart the best interests of the country and the people, are very generally of that opinion. Give us annexation, and plans will be at once pushed for such a development of the country as can not be even thought of under any other circumstances. Talk about a protectorate is idle. We have had enough of legal fictions. The institutions and connections of the country are mainly American. Let us have the name, as well as the appearance; the real power as well as the nominal acquiescence, and the Hawaiians will accept the situation. They will have to make the best of it, whatever may be decided upon for them. The best thing for the whole people is now to make American citizens of themselves as fast as they can. Those who know that they are aiming at the highest possible ideal can afford to wait with patience for its realization. The overthrow of an

obstructive and ruinous social and political system is the best preparation for the spread of the Gospel of Christ, and the enjoyments of its privileges and blessings.

Yours respectfully,

C. M. HYDE.

NORTH PACIFIC MISSIONARY INSTITUTE.

No. 27.

Statement by Col. O. P. Jaukea, late of Her Majesty's personal staff.

On arriving at the palace shortly after the landing of the United States forces, I found Her Majesty's household in a state of nervous excitement. The Queen, although calm and collected, showed signs of uneasiness. This feeling soon increased to one of grave alarm and apprehension when, a few minutes later, the troops were seen moving in the direction of the palace, and, without warning, immediately take a position a short distance from, and in full view of, the palace and Government building.

This unexpected show of force right under the palace walls deeply impressed Her Majesty; and when on the day following the United States forces were seen encamped in the Arion Hall, adjoining the Government building premises, and commanding the palace, it at once became evident that they were landed for some other purpose than the protection of life and property.

When therefore during the afternoon of the same day the revolutionists took possession of the Government building no resistance was offered by the Queen's forces, it being impossible to successfully resist them without precipitating a conflict with the United States forces.

O. P. JAUKEA,

Late of Her Majesty's Personal Staff.

No. 28.

Interview with Chief Justice A. F. Judd, Honolulu, May 16, 1893.

Q. Please state where you were born.

A. In Honolulu, January 7, 1838.

Q. Has this always been your home?

A. With the exception of four years in the United States, two at Yale and the other two at Harvard law school, and on occasional visits to the States and a trip to Europe. I entered the practice of law in this country in 1864, and was elected twice to the Legislature—in 1868 from South Kona, Hawaii, and again for Honolulu in 1870, and in 1873 I was appointed attorney-general by Lunalilo, and on his death in 1874, on the election of Kalakaua, I went onto the bench as associate justice of the supreme court. I continued on the bench until now, having held different positions. I took the position of first associate justice in 1877, and was appointed chief justice in 1881. I have been in judicial life since my first appointment as judge in February, 1874, and have had my office in the Government building during all that time, and am somewhat familiar with political changes that have taken place.

Q. How were your judges selected prior to the constitution of 1887?

A. They were appointed.

Q. How selected prior to 1887?

A. They were appointed by the King. The supreme judges have always been appointed in that way, and, whatever has happened to this country, I think the sovereigns have always aimed to give us good men as judges.

Q. Who did Kalakaua appoint first as judges?

A. Judge Allen was chief justice under a former appointment—he being in the United States at the time of Kalakaua's election, of course was merely continued in office. The other judges were Hartwell and Widemann. Hartwell was appointed attorney-general and Widemann as minister of the interior. Judge Harris was then made first associate justice and I second associate justice.

Q. None of these were men of native blood?

A. None.

Q. Were they men of substantial character?

A. Yes; all of them. We have had two judges of native blood on the bench.

Q. Appointed by whom?

A. By Kamehameha III and Kamehameha V. The first was Judge Ii. He was a pure native. The other judge of native blood was R. G. Davis. He was half-white.

Q. How was your Legislature made up prior to the constitution of 1887?

A. It consisted of one body—nobles appointed by the Crown and representatives elected by the people.

Q. How many nobles?

A. Twenty.

Q. How many representatives?

A. It seems to me twenty-four—perhaps twenty-six—I do not know positively.

Q. The number of representatives exceeded the number of nobles prior to 1887?

A. I do not remember, but I think so.

Q. How were nobles selected?

A. Appointed by the King on nomination by the cabinet.

Q. And the representatives were—

A. Elected by the people.

Q. What suffrage qualification had you?

A. Under the constitution of 1852 there was no property qualification. The Legislature consisted of two houses that sat separately. King Kamehameha V refused to take the oath to that constitution when he took the throne in the fall of 1863, and he called a convention of delegates to revise the constitution, with the purpose of limiting the power of the people and strengthening his own prerogatives. I was secretary in that convention, and after a very warm discussion the King was unable to agree with the delegates as to the measure of that property qualification. He then dismissed the convention and proclaimed the constitution of 1864, which prescribed a small property qualification for voters.

Q. What was the amount of that property qualification?

A. Two hundred and fifty dollars a year, I think.

Q. Was that property qualification for voters the main point on which the King and the convention disagreed?

A. It was.

Q. Prior to that there was no property qualification?

A. No.

Q. This constitution of 1864 then came by virtue of a proclamation of the King?

A. It did. The people acquiesced in it after awhile, and, although there was a good deal of dissatisfaction felt, the people voted under it and agreed to it, and a good many believed that it was wise—that is, making the Legislature of one house and not of two.

Q. Prior to the constitution of 1864 how were nobles appointed?

A. By the King.

Q. What support had the King in reducing the franchise of the native population of the islands?

A. He had the support of his cabinet, and I think that is about all.

Q. What was the disposition of the more intelligent people here?

A. They considered it very arbitrary. The King at that time was very much opposed to the growth of American influence and republican ideas. He was very bitterly opposed to the influence of the Americans, and especially American missionaries. His aim was to strengthen the royal prerogatives.

Q. But if he cut off the number of native votes by property qualifications would he accomplish any addition to his strength?

A. He had one house then only, and there could be no negative action on any affirmative action of his. It was not necessary for him to have a majority of each house.

Q. Were the bodies equal in number?

A. I think not; I think the representative body was larger. It was proportioned according to the population of the districts.

Q. Under the constitution of 1864 did you have a property qualification?

A. We did for a while.

Q. How long?

A. For several elections. It was finally eradicated by amendments to the constitution.

Q. In what year?

A. I can only speak from memory, but certainly before 1870, but I certainly can not say without reference to books.

Q. How was that brought about? What state of opinion brought that about?

A. It was mainly the feeling that this was an encroachment. Public sentiment did not feel the necessity for it. Demagogism was then not prevalent. I think the Hawaiians voted better then than they do now. That is, demoralizing influences had not set in.

Q. At that time, I suppose, it was somewhat of a struggle between the King and the people?

A. Yes, precisely.

Q. And they were attempting to recover a part of the power they had lost under that constitution?

A. Yes.

Q. I see in the compilation of your laws, page 220, section 780, the following:

For the island of Hawaii, eight, that is to say:

One for the district of North Kona, beginning at and including Keahualono, and extending to and including Puuohao; one for the district of South Kona, beginning at Puuohao and extending to and including Kaheawai.

One for the district of Kau.

One for the district of Puna.

Two for the district of Hilo.

One for the district of Hamakua.

One for the district of Kohala.

For the island of Maui, seven, that is to say, two for the district composed of Lahaina, Ukumehame, and Kahoolawe.

One for the district composed of Kahakuloa and Kaanapali.

One for the district beginning with and including Waihee and extending to and including Honuaula.

One for the district beginning with and including Kahikinui and extending to and including Koolau.

One for the district beginning with and including Hamakualoa and extending to and including Kula.

Two for the districts composing the Islands of Molokai and Lanai.

For the island of Oahu, eight, that is to say: Four for the district of Honolulu, beginning with and including Maunaloa, and extending to and including Moanalua.

And one for the district composed of Ewa and Waianae.

One for the district of Waialua.

One for the district of Koolauloa.

One for the district of Koolaupoko.

For the island of Kauai, three, that is to say: One for the district of Waimea, beginning with and including Nualolo and extending to and including Hanapepe, and also including the island of Niihau.

One for the district of Puna, beginning with and including Wahiawa, and extending to and including Wailua.

One for the district of Hanalei, beginning with and including Kapaa, and extending to and including Awa-awa-puhi.

Please say how many representatives you had under that?

A. Twenty-six.

Q. When was that established?

A. There have been laws of this character altered little by little, but a law of this general character has been in existence from very early times—that is from 1852. There would be occasional changes, adding one representative to one district and taking one away possibly from another district.

Q. I ask your attention to section 774 of your compilation of laws:

The house of representatives shall be composed of not less than twenty-four nor more than forty members, who shall be elected biennially.

Prior to 1887 you had in a legislative body twenty-six representatives?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it ever larger than that?

A. I think not.

Q. That gave them a popular element in the Legislature—a majority over the power of the King as represented in the nobles?

A. That is the way it was generally exercised. The King never appointed his full number.

Q. But the constitution itself provided that he might appoint thirty and that the representatives might be forty?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The fact was he generally appointed twenty, and the representatives were twenty-six?

A. Yes.

Q. So that there remained from this an excess of political power in the representatives in the legislative body as against the Crown?

A. That is true; but they rarely ever divided on that issue—nobles on one side and representatives on the other. Some of our best legislation was accomplished through the nobles. They were excellent men.

Q. What class of men generally?

A. Such men as Mr. O. R. Bishop, S. G. Wilder, and Mr. Dowsett. They were appointed by Lunalilo, who filled up the body to twenty.

Q. Were they generally appointed from the class of men who repre-

sented the intelligence and wealth and morality of the community or not?

A. In those days they were nominated to the King by his cabinet, and they were representative of the property of this Kingdom, combining also a fair representation of character and intelligence, until the middle of Kalakaua's reign, when, as vacancies occurred, he would appoint natives generally who did not have these characteristics of wealth, character, and intelligence.

Q. How was a ministry appointed and removed?

A. Under every constitution prior to 1887 the ministers were appointed by the King and removed by him; but until Kalakaua's reign it was a very rare thing that any King changed his ministry. They had a pretty long lease of political life. My father was minister for nine or ten years, and Mr. Wyllie for a longer period. It was a very rare political occurrence, and made a great sensation when a change was made. Under Kalakaua things were different; I think we had twenty-six different cabinets during his reign.

Q. How long was his reign?

A. From 1874 to 1891.

Q. What were the property qualifications of electors prior to 1887?

A. None—no property qualification.

Q. They had to be 20 years of age, and to be able to read and write?

A. If born since 1840 they had to be able to read and write, but this test was rarely applied. If born before that there was no qualification at all.

Q. Under the constitution of 1887 the same qualification of an elector for representative was continued?

A. Yes; substantially the same.

Q. Was there any very considerable change in the matter of the qualification of a voter for representative under the constitution of 1887 in the matter of allowing foreigners to vote?

A. There was.

Q. Please state it.

A. Previous to that time only citizens could vote; that is, native born or naturalized, or those who had received letters of denization. The constitution of 1887 allowed all residents, if they had those qualifications, excepting Asiatics, and they were not allowed to vote, even those who were citizens by naturalization.

Q. Did that cover the Portuguese element?

A. We allowed Portuguese to vote.

Q. Then the races that were excluded under that from the privilege of voting were the Chinese and the Japanese?

A. Yes.

Q. How about the qualifications to read and write for that class of voters—I mean the Portuguese, Americans, and Europeans who were allowed to vote? Did the qualifications as to reading and writing apply to them?

A. It did.

Q. Were there many Portuguese then voting under the constitution of 1887?

A. A good many voted. Not having the statistics before me I can not say what proportion.

Q. Under that constitution of 1887 were the number of nobles and representatives the same?

A. Exactly the same—twenty-four nobles and twenty-four representatives.

Q. The cabinet was appointed by the Crown?

A. Yes.

Q. And how removable?

A. Only by vote of want of confidence passed by a majority of elected members.

Q. What was the character of the increased power of the cabinet under the constitution of 1887 over that of 1864?

A. It made the ministerial responsibility clearer, I think, than it existed under the constitution of 1864.

Q. In what way was it made clearer?

A. By express provision after 1887, if I mistake not, saying that whenever any act was to be done by the sovereign it was to be done by and with the advice of the cabinet. That the supreme court has held to be the advice of a majority of the cabinet.

Q. Would that be so in the matter of the exercise of the veto power?

A. We thought not. That is, the justices of the supreme court thought not. Under the constitution, which made the legislative power consist of the King and the legislature, we felt that this act in approving or vetoing a bill was a legislative and not an executive act.

Q. What did the word signify, then, in relation to the power that the King could only do it with the advice of the cabinet?

A. We construed that power of the King which could only be exercised through the ministry as applying solely to executive and not to legislative acts.

Q. He could do nothing, then, without the sanction of a majority of the cabinet in the matter of administration?

A. No, sir.

Q. A single member of the cabinet would not answer?

A. No, sir. The Thurston ministry broke up on that principle, Ashford advising the King, contrary to the advice of the supreme court, that he was not bound to act unless all the members of the cabinet advised a certain measure. That led to a serious difference in the cabinet, which resulted in breaking it up.

Q. The court held that it required a majority?

A. Yes.

Q. Which Ashford was that?

A. C. W. Ashford. After his return from Canada he seemed to be very much changed.

Q. Your house of nobles was equal in number to the representatives. What was the qualification of an elector for nobles?

A. The property qualification was an income of \$600 a year, or unincumbered real property of the value of \$3,000. We held that where a man was paid wages and his board that his board was not to be included; that he must have a clear income of \$600.

Q. I wish to ask you the reason for these changes—what they were intended to accomplish—and I wish to ask you because of your high official position as chief justice and because of your high character?

A. The main grievance was this: The Legislature was composed of officeholders. I mean the representatives prior to 1887. The district justice, nominated by the governor of each island, would use his judicial influence by making it very easy with the offenses of the people. The same thing was true of deputy sheriffs, tax assessors, tax collectors, and all minor officials. When once in the Legislature they could be very easily controlled either by threats of withdrawing the offices from them, or by promises of other offices. As was well expressed by Mr. Gibson, who was premier at one time, the King was the larger part of the

Legislature. That is, his influence exerted through these agents became paramount. He could accomplish, against his ministry even, almost any measure he chose.

Q. Did he appoint all these officers to which you referred?

A. Not directly, but the governors, being appointed for four years, and being his favorites, would appoint any officials he suggested, and as a matter of fact Kalakaua nominated, directly or indirectly, the mass of the officials in this country.

Q. Do you mean to say that by the appointment of governors who were personal friends of his there came to be appointments of subordinate officers who were in sympathy with the King in his political views and his general wishes?

A. I do, and more especially to carry out the money votes which he was very eager for in order to pay his debts, the expenses of his tour abroad, of his coronation, of the military embassy to Samoa, and other extravagances which every respectable person thought very unwise. I recommended in my report to the Legislature a change in this respect, *i. e.*, in the qualifications of candidates to the Legislature, excluding judges, etc. Another cause, hardly second in importance, was the matter of the removal of ministries. I have said that up to that time there had been twenty-six changes of cabinets. It had unsettled the community so greatly and gave opportunity for what is called "backstairs cabinets" by adventurers and others that there was very little stability in the Government. It was almost impossible for any ministry to carry out any settled policy, certainly any policy that did not please the King.

Q. You changed the constitution so as to guard against that improper mode of the appointment of inferior officers?

A. It forbade any person being appointed to office during the whole time for which he was elected, and also forbade the election of anybody who held any office under the Government.

Q. Then you cut off that power of the King in the use of his patronage?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to the appointment of nobles, the idea was to take that away from him?

A. The nobles were elected by what was supposed to be the wealthy and influential class.

Q. That was taken away from the King and placed among the wealthy and influential classes?

A. Yes, so that they could have representation in the Legislature.

Q. Under that a minority of the natives only could vote for nobles?

A. Only a minority of them could vote; it gave them great dissatisfaction.

Q. Any other changes of consequence?

A. I think not.

Q. You say this new manner of selecting nobles gave the natives great dissatisfaction?

A. It did. The first election held under the constitution was very satisfactory. The natives voted well. Good men were elected. Then they were told that the white people had advantages, by reason of their wealth, over them, and this idea at election time, that they were put in an inferior position, was always forced upon them.

Q. Will you be kind enough to state how this new constitution was established?

A. The two events which brought this matter to a culminating point

were (1) the opium steal of \$71,000, by which a Chinaman named Aki was made by the King to pay him a bribe of \$71,000 of hard coin in order to obtain the exclusive franchise for selling opium, and (2) the expense of the expedition to Samoa in the *Kaimiloa*. A secret league was formed all over the islands, the result of which was, the King was asked to promulgate a new constitution containing those provisions that I have before alluded to. It was very adroitly managed by the Ashfords, and more especially by V. V. Ashford, who obtained the confidence of the King and Mr. Gibson. He was the colonel of the rifles, and he assured them that if he was paid a certain sum of money and made minister to Canada that he would arrange it so that the movement would be futile.

Q. How was he to do that?

A. By preventing the use of the military I suppose. And he arranged with the military authorities and Capt. Haley that they should be called out to preserve public order, although it was this large and well-drilled force which made the King fear that if he did not yield things would be very critical for him.

Q. Was that a Government force?

A. It was organized under the laws.

Q. A volunteer organization?

A. Yes.

Q. So that the men in sympathy with the movement of this secret league went into it and constituted it under form of law?

A. Of course I do not know what was told the King privately, but I know that he felt it would be very dangerous to refuse to promulgate the new constitution. I have no doubt that a great many things were circulated which came to his ears in the way of threats that were unfounded.

Q. What was the outside manifestation?

A. One great feature of it was its secrecy. The King was frightened at this secrecy. It was very well managed. The judges of the supreme court were not told of it until just before the event took place. I think it was the 2d or 3d of July, 1887.

Q. Was there then a mass meeting?

A. There was a large mass meeting held, and a set of resolutions was presented to the King, requiring that a new ministry be formed, by Mr. W. L. Green and one other person whose name I have forgotten.

Q. Was there any display of force?

A. The Honolulu Rifles were in detachments marched about in different portions of the town, having been called out by the legal military authorities.

Q. Who were the legal military authorities?

A. The governor of the island, Dominis, and Capt H. Burrill-Haley, the adjutant-general.

Q. Were they in sympathy with the movement?

A. No, sir; the officers of the corps were in sympathy with the movement.

Q. Who were they?

A. Ashford and Hebbard; I do not remember all.

Q. Did the governor order them out, not knowing of this state of things?

A. I think he did. I think he knew it; but it was to prevent as I believe, something worse happening. As I said, there were threats made.

Q. Of what sort?

A. I understood that at one time there was a very strong feeling that the King should be forced to abdicate altogether, and it was only the more conservative men born here who said that the King and the Hawaiians should have another opportunity.

Q. Were there not two elements in that movement, one for a republic and the other for restraining the power of the King?

A. Yes.

Q. Were there not two forces in this movement coöperating together up to a certain point, to wit: those who were in favor of restraining the King by virtue of the provisions of the constitution of 1887, and those who were in favor of dethroning the King and establishing a republic?

A. I understand that there were, and that the more conservative view prevailed.

Q. And the men who were in favor of a republic were discontented at the outcome?

A. They were, and they didn't want the Hawaiians to vote at all; and the reason that the Portuguese were allowed to vote was to balance the native vote.

Q. Whose idea was that, was that the idea of the men who made the new constitution?

A. Of the men who made the new constitution.

Q. It was to balance the native vote with the Portuguese vote?

A. That was the idea.

Q. And that would throw the political power into the hands of the intelligence and wealth of the country?

A. That was the aim.

Q. How was this military used?

A. It was put about in squads over the city.

Q. The officers of the corps were really in favor of the movement for the new constitution, and were called out by Governor Dominis to preserve order?

A. Yes. After the affair was over he was thanked by a military order from headquarters.

Q. Do you suppose he was gratified with thanks, under the circumstances?

A. Haley said to me when he showed me the order, "It is a little funny to thank a man who kicked you out, but I suppose I've got to do it."

Q. The King acceded to the demand for a new constitution and of a cabinet of given character?

A. In the first place he acceded to the proposition to make a new cabinet named by Mr. Green. The former cabinet, consisting of Mr. Gibson and three Hawaiians, had just resigned a day or two before. In three or four days the cabinet waited upon him with the constitution.

Q. What cabinet?

A. The cabinet, consisting of Mr. Green, minister of foreign affairs; Mr. Thurston, minister of the interior; Mr. C. W. Ashford, attorney-general, and Mr. Godfrey Brown, minister of finance. I was sent for in the afternoon of July 5, to swear the King to the constitution. When I reached the palace they were all there, and the King asked me in Hawaiian whether he had better sign it or not. I said "You must follow the advice of your responsible ministers." He signed it.

Q. This ministry had been appointed as the result of the demand of the mass meeting?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then, having been appointed, they presented him with the constitution of 1887 ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he signed it ?

A. He did.

Q. Was that constitution ever submitted to a popular vote for ratification ?

A. No; it was not. There was no direct vote ratifying the constitution, but its provisions requiring that no one should vote unless he had taken an oath to support it, and a large number voted at that first election, was considered a virtual ratification of the constitution.

Q. If they voted at all they were considered as accepting it ?

A. Yes, sir. I do not think any large number refused to take the oath to it.

Q. It was not contemplated by the mass meeting, nor the cabinet, nor anybody in power, to submit the matter of ratification at all ?

A. No; it was not. It was considered a revolution. It was a successful revolutionary act.

Q. And therefore was not submitted to a popular vote for ratification ?

A. Yes, sir. It had mischievous effects in encouraging the Wilcox revolution of 1889, which was unsuccessful. I think it was a bad precedent, only the exigencies of the occasion seemed to demand it.

Q. Was there discontent with that constitution on the part of Kalakaua ? Was he ever satisfied with it ?

A. He was very skillful in concealing his views. I do not think he was satisfied with it.

Q. Was the ex-Queen ever satisfied with it ?

A. I think much less satisfied with it than he was, and commenced movements against it even before her brother died—while she was princess. From my intimate acquaintance with her, I knew that she ran away with the idea that she was Queen only of the native Hawaiians and not of the whites, even though born here.

Q. Have the natives as a race been discontented with these changes ?

A. As shown in their public utterances in the Legislature, at election times, and through their native newspapers, I should say yes; but from my acquaintance with them personally, I am unable to see that it has worked to their injury, and I do not see evidences of their dissatisfaction.

Q. Were they in this secret league to which you had made reference ?

A. I think there was only one person of mixed blood in the league.

Q. Did your politics take on anything of a racial form at any time; if so, when ?

A. Occasionally a native in the Legislature would lose his head and say severe things against the whites as a class. It is generally frowned down upon by the most respectable of the natives and the foreigners. It has, however, been made a much more prominent feature in politics of late.

Q. Did Gibson use that race feeling to obtain power, and to maintain himself in it ?

A. He did; and he also used flattery to the King to exalt his position. He fostered in the King's mind the idea of proclaiming himself emperor of the Pacific in connection with the Samoan affair.

Q. But in dealing with the natives in the matter of suffrage did he play on the matter of race feeling ?

A. Somewhat. His emissaries generally looked to other means—
gin among them.

Q. Was he in the habit of abusing the whites, those who are called missionaries?

A. Yes; the first mischief he did was in thwarting the treaty of reciprocity.

Q. In what year was that?

A. In 1873.

Q. Before Kalakaua was King?

A. Yes; and the ministry of which I was a member, Mr. Bishop being leader, owing to the fact that King Lunalilo was in consumption, felt that it was prudent to abandon it.

Q. You were going to speak of race feeling in regard to politics?

A. It has been almost impossible to elect any kind of a decent white man in Honolulu for many years.

Q. Why?

A. I once had a conversation with a very prominent native and asked him why they never succeeded in electing a good white man in Honolulu. He said:

The man whom you regard as the best man the natives oppose just because you want him elected.

Q. I suppose you were not with the committee of safety during the late revolution?

A. I was not informed of any of their proceedings. They kept me out.

Q. Did you know that a constitution was going to be proclaimed in 1893 before it was done?

A. I had heard hints during some years before that the Queen was anxious to proclaim a new constitution, but I did not hear of her present intention until the morning of Saturday. Shortly before the prorogation, at 10 o'clock in the morning, a gentleman told me that immediately after the prorogation Mr. William White, the lottery advocate in the Legislature, was going to the palace with a large number of people and that the Queen was going to proclaim a new constitution. I mentioned it to my associates on the bench. They didn't credit it. I mentioned it to a few others, among them the French consul. It disturbed me very much. Immediately the Legislature was prorogued I looked out from the balcony and saw a large number of natives dressed in black and wearing beaver hats marching over to the palace with banners and carrying a parcel.

I said to myself that is the new constitution. Being invited by the chamberlain to go over there, which is customary after prorogation, I urged my associates to accompany me. Judge Dole had an engagement and could not go. Judge Bickerton and I went over. We stayed until 4 o'clock and saw the whole thing, except we were not in the private room with the Queen when she had her ministry there. The speech that she made, when she said she had designed to promulgate a new constitution but had met with obstacles and was prevented for the present, I wrote from memory. She said it in Hawaiian. I went home that evening, wrote it down from memory, and furnished it to the press.

Q. What was the point of it?

A. She was under great emotion. I never saw her in such a state of agitation. At the same time she controlled herself. It was really a magnificent spectacle. She said she had listened to thousands of voices demanding a change in the constitution—demanding a new constitu-

tion—and she thought the opportune moment had come. The constitution was very defective, and she turned around to defer to me as her witness, because I had had occasion so often to construe it. She had prepared a new constitution which she thought would meet the purposes required and would please the people; but she said with great sorrow: "I am obliged to tell you that I can not do it now. I have met with obstacles, but I ask you to go home; continue to love me, and I will continue to love you, and in a few days you will have your wishes gratified." Immediately a member of the Legislature, the throne room being full of the Hui Kalaiainas, turned around and said: "What shall we do with these men who prevent the gratification of our wishes?" meaning the ministry. We hushed him up; told him to keep quiet, and I left the palace.

Q. What do you suppose she meant that in a few days they would be gratified?

A. She hoped to overcome the objections of her cabinet. Parker told me that the reason he stayed by her without leaving her all that afternoon was that he was afraid she would break away from the cabinet, go out on the balcony, and say to the people: "The ministers won't approve it, and my chief justice won't swear me to it. Here is your constitution. Now look out for these men." We stayed there not under any physical compulsion. I sent in two messages by the chamberlain asking to be excused, but she sent word asking me to remain. Evidently she expected that thing done then and there. Mr. Wilson, the marshal, was in a great state of excitement, and told me that he had been fighting the battle alone all the morning with her, and wanted me to go in and use my influence to prevent her from doing it. I said that if the Queen asked me to come into her council I should be glad to do it, but I could not swear her to the new constitution.

Q. Have you any personal knowledge of improper relations between Wilson and the ex-Queen?

A. I know this as a fact, that when the supreme court decided that on the death of Kalakaua she could require the resignation of the cabinet appointed by him and could appoint her own cabinet, that she made three conditions with the new cabinet, and one of these conditions was such that Mr. Peterson would not consent to resume office under her. The three conditions were these: That Wilson was to be marshal, a native boy named Joe Aea was to be made turnkey of the prison, and that Wundenberg was to be dismissed as postmaster-general. Wundenberg had dismissed Henry Poor from a clerkship in the post-office, whose mother, living on Emma street, was a very strong friend of the Queen.

They were schoolmates together with me, and she, Mrs. Poor, is in charge of two boys. One of the boys is Dominis's own son by a woman named Mary Purdy. She is married to the messenger of the foreign office, named Kamiki, and the other child is a son of Joe Aea, and rumor says it is the Queen's own child. I do not know whether it is the Queen's child or a child of Aea's wife. I got it from Kamiki, who was deprived of the service of his wife from being Dominis's mistress. When Dominis died he died with one hand in the hands of the Queen and the other in Mary Purdy's hands. On one occasion I went to her about the morality of the palace, and she professed to me to be in favor of religion and morality. I went to her on account of a great deal of scandal in regard to the character of the palace invitations.

Q. Did Wilson live in the bungalow?

A. Yes.

Q. And when she went back to Washington Place he always had a cottage there?

A. Yes.

Q. He was marshal?

A. Yes; he had been clerk of the waterworks before that.

Q. Judge, you have a good many races of people here. Could you establish stable government here on the basis of a qualification that they should read and write the English language?

A. That would limit the number qualified to vote very much. It would exclude nearly all the old Hawaiians. It would exclude the Portuguese, except the younger class that have been to school here, and, of course, the younger Hawaiians, who are now taught English exclusively.

Q. What would be the proportion between the white and native vote, putting the English test?

A. I can not say.

Q. Would it leave the native vote in excess or not?

A. I think it would.

Q. Now, on the basis of reading and writing English, could you establish a permanent form of government?

A. I doubt it very much.

Q. Could it maintain a government such as obtains in the States of the United States—New York, for instance?

A. It depends upon the character of the imperial government over it.

Q. What do you mean?

A. I mean that a republic of our own would not be at all successful.

Q. Why?

A. Because our natives are so likely to be influenced by demagogues, and more especially such influences as obtained in the last Legislature, such as the lottery—such schemes as that. The natives joined with the lower class of whites. They have not sufficient character to resist.

Q. Could you establish one that would make life and property safe and preserve order?

A. I doubt it very much.

Q. Would you be willing to take your chances on that sort of government?

A. No sir. As a property-holder and a man of family I would not like to take my chances.

Q. Could you maintain a good government here as a State in the Federal Union, like the State of New York?

A. I have not thought that was possible, because I do not suppose the United States would ever consent to have two Senators from a place like this.

Q. I am not talking about what they would consent to, but as to what you consider the qualifications of the Hawaiians to vote. I do not want to imply that the Government of the United States means to do anything.

A. Yes, I believe we could.

Q. What is the character of the Hawaiian as a voter? Is he an intelligent voter?

A. That is a matter of comparison, of course. He is easily influenced.

Q. In what way?

A. When his prejudices are excited, and when he is told the usual election stories; that something is going to happen unless they vote for such and such a man.

Q. Is he in the habit of selling his vote?

A. I believe there has been a good deal of bribery in this way, paying a man's taxes for him—there being a qualification that a man shall have paid his taxes.

Q. Are they influenced much in elections by liquor?

A. Until the Australian ballot went into effect. The election of 1886 was largely managed by gin.

Q. What is their character as to honesty?

A. So far as they are concerned, they are not especially addicted to larceny.

Q. Not more than the white race?

A. No; I have lived in my present residence twenty-one years; have never had a theft; we live with our houses very loosely fastened.

Q. What is the moral character of the race?

A. The seafaring class are very much addicted to the use of liquor.

Q. What is the character of the Hawaiian women for chastity?

A. They are not chaste. At the same time they do not expose their immorality to public view. I think strangers would see scarcely anything of it. There is an outward observance of the laws of decency and morality.

Q. Why do they observe it outwardly and not practice it in secrecy?

A. I think it is the influence of their religious teaching. It is a source of profit to them.

Q. How?

A. Sailors and mechanics visit them, and that is what supports their families very largely in the low part of the town.

Q. Is that the character of the Hawaiian women generally?

A. I must except many very good, virtuous women.

Q. I do not mean exceptions.

A. They are accessible.

Q. As a race they are not chaste?

A. Their instincts are towards the sexual desire.

Q. Then the domestic circle is not marked by chaste conversation and life?

A. They are very careless in their conversation before their children.

Q. There is a good deal of intermarriage between the whites and natives here. What is the result of that? Is it a better type?

A. It is a more intelligent type.

Q. Are they not better morally?

A. As a class, no.

Q. Are the half-castes generally the result of matrimonial alliances?

A. There are a large number that are not.

Q. What social recognition have these half-castes?

A. They have always received social recognition. They have always been sought after by strangers.

Q. How in social life here; are they received among the whites?

A. Those of good character are. There are several large families received on terms of perfect equality.

Q. The Portuguese population here, is that leaving much?

A. Yes.

Q. To what extent; rapidly, would you say?

A. Yes. On account of their inability to obtain land.

Q. Why can not they obtain land?

A. A great many lands have been tied up by long leases, although the Government has commenced the system of throwing open lands to homesteaders.

Q. But still the tendency is to leave?

A. Yes; they want to go to California—to America.

Q. Then is it the land only?

A. No; it is the desire to go to America; it is their El Dorado.

Q. The Japanese population is probably your future reliance for labor?

A. Yes; but I think the Chinese make the best laborers.

Q. But the authorities who have been controlling the Islands have taken the view that it was best not to allow the Chinamen to come in in large numbers?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the action of the Government has been toward restricting that, and looking to Japan for laborers?

A. Yes; that has been the policy of the country for a long time.

Q. Are these Japanese beginning to get the desire for suffrage?

A. I only hear it through the newspapers.

Q. What do you hear?

A. I hear that they will in time demand suffrage.

Q. What do you think of them as voters?

A. I think they would vote as the consul wanted them to vote. They are an inferior class, brought up with the idea that they must obey their superiors.

Q. They belong to the lowest class of the Japanese population?

A. Yes; they have very great deference for their superiors.

Q. Are they learning to read and write the English language to any extent?

A. Those who remain in the field do not have the opportunity. Their children go to school and learn English.

Q. Your native population—do they understand generally how to read and write the native tongue?

A. Lately they are losing the ability to speak Hawaiian well, by reason of their minds being directed in school to English.

Q. What books have they in the Hawaiian language?

A. Very few books outside of school books and religious books, and a few trashy novels.

Q. They have the Bible and the Pilgrim's Progress?

A. Yes.

Q. You indicated a desire to make a statement in reference to certain occurrences in the legislature of 1892.

A. The body of Kalakaua arrived here on the 29th of January, 1891. At 2 o'clock that day Liliuokalani took the oath to support the constitution of 1887, which I administered. Kalakaua's cabinet consisted then of Cummins, C. N. Spencer, Godfrey Brown, and A. P. Peterson. There was a great deal of discussion and wire pulling as to whether that cabinet should have the right to continue. Finally the opinion of the court was asked and it was held that she had liberty to ask for their resignation. They resigned and she appointed Parker, minister of foreign affairs; Widemann, finance; Spencer, interior, and Whiting, attorney-general.

At the general election which took place in 1892 all the representatives of the island of Oahu were elected from the Liberal party, of which Robert W. Wilcox was the leader (with one exception, W. R. Wilder), who was elected for one of the districts of Honolulu. The Legislature was opened on the 20th of May. On the 6th of June a vote was taken to expunge MacFarlane's resolution, which was directed against Minister Stevens, which was carried by 33 to 13. On the 30th of August the Parker ministry was voted out by 31 to 10. There

was no new cabinet appointed until the 12th of September. That was E. C. MacFarlane, minister of finance; Parker, foreign affairs; Gulick, interior, and Neumann, attorney-general. On the 15th of September there was another vote of want of confidence in this MacFarlane cabinet. It received 24 votes against 21. The question as to whether that was a sufficient constitutional number to pass it was referred to the judges of the supreme court, who decided that 25 votes were necessary.

Meanwhile, on the 4th of October, there was a special election held on this island, and Maile, a native from the fish market, and Hopkins, a half-white, were elected as nobles, by a very large majority, over two very respectable men, M. P. Robinson and H. Waterhouse, by the so-called lottery faction; that is, people who were bound to carry the lottery bill through.

On the 17th of October there was another vote of want of confidence introduced in the MacFarlane ministry, and it passed 32 to 15. On the 1st of November, at 10 o'clock in the morning, the Queen appointed Cornwell minister of finance, Gulick minister of the interior, Nawahi minister of foreign affairs, and Creighton, attorney-general. At half-past 12 they were voted out—26 to 15, the same day. The 4th of November, rumors prevailed that the Queen would agree to appoint G. N. Wilcox minister of the interior, Cecil Brown attorney-general, P. C. Jones minister of finance, and M. C. Robinson minister of foreign affairs.

On the 8th of November this cabinet was appointed and sworn in. Then the country felt easy. The next important event was on the 6th of December, when the Legislature sent a request for an opinion to the justices of the supreme court upon the question whether an amendment to the constitution which had passed two successive Legislatures required the approval of the Queen. We answered that it did not.

Q. What was the constitutional provision?

A. It was something with reference to allowing legislation restricting the residence of Chinese here. The idea was that any laws that might be passed restricting terms of residence or rights of Chinese here would not be held unconstitutional.

Q. At that time was there any restriction on Chinese immigration?

A. Oh, yes; there were restrictions that had passed the Legislature with reference to their entering the Kingdom, but when once in the Kingdom they had the rights of all residents under Hawaiian law, and by our constitution no class legislation would be permissible under the constitution. The object of this amendment was to allow legislation of that character.

Q. Do you have reference to legislation providing that the Chinese should not reside here after the contract term had expired?

A. Yes; I think also as to the character of the employment they should engage in. It was the desire to pass that law which gave rise to this submission to the court. The constitution of 1887 left out all the provisions which had previously existed as to the sovereign signing an amendment to the constitution. The only popular reference was that any amendment that had passed one Legislature would have to be published three months previous to the election, and then if it passed the second Legislature it became a law.

Q. Was there no direct submission to the people?

A. Only in that way. On the 21st of December this ministry, which had the confidence of the people, began to have difficulty with the Queen with reference to the appointment of circuit judges under the new act.

Q. In what way?

A. They nominated Mr. Whiting and Mr. Frear.

Q. And she was not willing?

A. At first she was. The appointment of circuit judges was not to go into effect until the 1st of January, but it was deemed advisable that these gentlemen, who were in the practice of law, should be notified beforehand to arrange their business, as terms of the circuit court would begin with the new year. She first agreed that she would make these appointments. Then she said she did not care to appoint Mr. Frear, but wanted Mr. Rosa. I had a long talk with her. I told her that Mr. Rosa's habits would make him unfit; that he got drunk. She finally on the 3d of January appointed those two judges. On the 29th of December there was talk all over town and in the lobby of the Legislature that there would be a vote of want of confidence against the Wilcox ministry, and on the 4th of January Mr. Bush introduced one. It failed, 19 to 22. On the 10th of January the lottery bill, which everyone supposed was dead, was moved up by C. L. Hopkins, who had just been elected by the lottery people.

Q. What is he doing now?

A. He is in the fishing business. I can not say he is in the opium business. It passed on the second reading to the astonishment of everybody by 20 to 17. It was hurried right along and passed its third reading on the 11th of January, 23 to 20. Six of the members of the house had gone home. On the 12th at half past 1 Kapahu introduced a vote of want of confidence in the Wilcox cabinet, and it passed, 25 to 16. Noble C. O. Beyer being the twenty-fifth man and he voted that way because Mr. Widemann was promised by the Queen that he should form a new cabinet. On the 13th of January there was no quorum in the morning. At half past 2 the cabinet came in—Parker, Cornwell, Peterson, and Colburn. That was Friday. That night quite a number of members tried to get their forces together to introduce a vote of want of confidence in that ministry. People said no, it is no use. Saturday morning Mr. Peterson announced to the Legislature that the Queen had signed two bills that had interested the community for a long time—the bill licensing the sale of opium and the establishing of smoking joints, and the lottery bill, giving an exclusive franchise to these individuals for a term of twenty-five years to establish a national lottery, for which they were to give the Government \$500,000 a year.

Q. Did the bill provide how it should be used?

A. It provided that a certain sum should be used for the laying of a cable between here and San Francisco.

Q. Any other public work?

A. I do not now remember.

Q. Did you participate in the meetings of the committee of safety on 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th of January?

A. I did not, being a judge.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Mr. Blount.

A. F. JUDD.

No. 29.

Interview with the Hui Kalaiaina, Friday April 21, 1893.

At half past 3 a committee of the Hui Kalaiaina called at the headquarters of the Commission and presented resolutions from that society, which were read by the interpreter, Mr. Solomon Kaleiope.

In accepting the copy of the resolutions Mr. Blount responded as follows:

GENTLEMEN: Very much of the duties of my mission I can not communicate to you. I will say, however, that your papers which have been presented I will accept and forward to the President in the nature of information indicating the opinions of your people in these islands in reference to the inclination on your part to support the existing condition of things; that is to say, whether you are in favor of the Provisional Government and annexation, or whether your preference is for royalty. I am gathering information on lines of that sort for the purpose of submitting it to the President. That is the extent of what I can say to you by way of response. I would like to ask, however, a few questions. Which is the chairman of your committee?

INTERPRETER. W. L. Holokahiki, Honolulu.

(These questions were given and answered through the interpreter:)

Q. On the day of the prorogation of the Legislature a number of natives were reported to have gone in to see the Queen—about thirty in number—and that their object was to ask for a new constitution. Was that a committee from this organization?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many voters, people who vote for representatives, are there in this order.

A. Some thousands as we have it in our books; about 3,000 of native Hawaiians.

Q. What did the Queen say in response to your request?

A. That she was quite ready to give a new constitution, but her cabinet is opposed to it. Her cabinet refused it, so that she could not do otherwise. She told the people that they had to go home quietly and wait for the next session of the Legislature.

Q. When would that be if the Government had not been overthrown?

A. The time, according to our laws, was two years, and that would run us up to 1894.

Q. Then the information was that nothing could be done under two years on account of the disapproval of the cabinet?

A. Yes; the Queen could do nothing.

Q. She said she could do nothing?

A. Yes; because the constitution says she can do nothing without being approved by her cabinet.

Q. What did the committee do when they went out; did they give this information to the native people?

A. Yes, sir. This committee shortly after they came out they told the people they could not do anything now. That they would have to wait until the next session. Also the Queen came out and told the people she could not give them any constitution now because the law forbids.

(A great many petitions were exhibited; sometimes they were to the Queen and sometimes to the Legislature, asking for a new constitution.)

(A book was also shown, containing the names of members of the organization throughout the Islands, as follows:)

(Oahu, 2,320; Maui, 384; Hawaii, 266; Kaai, 222, and Molokai, 263.

Q. (To interpreter.) Why don't other natives join the organization?

A. They sometimes go to meetings. When anything happens they go together.

Q. These are active members of the organization?

A. Yes.

Q. In matters of this sort the natives followed the lead of the organization?

A. Yes, sir.

We have read the foregoing and pronounce it to be a correct report:

A. SOLOMON KALEIOPU, *Interpreter.*

W. C. HOLOKAHIKI.

J. ALAPAI.

JOHN KANUI.

J. A. KAHOONEI.

J. B. KUOHO.

J. KEEUL.

T. C. POLIKAPA.

D. W. KANAILEHUA.

No. 30.

Interview with J. W. Kalua, president of the Annexation Club, and others, May 1, 1893.

Q. Please give the names of the delegates and the islands they represent?

A. Interpreter J. W. Kalua, president of the Annexation Club and chairman of the delegation, Rev. A. Pali, O. E. Coe, W. F. Pogue, C. F. Horner, and E. H. Bailey, all of Maui.

(Through interpreter.)

Q. Mr. Kalua, were you chosen by a convention of delegates from various districts chairman of the delegation to present their wishes on the subject of annexation?

A. I was.

Q. Are the natives you represent in favor of annexation unless they have the right to vote?

A. They are not.

Q. Are they in favor of it with any property qualifications?

A. They are not in favor of it.

Q. Have the annexation speakers in addressing them conveyed the idea to them that the right to vote would be preserved to them if they went into the American Union?

A. It has been said to them in speeches.

Q. If the right to vote is preserved to them they are willing to give up the Crown and become annexed to the United States?

A. They are.

Q. Mr. Coe, were you born in the Island?

A. I was born in Grant County, Wis.

Q. How long have you lived here?

A. Twelve years this coming fall.

Q. Are the natives in favor of annexation unless the right to vote is preserved to them?

A. I think not.

Q. Would they be in favor of annexation with a property qualification?

A. No, sir.

Q. With the right to vote preserved to them, they prefer to be a part of the United States rather than to be under the Crown?

A. Yes, sir, thinking that the progress of the country would be advanced by being part of the United States.

Q. Provided the right to vote is preserved?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Horner, is that your understanding of the situation?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Pogue, is that your understanding?

A. It is.

Q. Mr. Kalua, how many voters do you represent on the island of Maui?

A. Taking the annexation list for me to go by—the foreigners represent three-fourths and the natives represent one-fourth of the lists of the annexation club—in all 700.

(The interpreter, Mr. Kalua, says there are more names on the lists than 700, but they have not all been opened yet. He does not know the exact number. He says the people have not all subscribed who will subscribe, owing to the short time the club has been started—they have not had the opportunity.)

(The notes of the foregoing were read over to the interpreter and others and pronounced correct.—E. M.)

No. 31.

Interview with Rev. J. Kanoho, of Lihue, Kauai, Wednesday, April 19, 1893.

(Mr. George Mundon, interpreter.)

Mr. BLOUNT. What is your occupation?

A. I am a minister of the Gospel.

Q. How many members of your church?

A. Sometimes 30 and sometimes 50.

Q. Do you belong to the annexation club?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many members are there in that club?

A. I can not state exactly how many.

Q. Well, about how many?

A. I think about 200.

Q. Are they in favor of annexation?

A. They are in favor of annexation.

Q. Are they in favor of annexation without having the right to ballot?

A. No, sir; they are not in favor of annexation without they get their right to vote.

Q. How do they feel towards the Queen?

A. A portion of them would like to have the Queen replaced. Those who have not signed for annexation would like to have her back. Those who have signed are not in favor of having her returned.

Q. Have most of them signed in favor of annexation or not?

A. Yes; a majority of them have signed annexation papers.

The foregoing has been translated to me by Mr. George Mundon, and I pronounce it a correct report.

J. KANOHO.

HONOLULU, *April 19, 1893.*

No. 32.

Interview with John Lot Kaulukou.

HONOLULU, *Thursday, April 13, 1893.*

Mr. BLOUNT. Where do you live?

A. In Honolulu.

Q. Were you in the city on the 14th of January last?

A. I was.

Q. Will you please give me a statement of the causes of the revolution which resulted in the dethronement of the Queen?

A. I will tell you what I know. On the 14th of January, the Queen dismissed the Legislature—discharged every member of the house at 12 o'clock. The Queen went into the palace with several people. On that day it was the first time I heard of the Queen's intention to declare a new constitution. Since 1887, after the decree of that constitution, the people were asking and filing petitions to the legislatures of 1890 and also 1892. There were many names on the petitions to his late Majesty Kalakaua, and when he died his sister came on the throne. The people sent petitions to the legislature and to Her Majesty the Queen to make a new constitution, because the people wanted to have a new constitution—a constitution for equal rights between everyone in this community.

Q. You mean by equal rights everybody to have the privilege to vote who were twenty?

A. Yes. The constitution of 1887 is to take away the rights of the natives to vote for the nobles. For instance, if I had property of \$2,999.99 I had no right to vote for nobles under that constitution, but a man who had an income of \$600, without property, he had that right. In these islands there were nine nobles and that man with an income of \$600 had a right to vote for nine nobles, and a man of property of \$2,999.99, he had no right to vote for noble, except one representative in the ward where he lived.

Q. You mean to vote for a member of the house of representatives instead of nobles.

A. Yes; and this man, with an income of \$600, he had a right to vote for nine nobles in these islands and also a representative in the ward where he lived. He voted for ten men. For that reason the people claim it is not right.

Q. These petitions to the legislature and to the Queen, what did they ask for in the matter of the election of nobles? Did they ask that the Crown should appoint them or the people be allowed to elect them?

A. That the people be allowed to vote for all—to give everyone an equal vote for both noble and representative. That was the intention of the petitions.

Q. Do you know what this constitution the Queen intended to proclaim contained in that connection?

A. No one in this community knows.

Q. You do know that the demand from the people was for the election of nobles by all classes of the people?

A. Yes; without any qualification.

Q. Well, please go on with your statement.

A. Many people went into the palace to see the Queen and also Kalakaua, and they sent a petition to the Queen and also to the legislature, and called a mass meeting, and that is the only reason Wilcox is elected; also Mr. Bush and Antone Rosa, and also the reason why they were elected in 1890.

Q. On the idea of making a new constitution on the ground these petitions asked for?

A. Yes; and also in 1892.

Q. In the elections of 1890 and 1892 the line of division amongst the people was upon that question of a new constitution, giving everybody the right to vote for nobles and representatives?

A. Yes; for any candidates running to oppose that view it was impossible for that man to go to the legislature in 1890 and 1892. They did not want the idea of taking all the power from the Queen. Under this constitution they took every power from the Queen.

Q. What power did they want to give the Queen?

A. In regard to veto. They wanted to give some power to the Queen. A bill goes to Her Majesty. They want to give that privilege to the Queen; if she thinks a bill not proper, not right, she should have the right to veto it.

Q. She did have that power and exercised it, didn't she?

A. After the case came before the court, the court decided in favor of her power to veto.

Q. When was that decision made?

A. I think about 1888 or 1889. It was after 1887.

Q. If that was settled by the court in 1888 or 1889, it would hardly be in the campaign in 1890 and 1892?

A. The real object of the people was for the constitution. They did not care about the veto question. They claimed the constitution was forced on Kalakaua. The people wanted a new constitution.

Q. You say the constitution was forced on Kalakaua. How was it forced on him?

A. He did not like this constitution.

Q. Why did he proclaim it?

A. People told him "if you don't sign this constitution we will overthrow you."

Q. What people?

A. White men—foreigners.

Q. Where did they live?

A. Here.

Q. And in the other islands?

A. In this island and in the other islands. I saw some from other islands.

Q. How many?

A. Saw only one that I remember.

Q. Any natives in the meeting which demanded the new constitution of Kalakaua?

A. Very few. About three or four natives went there.

Q. The native population is in the majority. Why didn't they stand

by him—by Kalakaua? He did not expect them to help him or he would not have yielded to the whites.

A. The Government had many soldiers and also volunteers. Volunteers supported the view of the new constitution in 1887. Many Portuguese. The officers had commissions from King Kalakaua. Government furnished guns and ammunition for them. Those people are the very people to oppose the King and go in favor of the new constitution. The Portuguese officers and men were opposed to the King.

Q. Do I understand you to mean that the desertion of these Portuguese officers and troops left him without the military power to oppose this movement of the whites?

A. The Portuguese officers and Portuguese soldiers went together with the volunteers at that time. There were two kinds of volunteers, white men, really white men, and the Portuguese joined together with the Thurston crowd and opposed the King.

Q. Were they volunteers?

A. Yes.

Q. How many soldiers had the Thurston crowd?

A. Including Portuguese, about 300.

Q. How many had the King?

A. I think the King had 700 or 800.

Q. Was the King with 800 troops afraid of Thurston with 300?

A. He was not afraid. His Majesty wanted to go and fight, but so many of his friends would go back on him.

Q. Why did they go back on him?

A. I don't know.

Q. Who were they?

A. Haley was one of them. He was an Englishman, I understand. The King did not want to have bloodshed, so he signed his name on that constitution. I have no doubt in my mind that if the King had opposed this crowd we would have no more town of Honolulu. There would have been property lost and lives lost—great many.

Q. You mean in 1887?

A. Yes.

Q. But he did not want to see that?

A. No; he didn't.

Q. Well, please go on where I interrupted you.

A. After that we got a new constitution, and every one of us took oath to support it. I myself do not like the constitution—the way of getting it—but the regulation issued from the interior office if any one of the natives did not take the oath to support that constitution he had no right to vote. For that reason I myself and all the rest of my native friends took oath to support the constitution. So we lived under that constitution, and the people did not like it; I mean the natives. They did not like it, not because everything in the constitution is bad, but they did not like the way of getting it. They were disgusted by the way of getting it. Part of that constitution is really part of the constitution of Kamehameha V.

In the election of 1890 Wilcox was a leader, and Bush and several others. Their platform to go before the people is that they want a new constitution. Part of their crowd came in and joined the natives and said they must have a new constitution. At that time, if I remember right, McCarty—Charlie McCarty (he was one of the volunteers against the King in 1887)—was one of the candidates for noble in 1890 to oppose the constitution, and by uniting of foreigners and natives

the whole island on that principle elected members of the House of Nobles and Representatives.

Q. How did they manage to elect nobles with the property qualification?

A. As I told you, whoever had an income of \$600 had a right to vote for nobles.

Q. Were a majority of the nobles elected in 1892 for or against the constitution?

A. They did not want this constitution.

Q. You do not understand my question. In 1892 you elected nobles. Now, were a majority of the nobles elected in 1892 for or against the constitution?

A. They were against the constitution of 1887. They wanted to have a new constitution. Some of them say, all I want is amendments, but a majority of the people wanted a new constitution. So you see a majority of the people wanted a new constitution. I suppose that is the reason the Queen wanted to have a new constitution.

Q. Now, a majority of the nobles and representatives being in favor of a new constitution, why didn't they pursue the plan laid down in the constitution?

A. The trouble was at that time, before the election they came forward to the people with the idea of a new constitution, but when they go inside the house some of the people go back on their constituents and they turn around. Some of them, like Wilcox. He was strongly in favor of a new constitution, but he never did anything in the house to get a new constitution. Some of them introduced a bill to make a new constitution, and some people say that is against the constitution. But yet people talk outside "new constitution! new constitution!" When we go before the house we never get constitution. They never did anything. That is the reason we did not get a new constitution. The people wanted to have a constitution for equal rights.

On the 14th of January I was in the palace myself, and before I went into the palace I heard the Queen intended to proclaim a new constitution. I went in to see if it was true or not. While there I saw Chief Justice Judd. He asked me, what is all this? I said I didn't know. I heard the Queen was going to proclaim a new constitution. He asked me what sort of a constitution? I said I didn't know. He said he would give \$50 for a copy of that constitution. We stayed there about an hour, perhaps two hours, and then the Queen came from the blue room.

Q. What you call the throne room?

A. Yes. She said:

My people, I am sorry to say I can not proclaim a new constitution to-day, because of the advice from my cabinet not to do so. Therefore, my people, I want you to go home. Behave yourselves and keep quiet. Do not make any disturbance.

The people went home.

Q. Was that speech made in the throne room?

A. Yes; so the people went home quietly. On Sunday morning the first I knew there were some posters on the street, the committee of safety calling for a mass meeting on Monday. There were no names on it; just committee of safety calling mass meeting at the armory on Beretania street. Sunday was a very quiet day—no disturbance, no riot; no reason to make any one believe a revolution had come on Saturday and Sunday—and Monday morning I saw another poster to have another mass meeting for natives on Palace square at 2 o'clock. I was at this meeting on Palace square.

Q. How many people were there?

A. I think, including foreigners and natives, about 5,000. There were many foreigners there.

Q. How many foreigners?

A. I think more than 500, between 500 and 1,000, the rest were natives. They made speeches and thanked Her Majesty, the Queen, for her intention to proclaim a new constitution. She could not do anything now because her cabinet had advised her not; but the meeting thanked her for her idea to proclaim a new constitution. They adopted resolutions as follows:

Resolved, That the assurance of Her Majesty, the Queen, contained in this day's proclamation, is accepted by the people as a satisfactory guaranty that the Government does not and will not seek any modification of the constitution by any other means than those provided in the organic law.

Resolved, That accepting this assurance, the citizens here assembled will give their cordial support to the administration and indorse them in sustaining that policy.

The meeting adjourned and the people went home. They made no disturbance. Saturday the Queen ordered the people to go home quietly. The natives always listen. They always obey. On this day, Monday, Bush and Nawahi told the people to go home quietly and calmly. They did so. I went home. Several others went home without any idea of any revolution to come after that. About 5 o'clock in the afternoon was the first time we had news of the landing of the Boston's troops on shore—on the same landing you came the other day. We went down to see. Heard that some marines and blue jackets were there.

If you were here at that time you could hear foreigners and natives asking this question: "What does this mean? For what reason do these people come ashore?" From there they marched on Fort street, turned their right on Fort street and came up to the consul-general's office—Mr. Severance. I suppose there were twenty of them formed there. There were perhaps twenty or twenty-four went over to the minister's; the rest of them marched over to King street, the front of the palace. They went over with guns, Gatling guns.

Q. The soldiers had Gatling guns?

A. Yes; they had everything ready to meet their enemies.

Q. How long did they stop in front of the palace?

A. I think they stopped in front of the opera house about three or four minutes, and from there they went over to the front of the palace. When they got there they saluted the flag.

Q. What flag?

A. The Queen's flag. The Queen generally had the flag up when she was in the palace. From there they went over to the corner of the palace. They remained there.

Q. How long?

A. About five minutes. From there they went over to Atherton, the place where the consul-general lives. I was there myself. I saw them sitting down smoking. After that I came to the Government house. While I was there, I think they came from King street and took charge of Arion Hall for that night.

Q. Who did the building belong to?

A. Mr. Gilbert J. Waller.

Q. They got it from him for occupation that night?

A. I do not know. I heard they went in without permission. They remained there for the night.

Q. How long altogether were the troops about the palace; how much time did they stay there?

A. They stayed in front of the Opera House about five minutes and went over to the end of the palace gate and stayed another five minutes.

Q. Did they show any signs of being mad in any way—of wanting to fight?

A. What I understand is this: I saw their guns, like this (holding his hands in a position to show that the weapons were ready for use) facing them towards the palace. Their intention I do not know. That evening everything around the town was very quiet. If I am not mistaken there was a band playing at the hotel that evening. A very important question in the minds of the people was: "Did you see the troops of the *Boston* come? What does this all mean?"

Q. Who were talking in this way, whites or natives?

A. Whites and natives too. I said nobody knows. Perhaps they have come to support the Queen's Government. I do not know. I will go back a little. On Monday the white men held their meeting at the armory. I was not there myself. There was nobody there except foreigners and some Portuguese.

Q. When you say foreigners, do you mean whites?

A. Yes, Germans, Americans and different nationalities. I think, from what I heard, there were only five natives there—Kanakas.

Q. Who were they?

A. One of them, I understand, is the editor of a newspaper under the control of the Serano E. Bishop—J. U. Kawainui. I heard there were five others.

Q. Was Wilcox there?

A. No, he was one of the speakers at the Palace square.

Q. Is he the man who headed the Wilcox revolution?

A. Yes. Wilcox says like this: "Any man who insults a lady is nothing but a pig and a hog, and more especially a man who insults the dignity of his Queen. He is nothing but a pig and a hog." At that time Wilcox had nothing to do with foreigners. He was strongly opposed against them. Tuesday morning the town is very quiet. The only question is this: What is all this? We never had any idea of a revolution or disturbance. About afternoon the only excitement I know we heard the news of the shooting of a man by Capt. Good, captain of the guard now at the barracks. He was sent to carry an order from the station house to stop the man to carry guns and ammunition that day. So Good shot him. People then saw there was some trouble coming up. Before that I saw some of these people here. I mean Thurston, C. L. Carter, W. L. Castle going around the streets. What they did I do not know. I saw Charlie Carter before 12 o'clock go over to Arion Hall and meet with one of the officers of the *Boston's* troop. The conversation I do not know. That evening, about half past 2, we heard the news of the proclamation of the Provisional Government and the overthrow of the Queen.

Q. What time was that?

A. About half past 2, I think. I did not look at my watch. I was there myself. A gentleman, now a judge on the bench, Mr. Cooper, he read the proclamation with his hand shaking.

Q. What day was this?

A. Tuesday the 17th. The marines of the *Boston* were lying between the fence of the Government house. They were lying there when the new government was proclaimed. Lying between the Government house and Arion Hall.

Q. How far is Arion Hall from the Government house?

A. About 50 or 60 feet.

Q. When that mass meeting was in session on the 16th where were the troops? Were there any troops on shore?

A. No. After that, about 5 o'clock of the same day, the troops landed.

Q. What did that mass meeting determine on that day?

A. The day the troops landed?

Q. Yes.

A. I can not tell you positively what was the object of their meeting. As I heard it, they wanted to overthrow the Queen because she was against her oath by her intention to proclaim a new constitution. Before Cooper read his proclamation for a new government, the marines of the *Boston* were lying at the same place. I was at the station house at that time with plenty of foreigners and also natives—plenty of white men and also natives ready to support Her Majesty the Queen's Government. We could have gone up there and cleaned those soldiers of the Provisional Government out in fifteen or twenty minutes. We had everything ready to go and fight. We could have cleaned up every one of them in fifteen or twenty minutes.

The barracks were in the hands of someone for Her Majesty the Queen. The station house was in the hands of foreigners and natives under control of the Queen's Government. So you see the Government building was the only place taken by the Provisional Government at that time. The barracks, the Queen's palace, and the station house were in the hands of the Queen's friends. I was one of the soldiers ready to support the Queen's Government. I think about 500 of us were there that day. Sam Damon came down there. He went out to Bill Cornwell, minister of finance; I saw him with Sam Damon.

Sam Parker was down at the station house. Peterson, the attorney-general, was there; Antone Rosa was there; in fact, the whole cabinet was there. The marshal was there; Deputy Marshal Martin was there, and a large crowd ready to go up to the Government house against the Provisional Government. While I was there I saw C. L. Hopkins in a carriage with a letter, and he went up to his excellency Mr. Stevens's residence. About half an hour afterwards Hopkins returned to the station house again with his answer to that letter.

The answer was, I understand, I am not positive, "I recognize the Provisional Government at this time." That is my understanding. I do not want you to think I saw the letter. We thought before Hopkins went up there that his excellency Mr. Stevens was in favor of Her Majesty's Government. When Hopkins arrived at the station house and some of the members of the cabinet read the letter they told us his excellency Mr. Stevens was in favor of the Provisional Government. He would not support Her Majesty's Government. For that reason we could not do anything, because we did not want to fight with the United States Government.

Q. When this man came back from the American minister with the letter recognizing the Provisional Government was the Queen then in possession of the barracks and the palace and the station house?

A. She was in control of the palace, in control of the barracks, and the station house. She was ready to meet the Provisional party. I assure you if Mr. Stevens had never sent any letter of that kind that evening I have no doubt the people in the Government building would have to clean out.

Q. How many were there?

A. About 50.

Q. Who knows how many troops the white people had there then—who else besides yourself knows about it?

A. Antone Rosa knows it; Henry Poor, he is three-fourths white; Charles Hopkins, and several others. At the time that man returned from Minister Stevens's house the station house, the barracks, and the palace were in control of the Queen.

Q. Was the Queen in possession of the barracks, station house, and palace when the proclamation was read?

A. Yes; I am sure. When we had news from Mr. Stevens in favor of the Provisional Government, then some of our friends said:

It is no use for us to go and fight the Americans. There are few soldiers here but there are 65,000,000 of people behind. It is no use to fight.

If Mr. Stevens had never sent that letter to recognize the Provisional Government I say Her Majesty would have remained on the throne to-day.

Next morning I read a letter from Minister Stevens in the newspaper. He said:

I recognize the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands, because it takes the palace, the station house, and the barracks. That is my reason why I recognize the Provisional Government.

Now he had recognized the Provisional Government before they had taken charge of the station house, the palace, or the barracks. There was only the Government house in the hands of the Provisional Government. We could not fight the United States. If Mr. Stevens had never sent any word of that kind, if he had never interfered, you would see these people cleaned out in fifteen or twenty minutes, and the Queen remain on her throne till to-day.

Q. How do you know what was in the letter which Mr. Hopkins carried to Mr. Stevens?

A. I do not know. I saw Antone Rosa write a letter and Hopkins took it to give to his excellency, Mr. Stevens.

Q. The letter Mr. Rosa wrote in the station house?

A. Yes.

Q. When Hopkins came back he brought an answer. To whom?

A. To the members of the cabinet, because they remained in the station house.

Q. Where is the letter?

A. I suppose Sam Parker or the Queen has it.

Q. Will you find out and furnish me with the letters?

A. I will try.

Q. I want the letter taken by Mr. Hopkins and given to Mr. Stevens and the reply.

A. Yes.

Q. Well, please continue your narrative.

A. Her Majesty the Queen did not surrender her Government to the Provisional Government, but to the United States Government.

Q. How do a majority of the people feel towards the Provisional Government?

A. They are against it.

Q. By what majority, if there was a vote on the Australian ballot system?

A. I do not think the Provisional Government would get one-tenth of the native people from the Island of Hawaii to Niuhau.

Q. That is the native people?

A. Yes.

Q. How about the whites?

A. I say I think nearly a majority of the white men in town is against the Provisional Government, or perhaps half and half.

Q. I have heard a good many natives were signing papers here and in other islands in favor of annexation. If that is true, how do you account for it?

A. I think some of them have signed their names in favor of annexation. I will give you the reason: Because their horses run in pasture of very people in favor of annexation. Some of them work under them on plantations. So they have control of them. Some natives sign because they are afraid of being turned out from their work. They say they will have no bread and butter; but if you declare an election like the Australian law, when their master or boss would have no control of them, it would differ.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Col. Blount.

J. L. KAULUKOU.

No. 33.

Statement of Liliuokalani.

His Excellency JAMES H. BLOUNT:

SIR: On the morning of the 26th of November, 1890, I went to Iolani palace, where I met His Majesty Kalakaua's ministers, Mr. J. A. Cummins, C. N. Spencer, G. Brown, and A. P. Peterson, awaiting the appearance of His Majesty.

We did not have to wait long and were ushered into the library, the King seating me in his chair and formally introduced his ministers to me. After exchanging assurances of fidelity to each other and faithfulness in the discharge of their official duties, the ministers left, and the King and I were left to talk over matters.

He told me of things that had transpired a few months back. That some of the ministers had thrown guns and ammunition into the sea from the steamer *Waimanalo*. It was done to prevent him from having them, and had evidently been directed by the reform party with whom a portion of his ministers were in accord, instead of keeping them for his protection and safety. These ministers were working with a party of conspirators, who are the very same parties who have been the means of the overthrow of my government on the 17th of January, 1893. They are called the missionary or reform party. The King went on to say that his guards had been reduced to twenty men and they were barely sufficient to protect me if there should be any disturbance. He had requested Mr. Cummins, minister of foreign affairs, to send back to the palace all the guns that were at the station house and that the carriages had been sent to the palace but the guns themselves had been kept back. It was an insult by his cabinet and he felt keenly his weakness; that he had no more power or influence since his cabinet was working against him. He explained all these things because he wanted me to study my situation so as to be able to cope with it.

The time for his departure on the U. S. S. *Charleston* drew near and he bade the Queen and myself farewell, and I felt in my own heart some misgivings that I would never see him again.

I spent a few nights in the palace and realized the insecurity of the situation. Every two or three nights there was an alarm of some kind. There was a fear that something was going to happen; what that something was no one could tell. Mr. Cummins had heard of some conspiracy but could not prove anything.

During the session of 1890 the Honolulu Rifles were disbanded, but the members of that company were still allowed to carry arms in the streets and to wear the uniforms.

I asked my husband, the Hon. John O. Dominis, how all this could be allowed. He referred me to the minister of foreign affairs. On inquiring of the minister he said that they were part of the Knights of Pythias and were permitted to carry arms. This was very unsatisfactory, and my husband and I concluded that there must be some underhanded dealings somewhere. After that I preferred to remain at Washington Place, only going to the palace during office hours.

A few weeks passed, and during that time grand preparations were made to receive the King on his return; but the morning of the 29th of January, 1891, the city was startled with the news that the U. S. S. *Charleston* was in sight with the Hawaiian flag flying at half mast.

I was so shocked by the news that it seemed as if I was in a maze, especially as those things which took place on that day was all done in a hurry by my ministers, of whom Mr. Godfrey Brown seemed to be leader.

Things that might have been put off for a day or two were all done that day, and I had no time to think wisely of my situation, or to realize the sad grief that had fallen on Kalakaua's Queen and myself and on the whole nation.

On that day, at 11, I was told that I was to take the oath. I sent a note immediately to my husband (at Washington Place) who was lying on a sick bed, and told him of the arrival of my brother's remains, and of all that had transpired, and he came to the palace weak as he was.

We conversed on the subject before us; also about the constitution. I told him I did not wish to sign it, as there was a general feeling in the community, and principally amongst the native Hawaiians, that it was not a good constitution, as it had been forced on the King and the Hawaiian people, but my husband persuaded me to sign it, and I obeyed.

At 2 o'clock p. m. we entered the room where all the privy councillors were assembled and there, in their presence, I took the oath of office and swore to abide by the constitution of 1837. As we left the room and waited in the blue room to receive congratulations as well as condolences, just before the members came in a piece of paper, hurriedly written, was thrust in my hand, on which was written, "Do not sign the constitution; I shall soon explain why." But the deed was done. Chief Justice Judd was the first who came forward, but instead of congratulations, said in an undertone, "Should your ministers come up, say to them that they may keep their portfolios." I suspected something wrong and kept my countenance.

After all the others had come and gone their turn came. Mr. Cummins, as head of the cabinet, said: "Your Majesty, we wish to say that we are not quite sure that we can hold our commissions." Then Mr. Brown finished the sentence for him by saying that the constitution distinctly states that the cabinet could only be dismissed by the Legislature; therefore, all that was required would be to have new commissions made out for them. It will be seen there is no clause in the constitution providing for the cabinet in case of the demise of a sovereign.

I asked them each to keep their portfolios until after the King's funeral, and at that time I would discuss the matter. On the 15th of February, 1891, the funeral took place, and on Monday, the 16th, at 9 a. m., Mr. Cummins and I had a private conference. He evidently wanted to know what my decision would be. I told him I thought they ought to resign, and I would give him another position.

At 10 I met the following gentlemen in the cabinet council: Mr. J. A. Cummins, Mr. C. N. Spencer, Mr. G. Brown, Mr. A. P. Peterson. I told them I had studied over the situation, and concluded that they could not remain as my cabinet; that they ought to resign. They said they had also considered the question and concluded that I ought to give them new commissions, and asked me to give them more time to consider, and it was granted them. It took two weeks before it was finally settled.

At 12 m. of the same day an audience was granted to Admiral Brown, as he intended to sail soon. When the hour for the reception arrived, I was surprised when the American minister, J. L. Stevens, came also, as no notice had been previously given to my chamberlain that it was his intention to come.

After the usual form of presentation was over Mr. Stevens took the opportunity to make an address, which I thought was not at all suited to the occasion. It was the first step that Mr. Stevens took to interfere, and I felt at the time that he would take some future occasion to make trouble. Two days after Admiral Brown remarked to me that I did not seem overpleased with Mr. Stevens's speech and that my eyes flashed fire.

Two weeks elapsed, when the cabinet consulted the supreme bench, and was told that they could not hold their seats or positions without I gave them new commissions, so they resigned.

The reading of the King's will took place, and Admiral Brown was invited by the Queen dowager to be present. I appointed my new cabinet. They were Mr. S. Parker, minister of foreign affairs; Mr. C. N. Spencer, minister of interior; Mr. H. A. Widemann, minister of finance; Mr. W. A. Whiting, attorney-general. I also appointed Mr. C. B. Wilson marshal.

Before I appointed my ministers Messrs. Bush and Wilcox called and offered their services, but as Mr. Bush had shown his ingratitude to the late King, and Mr. Wilcox a disposition of disobedience on the occasion of his revolution of 1889, I felt I could not have such men for ministers, and appointed others, which made them very angry.

I began a tour to the different islands with my husband and quite a large retinue. It took us nearly six months to make a complete tour, now and then returning between times to Honolulu on business matters, and in the month of July my husband was taken sick and on the 27th of August, 1891, he breathed his last. I felt his loss very much, as his experience of several years' service with Kamehameha IV and V, and also under Lunalilo and Kalakaua's reign, proved valuable to me. He was a kind and affectionate husband, a man of honor, and esteemed by all who knew him. To those whom he gave in charity it was never spoken of. His death was a severe loss, for I needed him most at that time to advise with in the affairs of state.

Soon after the appointment of my ministers I asked my husband to come to the palace and stay. He did not wish to because he had to climb those long stairs; so I told him I would have the bungalow put in repair and furnished, and Mr. Robertson, my chamberlain, had instructions to that effect, and to see that it was done.

My husband made a request that when the ministers were ready to put up the iron fence around the palace grounds (for which the Legislature of 1890 had given appropriations) he would like to have a wicket gate made for his own convenience. I told him to speak to Minister Spencer, which he did, but the gate was not finished until 1892, and it had never been used by anyone except Mr. Robertson, my chamberlain, to let the young ladies and gentlemen of the Minuet Club pass through.

Here I will state that in 1889 that palace walls had just been completed at a great expense to the Government and after the Wilcox revolution, this very L. A. Thurston, the agitator, who was in the cabinet that year, saw fit without any regard to the heavy amount expended on the wall, ordered the whole wall to be torn down; hence the appropriation of 1890 for an iron fence. The missionary ladies' party clapped their hands with glee as they stood outside the post-office and said, "Thank the Lord the country is ours." Had their fathers left a dying request that they should eventually control and hold power over these islands? One would suppose so from the actions of their sons and daughters.

I return to the events which took place after my husband's death. I asked my cousins Princes Kawanakoa and Kalauiaole to come and stay at the bungalow, but they did not seem inclined to do so, so one day Mr. Wilson asked if he and Kitty, his wife, might not come and stay with me, as he thought that it was necessary I should have some one near me to protect me, as he was fearful that some evil-minded person might do me harm, as there were parties who did not hesitate to make hateful remarks about me in his presence. Perhaps I was the obstacle to the full accomplishment of their wishes—that is *power*.

Mr. Wilson is a man of great decision and firmness of character, and as he had been appointed marshal of the Kingdom, I thought it would not be out of the way if I did accept his offer. I regretted in one sense shortly after that, that I had consented, because he was not the same person I had known as a boy. He was 19 years of age when he courted Evaline, a young girl who had almost grown up in our household, and my husband and I encouraged their marriage; but many years had flown by, and he had been through rough experience in his duties and exhibited now and then how well suited he was to the appointment of marshal. He had a brave heart and his wife I have a great fondness for.

The Legislature, Mr. Wilson said, was about to convene, and it was necessary for him at such a time to be near me, and I thought it best to let them remain till after the prorogation.

The day arrived for the opening of the Legislature, and I felt that my troubles had commenced. With such a party of men as those who comprised the Reform party, and with such unscrupulous men as Thurston, W. O. Smith, Alex. Young, J. Marsden, W. C. Wilder, and Henry Baldwin, as leaders, I knew that my cabinet would find it a difficult matter to contend against such a party.

Laws were made mostly for their special benefit, and others that would prove injurious to the Hawaiians and other nationalities. They brought in measures which only tended to prolong the session and to give them time for their scheme of annexation to ripen. In the meantime Thurston took a trip to the States to attend to his cyclorama, and at the same time try to make stipulations for annexing these islands.

In the month of August the Reform party began their policy of dismissing the ministry. They made promises to Mr. Cummins, of the

National Reform, and Bush, Wilcox, and Ashford, of the Liberal party, and P. P. Kanoa of seats in the cabinet if they joined their party, and they did so, besides taking Kamaooha, Iosepa, and another member with them, which made the Reform party very strong. On the 31st of August, for no good cause, the Parker ministry was voted out in accordance with a clause in the constitution of 1887, that any minister could be voted out by a majority of the members of the House for "want of confidence." It had been decided by myself and cabinet that our policy should be one of economy and retrenchment. This had been our course from the commencement of my reign, binding ourselves strictly to and guiding our course according to the laws and regulations of our Kingdom. The Parker ministry had no sooner gone out than twenty-five Hawaiian members of the House petitioned me to appoint Mr. Parker again. Next day Mr. Baldwin asked for audience and came with a request that I would receive the Hons. Kanoa and Kauhaue and ask them to form a cabinet for me.

I received those gentlemen, but they brought with them a petition with a list of names, principally of the Reform party, that I would nominate from those names my cabinet. They called the [sic] a constitutional principle. I knew if I yielded to their request I would be yielding my own right under the constitution, which gave me the right to appoint and the house to dismiss.

Two weeks passed and I appointed Minister Parker, Gulick, Macfarlane, and Neumann. The policy of this ministry was retrenchment in all directions, and Mr. Macfarlane, as minister of finance, immediately set to work with that purpose in view, and laid many satisfactory plans for them to pursue. In order to carry out the rigid economies prepared by Mr. Macfarlane, I consented to a reduction of \$10,000 in the appropriation for my privy purse and further reductions in "household expenses, state entertainments, and the military."

They had, however, been in office only a few days when the American minister, J. L. Stevens, made a request through Minister Parker that he would like to call on me the next day, the 16th of October, and that he would bring his secretary with him. The hour was set for 11 and a cabinet council was called to sit at 10. When the hour arrived, the cabinet rose to depart. I asked them to remain, but Mr. Macfarlane begged to be excused, as he had once, while as noble in the house, brought in a resolution against Mr. J. L. Stevens on account of a speech he made on the 30th of May, reflecting on the administration in Hawaii. Mr. Gulick and himself were excused and Mr. Parker and Mr. Neumann remained. Mr. Parker went to the door and received Mr. Stevens and at the same time asked what was the purpose of his visit, that he might apprise me. Mr. Stevens said he would mention it to me in person. They entered, followed by Mr. H. W. Severance. He seated himself in a manner which no gentleman would in the presence of a lady, and drew from under his arm a document which he read, stating that my Government had grossly insulted him, the ambassador of the United States and minister plenipotentiary for that nation, and holding them responsible for an article which appeared in the Bulletin reflecting upon his indifference in sending relief to the captain and crew of a shipwrecked American vessel.

He then read a clause in international laws relating to a minister's position in foreign lands. While he was reading he seemed to be laboring under great excitement and anger, and when he finished reading I rose and said my cabinet would give the matter their best consideration, whereupon Mr. Stevens and Mr. Severance took their leave. Was

he seeking to make trouble? I remarked to Mr. Parker and Mr. Neumann that it appeared that way. Next day a lunch was given by the ladies of the Central Union Church; the occasion was to help pay for the new church on Beretania street. Mr. Henry Severance took the occasion to say to me that he was entirely ignorant as to the intention of Minister Stevens before they arrived at the palace, as he had not told him of the object of the visit and was surprised at Mr. Stevens's conduct. I did not answer. Some correspondence passed between Mr. Stevens and my ministers, which resulted in the cabinet entering a suit for libel against the *Bulletin*, which was afterwards withdrawn by Mr. Stevens.

It was during this month that a meeting was held at the residence of Mr. Alexander Young, and a discussion arose as to my obstinacy in not appointing one of their number. They called this "constitutional principle." At this meeting it was proposed to dethrone me. The question was asked how it was to be accomplished, when it was stated that Capt. Wiltse of the *Boston* would assist.

Changes of ministry followed rapidly. The Cornwell cabinet lasted only one hour. Its members were W. H. Cornwell, J. Nawahi, C. T. Gulick, and C. Creighton. Without giving this cabinet any trial they were immediately voted out.

Here I must mention that when the Mafarlane ministry was voted out I wished to send them back to the house again, but Mr. Macfarlane and Mr. Neumann advised to the contrary. I felt loath to give up a cabinet composed of men in whom I had reason to know the community had confidence that their transactions would be straightforward and honest.

The Wilcox (Reform) cabinet came next. They were appointed by stratagem, as I found out afterwards. The policy of this cabinet was retrenchment, no changes in the monetary system of the country, and to make a commercial treaty which would bring us in closer relationship with the United States.

Their first policy they failed to carry out, as they went into all sorts of extravagant measures, such as \$5,000 for sending a commission to Washington—and that commission were to consist of Thurston, Wilcox, and others—with the purpose of annexing these islands; \$12,000 to send the band to Chicago, and \$50,000 for the Volcano road. All these measures were for Mr. Thurston's private benefit, but were passed in the house. It had always been customary for the ministry to consult the King or sovereign in cabinet council on any measure of importance, but in this instance and on all occasions the cabinet had already decided on those measures, and simply presented them to me for my signature. I had no resource but to acquiesce.

Whenever I expostulated their answer was generally "We have consulted the chief justice, and are of one opinion." I found that I was simply a nonentity, a figurehead, but was content to wait patiently until the next session, when probably they would be voted out.

It required diplomacy to overthrow the Wilcox cabinet and the Liberals used it. The cabinet felt secure because those who worked amongst the members as wire-pullers were so sanguine about their success, but where corruption is practiced there is no stability, and such it proved in this instance.

A short time before the overthrow of the Wilcox cabinet Cummins, Bush, R. W. Wilcox, Ashford, and their followers, finding that their hopes of being in the cabinet would never be realized, left and turned to help the Liberals once more, and with the aid of some of the Nationals

they were successful. They did not like the actions of the cabinet when it became known that the ministry had no consideration for the Queen and were carrying things in such a high-handed way.

These members had been deceived by the Thurston party, and they now combined to help the Liberals. Mr. White was the introducer of the bill providing for a constitutional convention; also the opium and lottery bills. He watched his opportunity and railroaded the last two bills through the house, but he failed in regard to the first bill.

A vote of want of confidence was then brought in. Three days before members flocked in at Washington Place and wanted to know if I wanted to get rid of my ministers. I said "No, it is not my privilege," they departed and others came and went. Mr. Colburn and Ashford called and said they understood it was my wish. I answered them as I did the others. Mr. Ashford said "I see, Mr. Colburn, we have made a mistake, but Your Majesty, should it be your desire to be rid of your cabinet, we can be of great service in bringing it about, but we would expect to have a representation in the new cabinet." I asked who of their number they would put forward, and Mr. Ashford replied "Mr. Cummins, Bush, and myself." I made no further reply, and they left.

It was a practice among some of the native members to sell their votes for a consideration. This was taught them by the Thurston party. They would come to me and then return to that party and repeat all that was said, for which they were usually paid something.

The Liberals won and the cabinet was voted out, partly because they were so sure of their success and on account of their own corrupt practices.

Mr. Geo. N. Wilcox and Mr. Robinson I have a high consideration for. Mr. P. C. Jones is a hearty sympathizer with his party, while I think Mr. Cecil Brown capable of doing anything that the Reform party directed him to do. Mr. Berger's vote was the casting vote. It was decided between Mr. Parker and myself that Mr. Widemann was to be a member of the next cabinet and for that reason Mr. Berger voted against the Wilcox cabinet. And so it was, for Mr. Widemann gave his consent and afterwards he withdrew. The next day Mr. Parker, Cornwell, Colburn, and Peterson were appointed. These gentlemen were accepted by the majority of the people in the house, who applauded them on their entrance, because they were men of liberal views, although they were not considered representative men, because they were not backed by moneyed men.

The same day of their appointment they advised me to sign the opium and lottery bills. I declined at first, as I wanted to please my lady friends, but they said there should be no hesitation on my part, as the house had passed those bills by a large majority, and they had been signed by the President and committee. I had no option but to sign. It took place on the 13th of January, 1893.

During the month of November, 1892, a private note was sent me informing me of the intentions of the American minister, J. L. Stevens, with the aid of some of our residents, to perfect a scheme of annexation, and that the cabinet had knowledge of the fact, but I gave little heed to it at the time.

On the 17th of December, 1892, another note was received, of which the following is a copy:

Her Majesty Queen LILIUOKALANI, may it please your Majesty:

MADAM: Referring to the confidential communication I took the liberty of addressing your Majesty a few weeks ago, about the attitude and utterances of the Ameri-

can representatives here, the perfect correctness of which have been confirmed by subsequent information, I now beg to be allowed to state, that through the same trustworthy source I have been informed that in a very late moment of effusion, some American official gave to understand that he had instructions to press and hurry up an annexation scheme, which he confidently expected to carry through at no distant date, with the help and assistance of the present cabinet.

If your Majesty will kindly weigh this information by the side of the bold open declarations and annexation campaign made at the present time in the Bulletin, by the Rev. Sereno Bishop, the well-known mouthpiece of the annexation party, I think that your Majesty will be able to draw conclusions for yourself, and realize not only that there is yet danger ahead, but that the enemy is in the household, and that the strictest watch ought to be kept on the members of the present cabinet. This again in strictest confidence from

Your Majesty's humble and faithful servant.

The above was written by a gentleman in whose word I have great confidence as a man who had the best interest of Hawaii at heart.

It was on the receipt of this note that I sent for the British commissioner, James H. Wodehouse, and asked his advice on the matter. I asked whether he thought it would be wise for me to invite all the foreign representatives of the diplomatic and consular corps fearing that a disturbance might arise over the political situation. He said he should not interfere with our local matters, and he dissuaded me from the idea, as he said it was like acknowledging that there was actual danger. "Did I think there was any danger?" I answered, "there might be." The morning of the 14th of January, 1893, arrived with all preparations for the closing of the Legislature. At 10 a. m. I called a cabinet meeting for the purpose of apprising them of their positions in the house and other preliminary instructions. I told them it was my intention to promulgate a new constitution. The cabinet had to meet the Legislature and we adjourned. At 12 m. I prorogued the Legislature. I noticed that the hall was not filled as at the opening. There were not many ladies present in the audience, and I also noticed that several members of the Legislature belonging to the Reform party were not there. This looked ominous of some coming trouble.

On entering the palace I saw Mr. Wilson at the entrance of the blue room. I went up to him and asked if all was ready. He replied, "Yes." Then I said, "You will have to be brave to day," and I passed into the blue room and sat awaiting my ministers. A half hour passed and they did not come. After a little longer delay they arrived. I immediately judged from their countenances that something was wrong. I had a few days before planned that I would sign the constitution in the throne room and in the presence of the members of the Legislature, the majority of whom had been elected by the people for the purpose of working for a new constitution.

At the commencement of my reign petitions were sent from all parts of the kingdom asking for a new constitution. Mr. Iosepa, of Hani; Kauhi, of Ewa; Nahinu, of Molokai; Kanealii, of Waihee; Kamauoha, of Kohala, and other members came to me repeatedly and asked for a new constitution. Mr. Parker, from the commencement of his ministry, advocated a new constitution, as well as most of my friends, but I was cautious in my answers to them; but to Mr. Parker I had always said it would be a good thing, and he said he would sustain me when the proper opportunity arrived.

A month later I met two members of the Legislature, and started in to make up a new constitution from Kamehameha V and that of 1887. After completing it, I kept it till the month of October, when I placed in the hands of Mr. A. P. Peterson, and asked him to correct it, and if he found any defects to strike them out and to put in such clauses as he thought would be good for the people and for the country. He

took it and kept it a whole month. To my knowledge he consulted many lawyers and others in regard to many points of interest in the document. When it was returned I looked it over and found no changes had been made, so I concluded that it was all right.

A week before the closing of the Legislature I asked Mr. Peterson to make a preamble for my new constitution, but up to the day of prorogation he had not made one.

Early in January I mentioned to Capt. Nowlein, of the household guards, and Mr. Wilson, the marshal, my intention to promulgate a new constitution, and to prepare themselves to quell any riot or outbreak from the opposition. They assured me they would be ready, and I gave strict injunctions of secrecy and showed Mr. Wilson a plan of the throne room on the day of the signing.

Mr. Parker and Mr. Cornwell had given me assurances of their support before their appointment as ministers, while Mr. Peterson understood that such was my intention, and although I had not mentioned it to Mr. Colburn, he had heard of it already from Mr. Peterson.

It appears that immediately on their learning of my intentions Mr. Colburn, on the morning of the 14th of January, immediately acted the part of a traitor by going to Mr. Hartwell, a lawyer, and informed him of my intentions, and of course received instructions from him to strongly advise me to abandon the idea.

This, then, was the cause of the delay and my long waiting in the blue room. The members of the diplomatic corps had been invited; also the members of the supreme bench and members of the Legislature, besides a committee of the Hui Kalaiaina. The latter were invited to be present because it was through them that many petitions had been sent to me. When the ministers arrived I told them everything in the throne room was ready and the guests were awaiting our presence; that we must not keep them waiting. I was surprised when the cabinet informed me that they did not think it advisable for me to take such a step, that there was danger of an uprising, etc. I told them that I would not have undertaken such a step if they had not encouraged me. They had led me out to the edge of a precipice and now were leaving me to take the leap alone. It was humiliating. I said, "Why not give the people the constitution and I will bear the brunt of all the blame afterwards." Mr. Peterson said, "We have not read the constitution." I told him he had had it in his possession a whole month.

The three ministers left Mr. Parker to try to dissuade me from my purpose, and in the meantime they all (Peterson, Cornwell, and Colburn) went to the Government building to inform Thurston and his party of the stand I took. Of course they were instructed not to yield. When they went over everything was peaceful and quiet, and the guests waiting patiently in the throne room.

The ministers returned and I asked them to read the constitution over. At the end I asked them what they saw injurious in the document. Mr. Peterson said there were some points which he thought were not exactly suited. I told him the Legislature could make the amendments. He begged that I should wait for two weeks; in the meantime they would be ready to present it to me. With these assurances I yielded, and we adjourned to the throne room. I stated to the guests present my reasons for inviting their presence. It was to promulgate a new constitution at the request of my people; that the constitution of 1857 was imperfect and full of defects. Turning to the chief justice I asked, "Is it not so, Mr. Judd?" and he answered in the affirmative, in the presence of all the members assembled.

I then informed the people assembled that under the advice of my

ministers, I had yielded, as they had promised that, on some future day I could give them a new constitution. I then asked them to return to their homes and keep the peace.

I noticed the look of disappointment in their faces when I retired. During all that transpired in the blue room from, 1 o'clock p. m. to 4 p. m., I was not at all agitated; was as calm as could be expected under the circumstances. When I reached the landing of the upper hall I heard a commotion below in the yard, so I hurried to the front veranda, accompanied by Prince Kawanauakoa and Kalaniauaole, and from there I addressed the people, saying that their wishes for a new constitution could not be granted just then, but will be some future day. They must go home and keep the peace and to pray for me, which they have done ever since.

There was a dinner prepared, at which forty persons sat down; everything was orderly and without confusion in the palace, and everything remained so all night. At 11 a. m. Sunday, the 15th, Mr. Parker came in to say that there was a meeting taking place in the Government building by the Reform party, but he did not say of what nature.

All Sunday everything seemed quiet until Monday morning. Even if any great commotion had been going on I would have remained indifferent; the reaction was a great strain, and all that took place after that I accepted as a matter of course. It was the disappointment in my ministry.

At about 10 a. m. Monday, the 16th of January, notice was issued by my ministers, stating "that the position I took and the attempt I made to promulgate a new constitution was at the earnest solicitation of my people—of my native subjects." They gave assurances that any changes desired in the fundamental law of the land would be sought only by methods provided in the constitution itself and signed by myself and ministers. It was intended to reassure the people that they might continue to maintain order and peace.

At about 5 p. m., however, the troops from the U. S. S. *Boston* were landed, by the order of the United States minister, J. L. Stevens, in secret understanding with the revolutionary party, whose names are L. A. Thurston, Henry Waterhouse, W. R. Castle, W. O. Smith, A. F. Judd, P. C. Jones, W. C. Wilder, S. B. Dole, Cecil Brown, S. M. Damon, C. Bolte, John Emmeluth, J. H. Soper, C. L. Carter. Why had they landed when everything was at peace?

I was told that it was for the safety of American citizens and the protection of their interests. Then why had they not gone to the residences instead of drawing in line in front of the palace gates, with guns pointed at us, and when I was living with my people in the palace?

I was sitting alone in the blue room when Mr. Widemann and Dr. Trousseau came in hurriedly to inform me of the approach of the troops. I asked them to go out and tell the people to be quiet, which they did.

There was no intention on the part of the Hawaiians to harm them or to raise any disturbance of any kind, nor was the life of any American citizen in danger. These revolutionists, having their wicked plans and objects in view, and feeling sure of the support from the American minister, had worked their feelings to such a state of excitement that they called a meeting of the citizens and met at the armory at Punch Bowl street on Monday at 2 o'clock p. m. There may have been 1,200 present, but the majority of those present simply went to see and hear what the revolutionists had to say, and had no sympathy with them or

their ideas. At the meeting they made incendiary remarks and appointed what they called a committee of safety. The Hawaiians called a massmeeting and passed resolutions supporting the actions of the Queen. It was a movement intended to reassure the people and to ward off the danger which they saw was approaching.

The troops remained in front of the palace until dark, when they withdrew to the Arion Hall.

That evening the Royal Hawaiian Band played as usual at the Hawaiian Hotel, and a large crowd of people met and everything around was quiet and peaceful. Tuesday morning at 9 o'clock Mr. S. M. Damon called at the palace. He told me that he had been asked to join a revolutionary council, but that he had declined. He asked me what he should do and whether he should join the advisory or executive councils, suggesting that perhaps he could be of service to me; so I told him to join the advisory council. I had no idea that they intended to establish a new Government.

At about 2:30 p. m. the establishment of the Provisional Government was proclaimed, and nearly fifteen minutes later Mr. J. S. Walker came and told me "that he had come on a painful duty, that the opposition party had requested that I should abdicate." I told him that I had no idea of doing so, but that I would like to see Mr. Neumann. Half an hour later he returned with the gentleman, and I explained to him my position, and he advised that I should consult my friends. I immediately sent for Mr. J. O. Carter, Damon, Widemann, Cleghorn, my ministers, also Mr. Neumann, Walker, and Macfarlane being present. The situation being taken into consideration and found, that since the troops of the United States had been landed to support the revolutionists, by the order of the American minister, it would be impossible for us to make any resistance. Mr. Damon had previously intimated to Mr. Parker that it was useless to resist, their party was supported by the American minister. Mr. Damon also said at the meeting that it was to be understood that I should remain at the palace and continue to fly the royal standard. At 6 p. m. I signed the following protest:

I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a Provisional Government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest and impelled by said forces, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo (f) the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

Done at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.

(Signed)

(Signed)

(Signed)

(Signed)

(Signed)

LILIUOKALANI R.
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

(Addressed)

To S. B. DOLE, Esq., and others composing the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

A letter was sent to the marshal of the Kingdom requesting him to deliver everything to the Provisional Government.

All that night and next day everything remained quiet.

At 10 a. m. the 18th, I moved to Washington Place of my own accord, preferring to live in retirement.

On the 19th of January, I wrote a letter to President Harrison, making an appeal that justice should be done.

His Excellency BENJAMIN HARRISON,
President of the United States:

MY GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: It is with deep regret that I address you on this occasion. Some of my subjects, aided by aliens, have renounced their loyalty and revolted against the constitutional Government of my Kingdom. They have attempted to depose me and to establish a Provisional Government in direct conflict with the organic law of this Kingdom. Upon receiving incontestable proofs that his excellency the minister plenipotentiary of the United States aided and abetted their unlawful movement and caused United States troops to be landed for that purpose, I submitted to force, believing that he would not have acted in that manner unless by authority of the Government which he represents.

This action on my part was prompted by three reasons, the futility of a conflict with the United States, the desire to avoid violence and bloodshed and the destruction of life and property, and the certainty which I feel that you and your Government will right whatever wrongs may have been inflicted upon us in the premises. In due time a statement of the true facts relating to this matter will be laid before you, and I live in the hope that you will judge uprightly and justly between myself and my enemies.

This appeal is not made for myself personally but for my people who have hitherto always enjoyed the friendship and protection of the United States.

My opponents have taken the only vessel which could be obtained here for the purpose, and hearing of their intention to send a delegation of their number to present their side of this conflict before you I requested the favor of sending by the same vessel an envoy to you to lay before you my statement as the facts appear to myself and my loyal subjects.

This request has been refused and I now ask you that in justice to myself and to my people that no steps be taken by the Government of the United States until my cause can be heard by you. I shall be able to dispatch an envoy about the 2d day of February, as that will be the first available opportunity hence, and he will reach you with every possible haste that there may be no delay in the settlement of this matter.

I pray you, therefore, my good friend that you will not allow any conclusions to be reached by you until my envoy arrives.

I beg to assure you of the continuance of my highest consideration.

(Signed)

LILIUOKALANI R.

It appears that President Harrison could not have taken notice of my appeal, or perhaps he was as anxious as the Provisional Government to annex these Islands, for the 16th of February I find he sent a message to the Senate transmitting the treaty, with a view to its ratification, without having first investigated or inquired into all the conditions or points of our situation, or that of the United States itself. I will not attempt to write the President's message, as you are already aware of its text.

I also wrote a letter to Mr. Cleveland, dated the 31st of January, 1893.

His Excellency GROVER CLEVELAND,
President-elect of the United States:

MY GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: In the vicissitudes which happened in the Hawaiian Islands, and which affect my people, myself, and my house so seriously, I feel comforted the more that, besides the friendly relation of the United States, I have the boon of your personal friendship and good will.

The changes which occurred here need not be stated in this letter; you will have at the time at which it reaches you the official information, but I have instructed the Hon. Paul Neumann, whom I have appointed my representative at Washington, to submit to you a précis of the facts and circumstances relating to the revolution in Honolulu, and to supplement it by such statements which you may please to elicit.

I beg that you will consider this matter, in which there is so much involved for my people, and that you give us your friendly assistance in granting redress for a wrong which we claim has been done to us, under color of the assistance of the naval forces of the United States in a friendly port. Believe me that I do not veil under this a request to you the fulfillment of which could in the slightest degree be contrary to your position, and I leave our grievance in your hands, confident that in so far as you deem it proper we shall have your sympathy and your aid.

I am, your good friend,

LILIUOKALANI R.

On the 31st of January the Hon. Paul Neumann received his appointment as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States of America. On the 1st of February he departed for Washington, with Prince David Kawanauakoa to accompany him on his commission, to negotiate for a withdrawal of the treaty and to restore to us what had been taken away by the actions of the revolutionists. At my request Mr. E. C. Macfarlane kindly consented to accompany the commission.

Happily, Providence ordered otherwise than as was expected by the revolutionists. Man proposes and God disposes. My commissioners arrived in time to stay the progress of the treaty. The members of the Senate became doubtful as to the correctness of the actions of the commissioners of the Provisional Government.

President Harrison's term expired, and President Cleveland's inauguration took place, and I hailed it as a good omen, having met him in 1887 while he occupied the Presidential chair that year, and I have not been disappointed.

President Cleveland's first act has been to withdraw that annexation treaty; the second, to send a Commissioner to investigate the situation in Hawaii Nei.

Your arrival in this country has brought relief to our people and your presence safety. There is no doubt but that the Provisional Government would have carried out extreme measures toward myself and my people, as you may have already seen ere this, by their unjust actions. If the President had been indifferent to my petitions I am certain it would have brought serious results to myself and tyranny to my subjects. In this I recognize the high sense of justice and honor in the person who is ruler of the American nation.

In making out this lengthy statement I will present the main points:

(1) That it has been a project of many years on the part of the missionary element that their children might some day be rulers over these islands and have the control and power in their own hands, as was the case after the revolution of 1887. Mr. W. W. Hall openly stated that they had planned for this for twelve years. It was a long-thought-of project, a dream of many years. So also said Mr. F. S. Lyman, of Hilo, in his speech to the people in the month of January. He said, "Fifteen long years we have prayed for this, and now our prayers are heard."

The disposition of those appointed to positions of authority, to act with the missionary element, tends to make the Government unstable, and because they found I could not easily be led by them, they do not like me.

(2) The interference of the American minister, J. L. Stevens, in our local affairs and conspiring with a few foreign people to overthrow me and annex these islands to the United States, and by his actions has placed me and my people in this unhappy position.

(3) My attempt to promulgate a new constitution. It was in answer

to the prayers and petitions of my people. They had sent petitions to the late King, and to the Legislature ever since 1887.

The Legislature is the proper course by which a new constitution or any amendments to the constitution could be made; that is the law. But when members are bribed and the Legislature corrupted how can one depend on any good measure being carried by the house? It is simply impossible. That method was tried and failed. There was only one recourse, and that was, that with the signature of one of the cabinet I could make a new constitution.

There is no clause in the constitution of 1887, to which I took my oath to maintain, stating "that there should be no other constitution but this," and article 78 reads that--

Wheresoever by this constitution any act is to be done or performed by the King or Sovereign it shall, unless otherwise expressed, mean that such act shall be done and performed by the Sovereign by and with the advice and consent of the cabinet.

The last clause of the forty-first article of the constitution reads:

No acts of the King shall have any effect unless it be countersigned by a member of the cabinet, who by that signature makes himself responsible.

My cabinet encouraged me, then afterwards advised me to the contrary. In yielding to their protest I claim I have not committed any unconstitutional or revolutionary act, and having withdrawn, why should the Reform party have gone on making preparations for war, as they did?

(4 and lastly.) That on the afternoon of the 16th of January, at 5 p. m., the United States troops were landed to support the conspirators, by orders of the United States minister, J. L. Stevens;

That on Tuesday, the 17th of January, 1893, at about 2:30 o'clock p. m., the Provisional Government was proclaimed, and Minister Stevens assured my cabinet that he recognized them, that Government; that at 6 p. m. of the same day I yielded my authority to the superior force of the United States.

We have been waiting patiently, and will still wait, until such time as the Government of the United States, on the facts presented to it, shall undo the act of its representative.

I hope and pray that the United States and her President will see that justice is done to my people and to myself; that they will not recognize the treaty of annexation, and that it may forever be laid aside; that they will restore to me and to my nation all the rights that have been taken away by the action of her minister; that we may be permitted to continue to maintain our independent stand amongst the civilized nations of the world as in years gone by; that your great nation will continue those kind and friendly relations that have always existed for many years past between the two countries. I can assure that Hawaii and her people have no other sentiment toward America and her President than one of kindest regard.

The Provisional Government, instead of being under the guidance of the President and cabinet, as the responsible heads of the nation, are virtually led by irresponsible people, who compose the advisory councils and "provisional army," and who set the laws of the land at defiance. A continuance of this state of things I consider dangerous to life and to the community.

I pray, therefore, that this unsatisfactory state of things may not continue and that we may not suffer further waste, justice may be speedily granted and that peace and quiet may once more reign over our land, Hawaii Nei.

No. 34.

Interview with Albert B. Loebenstein, of Hilo, Hawaii, surveyor and civil engineer, Tuesday, April 11, 1893.

MR. BLOUNT. What is your business?

MR. LOEBENSTEIN. I take charge of lands belonging to the Government in respect to rents and suggestions I am pleased to give relative to their reservation, whether best to sell them or what disposition.

Q. Will you tell me in whose hands the lands of the islands generally are?

A. Government lands?

Q. The whole land system?

A. The Crown lands, the Government lands. The amounts of Government land is about 873,000 acres and of Crown over 900,000 acres, throughout the group.

Q. Who owns the residue?

A. Bishop estate and private parties?

Q. What is the amount owned by private parties?

A. I can not say. The report of 1890 will give the figures of that.

Q. Can you tell me as to the holdings of the Kanaka population?

A. They are very small indeed.

Q. Can you give me any figures?

A. I can not. The tax returns would give that most accurately.

Q. To whom should I apply for that?

A. To the minister of finance. I know it is very small, and each year diminishes in amount.

Q. By leases and sales?

A. Mostly by mortgages, which foreclose by nonpayment of interest and principal. The Chinese have a large amount of lands which were originally assigned to Kanakas on these islands.

Q. Have they absolute title?

A. In most instances they hold by lease.

Q. They are not lands which belonged to the chiefs?

A. No; they are lands which come under the head of Kuleanas—small holdings, seldom over 5 acres in extent, and on these islands they are the principal lands which form taro patches and receive irrigation. They are now controlled by the Chinese.

Q. The Chinese are not owners of sugar plantations, are they?

A. No; I believe there is but one sugar plantation owned by Chinese, and that is on the island of Molakai. That has since been sold, and now the only plantation interest owned or controlled by Chinese is one on the island of Hawaii, and more particularly the plantation of Pepeekeo, in the district of Hilo, of which one-third of the capital stock is owned by one C. Afong.

MR. LOEBENSTEIN continuing at 11 o'clock Wednesday, April 12.

MR. BLOUNT. This is a map of Hawaii?

MR. LOEBENSTEIN. Yes.

Q. What do the various colors represent?

A. The yellow represents land belonging to the Crown, the green that owned by the Government.

Q. And the remainder?

A. The remainder represents individual ownership and other ownership, including lands conveyed by the Government, and also Kuleanas,

which represent small parcels conveyed to the original tenants, who resided on the land at the time that the land system was established.

Q. By whom?

A. By Kamehameha III. They were conveyed by the King on confirmation of the land commission subsequent to 1848.

Q. Were not some of them conveyed to chiefs?

A. No; all the lands which were conveyed to the chiefs were merely in reward for services rendered by their ancestors at the time of the conquest by Kamehameha I.

Q. Now, what part of the lands, outside of the Government lands and the crown lands, belongs to what is known as Kuleanas, and what part belongs to individuals and corporations?

A. At the time the awards were made about 11,000 acres in all were conveyed as Kuleanas by the King and privy council. Subsequent to that, and I might say for a short time preceding, sections of land were sold by the King, and subsequently by the Government, and royal patented to individuals—Hawaiians and foreigners—about 290,000 acres in all.

Q. What part of the 290,000 acres did the natives get?

A. On the Island of Hawaii, two-thirds; this is approximate. I want to be on the safe side, giving the Hawaiians the benefit of the ratio. Then there remained, of course, the lands which are still owned by the Government, and also those which come under the crown lands proper. On figuring up the area of the crown lands of Hawaii, allowing for those lands whose area is not correctly known, I should say there were over 625,000 acres of crown lands on the Island of Hawaii. There are nearly 600,000 acres of Government land. There are lands which come under the head of unassigned lands, and also those which have not yet been investigated, that I should say were nearly 150,000 acres more.

Q. What do you mean by unassigned?

A. At the time the land system was established a list of lands was made out. Certain lands were to be given to chiefs; others were reserved by the King, and the remainder were to form what has since been called Government lands. Certain lands were overlooked, and have since come under the head of unassigned lands. The larger portion of the crown lands are now under lease for long terms of years.

Q. What is the limit?

A. Thirty years, allowed by law. A number of these leases have lately been made, which of course throws them out of any calculation for development by small settlers for sometime to come.

Q. To whom are they leased?

A. Corporations.

Q. And for what purpose?

A. Grazing purposes and cane cultivation. That land is only suitable for that purpose and also for the needs of planters.

Q. What do you mean by the needs of planters?

A. They felt that they required land for the purpose of planting cane, and they offered so much a year, and generally they got it—sometimes far below the actual value. I know of several instances where leases have been executed for crown lands far below their actual value.

Q. To corporations?

A. Yes. Of course a large quantity part of this crown land is absolutely worthless. A reference to the map will show that most of these crown lands converge towards the backbone of the island. Then there

is a large amount of lava and other volcanic country unfit for anything, but enough remains to be applicable to purposes of farming, especially small farms. In the higher altitudes crops can be raised which are grown in temperate zones, and nearer the level of the sea tropical products. I should say that of these 625,000 acres 50 per cent can be made available, after the leases which now tie them have expired. I think the value of the crown lands has been very much overrated.

Q. You speak of the natives owning Kuleanas, and then of their having gotten lands sold by the Government.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The latter class; are they in small parcels or not?

A. The largest amounts of land sold to the native Hawaiian by the Hawaiian Government are seldom over 100 acres in extent. There are some which are of larger area, and when so have generally been purchased by a number of individuals pooling together.

Q. Well, now, the pooling of these lands; who owns them?

A. To-day?

Q. Yes.

A. Individuals.

Q. For sugar culture?

A. Yes, and for grazing. I should say that by far the larger part is now in the hands of foreigners.

Q. Did the natives sell it?

A. They sold it and they raised money on it by mortgage, and in some instances lost it by foreclosure.

Q. Have they conveyed away in that way the larger proportion of their holdings?

A. I should say that not over 10 per cent of the land originally conveyed to the Hawaiians or purchased by them from the Government has remained in their hands to-day.

Q. The lands sold then are generally in the hands of these corporations?

A. Yes, sir. I should state, in this connection, that the larger portion of the lands sold by the Government is situated in the districts of Kohala, Hamaqua, and Hilo, the three districts on the island of Hawaii which now produce over one-half of the crop of the Hawaiian Islands, over 60,000 tons. The districts of Kona and Kau in the olden times were mostly settled by Hawaiians. The fishing was good, and they preferred to live there in preference to living on the windward side of the Island. As the plantations throughout the group expanded and their needs for land increased, it gradually assumed control of these little sections.

Q. By purchase?

A. The process would be this: The Hawaiian would get hard up. He wanted to raise money on his property, and of course the plantation was always ready to advance that money; or if he went to other parties it would sooner or later be transferred to the plantation. The man who had made him advances would want his interest or principal, and in the natural course of events it always came over to the corporation, and this is how they managed to obtain the whole or larger part of the land.

Q. Now, the lands on the leeward; who are they owned by now mostly?

A. The ownership is about even between the descendants of the original awardees and the others who have obtained control in the manner I have just stated.

Q. What are they used for?

A. For grazing lands and sites for dwellings. The leeward side is largely volcanic—very rough and rocky—and the lower contours are unfit for anything but grazing. The higher contours are generally on larger awards, which are now owned by others. This condition holds good with the other islands as on Hawaii, only more emphatically so.

Q. You mean to say that these changes of title are more emphatic than on Hawaii?

A. Yes; Hawaii is only a sugar-producing island of comparatively recent date, while Maui and Kauai were the initial points of the sugar industry.

Q. How about this island?

A. Sugar on this island is of comparatively recent date. The total amount of land owned by Hawaiians on these islands does not exceed 7,000 acres. I am giving approximate figures.

Q. How much is owned by other parties?

A. The remainder. I think the area of this island is about 340,000 or 350,000 acres.

Q. And the remainder, after taking out the amount owned by natives?

A. About 65,000 acres is owned by the Crown; a small tract is owned by the Government and the Bishop estate, and private parties, mostly foreigners, come in for the remainder. Of the 7,000 acres I have given 1,200 acres or thereabouts is now under cultivation by the Chinese in rice and taro patches.

Q. Did they get that from the natives?

A. Yes. The remaining 6,000 is what is called Kula land, or plateau land. It is all heavily mortgaged.

Q. About what rate of interest is charged?

A. The legal rate is 9 per cent.

Q. Suppose more than that is charged?

A. If it is with the consent of the mortgagor, he is held.

(Mr. Loebenstein here presented a map of the island of Maui.)

Q. Will you please tell me what opportunity you have had for getting this information you have been giving this morning?

A. I have been a surveyor for a number of years and I am constantly traveling over all the islands of the group. I have taken great interest in the land system here and given it a careful study. I know the Hawaiian language thoroughly—I speak it, read it, and write it.

Q. How long have you been in the islands?

A. Off and on, fifteen years. I was born at Macon, Ga.

Q. You have not been south since you have been away?

A. No.

Q. Your surveying has been done at the instance of private parties or the Government?

A. Both. The Government has frequently retained me for work when their own corps was insufficient to carry on the work, but I am not a salaried Government official.

Q. You have perhaps found it more profitable to have private employment?

A. Oh, by far.

Q. When employed by the Government you get the same rate of pay?

A. I charge the same rate as I do to private parties. I would say this—that I also hold an appointment as Government land agent for the island of Hawaii, and my duties are to maintain an oversight and

supervision of Government lands. I have always endeavored to look out for the interest of the people as against the grasp and greed of other parties—that is in respect to fair figures for rentals, and setting apart such lands as I think should be set apart for homestead settlers, so as to give the experiment of small farming in the country a fair trial. Of the lands set apart for homestead purposes on the island of Hawaii there are about 7,000 acres in all, which have been laid out in tracts not exceeding 20 acres.

Q. Now, going from the land question, do you know anything about the causes which led to the dethronement of the Queen and the establishment of the Provisional Government?

A. I believe I have kept myself posted on the events of the day. I believe I understand to some extent how the crisis was brought about.

Q. Please give me your views.

A. Since the forcing of the new constitution upon Kaulakaua there has been a constant endeavor on the part of the Sovereign to undermine those constitutional checks which were set against the royal prerogative. That of course led to constant collision.

Q. You mean force?

A. No; constitutional collision. In many instances the constitutional side of the question, as I understand it, was set aside. That is to say, by opinions and decisions from the highest court in the land—the supreme court. The sovereign was generally sustained. All these different results and different tendencies finally combined in making the issue very plain and broad. Then again the Hawaiian looks upon the Government and upon official position as a legitimate source from which to fill his pocket. In other words, he is naturally corrupt. The younger generation have only the one ambition—to become Government employés. For this reason the sovereign has generally been able to depend on that element in its encroachments on constitutional liberty. These different streams all converged into that revolution of a few months ago, which set aside the Queen. I know, of course, that at times there must have been a private understanding and differences of opinion which were adjusted in order to maintain a peaceful condition of affairs.

Q. Who were these private understandings between?

A. In this statement I am giving my own individual opinion. I have nothing authoritative, but events have occurred at times which any lover of constitutional liberty, or anything which meant the independence of white men, would grit his teeth over and still find things would remain the same.

Q. Did these differences run along the race line generally?

A. I could answer that in this way—that what differences there have been have generally resulted in the race line being sharply drawn, and the Hawaiian would of course use his vote in strengthening his side of the case. There has been no working in harmony between the two races for the last ten years.

Q. The difference then practically has been between the whites and the Crown and the natives on such questions as you have already indicated? Is that true?

A. It is undoubtedly so.

Q. Did there seem to be a general sentiment amongst the whites for annexation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did that get to be pronounced?

A. You mean as a public enunciation?

Q. You can state it both ways.

A. It became a public enunciation January 16, and before that time there had been several. I know of one instance where the same movement was in force to bring about annexation.

Q. What time was that?

A. Between the months of March and October of 1892.

Q. Was that the Ashford-Wilcox movement?

A. Yes; I was requested to join the movement. It was a secret conspiracy at that time.

Q. The object being to dethrone the Queen?

A. To overthrow the throne and have annexation. I won't say to what republic. It was the initial step to evolve a system of annexation.

Q. Why did it fail?

A. In the first place the officials nabbed the head conspirators before the thing was ready. My personal conviction is that the time was not ripe; that capital, which is proverbially timid and slow to accept a new order of things, was unwilling to embark in the scheme.

Q. Did the leaders of that movement have anything to do with the failure of the capitalists to join?

A. Yes, sir; I believe it was the want of responsible men—who were known as men of financial standing in the community—that was the cause of the failure. Some of the leaders who were then announcing annexation are now violently opposed to it.

Q. And were they on the 16th of January?

A. I know of two who in public utterances opposed the movement.

Q. What is your judgment as to the disposition on the part of the people toward the Provisional Government?

A. Hawaiians, you mean?

Q. You can take the several classes in such order as you want.

A. I believe the feeling among the whites generally is in support of the Provisional Government. There are exceptions, but I think I have a right to say they do not represent the respectable element in the community.

Q. How are they in point of numbers? What percentage of the white population?

A. I know there are very few.

Q. There is an English element here. How is it disposed towards the present Government?

A. Equally divided as to annexation and nonannexation.

Q. Is it true or not that they and the whites generally are looking at the matter from a business standpoint?

A. In my conversations with a number of leading sugar-planters, and managers who represent owners, they have advanced several reasons like this: We are fully aware that the bounty is a thing that can be knocked in the head. We do not care. We want better government. And as for the contract labor, we can get along without it. We have enough Japanese in the country now. Some of them look at the thing from a financial point of view, and might be unwilling to express these views.

Q. What do they desire and expect if they entered into union with the United States?

A. Stable government.

Q. What do you mean by stable government?

A. A government which is not under the pleasure of a sovereign whose mere will or wish or pleasure will overthrow constitutional rights.

Q. The larger part of the population here is not white?

A. No, sir; they are not—whites only a small minority.

Q. Well, then, if the Portuguese and the Japanese and the Kanakas were allowed suffrage, would they not overthrow the political power of what is called the best people here?

A. The Hawaiians alone would do it without the aid of the other elements.

Q. With that in view, what is the expectation of the better class as to the question of suffrage in connection with their desire for annexation?

A. The original intention was—which is a matter of history—to apply for union with the United States and to be accepted by them under a territorial form of government.

Q. And so avoid the suffrage question?

A. Yes.

Q. Looking to the fact that, as you have said, the native population would overwhelm the better elements in any political contest if manhood suffrage was adopted, what condition, what relation could they hope to have with the Government of the United States to protect them from that situation?

A. A territorial form of government, formed on lines parallel to the government of the District of Columbia. That was the original idea and expectation when the Queen was dethroned.

Q. After the Provisional Government was established?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that was the original idea?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the idea now—any change of feeling or belief or hope?

A. I do not think so. I think the feeling remains the same; but, in view of the opposition which this has brought forth, the matter has now evolved into a desire to give them civil rights.

Q. Who?

A. The Hawaiians.

Q. To what extent?

A. Votes.

Q. Without qualification?

A. That has not been entered into, so far as I know.

Q. Do you think, in view of what you have said about the Government being overwhelmed by a popular vote, would you suppose they would be satisfied to go into the Union, giving unqualified suffrage to the native population?

A. I do not think they look that far ahead. I believe that the suffrage given to the Hawaiians would make them a football and an object which different political parties would try their best to get hold of. At the same time the Hawaiian has no love for the present dynasty of sovereigns.

Q. And if the question of annexation was submitted now?

A. It would be overwhelmingly defeated.

Q. By whom?

A. By the Hawaiians.

Q. Have you thought over that, and are you giving me your deliberate opinion?

A. I have studied the matter carefully.

Q. Then I will ask you why it is that so many of the native population are signing petitions in favor of annexation?

A. It illustrates the natural instability and unreliability of the

Hawaiian character. He signs petitions in favor of one thing to-day and repudiates it by signing a different one to-morrow.

Q. Then how could you feel assured that if submitted to a ballot he would vote against annexation?

A. He is in the hands of political leaders of his own race.

Q. And their leaders are against it?

A. Their leaders are at present against it. Personally, he is indifferent.

Q. The revolution of 1887, from which came the constitution of that year, was that accomplished by the people about Honolulu and on this Island?

A. The practical part of it was accomplished by the people of this town. There were divisions and auxiliary branches sworn to bring about the same results on the other islands.

Q. Made up of what race of people?

A. Whites, entirely.

Q. They did not participate in the actual movement in Honolulu at the time of the overthrow of the Queen?

A. No; it was purely and simply a movement by the people of Honolulu.

Q. Was there any participation on the part of anybody on any other island than this?

A. Only a moral support.

Q. I mean any physical force which was resorted to?

A. No; but a number of them were prepared to exert it if necessary to do so. I was one of them.

Q. You say there had been an organization in existence for some time for that purpose among the whites?

A. For annexation?

Q. No; I am speaking of the movement of 1887.

A. Yes, sir; it was conceived some time in January, 1887, and culminated in June, if my recollection is correct.

Q. The object of it was to wrest from the King the authority to appoint nobles?

A. Well, the object was to bring about a cleaner condition of affairs and to check his tendency to absolutism.

Q. Where did they get their arms from?

A. From San Francisco, and they were supplied by various mercantile firms in this town. I would say that there were in existence several militia companies who had arms and ammunition for sometime.

Q. In the movement of the 14th of January had there been any preparation in the way of the white people possessing themselves of arms?

A. I can only speak from hearsay and reading the papers.

Q. What did you believe?

A. That there was no preconcerted action whatever.

Q. They went to the armory, it appears from some proceedings furnished at Washington, and got arms. Do you know anything about those arms?

A. They were taken there after the mass meeting had been held in town protesting against the action of the Queen.

Q. From what source taken there?

A. From several mercantile houses here.

Q. What kind of arms?

A. Rifles—Winchester and Springfield, and whatever guns were there. Private citizens who had arms in their possession responded

and delivered them over to the committee of safety. When we heard of this on the other islands we put our guns in order. I had several.

Q. Is it the practice on the other islands to do as you did to have arms?

A. No, it is not; but very few had been as prominently identified as myself in matters of this kind. I had several rifles given to me at the close of hostilities in 1889. There was fear that an outbreak might occur on one of the other islands and naturally these arms and a lot of ammunition were given to me.

Q. And were they distributed about town in the same way?

A. I do not believe they were. It was for fear hostilities might arise and it was deemed best to distribute them there. A number there are of men who frequently go hunting and as a rule have a rifle or two in the house. But the Hawaiian is not naturally bloodthirsty. He is too indolent, and any crisis or issue which would have to be fought out by force of arms with native Hawaiians pitted against white men would be merely the result of demagogue teachings.

Q. Is it not generally accepted here that the superiority of the white race always suppresses the inferior races?

A. Yes; that is the feeling among white people.

Q. Is not that true?

A. Yes; emphatically true.

Q. Whenever you get to an emergency and the people are thoroughly aroused there is a feeling on the part of the white people that they can exert their will?

A. Certainly; and the average Hawaiian does not care.

Q. He is not disposed to fight?

A. No; it is not in him, but the leaders and half-castes—they are the dangerous element in the community.

Q. Well, but in a contest with the whites have they ever been able to successfully rally this native force?

A. No. I speak from experience, gathered in 1889, where a comparatively small body of whites were able to cope with an immeasurably superior force of natives. The average Hawaiian really does not care in this contest for annexation, but in any case at issue between his color and white men he will side with his own race. Get the leaders out of the way and the Hawaiians would very soon be reconciled. A few leaders keep alive the race issue.

Q. Is it not easy in a legal way to get rid of these leaders?

A. They can be influenced by financial considerations.

Q. Then, in order to control popular elections here, it would be necessary to resort to the use of money with the leaders?

A. I know it would be necessary or else give them places. The younger men are the ones on whom these demagogues depend. The younger ones really have a hatred of white men.

Mr. BLOUNT. Thank you. I will not detain you longer.

My father arrived in United States in 1848 from Germany. He was more or less mixed up with political matters there. He was traveling in Macon at the time I was born. I was brought up in New York City—graduate of Cooper Union—as a civil engineer and mechanical engineer. I was born in Macon in 1857, when my father, who was a musical artist, was traveling.

I have carefully gone through the foregoing interview between Col. J. H. Blount and myself and pronounce it to be an absolutely accurate report.

ALBERT B. LOEBENSTEIN.

No. 35.

Interview with Curtis J. Lyons, assistant on Government survey, Honolulu, Wednesday, April 12, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Lyons, I ask you to give me what you conceive to be the causes of the revolution—the causes of the dethronement of the Queen and the establishment of the Provisional Government?

Mr. LYONS. The revolution of 1887 was the spontaneous rising of the better elements here against the ultramonarchical government of Kalakaua.

Q. Let me interrupt you here. What do you mean by the better element of the people?

A. By the better element I mean the leading element in society and in business.

Q. And what nationalities would cover that?

A. Americans, English, and Germans.

Q. Please proceed.

A. The influence of the King over the Legislature was one of the grievances, and the meddling of Kalakaua unnecessarily with foreign matters in the Pacific, which would naturally lead us into trouble.

Q. What foreign matters?

A. Samoan matters. Then the taking of a large bribe from the Chinese for an opium license was especially aggravating. To illustrate the meddling of the sovereign in the Legislature. At a previous Legislature I have seen—

Q. Previous Legislature to what?

A. Previous to 1887—I have seen the King in the noon interim for lunch go with a body of legislators to the house of Mr. J. E. Bush, then minister of the interior, to arrange things for the afternoon session. It was the acknowledged object of their meeting there. The feeling in 1887 became very great. A body of volunteer riflemen was drilled.

Q. By whom?

A. By one of the Ashfords.

Q. They were not organized by the Government?

A. They were organized under the volunteer act; that is, volunteer companies were allowed, and under that act this volunteer company was drilled. Clubs for rifle practice were formed. The revolution was accomplished by means of a mass meeting which included the larger part of the foreign population of Honolulu. The rifle company was called out ostensibly to preserve order.

Q. By whom?

A. As I understand it, Antone Rosa, the attorney-general. He was requested to order it out. I do not know the details. At that time I was in charge of the survey office. I did not deem it honorable to join the movement, although my sympathy was with it. The rifle company came over to the Government building ostensibly to protect the life of William M. Gibson. A committee was sent to Kalakaua.

Q. Who was William M. Gibson?

A. He was then premier, minister of foreign affairs. The committee went to the King with demands, the main feature of which was the appointment of a new ministry which should prepare a new constitution. The ministry was appointed and the constitution promulgated in one week. This constitution had three notable features of reform. The first, that no executive officer of the Government should be elected

to the Legislature nor any member of the Legislature appointed to executive office during the biennial period for which he held office. That the nobles in the Legislature who had previously been appointed by the King should be appointed by a restricted vote having a property qualification.

Q. What was the property qualification?

A. It was a yearly income of \$600, or property of \$3,000 in real estate. The third important feature: the King was not to dismiss a ministry without a legislative vote of want of confidence. The vote for representatives which had been previously enjoyed was untouched. The vote for nobles was an entirely new feature which had never been enjoyed by any one previously. After this revolution—the Reform party which sustained it—

Q. Will you wait one moment? With a property qualification of \$3,000 or an income of \$600 to vote, how would the number of native voters compare with the number of white voters?

A. That could be settled by reference to the great register. My impression is that about 25 per cent of the voters would be Hawaiians.

Q. And the balance would be whites?

A. That is my impression.

Q. The result of that would have been to have given—if the whites were united—the election of nobles to them?

A. If they had been united it would.

Q. Was that the object of the change in that particular?

A. The object of the change from the King's appointment to the electoral appointment was to limit the power of the King.

Q. The effect would be the disqualification of the mass of the native population, so that there would not be more than 25 per cent of them having the right to vote as against 75 per cent of the whites. So that the proportion was fixed in order to give the white element the greatest power in the selection of the body of natives [nobles]?

A. It was not done with any reference to whites or Hawaiians. It was simply on the general principle of giving to those who had sufficient intelligence to earn \$600 per year the predominating influence.

Q. Conceding that principle, was it not expected that the principle applied would result in the whites having the power to select the body of nobles?

A. I can not say that was the exact intention as between the whites and the Hawaiians.

Q. Was it the expectation of the intelligent people on the islands that the application of this principle would mark out somewhat about what you have stated—25 per cent of the votes for the nobles by Hawaiians and the remainder by the whites—was that in the minds of the ruling class here then?

A. Any reflecting person of that class would see that that would be the consequence.

Q. Please resume.

A. After the successful ending of that revolution, matters went on well for some months, but there gradually developed a disruption.

Q. Of what?

A. The elements that carried the revolution through. What was called the National Reform party originated in opposition to what was called the Reform party. It gathered to itself a large element of the Hawaiian strength. It didn't sympathize with the main movement, and the Legislature of 1890 secured the ministry of that party.

Q. What party?

A. The National Reform party as opposed to the original Reform party. It is hard to define the elements of party in this little community. There was more or less complaint about the constitution of 1887.

Q. In what way—the matter of the election of nobles?

A. Principally in regard to the election of nobles.

Q. What was the exact point of complaint?

A. That the property qualification was too high. The Reform party claimed that the Hawaiians, the complaining party, had never had the privilege of voting for nobles anyway. Therefore they were not deprived of anything. The Legislature of 1892 may be characterized largely as a struggle for the possession of the ministry for the Government. It revealed, too, to thinking people the weakness of the system. I mean the ministerial system.

Q. What weakness did it reveal?

A. The change of government being placed so entirely in the hands of the Legislature it became a temptation to gain possession of the Government by manipulation.

Q. On the line of vote of confidence or want of confidence?

A. Yes. That Legislature lasted about seven months. The community generally became weary of the long struggle.

Q. Do you mean all classes and all races?

A. Yes. Several critical measures were hanging over the community. One was for unlimited paper currency—a paper currency based upon real estate, and practically unredeemable.

Q. What became of that currency bill?

A. It was defeated.

Q. By what vote?

A. I do not remember. I think it was not a very large majority.

A. (Continuing.) There was a bill for legalizing a lottery scheme which was favored very largely by the Hawaiians in the community as well as in the legislature. There was also a bill for renewing the opium license. Later in the session, about four months after the beginning of the session, a ministry was secured which commanded the respect of the business part of the community. Later on in the session there were attempts made to oust this ministry. The party which may be characterized as the reform party opposed this. They said that such a measure would tend to weaken the whole system of government, and it might perhaps bring on a crisis.

Q. In the form of debates in the legislature?

A. No; as outside advice. There was a feeling that if the Government didn't maintain its superiority that foreign interference might take place. The advice of these people who were in favor of what afterwards became the annexation movement, was to retain that ministry, and my opinion is that if it had been retained the Queen would have been on her throne to-day.

Q. Do you mean by that that the condition of that ministry would have been in accord with the views and feelings of the Reform party?

A. No, sir; but the displacement of that ministry produced alarm and resentment. It produced a feeling that the Government was unreliable. There was a withdrawal of business confidence. With reference to annexation ideas at that time, I would say that the general feeling as understood among planters and others was against it for this reason, that contract-labor system, which has been considered almost essential, would doubtless be broken up; and in the second place the United States tariff coming into effect here would affect business unfavorably in many

respects; in the third place there was little confidence that the sugar bounty would be continued and in the fourth place it was persistently said that the United States would not take us. I have favored annexation in a quiet way, so far as it was courteous for a person in my position, for a great many years. One attempt was made to oust the ministry, which is known as the George Wilcox ministry, which might be characterized as the Reform ministry which failed. Later on the lottery bill was passed by a very small majority, only one white man, as I remember, voting for it. I myself remonstrated with one of the members of the Legislature against making that a race issue, as the Hawaiians appeared to be making it so.

Q. Will you explain to me what you mean by making it a race issue as the Hawaiians appeared to be doing?

A. They seemed to regard it as somehow intended to benefit them.

Q. What was the exact idea they had as to how it would benefit them?

A. I do not know. I do not comprehend, myself. There is an instinctive tendency on the part of the Hawaiians to take the crown side upon questions of this sort. On one occasion in the Legislature the argument was seriously brought forward in favor of a bill that the Queen favored it. I forget what bill it was.

Q. Brought forward by some man making a speech?

A. Yes. (Continuing.) The lottery bill passed and there was a doubt in the minds of its supporters whether the ministry would carry it out. They took occasion of that to oust the ministry. That was the day before the closing of the Legislature.

Q. This was the 13th of January, the Legislature adjourned on the 14th.

A. Yes; the lottery bill passed on Wednesday the 11th. The vote of want of confidence in the cabinet passed on the 12th, 25 to 16. On the 13th, in the afternoon, the new ministry took their seats. There was an unusual amount of enthusiasm in the audience at the time this ministry was voted out.

Q. The Wilcox ministry?

A. Yes; I noted the enthusiasm among the Hawaiians with great concern.

Q. What was the occasion of your concern; what disturbed you?

A. I felt that the Hawaiian element had taken advantage of its majority and its ability to coalesce with other parties, and had taken the weak and vicious side—that it would bring trouble.

Q. What sort of trouble?

A. Indefinite. I could hardly say what. I thought that they would become bankrupt—not have money to carry on the Government, possibly.

Q. Did you think of it possibly creating a revolution?

A. No; I did not, because there was no intention of a revolution at that time. To put it plainly, we expected to grin and bear it until something turned up. On Saturday morning it was known generally that the lottery and opium bill had been signed by the Queen. The prorogation of the Legislature was set for noon. My own statement of the case was that it was time for the Hawaiians themselves to step down and out. I have always been a friend to the Hawaiians and tried to do what I could for them always. I have felt that they were wrecking their own Government, as a man might steer a ship to destruction. Nothing was generally known at the prorogation of a new constitution. There had been some abortive attempts to secure a constitutional convention in the Legislature. It resulted in nothing.

Q. Any petition to the Legislature on the subject of the constitution?

A. There had been many petitions.

Q. What was the substance of the petitions; what was wanted by the petitioners?

A. A large reduction in the property qualification or abolition of it. My recollection is that there were other important changes wanted to which I paid little attention.

Q. Where did these petitions come from?

A. The natives.

Q. From all the islands?

A. I can hardly say. It was deemed that the oath to support the constitution among legislators preclude a constitutional convention.

Q. The opposition to the constitutional convention was placed by the opponents on the ground that there was no authority to call a convention?

A. Yes; that there was only one way—to amend it—and that was specified in the constitution itself.

Q. And that was by a vote of two successive legislatures?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you familiar with the affairs of Saturday afternoon?

A. I was simply a spectator. I left my office half an hour after the legislature closed, rather wondering why the band continued playing at the palace. I passed legislature hall. I saw men talking. I said to myself the circus has begun. I saw soldiers drawn up in line from the palace gate.

Q. How many of them?

A. I should say 75, or about that number. The palace yard was full of natives waiting on the grass, and many out in the street. I saw a small flag held at the foot of the palace stairs.

Q. What kind of flag?

A. A small Hawaiian flag. The flag of the Hui Kalaiaina (the last word means statesmanship). A man met me at the palace gate. He said the ministers had just resigned. In fact, that they had just fled from the palace over to the Government building.

Q. How do you know they had fled?

A. I do not personally know. That was what was always stated and never contradicted.

Q. Do you mean that somebody was trying to arrest them, or that they went away from the Queen because they were unwilling to cooperate with her in this movement?

A. The general statement made was that they were intimidated; that there were threats made in case they did not yield to the command of the Queen to assent to the constitution.

Q. What sort of threats?

A. That they would be placed under arrest, and there was an opinion that the natives might use mob violence.

Q. Whose opinion?

A. That was understood to be the fear of the ministers then.

Q. Do you know of any of them having said so?

A. I do not know. I should say, from their general demeanor that afternoon, they were very much perturbed. They appeared like men who were afraid. I went immediately down town. The news was just spreading that the crisis was taking place at the palace. Citizens came up to the Government building to see what was going on.

Q. Do you mean by citizens white people?

A. Yes. I saw Mr. Cornwell, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. Colburn. I

believe Mr. Parker remained at the palace. I returned to the Government building to watch the progress of events. I was there when the Queen's messenger, Col. Richardson, came over and commanded the ministers to go back and wait upon the Queen.

Q. What was the form of the command? Do you know whether it was a command or an invitation?

A. I called it a command because that is the term usually applied to the Queen's orders to her ministers.

Q. It is an official phrase?

A. Yes. I stood at the front door of the Government building when Mr. Thurston stood there. He said: "This thing must not be repeated." He intimated—though I can not say what words he used—that it would continually be repeated under the present state of things. After some time we saw the society of the Hui Kalaiaina file out from the palace. The leader threw out his hands to intimate that they had not obtained what they wanted.

Q. What time in the day was this?

A. About 3 o'clock.

Q. How many were there of that organization present?

A. I should say about thirty in uniforms—in black with dress hats—carrying a flag at their head.

Q. Was it a committee from that society?

A. I do not know how they were appointed.

Q. That did not cover the number of that political organization in the islands?

A. It had been a large organization. It was first organized by Dan Lyons, who edited a paper a year or two previous. His main idea was to make public officers elective, but it had become entirely independent of his management and control. The size of the organization at that time I know nothing about.

Q. Would you suppose there were more than thirty persons in the islands connected with it?

A. I have no means of forming an opinion. I paid little attention to the society, thinking it amounted to nothing. They first formed in the front of the palace, until the Queen came out on the upper balcony and made a speech to them.

Q. Did you hear the speech?

A. I did not; I was too far off. I also saw at the same time a Hawaiian, who I was told was White, of Lahaina, come to the front steps and begin to speak in an excited manner. He was led back into the palace.

Q. By whom?

A. I think by Col. James Boyd. The soldiers then broke up and the audience gradually dispersed. There was great excitement among the foreign lookers on. I quietly went home myself.

Q. You were not at the meeting at Mr. Smith's house Saturday?

A. I was not. I met a prominent citizen Sunday noon. I said: "I believe annexation is the only thing to cure this." He said to me: "I believe a great many are now coming to feel that way." I had said two weeks before in a private conversation with Judge Judd that I believed annexation was the only cure for this. He shook his head. He said: "I do not know." About this same Sunday he acknowledged to me that I was right.

Q. Who did?

A. Judge Judd. It was about that time. I will not be sure whether it was Sunday or Monday. The *Boston* came into port on Saturday

morning from Hilo. Monday morning after reading the paper and noting the call for the two mass meetings in the afternoon, I said to my wife: "The situation is very serious indeed. It is more serious than it was in 1887. That with the arms and men at the disposal of the Queen they might use force to put down the other mass meeting or there might be a riot between the two elements outside of that." I also said—not knowing about any plans—that it would be wise for the *Boston* to land her troops to preserve order.

I went down to my office. I heard of the manifesto of the Queen disavowing her conduct of Saturday. About half past 9 a messenger from Mr. Colburn's office came to our office with the orders that if any trouble ensued that the staff of the survey office should report to the station house for service. Our names were taken down. I went over to the minister's office. I simply said to him, "I am not in a state of health for active service." His reply was, "We shall expect a very good excuse if you are not there." I left him, saying that perhaps I should be there. I attended the mass meeting at the armory or skating rink. It was very crowded. I felt it was a very critical moment. It would seem as if the Government forces might at any time be sent to disperse the meeting. The speakers all carried the main idea that the community must not again be exposed to this continual danger of revolution; that something must be done to put a stop to events which would lead at any time to revolution. This state of things kept our families in a state of alarm, injured business, and could not be endured longer. Nothing was said about annexation.

Q. Anything said about dethronement?

A. Nothing, directly. The speeches are reported, and correctly, in the papers of the succeeding day.

Q. So that was the spirit of the meeting?

A. Dethronement?

Q. Yes.

A. It was not so stated. It was to denounce the Queen's action; that steps must be taken to prevent any recurrence of that state of things.

Q. What sort of steps were in the minds of the speakers and audience?

A. There was evidence of very intense feeling and determination.

Q. To do what?

A. The vote was to sustain the committee of safety.

Q. In what?

A. In such steps as they might see fit to take. The meeting adjourned quietly and the history of the landing of the troops is well known.

Q. Now I will ask you on another branch; if the matter of the support of the Provisional Government was left to the people who had the privilege of voting under the constitution of 1887 on the question of sustaining the Provisional Government, what would be the result under the Australian ballot system?

A. I am inclined to think it would be against it.

Q. How much?

A. I can not say. I know there has been a growth of annexation feeling among the Hawaiian population.

Q. I simply want to know, taking the test by popular vote, what would be the results?

A. So far as I could judge I should say it would be against them judging from my general acquaintance with the population.

I have carefully read through the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Mr. Blount.

CURTIS J. LYONS.

No. 36.

Statement of Curtis J. Lyons.

HAWAIIAN LANDS.

The entire area of the Hawaiian Islands was anciently divided up into *ahupuuas* or small districts, each of which had its individual distinctive name. These divisions were either valleys, or strips of land between gulches, or strips with artificial boundaries, which were well conserved.

The feudal system under which these were held is described in Prof. Alexander's Brief History of Land Titles, in President Dole's Historical Paper on the Evolution of Land Titles, and in the accompanying series of papers by the writer of this, published in 1875 on Land Matters in Hawaii.

In brief, the actual history of the transition from the feudal system to the fee simple system which took place in the period from 1846 to 1850 may be stated as follows: It being premised that while the theory of the division of lands differed more or less from the actual practice, the ends attained were virtually the same.

The chiefs, under Kamehameha III, were holding lands in fief, varying in the number of those held by any individual chief from forty or more to one, according to rank or past service of the holder. The common people were tenants of these chiefs, or else of the King when living on his private lands.

Each chief made a division in writing with Kamehameha III as sovereign, in which the chief relinquished all right in about one-half of the lands held by himself and received from the sovereign a similar relinquishment in toto of the said sovereign's claim on the remaining half. This transaction was entered on the opposite pages of the book called the *mahèlè* book (*mahèlè* meaning division), one page bearing the deed from the King to the chief of the half of the lands by name enumerated, and the opposite page the relinquishment, by the same chief, of all claim on the other half.

The next step was the assignment by the King of much the larger portion of the half which remained in his hands to the Government or public domain. The third step was for the chiefs to also give up a small portion of their half to the same public domain.

Thus the property known as the Government lands became established, land which has ever since been more or less in the market, and of which the choicest portions were by especial effort placed by sale at nominal price in the hands of native Hawaiians.

The next step was for the chiefs to have their individual titles confirmed by the land commission. It was a subsequent matter to obtain formal royal patents.

The lands reserved by Kamehameha III, as above mentioned, with the choice lands which had been previously regarded as his own, were united in theory, and treated by himself and by Kamehameha IV as private lands. Kamehameha V, and the Legislature coöperating with him, made them inalienable, and created the board of crown commis-

sioners to take charge of them. Thus they became national property, the income of which, however, belonged to the occupant of the throne, and has never been accounted for to the Legislative Assembly. These are now known as the crown lands.

As an undercurrent to all these transactions, the small feudal holdings of the common people who had been tenants of the King on his private lands, and of the chiefs on their lands, and of the Government on its lands were made fee simple titles by what is termed the *Kuleana* system under the authority of the same land commission that confirmed the titles of the chiefs. The word *Kuleana* means primarily, "an interest in," and now is the name of a small holding awarded as above. The word *Evant* is used for all patents based on sales of Government land.

The above is a brief résumé of the essential points in reference to Hawaiian land matters as treated at length in the papers alluded to above. It is hoped that this succinct statement will aid in a study of the subject.

CURTIS J. LYONS.

HONOLULU, April 12, 1893.

LAND MATTERS IN HAWAII.

By C. J. LYONS.

[Published in the *Islander*, Honolulu, 1875.]

No. 1.

The change from barbarism to civilization that has taken place on these islands has in no respects had more material importance than as regards land matters. A more generally diffused understanding of some subjects connected with these matters may tend to benefit the community, especially as it may enable some to comprehend and grapple with certain difficulties that are universally felt to exist, and which however seem to be beyond the combined skill and executive ability of any one individual to remove.

The particular kind of civilization that took root on Hawaii was not of the kind that destroyed all that preceded it. It might have crushed out all ancient vested rights, ignored ancient subdivisions of land, and created a *carte blanche* upon which to begin *de novo* the marking out and mapping off of real estate; possibly endeavoring to introduce the monotonous rectangles of a United States public survey among the valleys and ridges of this diversified country.

Such a civilization would have treated the Hawaiian language as too paltry to put into print. Yet one is sometimes tempted to wish that not quite so much deference had been paid to the conservative side of the question. More of this hereafter.

The ancient divisions of land will therefore be our first subject to attend to. The islands were, if the phrase may be allowed, tremendously peopled in many portions thereof. I can think of no word to express the swarming state of population that must have existed in localities. Even had Capt. Cooke made no estimate, the evidences of such population are unmistakable. In general principles there must have been an inevitable diminution of the people with the advent of civilization, from the simple fact that the resources of the country would not support those same people so soon as their wants were increased. They were already industrious; what more could they raise from the soil, or furnish any way, save as they pandered to vice, in return for the accouterments of a new civilization. These are pertinent reasonings; certainly so to those who moralize on the diminution of races, though to follow them out would be a digression from our present subject.

Consequences of a long occupancy of this soil by a dense population, minute subdivision of land, and nomenclature thereof. Every piece of land had its name, as individual and characteristic as that of its cultivation.

The *unit* of land, so to speak, seems to have been the *ahupūa*. Its name is derived from the *ahu* or altar (literally pile, *kuahu* being the specific term for altar), which was erected at the point where the boundary of the land was intersected by the main road, *alaloa*, which circumsferenced each of the islands. Upon this altar at

the annual progress of the akua makahiki (year god) was deposited the tax paid by the land whose boundary it marked, and also an image of a hog (puua) carved out of kukui wood and stained with red ochre. How long this was left on the altar I do not know, but from this came the name (ahupuia) of the pile of stones, which title was also given to the division of land marked thereby. Many a time have I set up compass on ancient landmarks of this sort, especially on Hawaii. One near Honolulu may still be seen on the north external slope of the crater of Salt Lake. This, besides marking the boundary of the Halawa and Moanalua, marked also the limits of the Kona and Ewa districts. Near by I picked up an ancient ulu maika, the rolling stone of the old bowling game of maika. The more common name of the altar on the island of Oahu was kaananiau.

The ahupuia ran from the sea to the mountain, theoretically. That is to say, the central idea of the Hawaiian division of land was emphatically central, or rather radial. Hawaiian life vibrated from uka, mountain, whence came wood, kapa for clothing, olona for fishline, ti-leaf for wrapping paper, ie for rattan lashing, wild birds for food, to the kai, sea, whence came ia, fish, and all connected therewith. Mauka and makai are therefore fundamental ideas to the native of an island. Land, as we shall see in a subsequent article, was divided accordingly.

No. 2.

In a previous article we have seen that the old Hawaiian system of dividing lands was preserved under the new system of titles; that in populous portions the subdivision was very minute, and that the main idea of the ahupuia, or primary division, was to run a strip from the shore to the summit of the mountain, in order to give an equable share of all the different products of the soil and sea.

The ahupuia, however, was by no means any measure of area, as it varied in size from 100 to 100,000 acres, and on the almost worthless wastes of interior Hawaii attained to an even greater extent than this. Taking the above-mentioned island first in order, the common ahupuia is found to be a strip say of 1,000 feet average width, and running from the seashore, not by any means to the top of the mountain, but to the zone of timber land that generally exists between the 1,700 feet and 5,000 feet line of elevation. The ordinary ahupuia extends from half a mile to a mile into this belt. Then there are the larger ahupuiaas, which are wider in the open country than the others, and on entering the woods expand laterally so as to cut off all the smaller ones, and extend toward the mountain till they emerge into the open interior country; not however to converge to a point at the tops of the respective mountains. Only a rare few reach those elevations, sweeping past the upper ends of all the others, and by virtue of some privilege in bird-catching, or some analogous right, taking the whole mountain to themselves.

Thus Mauna Loa is shared by three great lands, Kapapala and Kahuku from Kau, and Humuula from Hilo. Possibly Keauhon from Kona may yet be proved to have had a fourth share. The whole main body of Mauna Kea belongs to one land from Hamakua, viz: Kaohē, to whose owners belonged the sole privilege of capturing the ua'a, a mountain-inhabiting but sea-fishing bird. High up on its eastern flank, however, stretched the already mentioned land of Humuula, whose upper limits coincide with those of the mamane, a valuable mountain acacia, and which, starting from the shore near Lanpahoehoe, extends across the upper ends of all other Hilo lands to the crater of Mokuaweoweo.

These same lands, generally, had the more extended sea privileges. While the smaller ahupuiaas had to content themselves with the immediate shore fishery, extending out not further than a man could touch bottom with his toes, the larger ones swept around outside of these, taking to themselves the main fisheries much in the same way as that in which the forests appropriated. Concerning the latter, it should here be remarked that it was by virtue of some valuable product of said forests that the extension of territory took place. For instance, out of a dozen lands only one possessed the right to *kalai waa*, hew out canoes from the koa forest. Another land embraced the *wauke* and *olona* grounds, the former for *kapa*, the latter for fish line.

On East Maui, the division, in its general principles, was much the same as on Hawaii, save that the radial system was better adhered to. In fact, there is pointed out to this day, on the short spur projecting into the east side of Haleakala crater, a rock called the "Pohaku oki aina," land-dividing rock, to which the larger lands came as a center. How many lands actually came up to this is not yet known.

On West Maui the valleys were a very marked and natural mode of division. The question suggests itself as to how the isthmus would be appropriated. Some powerful chiefs of Wailuku and Waikapu seem not only to have taken the isthmus, but to have extended their domain well up the slope at the foot of Haleakala. So that there is the rare case of a long range of lands in Kula, East Maui, without any sea coast.

On Molokai and Lanai, there are exceptional cases of lands extending directly across, from sea to sea.

On Oahu the ahupuaa seems to have been oftentimes quite extended. Waikiki, for instance, stretches from the west side of Makiki Valley away to the east side of Wailupe, or nearly to the east point of the island. Honouliuli covers some forty thousand acres on the east slope of the Waianae Mountains. Generally speaking, however, the valley idea predominates. Thus Nuuanu (with its branch Pauoa), Kalihi, Moanalua, Halawa, etc., are each the limits of single lands. So Waimanalo, Kailua, Kaneohe, Heeia, etc., are ahupuaas. The long, narrow strip so common on Hawaii is less frequent on this island, excepting in Ewa district. Singularly enough the ahupuaa of Waianae mounts the summit of the Kaala range and descends into the table-lands between Ewa and Waialua, and sweeps on up to the summit of the Koolau Mountains. One would suppose that naturally that table-land would be divided between Ewa and Waialua.

On Kauai, the writer is not familiar with the general divisions. Probably the interior of the island belongs to a few large lands, while narrow and rather short strips are quite common along the shore, interspersed with large or first-class ahupuaas.

No. 3.

The next subject that claims attention is that of the subdivision of the ahupuaa. The subdivision of the Ahupuaa were called ili. Some of the smallest ahupuaas were not subdivided at all, or at least seem not to have been, while the larger ones sometimes contained as many as thirty or forty illis, each, of course, named with its own individual title and carefully marked out as to boundary. The word is the same as that used to designate surface, and, in latter times, area.

There were two features of the ili, referred to by the terms *lele* and *ku*, which are worthy of notice. The former is its desultory character, like unto that of the states of Germany. That is to say, the ili often consisted of several distinct sections of land—one, for instance, on the seashore, another on dry, open land, or *kala*, another in the regularly terraced and watered *kalo* patch or *aina loi* district, and another still in the forest, thus again carrying out the equitable division system which we have seen in the ahupuaa.

These separate pieces were called, *lele*, i. e., "jumps," and were most common on Oahu. Indeed I know of none on the island of Hawaii. Some remarkable examples occur near this town. Punahou had anciently a lot on the beach near the Kakaako Salt Works; then the large lot with the spring and *kalo* patches where is now the school, and again a forest patch on the steep sides of Manoa Valley. Kewalo meanwhile had its seacoast adjoining Waikiki, its continuous *kula* on the plain, and one-half of Punchbowl Hill and its *kalo* land in Pauoa Valley. Kaakaukukui held Fisherman's Point and the present harbor of Honolulu; then *kalo* land near the present Kukui street, and also a large tract of forest at the head of Pouoa Valley. The *kalo* lands of Wailupe are in Pauoa Valley. In Kalihi and also in Ewa are illis with from eight to ten different *leles*, a most prolific kind of land, and now furnishing a truly desultory job for a surveyor to map out.

These different pieces were called variously, either by their own individual name, or by that of the whole ili, thus puzzling one sadly when attempting to obtain information with respect to them.

The second feature is referred to in the word *ku*, short for *ili kupono*. There were two kinds of ili; the ili of the ahupuaa, and the ili *kupono*. The ili of the ahupuaa was a subdivision for the convenience of the chief holding the ahupuaa; *alii ai ahupuaa*.

The *konohikis* of these divisions were only the agents of the said chief, all the revenues of the land included going to him, and the said land, in Hawaiian parlance, "belonging to the ahupuaa."

The *ili kupono*, on the contrary, was nearly independent. The transfer of the ahupuaa to a new chief did not carry with it the transfer of the *ili kupono* contained within its limits. The chiefs, previously holding the *ili kupono*, continued to hold them, whatever the change in the ahupuaa chief, having their own *koales* (chiefs' patches), worked by their retainers. There was, however, a slight tribute of work due to the ahupuaa chief; sometimes one or two days in a month, sometimes even less, or only certain days in the year. The illis which were used as places of refuges and those of the god Kaili, did not render even this tribute. Such were Kaahumanu', illis in Waikiki.

On the *ili kupono*, Waimea on Hawaii furnishes an eminent example. Nine-tenths of this ahupuaa are taken up with the independent illis of Puukapu and Waikoloa, to say nothing of half a dozen small ones of the same kind. Accordingly when a Waimea ahupuaa was declared in late years a crown land, it was necessary to declare Puukapu also a crown land, as though not included in Waimea.

Waikoloa was given by Kamehameha I to Isaac Davis, and it has remained in the Davis family ever since. When therefore the limits of Waimea were settled by the boundary commissioner, the Crown commissioners knew hardly more than they had previously of where the Crown land was situated. How much labor and confusion this principle has brought about remains yet to be seen.

Within the ilis all large kalo patches seem to have had specific names, especially on Oahu, which was the most microcosmic of the Islands. The koeles, or chief's patches, more particularly. *Kihapai's*, i. e., dry land patches, with their intervening ridges of small stones, or earth weeds, had also their appellation. These ridges of cultivation, often rows of sugar cane, too, were in cultivated sections, very frequently the boundaries of the ahupuaa, called *iwi*, bone—short for *iwi kuamoo*, backbone—and curving enough they are. Sometimes changed in ancient times, amidst fierce battling between the clans each chief could summon from his land.

The date of this division is fixed about twenty generations back in Hawaiian tradition, the names of the chiefs establishing it being given. The moku or district was fixed at the same time, such as Kona, Kau, Puna, Hilo, Hamakua, and Kohala on Hawaii. On Maui are some smaller divisions than the moku, called *kalana*, Lahaia being one of these. Wailuku, Waikapu, Waiehu, and Waihee were independent, belonging to no moku. On the map it is necessary to form a new district, and call it Wailuku, Nawaieha being too cumbersome and ill-understood. Oloa on Hawaii, it is said to have been independent of Puna and Waimea of Kohala. Otherwise the district division was very exact and comprehensive.

One other anomaly remains to be noted here. A large tract of forest land in Hamakua, Hawaii, was once cut off from a number of ahupuaas for the use of the whole district, and is called Kamoku to this day, becoming at the time of the "mahele," which must come next in our way, Government land.

No. 4.

We now come in regular course to a brief notice of the *mahele*.

The *mahele* was a phenomenon in national history not often repeated. The *mahele* was, in one sense, a revolution. In another sense it was most eminently a conservative movement.

To write a full history of this change would require more leisure, or, more correctly speaking, more time and strength than most persons in our community and in active life have at their own command. It will only be in place here to indicate its main features. I am very well aware that there may be widely different views on this subject among those of the legal profession, and those put forth here may be called decidedly unprofessional. It may be suggested, however, that occasionally the unprofessional opinion has the advantage. This is often the case with respect to theological matters, sometimes decidedly so in medical matters, and the common sense of honest jurymen frequently cuts at once through the entanglements of legal questions on both sides to the desired point of equity and justice to both sides.

The *mahele* was simply an endeavor on the part of the majority of the Hawaiian chiefs, and especially on the part of Kamehameha III, to secure to all parties what, on the ordinary principles of acquiring property, seemed to belong to them. It was contemporary with the organization of the department of the Hawaiian Government in 1845-'46.

The theory which was adopted in effect was this, that the King, the chiefs, and the common people held each undivided shares, so to say, in the whole landed estate. Whatever the legal deduction from the status under the former feudal system might be, the fact in equity was acknowledged that whoever had a share in making the land valuable held an interest in that land. Legally speaking, the title of the whole was in the King. The King who conquered the whole, viz, Kamehameha I, had partitioned the lands among his warrior chiefs, retaining a certain revenue from them, in default of payment of which the land was forfeited. These chiefs did the same to those below them.

Kamehameha III for the common good waived his title to the whole, under conditions—conditions that those under the chiefs should be treated in like manner, and, moreover, that a certain portion, one-third, should be given to a common landed estate, called Government lands, the proceeds of which were to go to the public treasury, and which should furnish that facility for the acquirement of real estate in fee simple which is so necessary for the growth of a community.

In other words, the Hawaiian nation agreed to divide as individuals their as yet undivided inheritance, the King taking a share proportioned to the general idea of the dignity of his position. (It should be stated that the word *mahele* signifies division.) It was moreover agreed that there was to be a portion devoted to the general good in two ways, viz, by rendering it obtainable to those who desired land and by using the proceeds for the benefit of the public treasury. It will be seen

that there was a double mahele—first of all amongst themselves, and second, of each with the general treasury.

This last was the trying point with the chiefs. It required no little effort to bring about its accomplishment, and no little self-denial and resolution on the part of those who thus gave up what they regarded as their lands. The scenes in the meeting of the council for this purpose have been described by eyewitnesses as thrillingly interesting. Almost everyone of those who took part in this peaceful but patriotic revolution has gone from the presence, we hope not from the remembrance, of this community. Among the ranks of these noble dead are Kamehameha III, and Kekuanaoa, Paki, Kekauonohi, John II, who was most active in bringing about the change, and a host of lesser chiefs. Messrs. Richards, Judd, Ricord, and afterwards Lee, were the leading spirits in inducing the chiefs to see the benefits of the new policy and system.

There were two great sacrifices made by the chiefs. The division with the Government we have noticed. Far be it from anyone to misappropriate these Government lands, thus conscientiously given up by the old Hawaiian chiefs for the national good. The other sacrifice was that of the kuleana, or land of the small tenant. These small tenants were permitted to acquire a full title to the lands which they had been improving for their own use. In the true view of the case, this was perfectly a measure of justice, for it was the labor of these people and of their ancestors that had made the land what it was. This subject will lead us to consider the land commission.

No. 5.

The lands having been divided, as we have seen in the last article, it became necessary in order to establish the real estate business of the Kingdom on a practical basis to give some formal evidence of title sanctioned by the law of the land. The mahele was an anomaly. The land commission, appointed to carry out the principles of the mahele, was another. Both were eminently practical and just in their idea.

Five gentlemen, John Ricord, William Richards, Z. Kaauiwai, James Young Kanhehoa and John II, were appointed by the King in February, 1846, to hear testimony upon the claims of individuals, and to issue awards to the claimants for the land claimed by metes and bounds. These commissioners drew up a careful statement of principles to guide their conduct in making the awards.

This statement was approved by act of Legislature and made law. It was further ordained that no claim should be valid unless approved by them, and unless presented before a certain time. The only appeal was to the supreme court. The commissioners took the oath of office and held their first meeting for regular business in March, 1846. The first claim upon and award signed was to James Voss, on the lot at the south corner of Hotel and Alakea streets. The taking of testimony was an herculean task, when we consider that the number of claimants were over 10,000. It was found that the taking of testimony, the surveying of boundaries, and the making final award would each have to be separate stages of work. Accordingly, while the first volume of land commission records contain lengthy masses of testimony attached to each award, in the second volume awards only are given, the testimony being thereafter by itself in another series of separate volumes. The commissioners worked with most commendable energy, going to every part of the islands to meet the people and prepare for awarding the kuleanas.

Kuleana means, originally, a property or business interest in anything. The common people were in former times assigned certain portions of the chief's lands, to occupy at the will of the chief. Generally speaking, there was a good degree of permanence in this occupancy, provided that service was duly paid to the superior. In 1839 a law was promulgated that no one should be deprived of his land without due cause, which law was a preliminary step to the subsequent one of giving to all those common people who would come forward, present their claim, their testimony, and pay the expenses of settling the whole matter a fee simple title in their improved lands. In the town of Honolulu all lots were to be subject to a commutation fee of one-fourth of their unimproved value to the Government. Elsewhere the award was in fee simple, without commutation. These awarded claims came to be known by the term "kuleana."

After the testimony in regard to their existence was taken the next step was to scatter a horde of surveyors all over the Kingdom, with memoranda of claims, to survey each separate one by itself, and send in the survey to the office, generally on a sheet of foolscap paper. At the office they were copied in huge, unwieldy volumes—volumes, however, ten in number, of infinite value to the real-estate interests of this little Kingdom. Of the surveys, more hereafter. They were generally paid for by the piece, at the cheap rate of \$2 to \$3 per kuleana. The total expenses for the land commission expenses were all borne by the claimants, and amounted to from \$6 to \$12 to each kuleana. Cheap enough; yet the poor natives were often a long

time in collecting the amount to pay over to the agent who distributed the papers containing award.

In fact, it seemed all like a dream to the common people, so long serfs under masters. All sorts of reports would spread through the country to the effect that the whole thing would be knocked in the head; that such and such lands were to have no kuleanas taken out of them, etc.

Then there was a vast deal of haphazard about the matter. In kalo patch land it was comparatively easy to determine where and where not the kuleana should extend, though many a contest between the claimant and konohiki chief's man took place even there. It was impossible for the commissioners to go upon the ground, so that responsibility in a large measure depended on the surveyor. In dry or kula land, where the soil has to remain fallow for years between crops, it was difficult to decide what a kuleana should contain, and, as we shall see, there was much variety of practice.

No. 6.

Mention was made in the last number of the haphazard or lack of uniform rule in establishing the boundaries and extent of kuleanas. The best illustration of this may be derived from an example. Three surveyors were sent to Hawaii to as many different districts to measure and report kuleanas. Directions, "to include what the claimant has cultivated and improved." Surveyor No. 1, a stranger to the country, found the people cultivating on the kula land, say, two or three acres of upland kalo. Not taking into account the fact, alluded to in our last number, that it was necessary for the land to lie fallow for two or three years before another crop of kalo could be produced from it, he surveyed merely the amount under actual cultivation. The kuleanas were awarded accordingly, the poor people having no one to take their part, and as a consequence in many cases abandoning their newly-acquired property as utterly insufficient for their needs.

No. 2, a native Hawaiian, was assigned to a district where the resident American missionary was one who took an active interest in the new order of things, and who believed—and not without some reason—that the people had the main right to the land anyway, on general principles. The consequence of this was that surveys were sent in from 15 to 30 and even 40 acres in extent, and were awarded.

Surveyor No. 3, meanwhile, after an arduous campaign among the kalo patches, with an ever-watchful konohiki to contest his progress, and to whom the reply to appeals for advice to the land commissioners was sent "Do the best you can," came out into the kula lands of his district. Multiplying the amount under actual cultivation by the number of seasons in which it would have to lie fallow, the estimate was made of from 6 to 12 acres as the ordinary run of upland kuleanas, and surveys were sent in accordingly. Reports of what was going on in the neighboring districts soon came in and, rather puzzled thereby, our man lay on his oars for a few weeks to see what would turn up. Finding that his surveys, too, were approved of he went on through the district on his own principles.

In defense of the above inconsistency the plea may be urged that the commissioners had such a mountain of business to dispose of that "anyway to get through" might well be their motto. To resurvey in all these cases was next to impossible, also to obtain full information. Then, while there lived a King who thus favored his subjects, it was expedient to make all speed possible lest a change might introduce worse confusion.

Another inconsistency was in the awarding of titles below high-water mark and on reefs in some instances and not in others. The immediate vicinity of Honolulu Harbor as compared with Pearl River and Kaneohe Bay furnishes a notable instance of this.

After the awards of the kuleanas came the awards to the lesser chiefs and to foreigners to whom lands had been given of the *ilis* which we have described above. They were generally though not uniformly awarded by their external boundaries, expressly stating in the award and in the patent based thereupon the *excepting of all kuleanas contained therein*.

The ahupuaas were awarded to the chiefs to whom they belonged in a similar manner, the exception including the *ilis* awarded as above, and also such *ilis* as by the statute law were declared on the basis of the *mahele*, as we have previously seen to be either crown or Government lands. Of course, when the *mahele* was made the division took place; the ahupuaa to one chief, or to the crown or Government, as the case might be, and the *ili* *kupono*, described in a previous number, to other chiefs, or the crown or Government, as the case might be. The crown and Government lands were expressly set forth by name in the statute at the same time that the land commission was created.

It is this *existence of titles within titles unseparated one from another by especial survey* that creates the unmitigated state of confusion that now exists on these islands. It might as well be confessed and made public that adequate steps may be taken if

possible to clear up the confusion, heightened as it is tenfold by the fact that all the kuleanas are recorded each by its own individual configuration and extent with no general map of any district. In the prospectus, so to call it, of the land commission, it was declared necessary to know the "configuration and extent of the several claims." The very important item of *location* was omitted. It was probably impossible to have carried out any general system of measurement which would have secured this, when we take into account the imperfect instruments employed by most who were employed in this really national work.

Another example from actual experience may come in here, perhaps to advantage. In Kalihi, Oahu, is an Ili of Government land. A large part of it was taken up, as usual with the kuleanas of the people resident thereon. The remainder was in all conceivable shapes, mixed in the interstices of the kuleanas, and including, however, some very valuable land. For some years the sovereigns of the country diverted this land to their own use. When, afterwards, it was deemed advisable to use or dispose of the land to the benefit of the Government, a survey was necessary to find where the Government land was situated. To this end every single kuleana lot, to the number of fifty or thereabouts, had to be resurveyed and located, errors, inaccuracies, and magnetic variation all to be taken into account, and their descriptions made out of what remained, to agree with the adjoining kuleanas, the whole involving about two months of labor. The resultant remainder of government lots of land were worth somewhere near \$1,500. More of this hereafter.

No. 7.

To sit in judgment on the past is not always advisable. It is easy, in the light of subsequent events, to perceive what would have been the wiser course. But it is not always easy to put ourselves in the places of our predecessors; to realize what difficulties may have beset them and what obstacles may have prevented the carrying out of their own conceptions of what should have been done.

This remark applies to the work of the land commission. The following imperfections in their work are very noticeable:

First. That already noticed, including titles within titles, kuleanas within illis, illis within ahupuaas, and so on, without distinct specification of what was expected within. It has frequently occurred that persons have purchased estate on the basis of the acreage of the whole, and then found, to their dismay, that one-fourth or even one-half of the area specified was taken up in kuleanas, titles in fact just as good as that of the larger estate around them. This has been a standing grievance with purchasers in this Kingdom, and has tended to bring the kuleana system into disfavor.

Second. The land commission ought to have been continued till all the land had been properly apportioned and award passed thereon by the commissioners, including in these awards also the crown and Government lands. The object aimed at, viz: the settling, for once at least, of titles, would then have been gained. The omission of the crown and Government lands has created uncertainty all over the group as to boundaries even to this day. The almost unlimited powers of the commissioners should have been used to put matters in a practical and accessible shape.

Third. The number of steps requisite to procure a full title has been too great. First the mahele, then the award, then the royal patent. Now, in the town of Honolulu, we will say, A and B have adjacent lots. A procures his award, and immediately goes on, pays the Government commutation, and receives a royal patent. B merely contents himself with the land commission award, leaving the future to look out for the payment of commutation. A and B both sell to C. C cuts up his property into small lots and sells. Now in some or other of these lots there will be at the same time, land commuted for, and land as yet uncommuted for. D, who has purchased one of these heterogeneous titles, wishes a full title, and is obliged to hire surveyors, lawyers, and what-not to find the imaginary line in his property, dividing the patented portion from the unpatented, describe the unpatented portion, and take out his "R. P." for the same in the name of the original awardee, dead, say twenty years ago. It would seem as if this threat of a government one-fourth ought to have been disposed of at the start.

Fourth. While the surveys were carefully recorded and indexed, there was an unaccountable lack of uniformity in the methods followed in making them. It would seem as though a person having the practical knowledge possessed by the late Hon. W. L. Lee, for so many years president of the commission, would have issued certain uniform rules to the persons employed. Instead thereof, we have every possible method of measurement adopted, every conceivable scale employed, meridians pointing everywhere, non-marking of corners; in short, everything left to the sweet will of the man who was hired at from \$2 to \$3 per kuleana to do the measurement. Nor was one district assigned to one man. No less than a dozen tried their hands at waikiki, no one being required to guide himself by the notes of another. Of course

overlaps and interlayers are the most common things imaginable. It has been the practice heretofore to regard the person holding the earlier award to take precedence in the case of an overlap and the one holding possession in the case of an interlayer. Some doubts in high quarters have been expressed, however, on this matter.

As we have said above, the real reason for all this looseness lies in the fact that there was little money to pay out and little time to wait for the work. It may be added that there was not then a single thoroughly competent land surveyor on the ground. The grounds for this assertion may be stated hereafter. Civil engineers there were, and amateur surveyors, but no thoroughly competent land surveyor.

To hasten the "quieting of titles" it was enacted by the Legislature that all claims not presented before a certain date should revert to the Government. This date was postponed several times. The land commission itself was driven to the policy of awarding titles by ancient boundaries, without survey—that is to say, simply by the name of the *ahupnaa* or *ili*, leaving the owners to fix the boundaries as best they could. In that way it was enabled to close its labors at the time prescribed by statute, viz, on the 31st of March, 1855. The receiving of evidence was finally closed on the 30th of December previous.

Even then an act had to be passed in 1862 "for the relief of certain *Konohikis*," enabling some such who had received land at the time of the *mahele* to receive an award from the interior department for the same, up to a certain date, beyond which the land, in unawarded, was to revert to the Government.

The question now comes up: Will these lands thus unawarded now be claimed by the Government? And, moreover, will similar lots in town be thus claimed? The view of the case taken at the time was this: "For the good of the community, land owners must be compelled to go through certain forms of law, failing in which the lands are forfeit." Was or was not this, in the circumstances, a constitutional act?

No. 8.

The land in the Hawaiian Islands was considered at the time of the *mahele* as belonging to the nation. It was divided off according to principles deemed equitable and titles were given, emanating really from the Government, representing the nation, by the King as the executive power. This, I think, is the true theory of the then new departure in land matters. The power to whom were given the Crown lands was not the power that gave legality to the new titles. The Crown lands were set aside for the private emolument of the King. The Government lands were for the benefit of the whole, for the parties as a whole, that divided the land.

When, therefore, the rule was made, or law passed, that lands not awarded should vest in the Government, it would seem to have been perfectly in the power of those making the law so to enact. It hardly seems proper, therefore, at the present day to assume that such lands should revert to the Crown as "Crown lands." They should revert to the Crown as the representative of the Government, not for the private use of the King, but for that which the King represents in his official capacity.

Where parties have been a long time in actual occupation of such lands, it would seem as if some liberal terms might be adopted which would facilitate the obtaining of a title, without waiving the right of the Government, against which the statute of limitations, i. e., of twenty years' occupation, does not hold.

The government lands about the year 1850 were put into the market throughout the islands. Previous sales had been made in a few localities, especially in *Makawao* and *Manoa Valley*. Agents were appointed in the different districts to receive applications, to attend to the surveys, and to report; also to collect the money for the land and forward to the interior office. The same desultory system of surveying was followed as in the case of *kuleanas*. Probably, between the years 1850 and 1860, nine-tenths of the available government land was taken up. The agents were, some of them, the American missionaries, who considered it not inconsistent with their position to assist the people in obtaining lands in advance of mere speculators. A commission was allowed; in at least one case it was declined, all service being rendered gratis.

After all this selling of land the Government were perfectly in the dark as to what remained. A lull in the business took place, and when in after years some of the remnants were applied for, it was impossible to proceed with any confidence in disposing of them. In addition to this, a new policy came in, with another administration, of refusing to sell land, partly from the revival of the ancient theory that the King was the Government; partly from a feeling that a fixed revenue might be derived from the remainder; partly from the cropping out of the ever-prevalent dislike of seeing lands go into the hands of foreigners; and partly from the difficulty of proceeding intelligently to work.

For instance (and this is from actual experience), a tract of, say, 10 acres, in *Palolo*

Valley remained to the Government. It lies at the foot of the steep valley side, and may or may not extend up that side or pali to its summit. The land above was awarded by survey, and to find how far down the face of the mountain it may extend it is necessary to run all the old lines of that upper land; probably two or three days of hard work would be none too much to do this in a reliable manner. In fact, one can be sure of nothing in such cases without surveying all the adjoining lands. A perfect incubus this has been on the disposal of the remaining government lands.

It was this state of things, as much as anything else, that led the late minister of interior, Dr. F. W. Hutchison, to institute the Government survey. A general survey seemed the only possible way to get at the facts of the case. It would be perfectly impossible to-day for the Government to state definitely what land it possessed in any one district.

Add to this the need of general maps for business purposes, for assessment of taxes, for any discussion of schemes for the benefit of the country, for searching of records, for the information of courts of law, of strangers, especially of scientific men, to say nothing of navigators, and one sees abundant reason why a general survey should be made.

Moreover, the Government failed in one important part of its duty, namely, in locating its own grants and awards. It is but fair that it should undertake that work as far as is practically useful and is possible without too great expense.

Another demand for general maps lies in the fact that while a person may in a few years become a walking encyclopedia of information respecting localities and titles, etc., in a district, he is liable to leave at any time, when all his stores of knowledge become annihilated in a moment, no record thereof being left for the benefit of his successor.

There is now remaining to be noticed the "boundary commission" business. As was stated before, a large number of ahupuaas and ilis were awarded by name only. The land commission having ceased to exist, it became necessary to provide some means of legalizing the lines of boundary between awarded lands wherever they had not been awarded by survey. This and nothing else is the business of the boundary commission. It is not concerned with boundary disputes as such. It is only when the locality of an award, and in a very few cases of a royal patent, has nothing but the ancient traditions and testimony founded thereon to determine it that the commissioner is called upon by the owner to issue a "certificate" defining it, "either by survey, by natural topographical features, or by permanent boundary marks." It will be seen that a description by means of ancient names of localities—"iaki pana"—is not in the limits of the statute.

The act for the appointment of boundary commissioners was passed in 1862. At first there were two for each gubernatorial district, the police or district justice in each place acting as umpire in case they disagreed. This, as might be expected, was a failure, and subsequently the late G. M. Robertson, of the supreme bench, became sole commissioner for the group. In 1868 the law was modified, since which time there have been four commissioners, one in each main district. Their work has progressed very slowly owing to various causes.

It is a matter of regret that there has been so little uniformity in their methods of procedure. Of a large number of lands thus defined no maps whatever have been filed in the interior department. Complaints often arise that sufficient notice is not given to parties concerned residing, as they oftentimes do, at a distance. The best way of procedure would seem to be this: Maps of the lands in question, prepared from good surveys by persons approved at the interior office, and containing such full information as to be intelligible to all concerned, should be on file in some public office, say for ninety days previous to the decision, and due notice given thereof in order that all parties may consider the matter at their leisure.

A better organized land office is very much needed. The general clerk of the interior office has too great a diversity of business to give due attention to it. The second clerk is mainly occupied in making outroyal patents on awards and furnishing copies of documents. The surveyor-general has the topographical survey on his hands, while his assistants are banded about from one kind of job to another, the whole groaning under the weight of the entanglement of old and new that has been previously pointed out in these papers.

The object aimed at should be that the Government should know the location of its own patents for land, and be able to furnish information concerning the same. It should know, too, what is left unpatented, and it was more for this object than any other that the then minister of interior, F. W. Hutchison, instituted the Government survey in 1870.

No. 37.

Statement of E. C. Macfarlane.

HONOLULU, May 9, 1893.

MY DEAR MR. BLOUNT:

I hand you herewith the statement you desired me to make as to the causes leading up to the dismissal of the several cabinets of the last Legislature. In this statement I have confined myself entirely to the bare facts you ask for, without attempting to introduce any of the arguments brought out in the debates. I have copies of all the proceedings in the Legislature, if you should want to read them at any time, and I hope to have another opportunity before your departure to talk over Hawaiian affairs with you.

I leave for Hawaii to-day to attend to some important matters in connection with the Volcano House Company, returning on Wednesday of next week. All of the papers in connection with the lottery petitions, will be in proper shape upon my return. I am only waiting for the clerk of the Legislature to make his affidavits.

In haste,

Very respectfully,

E. C. MACFARLANE.

HONOLULU, May 6, 1893.

Hon. JAMES H. BLOUNT,

United States Commissioner, etc., Honolulu:

SIR: Shortly after the commencement of the last session of the Legislature, it was an open secret that the Volney-Ashford-Wilcox party were planning a revolutionary movement, which had the support of the annexationist element, and that the latter element had the sympathy of the United States minister. I was firmly of the opinion that such a conspiracy was on foot and that it had the sympathy of Mr. Stevens, and a speech made by him on Decoration Day afforded me an opportunity to bring the matter before the assembly in the following inquiry:

SIR: I am constrained to ask Her Majesty's constitutional advisors whether they intend taking any steps to rebuke the unwarrantable action of the United States minister on a recent public occasion—an action which could only be intended to interfere with and obstruct the administration.

This was replied to by the minister of foreign affairs as follows:

Hon. J. S. WALKER,

President of the Legislature:

SIR: In answer to the question propounded by the honorable noble for Honolulu, E. C. Macfarlane, I would say, that Her Majesty's Government has given the matter careful consideration and has already taken action in the premises.

The following day I addressed the house upon a question of privilege, as follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: My attention has been called to an editorial in a morning paper criticising my question asked yesterday of his excellency the minister of foreign affairs.

I do not intend to be placed in a false position by the Advertiser, hence the privilege of which I avail myself. Let it be understood that I yield to no one in admiration of the great Republic in respect for its generous, liberty-loving people; neither do I fail to appreciate the generosity covered by our treaty of reciprocity. In a sense, the American minister represents that Republic and its people, but it is

only when he conducts himself within the lines laid down for diplomatic representatives.

I maintain that if this Government and people desire to retain the respect of the governments and peoples of the world they must be self-respecting and must resent all interferences with our affairs, when conducted with a proper regard for other nations, by foreign representatives. I have said that the American minister represents the American people, but I must again qualify this assertion by saying that he best does so when he refuses to interfere in our domestic affairs at the instance of a faction in this community, whose organ is the Advertiser, whose leaders are ex-ministers of Hawaii, who, like the followers of Moses, are longing for the flesh pots of Egypt, and whose purpose seems to be to rule or ruin. Against this faction every friend of the Hawaiian people must stand arrayed.

The inquiry by the minister of foreign affairs went so far as to call forth from Mr. Stevens a disclaimer of any intention to interfere with our domestic affairs. The matter was discussed with the Hawaiian members of the house in caucus, and they were made to believe that unless the objectionable matter was expunged it would embroil the country in complications with the United States, which would likely lose them the independence of their country.

Of this action in caucus I was informed by several of the Hawaiian members, and the following day Representative Kamaooha introduced a resolution to expunge from the records of the assembly all references to the matter, which resolution was carried.

In accordance with an understanding with the leaders of the Reform party, the conservative element in the National Reform party joined with the former and voted out the Parker-Widemann cabinet. The want of decision on the part of that cabinet in dealing with the Horner banking act (which proposed an unlimited issue of irredeemable paper money) was the principal reason for desiring the change. The unaccountable failure of that ministry to act vigorously and promptly in this matter created a strong opposition to the members throughout the whole business community.

On Saturday, September 3, 1892, the leaders of the Reform party called a caucus of the members of the assembly and passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That whereas a resolution of want of confidence in the cabinet was passed by the Legislature on August 30 last, such resolution being passed by a vote of 31 to 10; and

Whereas, by reason of the adoption of such resolution, the constitutional necessity has arisen for selecting a new cabinet;

Now, therefore, we, members of the Legislature, feeling this to be a fit occasion to more firmly establish the constitutional principles upon which our system of government is based, do hereby, regardless of previous party affiliations, declare that, under the principles of responsible representative government established in this Kingdom, Her Majesty should summon a leading member of the Legislature who voted in favor of such resolution of want of confidence, to form the new cabinet, thereby recognizing the constitutional principle that the cabinet should possess the support and confidence of, and represent the majority of, the Legislature, the elected representatives of the people;

And resolved further, That we do hereby pledge ourselves to govern our future action, as members of this Legislature, in support of this constitutional principle.

This resolution was sent to Her Majesty and called forth the following reply:

IOLANI PALACE, September 7, 1892.

Hons. ALEXANDER YOUNG, J. N. S. WILLIAMS, and WM. O. SMITH:

GENTLEMEN: As the bearer of a resolution passed upon by certain members of the Legislature, Her Majesty was pleased to grant you an audience and graciously promised to reply to the subject-matter of the resolution. I am now directed to say that Her Majesty is pleased to note the desire on the part of the gentlemen whom you represent "to more firmly establish the constitutional principle upon which our system of government is based, recognizing the principle that the cabinet should pos-

ness the support and confidence of, and represent the majority of, the Legislature, the elected representatives of the people."

The opinion is expressed that Her Majesty should summon a leading member of the Legislature who voted in favor of a resolution of want of confidence to form a new cabinet.

Sincerely desiring to meet the wishes of the representatives of her subjects, it has pleased Her Majesty to summon the Hon. A. P. Peterson to assist in the formation of a cabinet.

Her Majesty trusts that the acceptance of the suggestion to call a member of the majority of the Legislature to form a cabinet will bring about the result sought for.

Her Majesty also desires to express her appreciation of the courtesies received at the hands of the gentlemen of the committee.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, yours respectfully,

JAMES W. ROBERTSON,
Her Majesty's Chamberlain.

Mr. Peterson endeavored in every way to meet the wishes of the caucus in the formation of a cabinet, but the reform faction were irreconcilable, and would not agree to anything that he suggested. The resolution above quoted is misleading. I will not say designedly, for the contention was persistently made in caucus by Mr. Thurston, the framer of the resolution, that upon the defeat of a ministry, not only should Her Majesty send for a leading member of the victorious opposition, but that the opposition should select a cabinet, and send their nominations to the Queen for her acceptance, insisting that she should recognize this course as a constitutional principle.

I and a few others objected to the establishment of such a precedent, urging that under the constitution the Queen had the right to name her cabinet, which could only be removed by a want-of-confidence vote of the majority of all the elective members of the Legislature. See article 41 of the constitution, which reads:

The cabinet shall consist of the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the interior, the minister of finance, and the attorney-general, and they shall be His Majesty's special advisers in the executive affairs of the Kingdom; and they shall be *ex officio* members of His Majesty's privy council of state. *They shall be appointed and commissioned by the King and shall be removed by him only upon a vote of want of confidence passed by a majority of all the elective members of the Legislature, or upon conviction of felony, and shall be subject to impeachment. No act of the King shall have any effect unless it be countersigned by a member of the cabinet, who by that signature makes himself responsible.*

I see no good reason for departing from the meaning of this clause of the constitution so plainly expressed, and there was at least one good reason for doing so—the possibility of a majority of the Legislature which contained no material from which to form a cabinet outvoting that part of the Legislature from which a cabinet would naturally be selected. And again, it implied that Her Majesty could not go outside of the house to select her ministers. I consider it a decided advantage in the community that the Sovereign should have the privilege of selecting his or her advisers from the whole country.

The meaning of the constitution is plainly that it is the Queen's prerogative to appoint a cabinet, and that of the Legislature to dismiss it—not by any scratch vote, but by a majority of all the elective members.

Over a week passed without arriving at any settlement in the matter of forming a cabinet, during all of which time Mr. Peterson and myself met the members in caucus, from time to time, without reaching any result.

Mr. Peterson failing to form a cabinet, Her Majesty called upon me, on a Saturday, to do so, saying to me that a ministry must be formed to meet the house on the Monday morning following, as the tension

upon the community was becoming too great. It would have given me satisfaction could I have arranged a cabinet to satisfy a majority of the caucus, but in the limited time given me it was impossible to do so, it being evident that Mr. Thurston and his friends did not intend to permit the house to be prorogued without having a ministry selected from their faction. Accordingly I formed a cabinet which I thought would be acceptable to a majority of the assembly and to the community.

Mr. Thurston and his friends at once attacked the cabinet and immediately brought in a resolution of want of confidence, which failed to carry. In the meantime an election was called to fill the seats made vacant by the resignations (on taking cabinet positions) of Mr. Paul Neumann and myself as nobles for the island of Oahu. The clear-cut issue in this election was to indorse or not to indorse the ministry. The result of the election was the return of Messrs. Maile and Hopkins, who went before their constituencies as supporters of the ministry, and who were elected by an overwhelming majority—the cabinet thereby receiving the indorsement of a large majority of the electors for nobles of the island of Oahu.

No better expression of approval could be asked for by members of a representative government than that thus accorded to our cabinet, immediately following the defeat of a no-confidence resolution in the house.

This expression of confidence at the polls was the more emphatic, coming from the electors of the island of Oahu, who are accorded nine noble representatives out of the twenty-four, in deference to their property-and-income qualification, and might have been expected to lessen the virulence of the opposition.

Despite this verdict of the noble voters for the island of Oahu, which certainly represents the wealth and intelligence of the Kingdom, the unreconciled minority persistently pursued their tactics to force out the ministry.

As minister of finance, I had arranged with the two local banks for the protection of the depositors in the Postal Savings Bank, and on October 12 I informed the assembly that on the following Monday I would present the appropriation bill, outlining the financial policy of the ministry, and at the same time bringing forward additional revenue measures.

On the Monday morning, October 14, before any opportunity had been given to introduce the promised bills, a vote of want of confidence was introduced. Following is a copy of the resolution which was introduced by Representative Waipuilani:

Whereas the present cabinet has not announced or given any intimation or evidence of any financial policy which will extricate the country from its present dangerous financial situation; and

Whereas it is essential to the commercial progress of the country that more favorable treaty relations with the United States be obtained, whereby our products can obtain a free market in that country; and

Whereas the present cabinet has shown no disposition to favor any such policy, and the present head of the cabinet has displayed such conspicuous hostility toward the representative of that country in this Kingdom, and the general tone of the administration has been and is one of opposition and hostility to the United States of America and American interests, thereby rendering it improbable that any changes in our treaty relations favorable to Hawaii can be negotiated by this cabinet; and

Whereas the cabinet has given no evidence of any intention to attempt to remedy existing scandals in the police department, and have otherwise failed to evince any ability to successfully guide the nation through the difficulties and dangers surrounding it: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature hereby expresses its want of confidence in the present cabinet.

The debate on this resolution was almost altogether taken up with the attitude of the cabinet towards the American minister, who had a grievance against the *Bulletin* newspaper for publishing reflections on his not sending out the *Boston* in search of a missing American boat's crew. Mr. Stevens seemed to think that the cabinet controlled the *Bulletin*—which it did not—and a rather lengthy correspondence took place between him and the foreign office on the subject, which ended in the attorney-general's entering a suit for libel against the paper, after the editor's refusal to publish an apology dictated by the American minister.

During the debate I was anxious to have this correspondence read, which would have shown that we had tried to meet Mr. Stevens's wishes in every way, but the house would not allow the correspondence to be read. I regret that I can not here reproduce the letters, which would show a conspicuous absence of the hostility dilated on in the resolution.

I have already said that I was prepared with a financial statement; as to the other count in the indictment—alleging scandals in the police department—this resolved itself into a demand for the dismissal of the marshal; but, though much was said, nothing was proved against him. When the reform cabinet took office, the members of it seemed to forget how very scandalous the marshal was, for they retained him in office during the whole term of their incumbency.

On Tuesday, November 1, the Cornwell-Nawashi cabinet took office and was voted out the same day, no opportunity being afforded to outline a policy.

On Friday, November 4, Her Majesty called upon Cecil Brown to form a cabinet, Mr. Brown not being at the time a member of the assembly. This fact, however, did not call forth from Mr. Thurston and his friends any protest, as it was well understood that he (Mr. Brown) would form a ministry that would be acceptable to the reform party; the "constitutional principle" which Mr. Thurston and his friends had contended for being easily forgotten when occasion required. They continued in office simply because they allowed the assembly to do as they pleased with the appropriation bill, the result being that the grand total of the budget alarmed the assembly and produced disaffection, leading up to a vote of want of confidence. The vote, however, failed to carry, but a second attempt was made soon after, and the cabinet was voted out on the 11th of January, 1893. Two days later the Parker-Colburn cabinet took office, and the house was prorogued the following day.

During the time I had a portfolio frequent conferences with Her Majesty satisfied me that she was anxious to promote legislation and to keep down expenses of government, going so far as to suggest to me that the first reduction in the appropriation bill should be made in her privy purse and royal state.

In reference to the lottery bill, about which so much has been said derogatory to the Queen, it should be said that Her Majesty was quite willing to see it fail; but a majority of the members of the Legislature had been worked upon by individuals who had circulated petitions favoring the establishment of a lottery, and the bill having passed, Her Majesty declined to exercise her prerogative in vetoing the bill, a prerogative which she refused to avail herself of, excepting upon the advice of her constitutional advisers.

In this connection I should say that the lottery bill was, during my brief ministry, in the hands of a committee and did not come up at

all for discussion. My colleagues and myself were, however, a unit against it, and in negotiating financial assistance for the Government I distinctly said so, both to Mr. Damon and Mr. Irwin, the representatives of the local banks.

In the matter of the opium bill, there was a division of sentiment on the part of the Brown-Wilcox cabinet (reform), two ministers voting for and two against the measure, it being a question upon which there might be an honest difference of opinion, the opinion being held by a large portion of the community that prohibition did not prohibit.

What followed the prorogation of the Assembly it is not my purpose to touch upon.

I have the honor to remain, sir, your most obedient servant,
E. C. MACFARLANE.

No. 38.

Interview with George Mundon, of Kealia, Wednesday, April 19, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. Do you work for Mr. Blaisdell?

A. I am hauling wood for him.

Q. Do you belong to the Annexation Club.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you for annexation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you for annexation if your people are not allowed free suffrage?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are a majority of the native population that way?

A. No, sir.

Q. They are opposed to annexation unless they are assured they have the right to vote?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, is that the case of those in your club?

A. Yes, sir; that is the case as long as they get their franchise.

Q. Well, outside of the club, are a majority of the natives for or against the Queen, if they had their choice?

A. I can not say.

Q. Do not you mingle with them?

A. Well, before the overthrow of the Government the majority were against the Queen's action.

Q. About the new constitution?

A. No, not particularly the new constitution, but the way she carried on.

Q. Did they want her dethroned?

A. I can not say they wanted her dethroned, but they were talking against her political actions.

Q. You were not here during the revolution?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know anything of the sort was likely to take place?

A. I did not think it was going to take place as soon, but I thought it would take place.

Q. What made you think it would take place?

A. In regard to the way the Government was carried on. It was against the wishes of the people.

Q. What people?

A. Hawaiian people and whites. There was a good deal said about ft. She would appoint her favorites to office—her cabinet officers.

Q. What time was this?

A. I am talking about the time the last legislature was sitting. She would appoint ministers—that is her cabinet—the legislature would vote them out, and she would take a part of them back again. I think we had four or five changes in that way. That was talked about greatly. It was against the wishes of the people—and one particular point I want to say—it was against my wishes and a majority of the Hawaiians, the retaining of our marshal, Charlie Wilson. He was always in office. We thought he was an incompetent man. The Wilcox cabinet was approved by all of us. We thought it was a good cabinet. Through some bribery they were voted out.

Q. Were you here?

A. No, sir; but I take and read the papers.

Q. Was it from the newspapers you heard there was bribery?

A. I heard it from friends. We knew our representatives were not very good men—men of no standing—and especially one named Akina. He is half Chinese. He is a lawyer. He came up here with a salary of \$250. He had a family to support. He was up here six or seven months. We knew he could not live on \$250, and on his return he must have brought down \$300 or \$400 worth of furniture.

Q. Any more persons you think were bribed?

A. I can not say positively that he was bribed; but there was one of our natives, Paul Kanaa—I won't say he was bribed, but he voted against the party he went for.

Q. Did the Reform party elect him?

A. Yes, sir. He even voted out the Wilcox cabinet.

Q. Did he help to vote out any other cabinet before that?

A. I can not say, but I think that he did. Rumors were sent out to Kealia that the United States would send out a Commissioner; that the United States flag was going to be taken down and the Commissioner was going to put back the Queen. They felt sorry for the Queen and wanted her put back—some of them, not all—some of the ignorant people. Down where we live they are not all well posted.

Q. Are they mostly ignorant?

A. I can not say they are ignorant. They can all read and write.

Q. Do they generally speak English or native?

A. Native; but some of them understand English and speak very well?

Q. How are they generally occupied?

A. They plant taro; some work on plantations—bullock drivers and so on.

Q. Do they make their own living generally; they do not beg or live at public expense?

A. No, sir; they all earn their own living.

Q. Is it generally true of the native population that they do not beg nor steal but make their own living?

A. Yes, sir; they all make their own living. We have no stealing. It is a very rare case to have a native up for larceny.

Q. Who generally commits larceny?

A. The Chinese.

Q. How about the Portuguese?

A. The Portuguese are very seldom brought before the court. I do not think we have Portuguese brought before the court once in a year.

Q. How about the Japanese?

A. Well, very seldom.

Q. Do they (the Chinese) intermarry with your people some?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that generally agreeable to the native population?

A. No, sir; it is against the wishes of the native population.

Q. Is there much of it done?

A. Well, yes; they manage to get some of the young girls by bribing the parents with money.

Q. To pay for the girls?

A. They do not exactly pay right out, but by giving presents to the parents and girls.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Mr. Blount.

GEO. MUNDON.

HONOLULU, April 19, 1893.

No. 39.

Interview with Samuel Parker, Honolulu, Thursday afternoon, April 6, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Parker, you are a Royalist, I suppose?

Mr. PARKER. I am.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will you be kind enough to give me your views of the causes which led up to the establishment of the present Government?

Mr. PARKER. My honest opinion is this: I think it never would have taken place if the Reform ministry had not been put out. When the Wilcox ministry went in the Reform party controlled the Government. I mean by this what they called the Reform ministers. The cabinet council consisted of four ministers and the sovereign—the Queen. That is my reason for saying when that ministry went in that that meant the Government.

Mr. BLOUNT. In other words the action of the Queen was controlled by the ministry?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; by the ministry.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, why did the removal of the Reform ministry lead to the deposition of the Queen as you understand it?

Mr. PARKER. The four ministers that came in were not Reform ministers, but were what might be called a fair ministry, being comprised of two Hawaiians and two Americans. There was the opium bill and the lottery bill—both helped the downfall. They were passed through the house during the Wilcox ministry, which was called the Reform administration. This opium bill and lottery bill had passed the Legislature. When we went in we advised the Queen to sign the opium bill and the lottery bill. The Queen signed it, and it was countersigned by the minister of the interior, and became a law.

Mr. BLOUNT. What were the reasons for passing the lottery bill?

Mr. PARKER. The same reasons that there were for passing the opium bill. There was a money franchise of \$500,000 to be paid the Government every year. Out of that \$500,000 certain amounts were to be given to different public institutions. It was to be divided up into parts—to the leper hospital so much; I do not remember the sum. A proportion was for a telegraphic cable between the United

States and the Islands. It was to be divided up in that way. We thought it would be a benefit to the country.

Mr. BLOUNT. In the way of revenue for the purposes to which it was to be appropriated?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; it was in the bill. Out of the \$500,000 there must be so much to this institution and so much to that; so much for a railroad, etc. I do not remember the sums.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who was this franchise voted to?

Mr. PARKER. It was given to four or five men—people living on these Islands. The franchise was in their name. It was reported to us that it would go to the Louisiana Lottery people, but that was not known in the franchise. It was the supposition it was to go to the Louisiana Lottery people, or to some syndicate in the United States.

Mr. BLOUNT. What were the reasons for the opium bill?

Mr. PARKER. The opium bill was for giving a revenue. Now, as there is no license, there is a certain amount of opium being smuggled into the Islands. We do not have force to protect our shores. We have no revenue cutters as you have in California, and we thought that as opium was coming into the country all the time, it would be better for the Government to derive some benefit from it; to have the license put up at public auction and sold to the highest bidder. It would be estimated at from \$100,000 to \$200,000 a year. It was discussed thoroughly by the Legislature and carried by a big majority. The Reform ministry was divided on that—two in favor and two against it. It passed the house by a big majority.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it your opinion that this movement would have occurred if there had been no effort to proclaim a new constitution?

Mr. PARKER. I think it would.

Mr. BLOUNT. Why do you think so?

Mr. PARKER. A majority of the capitalists of the town had no confidence in our ministry. I think it would have come about any way.

Mr. BLOUNT. Come about soon?

Mr. PARKER. It would have come about, because even when this attempt of promulgation of the new constitution was made, we were told that they would support us for what we had done—for holding out against the Queen in requesting us to sign the new constitution. This was said to us at that time—at the time when the Queen was asking us to sign it. During the day they had a meeting of the citizens. I mean such men as Thurston, Hartwell, and leaders of the Provisional Government. They told us they would back us up. They admired us for our pluck in holding out against the Queen's wish.

Mr. BLOUNT. Would this imply a disposition to take action towards dethronement?

Mr. PARKER. I think it came from the McKinley bill—the first action was on account of the McKinley bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. What do you mean by action?

Mr. PARKER. They said that unless something is done—closer relations with the United States—we are bankrupt. That was long before the Legislature came in session. When I first went into the cabinet.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who do you mean said this?

Mr. PARKER. A majority of the sugar men. Those now at the head of the Provisional Government—capitalists and planters. They said that something must be done to get closer relations with the United States to hold us up; with sugar down to \$45 and \$50 a ton, something ought to be done; a commercial treaty or something ought to be negotiated with the American people.

Mr. BLOUNT. The question of annexation was not presented then, was it?

Mr. PARKER. No; the question was how could we get any commercial treaty with the McKinley bill in force. That was the talk of a commercial treaty with the United States to benefit these islands.

First the opium bill; then came the lottery; then came the promulgation of the new constitution. That, perhaps, hurried matters. I was the trusted party on one side, and it was never broached to me in that way. I suppose those causes brought it about. You see our Queen had already issued a proclamation, countersigned by our ministry, that she would never do anything.

Mr. BLOUNT. Of what sort?

Mr. PARKER. Of bringing about a new constitution. This was on Saturday or Sunday morning.

Mr. Parker here presented this memorandum of Mr. Peterson:

On Sunday evening, January 15, 1893, at 6:30 o'clock, Mr. L. A. Thurston came to my house in company with J. F. Holburn, minister of the interior. He said he wished to have a talk with me. He said the committee on safety had had a meeting the night before and had come to the conclusion that things could not go on as at present, and that the committee had decided that the Queen should be dethroned and a provisional government established. He said that Mr. Stevens would land his troops and support the movement, if a proclamation to that effect was issued from any building in town. He then asked Mr. Colbert and me if we would, without consulting with our colleagues, take control of the situation, and in our own names ask the American minister to assist in carrying out their proclamation. We declined.

Mr. PARKER. In the memorandum of the meeting I omitted the statement he (Mr. Colbourn) made about "Parker being a treacherous liar, etc." Did not want to think we were trying to take advantage. I told them not to put that in the memorandum.

Mr. BLOUNT. Was there any movement, any effort on the part of the Queen or her ministers or friends to induce Mr. Stevens to take action in the interest of her Government?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; Mr. Peterson and myself called on Mr. Stevens. As to what occurred in this connection this memorandum discloses:

On Sunday evening, January 15, at half past 7 o'clock, Mr. Samuel Parker, Her Majesty's minister of foreign affairs, and myself, as attorney-general, called upon J. L. Stevens, American minister, at his residence, to talk over the situation and to obtain, if possible, from Mr. Stevens the stand he, on behalf of his Government, would take in the event of an armed insurrection against the Queen's Government, at the same time informing him that Her Majesty's Government were perfectly capable of dealing with the situation. Mr. Stevens stated that he desired to protect the Government, and advised Her Majesty's Government not to resign, but said, in answer to a direct question put to him by me, that in case the Government called upon him for assistance he did not see how he could assist them as long as C. R. Wilson remained marshal of the Kingdom, terming Mr. Wilson a scoundrel.

The only reason given by Mr. Stevens for this position taken by him was that Mr. Wilson had caused the arrest of his (Mr. Stevens's) Chinese coachman for carrying concealed weapons, although Mr. Stevens stated that he had other matters against Mr. Wilson which he did not state. After which Mr. Parker and myself left.

On Tuesday afternoon, January 17, at 2 o'clock, Mr. Parker and myself again called upon Mr. Stevens at his residence in Nuuanu Valley to learn if possible the truth of the statements made publicly by the leading members of the so-called committee of safety to the effect that Mr. Stevens had promised that if a proclamation declaring a provisional government was issued he (Mr. Stevens), on behalf of his Government, would immediately recognize such Government and support it with the United States forces at his command. I asked Mr. Stevens what action would be taken by him (Mr. Stevens) in case the insurgents attacked Her Majesty's Government and the Government called upon him for assistance.

Mr. Stevens replied that in that case he could not come to the assistance of the Government. I then asked Mr. Stevens what his action would be in case Her Majesty's Government should treat the insurgents as rebels and attack them and arrest them. **Mr. Stevens** replied that in that case he should feel it his duty to interfere

with the force at his command. Mr. Stevens further said that he had made up his mind that if any number of what he considered responsible citizens should ask his assistance in establishing a provisional government he should grant that assistance and should recognize them as such and support them. Mr. Stevens, during this conversation, was lying on a sofa in his private office and spoke with difficulty, as if in a weak and exhausted state. At 2:30 o'clock Mr. Parker and I left Mr. Stevens and proceeded to the station house, the headquarters of Her Majesty's cabinet and Government.

A. P. PETERSON.

Mr. PARKER. At 5 o'clock Monday the troops were landed. When I found out they were on shore I went up to the club and found the governor.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who was the governor?

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Cleghorn. There was a little complication in our military law. We were really both at the head of the military.

Mr. BLOUNT. You were secretary of state?

Mr. PARKER. I was secretary of the foreign office—what we called minister of foreign affairs. I was responsible for all money paid out to the military, but the governor was supposed to be commander in chief. Our military laws are complicated in that way.

Mr. BLOUNT. You went up to protest against the landing of the troops to Mr. Stevens. What did Mr. Stevens say?

Mr. PARKER. I said: "What does this all mean?" He said: "I gave orders."

Mr. BLOUNT. The next thing was your formal protest, and that you will hand us.

Mr. PARKER. I do not know whether I can do it.

Mr. BLOUNT. What was the substance of it?

Mr. PARKER. The substance was that he ought to have notified us in accordance with international law. Hastings wrote it. I got the governor to make a protest, too, so that he could not say he got authority. This was on Monday evening.

Mr. BLOUNT. What day was the Provisional Government proclaimed?

Mr. PARKER. On Tuesday.

Mr. BLOUNT. At what hour.

Mr. PARKER. About 4 o'clock, I think.

Mr. BLOUNT. When that was done, what action was taken by the Queen—when the troops were landed?

Mr. PARKER. The troops were landed on Monday and the protest was made on Tuesday, and on Tuesday I had a meeting of the Diplomatic Corps. I invited them to come. There was Mr. Woodhouse, the British minister; Mr. Carnavara, the Portuguese minister; Mr. Vizavona, the French minister, and Mr. Fugii, the Japanese minister, present. We asked their advice on the subject. The advice from them was to offer no resistance. Mr. Stevens did not come. He sent word that he was not well enough.

Mr. BLOUNT. Was that after the proclamation?

Mr. PARKER. No; before.

Mr. BLOUNT. In this consultation it was assumed that the Provisional Government would be proclaimed and you were advised to offer no resistance.

Mr. PARKER. I think that was it. We had heard there was going to be trouble.

Mr. BLOUNT. You said the Diplomatic Corps advised no resistance.

Mr. PARKER. Yes; not to have any bloodshed, because they all knew we had a big force. We had seen Mr. Stevens before. Mr. Stevens had told us that they would not assist us.

Mr. BLOUNT. Did he say who he would assist?

Mr. PARKER. I think that will appear in our memorandum. He considered the committee of safety represented the capitalists—represented the people—the responsible people.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does that appear in your paper?

Mr. PARKER. I think so.

Mr. BLOUNT. Won't you please state the circumstances attending the conference between the cabinet and the Queen about signing the new constitution?

Mr. PARKER. Before the Legislature met that Saturday morning we were asked to come there and meet her, in the first part of the day.

Mr. BLOUNT. You had met her in the morning?

Mr. PARKER. No; this was the day when the Legislature was prorogued. In the morning she asked us to come there to talk about this situation. I arrived there first, but my colleagues were late. I waited for them. Nine o'clock or ten, I do not remember exactly, was the hour for the Legislature to meet at Legislature Hall. When my colleagues arrived we had to go right out without having a meeting. In the meantime she had stated that she wanted us to come there in order to sign the new constitution. I said: "Your Majesty, we have not seen the new constitution." It will be time enough, she said, when you come here. I will show it to you and your colleagues. She asked me to be there soon after the prorogation of the Legislature. Just then my colleagues came up to the palace. I said: "Your Majesty, we have no time. We have to be at the Legislature now." I told my colleagues we had to go right over to the hall. We left her.

On the way, I told them that the Queen was requesting us to be there at such and such a time for the promulgation of the new constitution; I said I had not seen it and that I had told her we could not do anything until we first read it. That was what I told my colleagues. After the Legislature was prorogued someone said to me that the diplomatic corps would like to meet the cabinet before they went over. Of course, I did not know what was up. It seemed that a rumor had got down town that the Queen was going to promulgate a new constitution. Rumors got out, and the diplomatic corps wanted to ask me if it was so. I said it was a fact. I had not seen the constitution, but the Queen had requested me to be there with my colleagues. I told them I had not seen the constitution and had no idea what kind of document it was. We all assured them that we would not consent to sign the constitution and then we went over to the palace.

We went into the blue room. She said "I sent for you gentlemen; I was requested by my people to promulgate a new constitution. I want you gentlemen to sign it or to consent to it." They all looked to me. I said: "Your Majesty, we have not read the constitution, but before we read it, you must know it is a revolutionary act. It can not be done." She said: "Read it; see what it is." On that point we said, after we had read it: "We advise you to give it up—not to think any more about it." By that time she got pretty well excited, and some of my colleagues said: "If you insist upon it, we will resign." I said: "Now, gentlemen, if you will walk out into the next room, I will have a few words with her Majesty." They went out. I talked to her, but of course she said that it was her people's wish, and so many thousand signatures had been sent in. She said: "I have thought over the matter carefully, and think that I ought to give them a new constitution."

I told her I would not and my colleagues would not agree to it. There were a good many words passed between us. She said: "Why don't you resign?" I said I would not resign unless it was according to law. When I got down to Government house there was Mr. Thurston, Mr. Hartwell, and Mr. Smith, the attorney-general there, and a great many others for consultation in regard to this. They all complimented us; said they would give us all assistance, etc. I told my colleagues they might as well go over with me. They went over and persuaded her (the Queen) to give it up.

Mr. BLOUNT. Was this Monday?

Mr. PARKER. This was Saturday.

Mr. BLOUNT. She agreed to give it up that night?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; that day. I do not know exactly the words she used. On Sunday we called on some influential people around town, Mr. Damon, vice-president of the Provisional Government, and half a dozen other prominent men. We knew they were friends of the Queen and friends of the people, and they thought if the Queen would come with some proclamation of some kind and assure the people that she would give up all idea of the promulgation of a new constitution that they thought the people would be satisfied. That was on Sunday afternoon. Some thought we ought to have the committee of thirteen arrested, but I thought it was not necessary.

On Sunday night we prepared a document for her to sign, and Monday morning I went there about half past 8. She was at breakfast. I showed her this document. I said I wanted her to sign; the cabinet advised her to sign the proclamation, and I would have it brought up. I had had it set up at the printing office, so that it would be ready to be struck off by thousands. The copy was made out at my office. She signed it and it was given out to the public and a copy sent to the diplomatic corps. A little later on they thought that we ought to have sent a special one to the diplomatic corps. So we got up another in a little different wording and sent them to the diplomatic corps addressed to them.

Mr. BLOUNT. When was the Provisional Government determined on?

Mr. PARKER. I do not think it was given out to the public. There was nothing spoken of in public about the Provisional Government. That was kept secret. They had a meeting on Saturday night. We got hold of it that they were talking about this dethronement, and on Sunday it was substantiated. I for one have talked to the people and have also advised the Queen not to make any demonstrations whatever against the Provisional Government, as it was understood that it was only to be a temporary government until the matter was settled by the United States. If it was permanent I do not think it will work.

Mr. BLOUNT. Why?

Mr. PARKER. The head is all right, but it does not go to prove that what they do will be heeded by him. Now, the parties that consist of that Provisional Government outside of Damon, Dole, and Allen, and one or two others, are not men of standing, men of such stamp as would not carry weight in any country. That is the kind of men who are making our laws. I do not think the representative men here would want to live under such a government, with such men at the helm, if it was permanent. I was a member of the board of health. I would not take the oath to support this Provisional Government. I was minister under the Queen. I was using all my influence among my people to keep quiet, to keep the peace, and to assist all we can in keeping

everything quiet until it is settled for annexation, protectorate, or whatever the case may be.

Mr. BLOUNT. What is the feeling of the majority of the people here?

Mr. PARKER. Among the Hawaiians it is for the restoration of the Queen. That is my own feeling, and I think I speak for the people, too.

Mr. BLOUNT. You have a table of the registered native voters for 1890. What is the total vote there?

Mr. PARKER. About 9,000 voters in all. Out of that I will say if it was secured—a valid vote—out of 9,000 there would be 8,000 in favor of restoration.

Mr. BLOUNT. Native population?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLOUNT. How would you class all other voters besides those you have named?

Mr. PARKER. Foreign voters. I think they would be divided. I would not want to express my opinion. The majority would be for annexation. That is my opinion—among foreign voters.

Mr. BLOUNT. What would be your opinion as to the majority, if the 13,000 votes were all polled; how many of them would be for royalty, and how many against?

Mr. PARKER. I say in regard to royalty—I suppose out of 13,000, I would put it 10,000 for restoration.

Mr. BLOUNT. Suppose you take a little time and make some figures.

Mr. PARKER. There are 9,000 native voters. When I speak of natives I know, but when I talk of foreigners I am at a loss. I know most are for annexation, except perhaps a few English and other nationalities. The Englishmen are naturally prejudiced. I can speak for Hawaiians, but would not want to give my opinion on foreigners. I would put it, out of 9,554 native voters 8,500 would be in favor of it (royalty) and 1,000 against it, among Hawaiians. One-fourth of the foreigners would be for the restoration of the Queen, I think, but it might not be as much as that.

Mr. BLOUNT. You wanted to qualify a while ago in what you said about the restoration of the Queen.

Mr. PARKER. The restoration of the Queen under an American protectorate would be a more stable government than the old régime. There is a feeling that unless we are under some country like the United States it would be the same old revolutionary trouble coming up all the time. I do not think it would be a very stable government. There is a certain class of people here—a certain class like the Germans and Portuguese. They say, "Give us a revolution and it will give us something to do—give us a dollar and a half or two dollars a day." I understand the Provisional Government is paying \$40 a month and found. That class of people would sooner have a revolution night in and night out. So that I say I do not think it will ever be a stable government unless we are under a protectorate. If we are under a protectorate I say let it be the United States. I do not say this because you are the American Commissioner.

Mr. BLOUNT. Your idea is that a majority of the people are for the Queen, but that if the Queen were reinstated she would not be able to maintain permanent order here without the sanction of her authority by a protectorate, say, of the United States?

Mr. PARKER. That is what I think. I have not talked with the Queen on the subject; that would be my advice to her. I would not accept the same position I had before the revolution unless there was a protectorate. If she said: "I want you to be in the same position you

held before this revolution took place—minister of foreign affairs," I would say, "no; unless you have it under a protectorate." It is no use looking to England, Japan, France, or Germany. All our benefits are derived from the United States.

Mr. BLOUNT. What is the feeling of your people on the question of their right of suffrage?

Mr. PARKER. The right of suffrage means of course a great deal to the Hawaiian people. If they were admitted as the District of Columbia, which has no vote, the natives would not like it. It would be an eyesore to them. They want suffrage.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is there any apprehension in their minds about the question of suffrage?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; they are very well posted on that.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is there any apprehension that the friends of the Provisional Government contemplate any deprivation of the right of suffrage?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; it was given out that the natives could not be trusted and it was out in native papers just as quick as it was in other papers. There was a howl when they heard that; when young men, nursed by Hawaiian women, as they said, would ever live to work against the interests of Hawaiian people. I said to the people that we could not expect to be under a monarchical government all the time; a change is bound to come some day. Every day this thing becomes more apparent. The native race is decreasing every year.

Mr. BLOUNT. Would you please state the cause of that?

Mr. PARKER. That has been brought up in the legislature year after year, and all the conclusions we could come to was that we are like all dark races—that they go out when the white man comes in. It is a problem why we should die out. I have eight children, and many others have as many. If all other Kanakas should have two children each we should increase very much. I can not account for the decrease.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it a fact that they do not have so many children as other people here?

Mr. PARKER. Oh no; I can show you a dozen of my stamp. I have eight children, another five, and so on. I am seven-eighths native; my wife is seven-eighths. That is nearly all Hawaiian, with little foreign blood in it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Children are born, but not raised?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; they are careless. It is a customary thing for Hawaiian women to give birth to a child this morning and then ride out horseback in the afternoon. The better class, though, go under proper treatment. I have been married twenty-one years. With our first child my wife was in bed nine days. My aunt said, why should she lie in bed so long? When she gave birth to her first child she was out the next day.

The Hawaiians are good breeders, but they are careless. When the children get fevers they give them cold baths. When the smallpox was here, about 1881, some 400 or 500 natives died. Other nationalities very few. Natives will sit in draft or jump into a bath if they are fevered. They are very careless in that way.

Mr. BLOUNT. You said awhile ago that the native vote, as expressed in secret ballot, would not show the same opinion as if they were asked to sign a petition.

Mr. PARKER. It would never be the same.

Mr. BLOUNT. Why?

Mr. PARKER. You take the plantations. Every plantation has more or less men under them. They look up to the owner of an estate as to a little king, or as their guardian, and they would sign any petition that he wanted them to do. Mr. Spreckles has 300 native laborers. They would all favor the side he did. Mr. Rentre was in favor of restoring the Queen. Everyone of the people on his plantation signed a petition for restoration. They worshiped him. If I was for annexation, every one of the people in my employ would sign it. All laborers would do exactly as the overseers wanted. They say the Queen is our Queen. But supposing they had to do it in secret ballot; they would say, we want restoration. The Wilder Steamship Company, rank annexationists, employ natives. They could intimidate these natives. If you gave them a secret ballot they would vote as they felt.

I have carefully read the foregoing and find it to be a correct report of my interview with Col. Blount.

After the troops were landed I met Mr. Thurston, and laughing at me, he said, "Who ordered those troops ashore?" I replied, "I don't know. I suppose your committee of safety had it done."

My impression was that they were landed in the interest of the movement of the committee of safety.

SAMUEL PARKER.

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, *June 15, 1893.*

No. 40.

Statement of the Hawaiian Patriotic League.

His Excellency GROVER CLEVELAND,

President of the United States of America:

SIR: The undersigned are the officers and executive committee of the Hui Hawaiian Aloha Aina (Hawaiian Patriotic League), a political association, with branches in every district of the Kingdom, representing, together with a large following of foreigners, over 7,500 native-born Hawaiian qualified voters throughout the islands (out of a total of 13,000 electors), and to which is annexed a woman's branch of over 11,000 members.

This league was formed for the purpose of uniting the efforts of all who love this country as an independent commonwealth, and of insuring by all legitimate methods the perpetuation of the autonomy of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the restoration of its legitimate sovereign, Queen Liliuokalani, who was ruthlessly and wantonly deposed by a mob of foreign filibusters, abetted by the United States minister resident and shielded by the United States forces, which were by him landed on their behalf, in violation of all international laws.

The Queen, though having ample force to quell the insurgents, yielded her throne, not to them, but "to the superior forces of the United States," in order to avoid useless bloodshed. She then appealed to the Government of the great Republic for justice and redress, and she carefully instructed her people to quietly submit to the rule of the usurping Provisional Government pending the result of her appeal.

Our patriotic league, following the Sovereign's intentions, has also repeatedly warned its members to keep the peace, under every provocation, and await with patience the judgment of the United States Government; and while we can boast of having up to the present time successfully subdued every popular tendency for agitation or armed resistance, we must also proclaim, to the credit of the Hawaiian people, that they have behaved with a discipline, a decorum, and a forbearance which we believe no other nation on earth would have shown under similar circumstances, that of a country not conquered, but confiscated by a faction of aliens.

But it is now already several months that the Provisional Government have assumed the reins and instated, under the protection of the American flag, a true pretorian tyranny, without any regard for popular rights and wishes or for constitutional principles. And the people's patience is wearing out, looking anxiously for a solution from the United States Government (hitherto our great friend and constant protector) and expecting by every incoming mail some action, no sign of which is yet forthcoming.

In the mean while the situation here is growing highly unsatisfactory—every day worse—and loud complaints are heard from all sides. The Provisional Government have succeeded in making themselves unpopular even with their adherents, and their rule is becoming daily more odious to the natives, who are not even granted the shadow of a representation in their councils. The Hawaiians generally are being dismissed from public service to make room for hungry foreigners, adherents of the Provisional Government; and, as if to incite a revolt, the native feelings have been purposely aggravated by the desecration of the royal palace and by numerous other instances of petty despotism, which can not fail to be galling to the real citizens of this country. In their administration they are exceeding all the possible rights of a provisional government in repealing statutes made by the lawful representative Legislature and enacting an interminable string of new laws, some of which are simply useless or childish though vexatious, others really obnoxious. In their financial policy the Provisional Government compromise the future to meet the present extravagant wants, hoping that "Uncle Sam will pay the bills."

All public works and improvements are virtually at a standstill, whilst they are squandering the public funds in the maintenance of a mercenary soldiery, recruited from runaway sailors, escaped criminals from other countries, or other bad characters from the slums of San Francisco, who are extravagantly paid and live luxuriously at the expense of the honest taxpayer. And the money thus wasted could be used to much better advantage at the present time by furnishing useful work to the deserving and suffering laboring classes.

All these and other substantial grounds for the general discontent make it an uncontrovertible fact that the Provisional Government are incapable of maintaining themselves in power except through the help and propping up of the United States Government. Left to their own resources they would not be saved, even by their large force of alien mercenaries, who are their only supporters, but who remain so prudently, cautiously, intrenched in the royal palace, trembling every night for fear of some attack, the idea even of which has never yet been entertained by the royalists.

But the obvious and utter weakness and unpopularity of our self-assumed administration have thrown a general veil of uncertainty and

uneasiness on the whole country, whereby all transactions are paralyzed and the value of real estate reduced to naught, even the Government bonds, which have always been above par, having lost nearly 10 per cent. Every kind of business has become seriously depressed, the working classes are suffering for want of work, and the wheels of progress and industry are stopped, threatening stagnation and disaster, whereby all classes are becoming impatient, the natives chafing under the insults of the Provisional Government and beginning to talk of revolt, and the foreign element of our league beginning to press for relief from a situation which has evoked many bitter enmities.

To render the matter still more serious the time is waxing near when the taxes are becoming due, and there is a general disposition to refuse to pay any money to the present government until things are settled by the United States' decision. Of course a general refusal of taxes would precipitate serious complications; but, as the situation is now, already it is only through the greatest vigilance that the patriotic league manages to repress the feelings of its members. And if the present condition continues a while longer the result may be an outburst that the patriotic league, hitherto the leading influence of the country, will be unable to prevent, and lives and property may be jeopardized.

Truly, therefore, may it be said that the situation is growing intolerable and delay unbearable; and there will be, there can be, no relief until the United States Government has determined our future, and thereby a permanent legal government has been put in power here.

Under the circumstances, which the public press openly and justly qualifies as "disastrous and deplorable," we, the undersigned, are moved, in answer to our league's wish, to take the liberty of addressing your excellency, through your accredited minister here, Hon. J. H. Blount, and of respectfully saying that since the fate of our little kingdom and its inhabitants is in your hands, we do humbly pray that a speedy solution may be reached to avoid impending calamities, and so that we may once more enjoy the blessings of peace, prosperity, and a proper government.

That the natives have as yet been quiet, apparently apathetic, must not be construed as meaning that they are gradually accepting the new order of things, by which they are deprived of all their rights in their own country. They are simply waiting, in their simple faith in the generosity and honor of the most liberal and honorable Government of the world; and they expect *justice*, id est, *restoration* of their legitimate sovereign. And the American Government must now be sufficiently well informed of the enormous injustice committed against this defenseless and peaceful nation, so that it seems to us that little or no doubt can yet be entertained by any impartial mind as to what ought to be the proper course for dealing with the "faits accomplis" here, and no doubt as to the true royalist sentiments of the large majority of our people.

But owing, as we represent, to the gathering storm, all good citizens are anxious that no more delay than actually unavoidable should now occur in the settling of this matter; and, therefore, if it is considered by your Government necessary for the question to be referred to Congress, we do respectfully, but most earnestly, fervidly beseech, in the name of our people, that it be submitted if possible to this now coming extra session.

And we further pray that Almighty God will vouchsafe you and

your Government his divine guidance in assisting you to deal fairly and justly with an unhappy nation, whose sole hope lies in you.

Most respectfully, your excellency's humble servants,

(Signed)

J. A. CUMMINGS, *Honorary President.*
 JOSEPH NAWAHI, *President.*
 JNO. E. BUSH, *Vice-President.*
 J. W. BIHIKANA, *Vice-President.*
 JOHN LOLEKAULUKOU, *Vice-President.*
 J. E. KAUNAUIANO, *Vice-President.*
 JAMES K. MERSEBURG.
 JOHN KAPUMAWAHO PRENDERGAST.
 ABRAHAM K. PALEKALUHI.
 SAM'L K. AKI.
 H. S. SWINTON.
 JAS. K. KAULIA, *Secretary.*
 S. M. KAAUKAI.
 W. L. HOLOKAHIKI.
 JNO. SAM. KIKUKAHIKO.
 L. W. P. KAUEALII.
 J. KEKIPI.
 F. S. KEIKI.
 J. MAHIAI KANEAKUA.

HONOLULU, July 15, 1893.

No. 41.

Statement of the Hawaiian Patriotic League.

MEMORIAL ON THE HAWAIIAN CRISIS

I.—*Generative causes.*

The strongest argument of the men who, for personal aims, crave for the overthrow of the Hawaiian national monarchy, is that the natives are incapable of self-government, and to this flimsy and false argument the United States minister resident, J. L. Stevens, as a complaisant echo, adds that the natives are always "misled by unscrupulous hoodlum foreigners," "unscrupulous hoodlum" being apparently Mr. Stevens' pet diplomatic qualification for every man who does not agree with his diplomatic friends and accomplices.

The historian's ready answer to these calumnies is that ever since the pacification of the country, which followed Kamehameha's conquests, the natives when left alone have had a most satisfactory, peaceful, and progressive Government, while all the dissensions, riots, and troubles recorded in the annals of these islands have ever been *by or through* foreigners seeking to wrench the power and wealth from the poor natives, these being ever the peaceful and patient sufferers thereby, not "misled," but terrorized and oppressed.

As it can be seen, even in Alexander's *Brief History*, all political difficulties experienced by our native Government in the past, up to the present one, have been through foreign extortion and violence, beginning with the outrages committed by whalers and lawless sailors or adventurers down to the intemperate domineering pretensions of for-

eign representatives, so that a rapid review of ancient history will serve to shed a true light on the present situation.

The unjustifiable seizure of the islands by Lord Paulet (1843), some features of which are not very different from our present situation, was brought about by the high-handed enforcement of trumped-up charges and claims by the English consul Charlton, and the French incident in 1849 was caused by Consul Dillon's arrogance. As Alexander's history states it, "for years the Honolulu community was kept in a state of turmoil by consular grievances," and in 1846 a table of such grievances, prepared by order of the Legislature, "formed a roll 120 feet long." Every consul, and more prominently at one time the United States Commissioner Brown, insisted on "the right of diplomatic interference with the internal affairs of the Kingdom," and of "ready access to the person of the Sovereign." (Alex., 261.) It would now seem that in those early times the various powers represented here were vying with each other to seize any pretext which might give them a shadow of right for taking possession of these desirable and coveted islands, so that the late policy of Minister Stevens and Capt. Wiltse, of lying in ambush and waiting for the most trivial pretext to jump on the native Government, has not even the merit of being original with them.

Fortunately, in the past, the various great powers have been generous, disinterested, and honorable enough to disown the political cupidity of their agents, and this is one of the reasons why the natives to-day are so patient and peaceful; they know that the great American Republic is the most honorable and generous of all nations, and takes the lead in all just and liberal ideas, moreover they have such an inborn faith in and respect for the United States Government, whom they have been taught by their early teachers to regard as their best friend and natural protector, that they can not be otherwise than confident that history will only repeat itself and that their precious independence will not be less respected by America than it has been by England and France.

This confidence is all the more justifiable, as this is not the first time that the country has been disturbed by some annexation craze. In 1853 things here reached such a crisis that the foreigners then living in Honolulu, and "especially men recently arrived from California thought that 'the times were ripe,' and organized with the view of forcing on King Kamehameha III, annexation to the United States; 'petitions in favor of it were circulated and signed and strong commercial interests used for its furtherance;" and stranger yet to say the King got to be "so tired of demands made on him by foreign powers, and of threats by filibusters from abroad, and by conspirators at home to overturn the national government" that he himself declared in favor of annexation "as a refuge from impending dangers." (Alexander.) But fortunately, at that time, the last remaining faithful missionaries of the old stock strongly opposed the project, believing "that its effects would be disastrous to the native race" (Alex., 277), and the honest American diplomats of the period indorsed that opinion. And here, let it be said to their honor, the early American missionaries have ever been found on the side of the rightful native authorities, advising them and helping them to resist foreign aggressions, and being allowed in consequence full political control. Even to-day, faithful to their original mission, the Roman Catholic and Anglican clergies are still found on the side of the native independent government.*

* The fact of these two religious denominations not being favorable to annexation may make it interesting to add here a statistical note about the approximate distri-

But the descendants of the early American missionaries have turned against the honorable traditions of their fathers; they only attend to the natives now to negotiate some ironclad mortgage deed, and they no longer care whether or not the "effects of annexation would be disastrous to the native race," although the old reasons therefor are just as patent now as forty years ago. Further than that, they have not only ceased to be the trustworthy advisers and helpers of royal authority, but they have been bent solely on using all their moral and financial influence to grasp the administrative power for the furtherance of their own ends and interests, and from these men arise all the present troubles.

This change in the morality of the missionary descendants came to its climax through sugar, and it may here be said that sugar has been a curse to these favored islands, making some few men—foreigners—immensely rich, but impoverishing the masses, the natives especially, and bringing about corruption and greed, and political venality unknown to the converts of the early missionaries.

The sugar greed was of long and gradual growth, the early efforts to give it an impetus by appealing to American generosity having repeatedly failed through the prudence of Congress; and it can be safely said that just prior to the season of extraordinary financial prosperity that followed the treaty at last granted in 1876, by the kindness of our great and good friend, the Republic of the United States of America, all the old foreign complications had worn out, so that the native Government was running smoothly and our people at large were living in peace and in greater harmony than they have ever since. It was a time when we had less wealth and less selfishness, but more quiet contentment.

The divergence of sentiment and lack of harmony came about through the ambition, the sordid desire of foreign residents and sons of missionaries to accumulate great wealth and grow suddenly rich. To accomplish this end the few who had the advantage in lands, money, and friends saw that the main point for them was to control the Government, so as to secure the special legislation necessary to carry out their designs, and especially to procure the indispensable cheap labor and keep them down under labor laws equivalent to slavery. To this faction this country owes the undesirable and un-American introduction of Chinese, Japanese, and the still more ignorant and illiterate Portuguese. Millions of public money, under the fallacious pretext of "encouragement to immigration," have been spent for the sole purpose of bringing in laborers for the planters, and even the voyage around the world of King Kalakaua was made use of to try to obtain Indian

bution of the population according to religious beliefs, and it must be taken as very significant that, in the last census, the religious element was left out altogether, for the reason that the missionary party who presided over the operations of the census could not allow their decline to be made public together with the ascendancy of their rivals. In the absence of other authorities, the Catholic clergy claim 30,000 adherents on these islands, about 18,000 being natives, out of a total of 40,000; and as the Anglicans, Mormons and Seventh-Day Adventists also claim quite a number of converts, it is thus seen that very considerably less than 22,000 natives remain under the spiritual sway of the annexationists' faction, and, moreover, it could easily be ascertained from the missionary publications that, within the last few years, the Hawaiian communicants reported by their churches have diminished in the proportion of about 90 per cent (2,200 against 21,600), the reason of this is solely the anti-patriotic anti-Hawaiian anti-loyal attitude assumed by the missionary churches and their schools, wherein teaching the children to pray for the country and sovereign has been discontinued. Even in the Kamehameha industrial school, founded with the money of the last of that illustrious native family, the pupils are taught rank republicanism and disloyalty to their country and race, and forced to sign the annexation pledge.

coolies under British jurisdiction, which would have made this country practically an English colony, had it not been for the veto of the American Government, and yet the idea was not entirely abandoned, for only a year ago Mr. Marsden, one of the commissioners who went to Washington to beg for annexation, was sent to India to try to revive the matter, and he reported in favor of it.

This goes to show the reason why so many annexationists in the country have alternately shifted from loyal Hawaiians to rank annexationists, according to what appeared most expedient for their purposes or gain; thus it can be safely said that few indeed is the number of those who want annexation for mere patriotism; for the majority, it is essentially a question of dollars and cents they think they can make out of Uncle Sam, and even to-day, many of the hottest annexationists would turn right over to any other power if they had any prospect of making more money by such a change.

Through the American reciprocity treaty of 1876, which was granted essentially with the idea of benefiting especially the aborigines, American gold began to roll in by millions into the coffers of the planters, who were thus enabled to pay usurious interests to our bankers and capitalists, large commissions (as high as 7 per cent) on all sales and purchases to the commission merchants, the balance of the profits still constituting princely incomes, with which the planters were enabled to travel abroad with their families, while the silent authors of this untold wealth—the poor laborers—got barely enough to cover their nakedness and food enough to give them sufficient strength for their daily task.

This inhuman and immoral system could not last eternally, and the masses, including the foreign laborers, realizing its injustice, gradually obtained control of the Government; this, moreover, culminating in 1886, in the Gibson anti-missionary administration.

When the planters and their missionary friends realized that the administrative power was slipping out of their hands, through the fact that the Kanaka, in spite of all coaxing and bribery used, would not always vote to suit the selfish wishes of that class, nor submit himself to their greedy tyranny, it was deemed a necessity to down them, and from that time dates the determination on the part of the wealthy foreign class to gradually rob the native of his political manhood, which he knew too well how to use; and this policy culminated in the assertion made by Commissioner Thurston, in the states, that henceforth Kanakas must be totally disfranchised and not allowed to vote, otherwise the infinitely small minority of the sugar revolutionists would be swamped. And this is how and why the Kanakas are incapable of self-government.

At the same time the sugar oligarchy began to look out for a political change that would bring their waning power back to them. They thought that they would find the desired goal in annexation, through which they could use the United States as their supporter. Conspiracies were then initiated for the purpose of bringing about annexation, and were continued for over three years against the same King Kalakaua who had been instrumental in obtaining the long-wished-for treaty for the planters. This flagrant ingratitude culminated in 1887 by the first revolution, planned and carried out exclusively by a handful of foreigners at the instigation of the missionary sugar-planters and capitalists, who formed that party afterwards known under the deceptive name of "reform party." Through the adroitness of the King,

this movement was only partially successful, inasmuch as the overthrow of the monarchy, then contemplated, could not be accomplished.

It, however, gave a very severe blow to public liberties and to equal rights, because a reactionary constitution was forced upon the masses, which has since been the law of the land without having ever been submitted to the approval or ratification of the people; and its modification has been strenuously opposed by our plutocrats, because they knew, from its inception, that the said document was a fraud and a snare. It professed to be liberal, but it was about as deceptive a document as the character of the men who inspired it. It disfranchised a large number of natives, while it gave to utter strangers, and to all the illiterate Portuguese then under the influence of sugar-planters and others, the unprecedented right of voting without having to take any allegiance to the Government. The reaction, which naturally followed the violent inauguration of such a retrograde factum, led to the second revolution, attempted in 1889, by some natives under R. W. Wilcox—the only instance in Hawaiian history in which the natives tried to assert themselves politically without foreign help.

The failure of this movement did not deter the natives, but aroused in the masses a strong feeling of opposition to the reform cabinet then in power, which was formed by the very same men who headed the present rebellion. This opposition of the masses showed itself very emphatically in the regular elections following, notwithstanding the inequalities of the franchise, which virtually gave the wealthy classes the control of half of the law-making power of the land; the Hawaiian people, whom the missionary sugar-planters had aimed to control in this manner, repeatedly carried a majority at the polls in all the elections since 1890, and the only method left to the reform party to attain the ends to control the Government has been by bribery and corruption, with that very wealth which the generosity of the American people had given to Kalakaua for the general benefit of all his subjects. Thus the good that the great American nation had intended for the Hawaiians turned out in the hands of a few greedy foreigners to be the means of oppressing those very same natives.

The flagrant inequalities thrust by this revolutionary constitution on the native people, thus disfranchised in their own country, has been the bone of contention ever since. The Hawaiians have been as a unit at the polls in carrying the representative seats for the special object of obtaining a new constitution doing away with the injustice embodied in the present one. They have, for four years, demanded the enactment of a law by the Legislature, authorizing the election of delegates to a constitutional convention, for the framing of a really liberal organic law. In seeking a new constitution, the natives do not want to disfranchise anyone or put any qualification upon a voter other than that he should be a resident in the country for a certain period of time and should know how to read and write in his mother tongue; but they do want equal rights for all.

However, every honest effort made by the native Hawaiians to secure a liberal change of this nature, a change that would give freedom and equality to every soul that came freely into this country, has been defeated by the most unprincipled means that men can be capable of employing; and to their shame, the missionary sugar planters, the descendants of men who preached the eternal principles of good morals and claimed freedom and equality as their birthright, are the very men who stand in the way of the fulfillment of these liberal principles. But the very people who have been represented to the great American

nation as being illiterate, illiberal, and not worthy of sympathy, not worthy of the manly right to vote, are about the only ones here who are struggling for liberty and equality to-day, and these are the much traduced Hawaiians. Thus the political situation here for years past can be clearly defined as follows: The Hawaiians have been patiently and peacefully contending to regain by legal means a just political status, whereby all the foreigners would also enjoy equal liberal rights; while the reform party have been intent on realizing, by violent and arbitrary ways, the gradual but total disfranchisement of the natives, and accessorially the control of the poorer classes of foreigners, by capricious property qualifications.

In other words, the sugar oligarchy have sought to override all true constitutional principles and to realize the un-American phenomena of creating a plutocracy of their class, to whom all other classes and interests should be politically and materially subservient.

In this they may have been encouraged by the docility of the Hawaiians in general; but certainly neither the revolution of 1887 nor the *coup de main* of 1893 have in any way been revolts against unfair, oppressive administration, while they may be fairly characterized as desperate grabs for personal power, which the plutocratic faction could not obtain by fair, honest means at the ballot box.

Furthermore, the policy of the reform party may be said to be one of gross ingratitude, in the sense that the native legislators—of whom it is safe to say that they always acted with decorum and intelligence equal to any State legislature in the Union—have never refused to enact laws or appropriations for the benefit of the sugar industry, which has been fostered in every practical way. Our statute books are full of liberal laws, and in nowise oppressive, showing ample evidence of the intelligent and progressive character of our Government, and of generous provisions for the protection of foreign capital and fostering of industries conducted here by foreign investors. In no other part of the world, under aboriginal rule, have foreigners prospered so well as here. Even the system of taxation ought to satisfy any men but selfish plutocrats; for it is the masses, the poor people, who bear the principal weight of direct and indirect taxation (which is heavier than in the United States), while taxes on property are very light and easily evaded; planters have never been taxed anywhere near to a just proportion to the actual values, and, moreover, their taxation has been reduced by 25 per cent since the McKinley act came into effect, while no reduction of any kind has been granted to the other classes.

Having regained temporary possession of the power, through the revolution of 1887, the sugar missionaries dropped for a time their annexation schemes, and merely tried to use the United States to keep themselves in power, reserving annexation as a desperate expedient. This is proved by the treaty which they attempted to negotiate in 1889-'90, in which a special clause, now known as the "bayonet clause," allowed them to call at any time for the landing of the United States troops, to protect them and any cabinet they might uphold. This treaty was rendered impossible by the turn of the elections in 1890, in which the sugar planters and missionary influence combined were downed by the strong will of the natives, allied with the foreign workingmen and mechanics, who opposed the coolie-labor policy of the wealthy class.

The reform party then turned again to their old schemes of plotting for annexation. Rumors of conspiracies and expected uprisings on their part have been rife ever since 1890, and the liberal results of the various

elections of 1892 only increased their desperate activity. Mr. Thurston, the reform star, was openly accused of being the leader of these conspiracies, one positive manifestation of which was the movement instigated by the reform party in May, 1892, which led to the arrest of R. W. Wilcox and V. V. Ashford, both of whom were saved from legal punishment through the influence of the leaders and "respectable men" of the sugar missionaries, who feared being exposed and implicated in the movement.

Unfortunately the popular party was divided into two factions, making three with the sugar missionary reform party. These divisions rendered the last Legislature utterly impotent to carry out strict party measures, and was the means of prolonging the session to an unprecedented length of time, about eight months. It also raised the expectations of the annexationists and plotters to the highest pitch, which increased when they found a willing abettor in the person of the United States minister, Stevens. Hence they resolved to seize the first plausible excuse, the first practical reason for another revolution; and unfortunately this apparent reason and pretext was given to them by the Queen herself, in her endeavors to meet the popular will.

It must be inserted here, that it was only because the immortal principles of justice, liberty, and equality were violated or ignored in the Bayonet Constitution of 1887 that the Queen to satisfy her own people undertook to suggest to her constitutional advisers, the cabinet, the promulgation of a new constitution embodying these desirable features and addressed to the masses, not to a mere faction. Upon the advice of her ministers she withdrew the proposition and requested her people to be patient, to forbear, to wait until a legitimate time, when she hoped they would be enabled to secure the object of their wishes. This act of the Sovereign, too liberal to be forgiven by the reactionary reform party, drove them to a desperation, because it would have forever thrown the control of the Government out of the hands of the wealthy minority. Therefore the missionary offsprings and their plutocratic friends and followers used it as a pretext for robbing the last and only vestige of right left to the Hawaiian in his own country, his independent nationality, his flag, denying him even the claim to be a human being.

Now to show what authority the insurgents had to dictate in the matter it will be in order to resort to statistical points. The last official census, made in 1890, corrected to date, puts the total population of the group at 96,075. Out of this number 15,570 are Chinese, 18,474 Japanese—two races not allowed as yet to take a share in local politics, though the Japanese Government now claims for its citizens equal rights with other foreigners. The balance of the population is distributed into natives and half-castes, 40,622 plus 7,495 Hawaiian born of foreign parents and into 13,912 foreigners, among whom the Americans count only a total of 1,928 "of all ages and sexes," the British 1,344, the Germans 1,034, the Portuguese 8,602, and other nationalities 1,004. Thus the total American element all over the islands amounts to only about two-hundredths of the whole population and one-seventh of the total number of foreigners.

More especially in Honolulu, which is only part of the country that participated in the insurrection, the Americans number only 767 males, as against 2,003 other male foreigners (among which are no less than 529 English) and against 6,902 male natives. Furthermore, all our American residents are *not* in favor of annexation; it is only a fraction of this small number of 767 Americans, with a few Germans and Portu-

guesse (therefore a minority unsupported by the rest of the population), who have accomplished the overthrow of the recognized native Government, through the American official influence.

Can it be possible that so small a faction, and so heterogeneous at that, whose only force is to be loud-mouthed and utterly regardless of veracity, should be allowed to impose their whims on the rest of the population, and rule it contrary to all American ideas of popular government?

To cover their numerical weakness, the annexationists' faction have tried to awaken American sympathies by alluding to the necessity of protecting American capital, which they claim to be so largely invested in these islands. To give plausibility to this assertion, tables have been prepared, purporting (on estimations, not on any positive documents) to show that the total capital engaged in sugar (in corporations and nonincorporated plantations) amounted to \$33,420,990, out of which \$24,735,610 were claimed to be American, or about four-fifths; \$6,038,130 British, \$2,008,600 German, \$226,280 native, and \$299,000 of other nationalities. This fantastic array is contradicted by the mere fact that out of a total of \$537,757 for internal taxes, Americans paid only \$139,998 (official figures), or one-fourth, while, according to the above statement, American plantation stock alone, outside of commercial firms and other American taxable property, ought to have paid over \$247,000. But even allowing that a large portion of the sugar interests may be *apparently in American hands*, it is far from correct to call it American capital.

It is an undeniable fact that outside of Mr. Claus Spreckels, of California, no American has ever brought into this country any capital worth mentioning, but many have sent away fortunes made here; most of our present American capitalists, outside of sons of missionaries, came here as sailors or school-teachers, some few as clerks, others as mechanics, so that, even if now they do own or manage, or have their names in some way connected with property or corporations, this does not make their wealth of American origin. Those who are now independent run their plantations or business firms on money made here, out of the Hawaiian people and from Hawaiian soil, through coolie labor; the others are simply running on capital borrowed principally from English or German capitalists, and their concerns should be more justly called English or German capital because, in case of bankruptcy, such capital would really be lost, not American capital.

The local Cæsus, American by birth, the banker, C. R. Bishop, came here poor and started his fortune by marrying the wealthiest native princess, whose lands and income allowed him to duplicate it by banking on Hawaiian capital; surely his can not be termed American capital. The conclusion of all this must then be, that certainly American capital and interests here can be cheerfully acknowledged as very large and important, and entitled, like all other foreign capital and interests, to every consideration and protection; but American annexation can not be justified on the sole ground of the asserted extreme preponderance of such American capital, or on the pretension of that capital to be entitled to special or exclusive protection or favor, not any more than German or English planters would be entitled to ask for annexation to their countries on the same grounds.

II.—*Development.*

The phase by which the budding conspiracies of the reform party bloomed out into open rebellion can not be better compared than to the filibustering schemes of the well-known Walker and other historical desperadoes, with this difference, however, that all those expeditions were made without participation of any United States official, the United States Government, on the contrary, making every effort to check and frustrate those attempts against international laws, whilst the Hawaiian crisis has been helped, promoted, precipitated, encouraged, and countenanced by two representatives of the United States Government. Moreover, it can be boldly asserted that the Honolulu filibusters (for they repeatedly admitted it themselves) would never have dared to attempt their uprising without the moral stimulus and promises of the United States minister, nor would they have had strength to carry it out successfully against the Queen's well-armed forces and the numerous volunteers ready to fight for her, nor could they have maintained themselves one day in power, without the material armed support of the United States troops on shore and the guns of the U. S. S. *Boston* trained on the town.

Therefore, this military interference and aid to a mob of filibusters can only be qualified as an overt act of piracy by a United States officer against a defenseless friendly government. The whole proceedings are the most outrageous example known in modern times of naval forces abusing their power without urgent cause and without previous declaration of war. If sustained by the American Government the action of Capt. Wiltse will be a precedent that will set to naught all international rights, all security of weak powers against their more powerful neighbors; henceforth any group of lawless, quarrelsome foreigners residing in any port of other nations will be justified in raising a riot on the most flimsy pretext, and then calling on warships of their own nationality to help them to take possession of, "annex" the place, against the rights and wishes of the aborigines. It will then only be a question of the survival of the strongest, of possible application wherever a weak native government or a pacific population can be cowed by a foreign element sufficiently strong or enterprising; but what renders the facts still worse in our case, is that they have been the result of a long premeditated policy.

The extreme intimacy of Minister Stevens with the various members of the Reform party, to the exclusion of all men belonging to other parties, had been remarked even before Kalakaua's death, and it was common talk that plotting accompanied dining at the United States legation in Nuuanu street. It was whispered with glee by the Reform partisans that Stevens had been sent here purposely to promote annexation, which the death of Kalakaua seemed to facilitate, hence it is not surprising now to note that, from the start of her reign, Stevens shows himself inimical to the Queen, evidently as reflecting the opinions of his Reform friends. Far from acting like the representative of a friendly government, his relations with the Hawaiian administration were ever unfriendly, meddling, and quarrelsome to such a degree that, at one time, the chairman of the committee on foreign affairs of the Legislature suggested that he be given his passport, and it is greatly to be deplored that the suggestion was not acted upon. The address he had the presumption of making to the Queen, on her accession, was of the nature of a threatening lecture from a rigid Sunday-school teacher to a very vicious child, and was as ungentlemanly as it was undiplomatic,

according to the universal rule which prohibits every diplomatic agent to interfere in the internal affairs of a foreign country.

Then claiming the old forgotten assumption of "ready access," so abusively used here by consuls fifty years ago, he took the pretext of some flimsy newspaper article to make a display of his ignorance of common etiquette as well as of his spiteful feelings, by forcing himself on the Queen and trying to make Her Majesty and her ministers personally responsible for that article, which eventually did not justify any ordinary legal proceedings.

During the various changes of cabinet that marked the end of the Legislature, Mr. Stevens was satisfied only when reform missionary men were chosen for ministers, and his extraordinary antimonarchic oration on Decoration day, as much as his attitude towards the Parker cabinet, during the days that preceded the revolt, plainly show how biased he was, and bent on embarrassing the Hawaiian Government.

The other actor in our tragedy, Capt. Wiltse, from the time Admiral Brown left him in charge of the station, made no secret of his purpose to secure annexation, and boasted that he would not leave before it was accomplished; if he did not keep his word in its entirety, it is certainly not through any fault of his. During the parliamentary changes of cabinet he openly stated that, in case the Queen did not select for her ministers Reform men, or men satisfactory to that party and to Minister Stevens, the *Boston* troops would be landed to interfere, and thereby bring about annexation. Even the foreign diplomats were aware of those boasts. Unfortunately Wiltse's utterances were not taken into sufficient consideration and treated seriously by the Hawaiian Government, but were deemed only to be expressions of intemperate language of an eccentric officer, not to use any harsher term, whom the American correspondents were making fun of.

But there is no doubt now that at all times he has been an extremely industrious intermeddler in Hawaiian politics, frequently lowering his high position by interviewing hackmen on the streets on local affairs. Further than this, the officers of the *Boston* will probably testify to the fact that several times during the legislative period, and evidently in accord with a preconceived plan of seizing any favorable incident or pretext, the United States troops were kept in readiness for landing when there was not the smallest sign of disturbance or even excitement in town or in the Legislature.

And it must here be recorded that Capt. Wiltse made a veritable debauch of military demonstrations during the Legislature, landing troops and guns several times a week, and parading them through the town as no other foreign vessel had ever done before, with the undoubted intention of intimidating the native population and preparing future events.

After the exhaustive accounts that have been published of the facts of the revolution, and especially after the printed statements made by the Queen and her envoy, P. Neumann, and by the attorney-general, Peterson, the various details of which appear to us perfectly exact and correct, we do not deem it to be in our province to offer a new narration, but simply to point out certain facts and their signification in the interest of the people we represent.

Of the new constitution, which has been the apparent motive for the explosion of the long prepared revolution we have already stated, that it was desired and demanded by nine-tenths of the native population; moreover, to make the position of the Queen plainer, it may be well to recall the fact that in this country all previous constitutions had been

granted by the free will of the different sovereigns, until the last one 1887, was extorted out of Kalakaua by an armed mob of foreigners led by the same men who directed the present rebellion, so that the Queen might have considered herself perfectly justified by the local precedents as to her power of granting a new constitution at the request of her own people.

Rumors of this new constitution had been current during the session of the Legislature, so that the surprise assumed by the reform party was not genuine, and it may be well to ask what there was in the document prepared for the Queen so *utterly obnoxious* to the reform party, and how they could possibly know what its contents were, since its text has not been published?

The first outcome of the Queen's attempt to proclaim her new constitution (Saturday, January 14), was a meeting in the office of W. O. Smith, of about 70 members of the reform party, which afterwards they had the impudence of calling a public meeting (!) and in which it was decided to support the cabinet against the Queen (for the maintenance of the old constitution), and to exact from Her Majesty "guarantees" against any further move in the matter on her part. But this conservative decision did not satisfy the firebrands who wanted annexation, and who immediately held another meeting secretly, about two dozen of them, at Mr. Thurston's house, in which a secret "committee of public safety" was appointed, composed of about the same incorrigible demagogues who had concocted and led the "1887 revolution."

This committee then ordered a mass meeting at the armory (Monday, 18th), to which from 700 to 800 foreigners responded, many of whom were utter strangers, tourists, sailors from the merchantmen in port, and many others only present through mere curiosity, so that it is safe to say that in this meeting (which was going to have such an influence on the political destiny of the whole country) not half of the men present were legal voters, the natives especially being absolutely absent and assembled elsewhere. The object of this meeting was clearly stated as merely to give authority—or a shadow of it—to the self-appointed 13 members of the "committee of public safety," and to empower this committee to demand and obtain from the Queen "assurance and guarantees of a better government," *id est*, a promise to respect the 1887 bayonet constitution, this pet offspring of the reform party. Nothing more was demanded of the public at the meeting, as the perusal of the speeches there made by the most responsible speakers, Messrs. Wilder, Glade, Young, and others, will conclusively show. Not the smallest allusion was made to an impending change of government, and not one man in the audience, outside of the leaders, did guess that the resolution then submitted for approval meant anything beyond "guarantees from the Queen for good government and preservation of order."

And certainly not one dreamed that in the innocent looking tail of this resolution, running as follows: "And we do hereby further empower such committee to further consider the situation and further devise such ways and means as may be necessary to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order, and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii," there could be meant a dethronement of the Hawaiian monarchy by a clique of foreigners without any submission to or indorsement by the voters at large; and worse than that, a subsequent wild rush for annexation to the United States without even consulting the whole foreign element. We claim that, had this meeting realized that such were the intentions of the self-appointed committee of public safety, the revolution would not have been carried, or at least

only an infinitesimal minority would have backed it. But this meeting in itself was only representative of a mere fraction of the population, for, at the same hour, at Palace Square, another meeting of between five and six thousand natives and loyal foreigners cordially supported the Queen, accepting her apology for withdrawing her constitution and her promise of leaving the matter to be accomplished constitutionally.

Thus the majority of the population of the town was plainly with the monarchy, and the Provisional Government, which was subsequently appointed by the committee of public safety, represents but the arbitrary assumption of a clique, with no popular backing. We claim that they can sustain themselves through force and only so long as no appeal is made to the electors, but soon as an election be held not one of the members of the Provisional Government would receive even a decent minority of votes, for they only represent the old reform party—that party defeated at the polls in 1890 and 1892, and who is now in power through a surprise under false pretenses. The utter weakness of the Provisional Government and of the party back of it was unmistakably shown on the day of the proclamation (Tuesday, 17th), when the whole population ought to have been in arms if they had been in sympathy with the insurgents (as falsely represented in America); while on the contrary, it was with the utmost difficulty that fifty ill-armed men could be mustered to march on the Government house, for a cash consideration, and with the positive understanding that in case of failure they could take refuge behind the files of United States marines, and from there on board of the *Boston*.

What was the attitude of Minister Stevens during the leavening of the revolution will be better gathered from the official documents and affidavits of the Queen, her ministers, and her marshal. We need only, in the name of the people, ask that this diplomat should be made to answer positively *why* he ordered the landing of the *Boston* troops, right after the two meetings above mentioned had so peacefully transacted their business and so quietly dispersed? There was not the smallest sign of excitement, the whole population manifested only the most pacific disposition, everyone being under the impression that, with the work of these two meetings and the adoption of their resolutions, the whole matter had come to an end, and that things would be satisfactorily and peacefully settled between the Queen, her ministers, and the self-appointed committee of public safety.

Especially the natives, from whom alone any fear could have been entertained of "riot or danger to persons and property" (for such has been Mr. Stevens' flimsy excuse) were exceptionally quiet or even indifferent, and they are not a fighting race; no groups were seen in the streets, the royal troops had quietly laid their arms as usual in the barracks; there was no display of police forces, and not a shadow of danger breathed in the whole atmosphere, so that the United States troops had no business on shore. Mr. Stevens then refused to give officially any reasons for this landing, and it has since been said that it was executed at the request of the self-appointed committee of public safety, who had yet no legal standing, this going to show that, at that early date (16th) Stevens was already disposed to acknowledge their authority and attend to their wishes in preference to deferring to the regular and legal Government.

The landing was made without any previous official notification, an act contrary to all international rule, and it was evidently precipitated by the fear that, in the meantime, the Queen might have proclaimed martial law, which would have made the position more embarrassing,

and probably would have prevented any further complication. We say, therefore, that the landing of the troops was a direct violation of all civilized laws, and ordered for no other purpose than that of helping the brooding insurrection. The further facts of the force being made to occupy the Arion Hall, alongside the Government houses and opposite the palace, when other buildings (the two armories, and the new shed in construction on Merchant street) were available, shows that the intention was to command the Royal Palace and interfere with the movements of the Royal troops, so as to render possible the seizure of the public treasury, and the farce of proclaiming the new Government, although it was reported that Mr. Stevens had promised to recognize their proclamation whenever it was made from any building in town.

The official documents and the examination of witnesses will show that when the proclamation was made by the armed mob at the Government house, and there recognized by the United States representatives, the Queen's full force, with artillery and Gatling, were still in possession of the palace and barracks and of the strong police station, and this last could not have been taken without a severe siege which the Provisional Government alone was utterly incapable to undertake and carry out; therefore, the legal Hawaiian Government was still *de facto* in power and able to maintain their situation, and Mr. Stevens has willfully prevaricated in his *assertion* to the contrary. It was only when it became known that Mr. Stevens had declared that he would recognize and protect against the Queen any government formed by any group of what he would consider (as to him) "responsible citizens," that the Queen, her Government, and her numerous partisans surrendered to avoid useless bloodshed, and surrendered under protest, not to the insignificant Provisional Government, but to the superior forces of the United States warship.

At that time, the natives would have shown fight, but all their leaders urged upon them to keep quiet, as everything was left in the hands of their constant protector, Uncle Sam, who would see that justice be duly rendered; and most admirably, most deservedly, quiet they have kept ever since, under severe provocation, but confident in American honor and impartiality, that justice would be done.

As soon as all danger had disappeared by the surrender of the Hawaiian Government, a couple of hundred men, all foreigners, and principally penurious Germans and Portuguese, flocked to help the new Provisional Government and take the place of the disbanded Hawaiian guards; but this was not done out of sympathy for the movement, and still less out of a wish for annexation (the possibility of which had not yet permeated the public as being the saving anchor for a weak usurping Government). No, the adhesions to the Provisional Government were merely out of personal convenience, and their number only goes to show, not the popularity of the reform filibusters, but simply how many men there were in town out of employment, who gladly jumped at the chance of gaining a salary.

As the "Liberal," an uncontrovertible authority in the matter, said: "The revolution was a Godsend to many people out of work (from the results of decrease in business through the McKinley bill), who for weeks had been destitute; they shouldered their guns to fight for bread as much as anything else, and while the guard was maintained (by the Provisional Government) they had a very congenial employment and a good pay." Very good indeed for these foreigners, but we Hawaiians take this occasion for protesting against the lavish expendi-

ture of public funds, made from a nearly bankrupt treasury, for the maintenance of an extravagantly large, useless, and dangerous military establishment of armed aliens who have no vested interests in the country, mere mercenaries, officered by men known for the hatred they bear against the Hawaiian people. We protest all the more because the very men who thus squander the people's money on several hundreds of unnecessary play soldiers, are the very same ones who, in the last legislature, ridiculed and opposed a total of sixty men for the Queen's guard and purposely reduced the police force.

We must here dwell on the fact that no Hawaiians, even from among those few who are said (with great flourish of trumpets) to favor the insurrection, enlisted in the Provisional Government Army, in spite of all pay and uniform allurements; but, on the contrary, we must take good note of the fact that the Hawaiians of the old royal band refused, to a man, to continue their service under the Provisional Government, preferring starvation prospects to perjuring their loyalty; they started an independent organization, with instruments paid with their own money, and the people show their appreciation of the boys' noble and disinterested fidelity by patronizing their concerts in unusual crowds. And this may be taken as a good sign of the general feelings of the natives against the Provisional Government sprung on them by their old enemies, the Reform party.

But eight days had not yet elapsed before the loyalty, fidelity and patriotism of the incongruous, discordant crowd, who supported the Provisional Government manifested itself by dissensions running riot, to such a point that the only manner of saving the new order of things was to implore Mr. Stevens for a declaration of American protectorate. Since this protectorate has been withdrawn the Provisional Government have certainly had no trouble in maintaining themselves, but simply through the fact that the natives are quietly and peacefully awaiting for the decision of the United States.

It would be foreign to our aim here to follow the Provisional Government in its subsequent career of despotism and intimidation practiced in the name of American liberty and under the protection of American bayonets.

It will suffice to say that we, Hawaiians, do not and can not contentedly acknowledge the right of a faction of turbulent foreigners to dictate in our country for the satisfaction of their greedy selfishness and lust of power; but we are ever ready to bow and submit to the rule of the majority, whenever legally expressed, and we would willingly abide by the decision of a plebiscite, honorably and fairly carried out, if such was the will of America. Therefore, we proclaim that we have not and never will recognize the present Provisional Government, a government sprung out of a *coup de main*, abetted and shielded by foreign intervention and run by a clique who do not enjoy the confidence of the people, their unpopularity being so thoroughly known to themselves that they expected to maintain themselves only by disfranchising the whole nation. They rule only by the force of bayonets, through martial law and the Draconian treason laws they enacted for their support, and we do protest against their arbitrary assumption of legislation, repealing old laws and making new ones of odious nature, thereby exceeding all rights that a provisional administration can dare to assume.

Of the men of the present Government we have nothing to say, except that they are politicians repeatedly defeated at the polls who want to rule or ruin, or mere boys utterly unknown and of no weight,

chosen for the fact of their being willing to jump into a harum-scarum, break-neck policy; but we do protest against their pretention of perpetuating themselves in power without reference to the people; and we most solemnly protest against their high-handed policy of gagging the press, of intimidating officials into taking the oath of allegiance, and signing annexation petitions and club rolls against their free convictions; of spitefully discharging others, especially Hawaiians and old residents (conveniently accused of being "royalists") to make room for foreigners, new comers, Hawaiian haters, and of calling to the supreme bench and other high public offices aliens of brief residence, whose sole claim is that they carried a gun under the protection of the *Boston* sailors.

But all coercive measures are of no avail, for the Hawaiians remain Hawaiian, true to our race. To us, Hawaii and our native government are just as dear as America is to every true-born American, and no loyal and patriotic subject of the glorious stars and stripes can blame us for being imbued with a similar patriotism, for loving the dear land of our birth, and even preferring our modest flag to any other, however glorious it may be.

We do not believe that the times and circumstances warrant the present movement of annexation; our people are not yet ripe for it, and we prefer remaining under the paternal rule of our own monarchy that understands our wants and wishes, and under which we claim to be quite capable of self-government. Nevertheless, we want it well understood that we Hawaiians have no objection against America or the Americans; on the contrary, we have been brought up to honor and respect our great and good neighbor, and through American teachings more than half century of civilization and experience of self-government have given us an intelligent appreciation of the political doctrines and democratic principles of constitutional government, with America and Great Britain as chief patterns.

More particularly do we value, respect, and comprehend the fundamental principles of the American Constitution, such as "no taxation without representation," "the rule of the majority," and "government of the people, by the people, and for the people;" and we have tried to follow those principles, when not disturbed by an intriguing, bribing plutocracy of foreigners who repudiate such liberal principles and wish to make peons or pariahs of us. Without past political experience of American institutions we could not accept contentedly any such forms of restricted government as the Provisional Government commissioners to Washington, without any authority from the people, have tried to obtain from the United States in order to keep their clique in power. If annexation is to be accomplished with any justice it must be by the consent of the majority, not at the beck of a few adventurers or greedy plutocrats, men who, to further their private ambition or avoid impending bankruptcy, have remorselessly thrown on the United States the responsibility of a very dishonorable action, that of robbing a people of their nationality, men also who, through their annexation scheme, would entangle the United States Government with some foreign problems of difficult solution—the Japanese one especially.

It has not yet been clearly demonstrated that annexation would benefit either this country or America, and to us it seems as if both sides may have much to lose and little to gain by it. In what concerns America we can not presume to pronounce on military or strategic reasons, but we do agree with many eminent American writers that annexation would rather be a source of danger, a cause of weakness to

the United States, without giving them better commercial advantages than such as can be more safely and easily obtained by intimate treaty relations with an independent government here. On our side, the gain from annexation to such a distant country is also difficult to prove, while the fiscal policy of the United States may at times place our sugar, rice, coffee, and other tropical products at a disadvantage by binding us to rival interests and preventing our seeking freely the most advantageous outlets.

For all the above reasons and others too long to enumerate, we protest against the present movement in favor of doing away with the independence of our country; we protest against the effort made to force annexation to the United States without consulting the people, and we especially protest against the interference of the United States minister, Stevens, in Hawaiian politics and his violation of our sovereign rights by the unjustifiable landing of the United States troops and the biased recognition of the insurgents.

We particularly resent the presumption of being transferred like a flock of sheep or bartered like a horde of untutored savages by an unprincipled minority of aliens who have no right, no legal power, no influence over us, not even a claim of conquest by fair-handed warfare, and we can not believe that our friends of the great and just American nation could tolerate annexation by force against the wishes of the majority of the population, for such an annexation would be an eternal dishonor, an indelible stain on the pure escutcheon of the leading nation of the world.

It is therefore with the utmost confidence in the wisdom, honor, and impartiality of the United States Government that we respectfully but earnestly pray for our independent autonomy and the restoration of the Hawaiian Monarchy; and our gratitude will ever bind us more indissolubly to the great Union by a stronger tie than any enforced annexation could ever realize.

God save Hawaii Nei.

God bless the great Republic and its magnanimous and just leader, President Cleveland.

J. A. CUMMINS,
JOSEPH NAWAHL,
JNO. E. BUSH,

For the Hawaiian Patriotic League.

KA HUI HAWAII ALOHA AINA.

[Hawaiian Patriotic League.]

KE KUMUKANAWAI.

Oiai na ike ia ae nei ka loli ano nui ana o ko kakou aina, he mea hoi e mana'ioia ai, e hoopilikia ia ana kona Kuokoa ame na Pono Kivila o kona mau Makaainana, a me na Kupa, a no ia mea, he mea pono e kukuluia ona Hui manao lokahi a makala mawaena o na kanaka a pau e aloha ani i ka Aina, me ka nana ole i ka Aoao Kalalaina a Mana'io Hoomana paho. Nolaia:

E hooholoia. O makou o na makaainana kupaa a me na Kupa Aloha Aina, a makee maluhia hoi o Hawaii nei, no ke

CONSTITUTION.

Whereas vital changes in our country have taken place, which may affect its independence and the civil rights of its subjects and citizens, thereby rendering indispensable a compact and zealous union between all men who love the country, irrespective of party or creed;

Therefore, resolved, That we, the patriotic, peaceful, and loyal subjects and citizens of Hawaii nei, for the purpose

kiai makaala ana i ko makou mau Pono Kivila, ma keia, ke hoohui nei makou ia makou iho na kekahi Ahahui, malalo o ke kumukanawai mahope ae nei. penei:

Inoa.

PAUKU 1.—O ka inoa o keia Ahahui, oia, "Ka Hui Hawaii Aloha Aina."

Ka hana.

PAUKU 2.—O ka hana a keia Ahahui oia ka malama ana a me ke kakoo ana, ma na keehina hana maluhia a kue kanawai ole, i ke kulana Kuokoa o na Pae Aina o Hawaii, a ina he mea hiki ole ke malamala ko kakou Kuokoa, alaila, o ka kakou hana oia ka hooikaika ana i na hana kue ole i ke kanawai a me ka maluhia e hoomau ia ai ka Pono Kivila o na kanaka Hawaii a me na Kupa makaainana.

Na mahela.

PAUKU 3.—Aia iloko o keia Ahahui e kukulu ia he hookahi Hui Nui ma Honolulu i kapa ia "Ka Hui Kuwaena" [central body] a mai loko aku ona e kukulu ia ai i man Ahahui lala ma na Apana Koho o na Mokupuni.

Na Lala.

PAUKU 4.—[A] O na Lala o keia Ahahui, oia na kanaka Hawaii maoli o keia aina, he 20 makahiki a oi aku i make-make e hoopaa ia iakou iho malalo o na kumuhana o keia Ahahui, ua kupo ia e lilo i mau hoa, a lilo hoi i mau lala manuli nae o ke kaku inoa ana malalo o keia Kumukanawai.

[B] O na kanaka a pau o na Aina-e, o noho nei i keia wa he mau Pono Kivila ko lakou iloko o keia aina a i lokahi pu hoi, na manao e kakoo i na kumuhana a keia Hui, a i makemake e hoopaa ia lakou iho no ua Hui la. ma ke kakau inoa ana malalo o keia kumukanawai, e lilo no lakou i mau hoa Manohano (Lala) no keia Ahahui.

Na Hoohonohoko Ana.

PAUKU 5.—O ka Hui Nui Kuwaena [central body] o "Ka Hui Hawaii Aloha Aina" oia ke noho mana maluna o na Ahahui lala o keia a me keia apana koho, a e lawelawe ia ana e na Luna Nui malalo iho nei, penei:

1—Peresidena Hanohano. 1—Peresidena. 2—Hope Peresidena. 1—Kakauolelo. 1—Pauku a me 13 mau Hoa Kuka, a o lakou a pau, oia ka Aha Hooke o 19 lala. O keia mau luna a pau he pae kanaka Hawaii maoli, a e koho ia lakou ma ka Balota, no ka manawa a e hoakaika e na Rula o keia Ahahui.

of peaceably guarding our civil rights, do hereby form ourselves into a league, under the following constitution:

Name.

ARTICLE 1. The name of this association shall be the Hawaiian Patriotic League (Ka Hui Hawaii Aloha Aina).

Object.

ARTICLE 2. The object of this association is to preserve and maintain, by all legal and peaceful means and measures, the *independent autonomy* of the islands of Hawaii nei; and, if the preservation of our independence be rendered impossible, our object shall then be to exert all peaceful and legal efforts to secure for the Hawaiian people and citizens the continuance of their civil rights.

Divisions.

ARTICLE 3. The league shall consist of one central body in Honolulu, with branches in the various districts of the other islands.

Membership.

ARTICLE 4.—(A) All the natives of this country, over 20 years of age, who are willing to pledge themselves to the objects of this league, are eligible for membership thereof and may become members by signing this constitution.

(B) All foreigners, at present enjoying or entitled to civil rights in this country, and in sympathy with the objects of this association and willing to pledge themselves to it by signing the constitution, may be admitted as *honorary members*.

Organization.

ARTICLE 5.—The central body of the *Patriotic League* shall rule over all the district branches, and shall be conducted by the following officers:

1. Honorary President.
1. President.
2. Vice-Presidents.
1. Secretary.
1. Treasurer.

And 13 councillors, who together shall constitute an executive council of 19 members. All these officers must be native Hawaiians and must be elected by

E koho no na Ahahui Lala o na apana koho i ko lakou Lunahoomalu, Hoce Lunahoomalu; Kakauolelo a me ka Punku, a e koho i hookahi Elele i wahaolelo no lakou e hele mai ai imua o ka Ahahui Nui (Hui Kuikawa) ma Honolulu, a ua loa i ua Elele la ke ku leana e hele ai ma na halawai o ka Aha Hooko a me na halawai o ka Ahahui.

Na Luna Hanohano.

PAUKU 6.—O na kanaka o na Aina E, e lilo ana i mau lala, e kohoia lakou e ka Aha Hooko no na kulana hanohano e like me keia :

1. Peresidena Hanohano.
2. Hope Peresidena Hanohano.
2. Kakauolelo Hanohano.
7. Hoa Kuka Hanohano, a oi aku paha e like me ka mea e hooholoia ana e ka Hui ma keia hope aku;

O keia mau Luna Hanohano oia ka Aha Cuka [Advisory Council] e noho pu a e koho me ka Aha Hooko.

Na Hana a na Luna.

PAUKU 7.—O na hana a na Luna Nui, ua like no ia me na hana maa mau e pili ana ina Hui e ae e like me keia ano Ahahui, a e hoakaka pono ia ana hoi ma na rula e aponoia ana ma keia hope aku e ka Aha Hooko.

Na halawai.

PAUKU 8.—Na halawai o ka Hui ekahea ia no ia e ka Peresidena, ma ke kauoha a ka Aha Hooko, a o kekahi mau Hoa paha he 10;

E kahaia na halawai a ka Aha Hooko e ka Peresidena ma ke noi a kekahi mau hoa 3, o ua Aha Hooko la;

O na hana o na halawai a pau o ka Hui a me ka Aha Hooko e alakai ia no ia e na rula o na anaina maikai, a me na rula maa mau o na Ahaolelo.

Kipaku ana.

PAUKU 9.—O kela a me keia hoa o ka Hui a o ka Aha Hooke paha, e hanaana i kekahi hana e kua ana i ka mana o me na hana a keia Ahahui, e kauohaia no ia e ku imua o ka Aha Hooko, a ina ahewa lakou iaia, e kipakuia no oia mai ka Hui aku.

Na hoololi o ke kumukanawai.

PAUKU 10.—O na hoololi a me na pakui ana mai i keia Kumukanawai, e hana wale ia no ia ma ka hooholo ana a na halawai mau o ka Hui.

Aponoia ma Honolulu, i keia la 4 o Maraki, 1893.

Peresidena Hanohano
Peresidena
Hope Peresidena
" "

J. A. CUMMINS,
J. NAWAHI,
J. K. KAUNAMANO,
J. W. BIPIKANE,

ballot, for such term of office as may be provided in the by-laws of the league or council.

The district branches shall elect their chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer, and shall appoint one *delegate* to represent them before the central body in Honolulu, which delegate shall have a right to attend the meeting of the executive council and of the league.

Honorary officers.

ARTICLE 6.—Foreign members shall be elected by the executive council to the following honorary offices: 1 honorary president, 2 honorary vice-presidents, 2 honorary secretaries, and 7 honorary councillors, or more, as may hereafter be determined by the league. These honorary officers shall constitute an advisory council who shall sit and vote with the executive council.

Duties of officers.

ARTICLE 7.—The duties of the various officers shall be those pertaining to the respective offices, as is usual in all similar organizations, and shall be more expressly defined in such by-laws as may be hereafter adopted by the executive council.

Members.

ARTICLE 8.—Meetings of the league shall be called by the president, at the request of the executive council or of any other ten members;

Meetings of the executive council shall be called by the president, at the request of any three members of said council;

All proceedings of meetings of the league and of the executive council shall be governed by the usual decorum and rules of parliamentary usage.

Expulsions.

ARTICLE 9.—Any member of the league or of its executive council who may commit an act violating the spirit and purposes of this league may be summoned before the executive council, and upon conviction by them be expelled from the league.

Constitutional amendments.

ARTICLE 10. All amendments or additions to the present constitution must be approved by a general meeting of the league.

Adopted, Honolulu, this 4th day of March, 1893.

Honorary President.
President.
Vice-President.
" "

No. 42.

Interview with the Hawaiian Patriotic League, May 2, 1893, printed with Mr. Blount's No. 4, dated May 4, 1893.

No. 43.

Statement of A. P. Peterson.

His Excellency J. H. BLOUNT,
Commissioner, etc.:

SIR: The causes which led to and the motives which actuated the trouble in Hawaii are varied. In the first place the passage of the McKinley bill and the consequences resulting led to a feeling of dissatisfaction among the merchants of Honolulu and the planters generally. This feeling of dissatisfaction has also led to a feeling in favor of annexation with the United States among a few, and that feeling caused them to assist in the background the Ashford and Wilcox rebellion in the spring of 1892. And when that failed through the arrest and trial of the leaders, even although they were not found out and arrested, the same feeling of dissatisfaction still led them to look about for any pretext to carry out their ideas and by this means serve their pecuniary interests.

If the price of sugar had been higher we would have had no revolution. Another cause was the feeling of the Missionary or Reform party that they and they only possessed the divine right to rule, to rule at all hazards, if not in one way then in another. They could not forget the long years when they had had complete control of the Government, when their word had been law with the Kings of Hawaii, and which rule had been wrested from them by a movement which had joined together the natives, disgusted with missionary rule, and the mechanics, discouraged at the hordes of Chinese and other Asiatic labor brought into the country by that rule, which uprising in 1890 had wrested from them their power. This feeling of desire to rule can best be illustrated by Mr. Thurston's statement, made at a public meeting in Honolulu during an election campaign in 1892, when he said: "That to carry out their object they would join hands with the devil if necessary."

This statement coming from Mr. Thurston thoroughly illustrates the idea of rule or ruin policy which has been adopted by the Missionary party of which he is the leader. This idea led that party in the last Legislature to adopt a course which they did. Having been elected practically upon a joint platform with the National Reform party, the party which in that Legislature adopted a conservative course, and were naturally in sympathy with the best people and the best interests of the country, they, the Missionary or Reform party, took the first opportunity to break loose from their natural ally, the National Reform party, and to join with the common enemy whom then had opposed during the election, what was known as the Ashford and Bush wing of the Liberal party, simply for the reason that upon the overturn of the Wideman cabinet, whom all parties had agreed should go out, they, the Missionary party, had not the appointment of the cabinet to follow. This joining with the common enemy naturally estranged the members of the National Reform party and forced them into an alliance

with the more conservative wing of the Liberal or native party, as no party in the Legislature had a working majority.

After the overthrow of the Wideman cabinet the opposition, headed by Mr. Thurston, took a position in favor of what they called the constitutional principle, that the Queen should call a leading member of the opposition to form a cabinet. The Queen did so, and called me. I being a member of the National Reform party and not their choice, they objected to my forming a cabinet because I had stated to them my determination not to enter such cabinet. But they decided to waive that point if I would name or form such cabinet as they should nominate and select in caucus. This I declined to do and notified the Queen that I could not form a cabinet. She then called upon Hon. E. C. Macfarlane, another leading member of the opposition, who formed what is known as the Macfarlane cabinet. This was still not satisfactory to them, as they claimed, because they had been told that every member of the cabinet had not been Mr. Macfarlane's own selection, but in reality because Mr. Macfarlane and the majority of the cabinet selected were not from their party.

They immediately attempted to oust them, upon the sole ground that the constitutional principle, as they claimed, had not been adhered to. They failed upon the first attempt, but later, having thoroughly organized and appointed a committee which had no name, but which can only be called a corruption committee, they succeeded, by the use of a large amount of money, in finally ousting the cabinet, having won over, through these peculiar and almost unheard of means in Hawaii, sufficient natives to carry their vote. The Cornwell cabinet which followed, and which was the personal choice of the Queen, was within a few hours summarily dealt with by this combination of the missionary and the devil and put out in a few hours. This was followed by a cabinet which was formed by the Hon. Cecil Brown, who was not a member of the Legislature and was in no sense a leading member of the opposition, and who but a few weeks before had been defeated for a seat in the house, but, getting together a number of members from the Reform party, he satisfied the desire of that party in his choice.

Although they had sworn to stand by the constitutional principle before spoken of, as soon as a cabinet was formed satisfactory in its personnel to this party which lacked by a considerable number a majority in the Legislature, they were perfectly willing to abandon their constitutional principle and stand and support a cabinet composed of their own members. When this cabinet, which they had sacrificed so much principle for, was voted out for purely political reasons, they realized that their hold upon the politics of the country was forever gone unless they could by some grand coup regain their power by overturning representative government. In this connection it may be said that the charge made by the insurgents who formed the Provisional Government, in their proclamation of corruption in the late Legislature, was to a certain extent true. But it is no valid reason for their action, as the Reform Party, representing as they did the planters and therefore a large part of the wealth of the country, were the people who paid the money and caused the corruption and should be blamed very much more than the Hawaiians who took their money.

All these causes combined bound together a few hundred people in Honolulu, dissatisfied malcontents, either because they were not making as much money as formerly, or because they had not the control of the Government, who were only too glad to take advantage of the attempt of the Queen to promulgate a new constitution, especially

backed as they were, or as they claimed to be and as after events showed were true, by the assurances of Mr. Stevens, the American Minister.

It is not necessary for me to go into the details of the revolt here, as the most of it has already been told by me in a number of affidavits already on file, and I shall confine myself to mentioning only a few facts, which, if stated at all, have been misrepresented.

On Saturday afternoon, after the prorogation, and after the Queen had declined to promulgate a new constitution, a meeting was held at the office of W. O. Smith and over seventy of the prominent citizens of Honolulu, most of whom were afterwards actively engaged in the movement to dethrone the Queen, signed a document agreeing to support the cabinet of which I was a member in the stand they had taken against such promulgation, and promise that that support should exist so long as the cabinet stood by their position. In less than three hours the meeting which formed the Committee of Safety was held at Mr. Thurston's house, and they were determined to break their pledge unless the cabinet would agree to dethrone the Queen and form a Provisional Government. This breaking of their pledge did not surprise the cabinet, as they could expect nothing but such a failure to keep their word from the men who were engaged in it.

This action of the Queen in attempting to promulgate a new constitution, although it was petitioned for and desired by ninety-nine one-hundredths of her native subjects, was deprecated by her cabinet and was entirely new to them, although statements have been made to the contrary, and by their efforts solely the danger was averted. Upon the promise of the citizens who had signed the agreement to support the cabinet, they acted and advised the Queen that it was necessary for her to issue a proclamation stating the circumstances under which the attempt to promulgate a new constitution was made, and assuring the foreign representative and the people that she recognized her mistake and that no attempt hereafter would be made to alter the existing constitution except as provided therein. This proclamation was issued and signed by the Queen and cabinet and assurances were also sent to the representatives of foreign Governments that such was the Queen's intention.

This proclamation, and especially the assurances to foreign representatives, which was looked upon as a treaty with the foreign powers and at any time could have been treated as such, was deemed satisfactory by the majority of the prominent and wealthy merchants of the city. The mass meeting which had been called by the insurgents and the counter mass meeting called by the opposition were both attempted to be stopped, but the committee of safety felt that they had gone so far that a meeting should be held denouncing the action of the Queen in order to avert further possible harm, it being understood among the leaders of that party that that was the extent to which their meeting should go. At their meeting on Monday afternoon they had less than 700 people present by actual count. The resolution presented at that meeting was confined entirely to the action which had been proposed, except the ending clause, which was slyly introduced by the most fiery members of the committee of safety, giving that committee liberty to act in any emergency which might arise. If the action which the committee saw fit to take within one hour under that resolution had been for one moment thought of by that meeting they would not have been able to carry their resolution.

The counter mass meeting was attended by more than six times as many people as attended the other, and understanding that the critical situation had ended by mutual consent, the meeting was conducted in

a peaceful and quiet manner. After the meetings the people dispersed to their homes and matters were quieter than they had been for many a day, until shortly after 4 o'clock word was heralded about the town that the United States troops from the *Boston* had landed at the request of the committee of safety. On Tuesday the Government was ready to meet any emergency, which fact Mr. Stevens, the American minister, was notified of, and were prepared to keep peace at all hazards, and at any time could have arrested and dispersed the insurgents, most of whom joined them only on the promise that the United States was behind them and would protect them. The Government had well armed and equipped more than ten men to one insurgent. Nothing was done by the Government except to keep in readiness, as they desired to first find out Mr. Stevens' position in the matter, which he had indicated in his conversation with myself and Mr. Parker on Sunday afternoon, but which was not absolutely certain.

After our conversation with Mr. Stevens, Tuesday afternoon, which has been detailed fully in our affidavits, and which was ended at a little after 2 o'clock in the afternoon and before the proclamation by the Provisional Government was issued, the cabinet came to the conclusion that it was absurd to think of resisting the United States, and waited only until Mr. Stevens formally notified them of his recognition of the Provisional Government, which he sent us in answer to a letter from us. This letter in answer to ours reached us before 4 o'clock and less than an hour after the issuing of the proclamation by the Provisional Government. After receiving his notification that he had recognized and would support the Provisional Government we entered into negotiations with the Provisional Government, and upon their promising certain matters in connection with the Queen's protest, which by the way they afterwards failed to carry out, we delivered up the station house, which was then, and always has been in time of trouble here, the headquarters of the Government, the barracks, and palace, under the protest which has been published and which explicitly says that we yielded to the superior force of the United States troops.

This ended the affair as far as the Hawaiians are concerned, who, acting upon the advice of their leaders, determined to leave their case to the justice of the American people in dealing with the protest of their Queen. Since that time the only danger which has menaced the community has been that caused by the presence of the troops of a foreign nation guarding the sacred halls of their chiefs, and the still greater menace of the vagabonds which the Provisional Government called in to their assistance and organized into what they term a Provisional army. These facts show that Mr. Thurston's statement that Mr. Stevens didn't recognize them until after the surrender is false, and also show that the whole affair was premeditated and thoroughly understood between Mr. Stevens and a few of the citizens of Honolulu.

It has been stated by the supporters of the Provisional Government that the main reasons for the movement they undertook were the passage of the opium and lottery bills at the close of the Legislature. To show the untruthfulness of these statements it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that the opium bill was passed by an overwhelming majority at the desire of nearly all classes in the community, and was supported by two members of the administration, which they have repeatedly stated was entirely satisfactory—Mr. Robinson, minister of foreign affairs, and Mr. Brown, attorney-general.

As to the lottery bill, from its first mention it was supported by the Hawaiians generally, by the mechanics almost to a man, and by a majority of the storekeepers, smaller merchants, and clerks. It was

opposed by the banks and the larger wholesale merchants, who gave as their reason for such opposition that it was not wise to place such political power as the bill proposed, or which might be taken under it, in the hands of a single corporation. The argument used in favor of the passage of the bill was that times were hard; that there seemed no immediate prospect of better times coming; that the poor man and the small dealer would be forced to the wall unless some relief was had; that while they did not believe in lotteries generally, it was the only tangible relief in sight and as such was grasped at. In fact, the arguments were exactly such as the same men use now in favor of annexation to the United States—anything to better our financial condition. To show the public feeling on the question of the lottery it is only necessary to refer to the special election held in Honolulu last October for the election of two nobles for the island of Oahu, when almost entirely upon the issue of the lottery Hopkins and Maile were elected by a large majority; they supporting the lottery, as against Mr. Brown and Mr. Robinson, afterwards called into the Wilcox cabinet, and Mr. H. Waterhouse, a member of the provisional council.

The cabinet of which I was a member have been accused publicly and privately of having favored the purpose of the Queen to promulgate a new constitution, and in support of that it has been said that Her Majesty told me, at the meeting in the palace, that I had had the constitution in my pocket for a month. What she did say was, in answer to a remark by Mr. Parker, that we didn't know what the constitution contained; that I—Mr. Peterson—had had it in my possession for several weeks. The explanation of that remark is this: During the early part of the session of the Legislature, some three or four months before the prorogation, the Queen sent for me one day and handed me a roll wrapped in newspaper, and, without saying what it was, asked me to look it over and see if I could propose any changes. I carried it home and looked at it and found it to be a draft of a constitution. I did not read it through, and can not say whether or not it was the same as was afterwards shown to us in the palace. I thought nothing of the matter at the time, as the subject of a new constitution was then before the Legislature in the shape of a bill providing for the calling of a constitutional convention; but as I was opposed to the measure, and shortly afterwards voted against it in the house, I was not desirous of assisting in the project, as I supposed this to be, and so did not look at it again after the first day. Some two or three weeks after the Queen sent Mr. Robertson for the package, which I returned exactly as I received it, having looked at it but once, and having made no changes.

The course the cabinet pursued during the revolution has been much criticised, but it must be remembered that the cabinet had only been in office but a day or two, that the most of them were green in their positions, and felt that the wisest course for them to pursue was to be guided by the advice of more experienced men in public affairs. They accordingly took no important step without consulting either with the diplomatic corps or a number of prominent citizens who kindly assisted Her Majesty's Government, among whom were J. O. Carter, Paul Neumann, and E. C. Macfarlane. These gentlemen, after learning Mr. Stevens's attitude, were convinced, and so advised the Queen and cabinet, that the best course to pursue was what was finally done, to yield to the superior force of the United States.

I remain, your obedient servant,

A. P. PETERSON.

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, July 13, 1893.

No. 44.

Interview with Wm. Hyde Rice, of Lihue, Kauai, April 28, 1893.

Q. You filed on April 20, 1893, four petitions?

A. Yes.

The petitions are as follows:

To the honorable W. H. Rice:

We, the undersigned, residents of the islands of Kauai and Niihau, Hawaiian Islands, do hereby nominate and depute you as delegate to represent us at Honolulu before the United States commissioners in matters concerning the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States to endeavor to procure for us equal rights and privileges accruing to citizens of the United States.

(Signed by 137 names.)

To the honorable W. H. Rice:

We, the undersigned, residents of the islands of Kauai and Niihau, Hawaiian Islands, do hereby nominate and depute you as delegate to represent us at Honolulu before the United States commissioners in matters concerning the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States to endeavor to procure for us equal rights and privileges accruing to citizens of the United States.

(Signed by 18 names.)

To the honorable W. H. Rice:

We, the undersigned, residents of the islands of Kauai and Niihau, Hawaiian Islands, do hereby nominate and depute you as delegate to represent us at Honolulu before the United States commissioners in matters concerning the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States to endeavor to procure for us equal rights and privileges accruing to citizens of the United States.

(Signed by 43 names.)

To the honorable W. H. Rice:

We, the undersigned, residents of the islands of Kauai and Niihau, Hawaiian Islands, do hereby nominate and depute you as delegate to represent us at Honolulu, before the United States Commissioners in matters concerning the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States to endeavor to procure for us equal rights and privileges accruing to citizens of the United States.

(Signed by 81 names.)

Q. How did you come by these?

A. I was telephoned from the Waimeau natives asking me if I would represent them here before Commissioner Blount. I said that I had no wish to come, but if it was their wish I would be willing to represent them.

Q. How far from where you are?

A. About 25 or 30 miles from my residence.

Q. Then what?

A. They said they would draw up papers and send them around to be signed at the precincts in that place.

Q. Here is the fifth petition similar in form presented this morning, the 28th. How did you come by this?

A. It was sent up from the island of Nuphau last Sunday. They wished to circulate them all around the islands, but hadn't time.

Q. And you were not near when these papers were gotten up?

A. No; I was not. I have not been near any of their meetings.

Q. Were you governor, at any time, of the island?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. I was governor for about one year of the islands of Kauai and Niihau.

Q. What year?

A. From the 14th of February, 1892, to the abolition of the office by the existing Government.

Q. Where were you on the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th of January, 1893?

A. I was on the the island of Kauai?

Q. When did you learn of the dethronement of the Queen and the substitution of the Provisional Government?

A. On the 23d of January.

Q. Was there anything known of any movement of this sort in the island prior to its happening?

A. No. We had some rumor that there would be trouble on that Saturday morning—that there might be some trouble, as the Wilcox ministry had been voted out Thursday afternoon. I heard on Friday morning.

Q. That there might be trouble?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. On account of the going out of the ministry?

A. Yes.

Q. What sort of trouble was indicated?

A. We had no idea.

Q. You did not know whether it would take the form of force or what?

A. We had no idea.

Q. Was there any suspicion of the dethronement of the Queen?

A. I think not.

Q. Have you anything you wish to add, Mr. Rice?

A. I had been with the Queen when she told me of the appointment of the Nawahi ministry; as they called it, the Nancy Hanks ministry. She told me who the appointees were. I said: "That won't hold; you had better have another ministry ready."

Q. Are you interested in sugar-planting?

A. I am not a sugar-planter. I own stock in a plantation. My business is running a cattle and horse ranch.

Q. You superintend that, but you have some investments in sugar?

A. Yes; I have stock in one sugar plantation. I inherited the stock. I am not what is called a sugar-planter.

Q. What is your idea about annexation?

A. I think if we are not annexed to the United States I do not know what will become of us, because we are incapable of ruling ourselves.

Q. Why?

A. There are so many different factions and interests that it will produce pandemonium if we tried to rule ourselves.

Q. Do you mean by that that the native element is not qualified for self-government?

A. I mean that.

Q. Why?

A. Because no native is capable of carrying on business for himself, and much less of carrying on government.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it a correct report of my interview with Col. Blount.

W. H. RICE.

No. 45.

Interview with Antone Rosa, Honolulu, April 17, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to have your opinion as to the various causes which culminated in the dethronement of the Queen.

Mr. ROSA. The only legitimate cause—if that can be construed into a cause—is this: The Queen signing the opium bill, which passed more than two thirds of the house and was favored by two members of the cabinet, and her signing the lottery bill, and the presumption on their part that the Queen was using her influence in an underhand way to oust the Wilcox cabinet. Those were the immediate causes.

Q. What were the remote causes?

A. The remote causes I should judge to be a dissatisfaction on their part in not being able to control the Government. I mean by that in not having their own men at the head of the Government. I do not think they cared much about the minor offices, but the cabinet and the principal offices of the Government they wanted to control, claiming that they are the substantial people of the country; and I can not see any more tangible cause than this. The Queen since her reign has not exercised any of the powers her late brother did.

Q. What do you mean by the powers he exercised?

A. Such as meddling with politics, demanding certain persons to be put in office, and undue expenditures of public money. She did not have as much right to enter into politics as her late brother, because during his reign whenever the ministry did not carry out his projects he would dismiss them without a vote of want of confidence.

Q. Without a vote of want of confidence?

A. Yes; prior to the constitution of 1887.

Q. After that did he dismiss the ministers without a vote of want of confidence?

A. No, he did not; he could not. He sometimes would obstruct some of the movements of the so-called Reform party. It went so far one time as to force the cabinet to require the King to make a pledge; I do not think he was made to sign it.

Q. What was the pledge?

A. That he should not in anyway obstruct the proceedings of the ministers, nor interfere in politics, but that he should accept every advice from them, as they were responsible for the King's acts under the constitution. I do not think he exercised any rights against the cabinet except what he thought he had a right to; as, for instance, the right to veto. They contended that he did not have that right personal to himself, but that it was a right which he should exercise by and with the advice of his cabinet. That question was submitted to the supreme court and they decided in his favor.

Q. By unanimous vote?

A. I can not say; but I could refer to it. It was decided in favor of His Majesty's contention that it was a personal prerogative.

Q. What was the cause of the revolution of Wilcox?

A. The revolution of Wilcox on July 20, 1889, was a public demonstration of the natives' opposition to the constitution.

Q. How?

A. They contended that he was the undercurrent in the attempt to overthrow the Government, but he publicly denounced it in a letter, written at my instance and at the instance of another friend of his.

He was then quartered at the boathouse. I personally thought he was a party to it.

Q. That Wilcox was?

A. No; that His Majesty was. I personally felt that way.

Q. How do you mean he was a party to it?

A. I can not tell you from any direct evidence; but circumstances appeared to me as though he was a party to it.

Q. In what way; what was the scheme he was trying to effectuate?

A. It was the overthrow of the 1887 constitution, and to be replaced by another one which he framed. The fact of his having his Queen removed from the palace the night before the movement; the fact of his intimacy with certain revolutionary leaders, and other circumstances, which I can not call to mind, make me think so. I was very intimate with him then, but felt that his conduct through the whole matter was unjust.

Q. You think that he was secretly promoting the movement to undermine the Government with a view to giving him the powers he had prior to the constitution of 1887?

A. I believe so.

Q. Was that generally entertained?

A. I believe so—by the cabinet.

Q. Who was in the cabinet?

A. Thurston, minister of the interior; Damon, minister of finance; C. W. Ashford, attorney-general and Jonathan Austin, minister of foreign affairs. About 1 o'clock in the morning the King received a message that the movement was to dethrone him and put Liliuokalani in power.

Q. When he received this message where was he?

A. In the palace.

Q. Was that the day before the revolution broke out?

A. It was the same morning. It was supported by the fact that W. R. Castle and others had approached the present Queen and asked her if she would not take the throne. This may require corroboration. It is secret history. It is not denied that she had been approached on that subject. I do not know whether she favored it or not, but he distrusted it and somewhat intimated it to me personally.

Q. Now to pass on, how about the Wilcox cabinet? How did that happen to get out?

A. It was a very satisfactory cabinet. It did not seem so to the house. They were got out by means of some maneuvering. The Nationalists and Liberals joined to get them out.

Q. The Liberals came over to the Nationalists?

A. Yes. And which ever way they went they tumbled out the cabinet. I suppose the reason is that the natives feared they were an annexation cabinet. The natives were all afraid of them save myself. I did not believe it, because up to that time they were all anti-annexationists, and I knew Wilcox was against it at that time and prior to it. He has always been friendly to the natives, always opposed to anything that might lead to annexation, and he is a good man, particularly friendly to the natives. But he has always said if it was done voluntarily by the natives he was willing to join in.

Q. The constitution of 1887 took from the King the power to appoint nobles?

A. Yes.

Q. It then provided for an election by electors having \$3,000 worth of property unincumbered or an income of \$600?

A. Yes.

Q. The elimination of everybody except persons having these qualifications left the relative strength of the foreign population in what proportion?

A. I should presume three-fifths of the voters were foreigners and two-fifths natives; perhaps less. The foreigners became much stronger.

Q. There was also coupled with that the permission on the part of foreigners who claimed their citizenship in other countries to vote?

A. Yes; by registering and taking oath. It was always a dangerous element to the native people, because a man for the sake of a few months' occupation could vote.

Q. The power to appoint nobles was taken from the King and conferred practically upon what are sometimes termed foreigners?

A. Yes, that is true; there is no question about it.

Q. Was that or was it not a cause of discontent among the native population?

A. Yes; I suppose it was.

Q. Do the native population want the right to vote for nobles themselves or do they want the power vested in the Queen?

A. I believe that they want the power in themselves, but I myself and a few of us have always felt that it is an unsafe thing to give them all that power, and that is one reason why it has not been adjudged safe to give them full power—only to give them some limited power.

Q. How far did you want to go?

A. I should go down to three or four hundred income and, say, a thousand dollars' worth of property. I presume they would be satisfied if that right were given to the Queen. Then opposition would come from the foreigners to that.

Q. You think they would be content to give up the right to vote for nobles?

A. I believe so.

Q. Is it the desire of the native population to have the Queen appoint the nobles rather than to have the right to vote for nobles themselves?

A. I think so; that is, of the mass. Now, a person like me—I would not like to see it.

Q. You want more extended suffrage?

A. Yes. I would rather the sovereign should not exercise that right. She might be influenced to appoint persons who ought not to be appointed—who would not fail, for instance, in the Legislature to vote for the measure she favored or that the cabinet favored. She might appoint very good men, like Mr. Bishop, Mr. Irving, and Mr. Damon and others.

Q. Is it that feeling of preferring the exercise of the power of creating nobles growing out of the old relationship of the masses of the people to a chief, and consequent tendency to obey a chief, rather than an appreciation of the forms of popular government?

A. Yes; I have not the least doubt that it is the desire of more than nine-tenths of the Hawaiian population, meaning native Hawaiian. They have always felt that as long as a Hawaiian was at the head of the Government—their sovereign—that they were always safe as regards the country and its general welfare. I believe if this subject were put to a popular vote I would be right in my view.

Q. Do you mean to say that you believe that they would favor the appointing of the nobles by the Queen?

A. I do.

Q. And would not care for an election of nobles by the people?

A. Yes.

Q. Is the preference for the appointment of nobles by the Queen the result of the fear that in an election they may sometimes lose in a contest with foreign residents, or is it independent of any fear of foreign residents, or is it a fear of their own ability to wisely elect nobles?

A. I do not think it is from a fear on their part to wisely elect nobles, but it is from a fear that the foreigners will be supreme in the elections. The result of the elections so far since this right has been taken away from the sovereign confirms what I say—the nobles nominated under this system by the foreign element have nearly all been elected.

Q. Suppose the property qualification was reduced to moderate figures, would that make any change in the sentiment of the natives on the question of preference between the appointment of nobles by the Queen and voting for them?

A. I hardly think so. I think they prefer that power left with the throne.

Q. Suppose the property qualification to vote for a noble was the same as that which obtains in the matter of electing a representative, would the native mind prefer to create nobles in that way, or would it prefer that the Crown should appoint them?

A. My impression is that they would prefer to have the right in their own hands, not distrusting the Queen, however.

Q. Why would they prefer it?

A. It would be granting them rights which they never had.

Q. You think, then, if they had the right to elect in the way that I have indicated that that old disposition to subserviency to the chief would be replaced by a disposition to select their government by popular methods. I do not mean the dethronement of the Queen, I mean in the way I have indicated?

A. I think they would use that privilege fairly. They would not be subservient to the sovereign. I think they would exercise it fairly and wisely.

Q. Then is it with them a selection between the present mode of electing nobles and the Queen's appointing them?

A. I do not know that it would make any difference to them as to whether they exercised the right or the Queen did, for the reason that the subject has not been much discussed among them. They consider it unfair that they in their own land should not have the right to vote for nobles. That has been the contention. It has not been put in the shape you have placed it, so that I can not give you any idea in that form.

Q. Is the discontent of the native population with the mode of selecting nobles that it takes away from the natives the right to vote?

A. Yes; there is no doubt about that. That is clearly the reason why there is so much discontent. I have no hesitancy in answering that.

Q. In the fear of political aggressions by foreign residents to the disadvantage of the natives, is it true that the natives feel that they would be secure in the appointment of nobles by the Queen or by manhood suffrage?

A. It is true that they would feel more secure if the nobles were either appointed by the sovereign or by giving the native population the right to vote for them without any property qualification. It is the popular view now and the subject has been a source of discontent for years to the Hawaiian people. It appears in the newspapers and all

over the country, in fact. The revolution of 1889, of Wilcox, was with that view mainly.

Q. With a view of doing away with that mode of electing nobles?

A. Yes, sir; and to restore it to the sovereign or popular vote. Of course this view would be very strenuously opposed by the foreign element.

Q. Is that the view of the mass of the population of the islands?

A. There is no question about it.

Q. How do a majority of the people of the islands feel toward the existing government?

A. They are opposed to it.

Q. I hear—I don't know as to the truth of it—that a good many of the native people are signing petitions for annexation, which would indicate that they were in line with the Provisional Government?

A. I do not believe it. Those who are signing, perhaps, are those directly affected by pecuniary considerations, such as being in the employment of persons who favor annexation, and such as being in a position to receive money from them in any business way—in a legitimate way, probably—and for fear that they would be dismissed from service.

Q. Suppose the matter of sustaining the Provisional Government in its policy and purposes was submitted to a popular vote in the islands with the qualification of a person voting for representative, what would be the result, in your opinion?

A. I think they would be swamped.

Q. By how much?

A. I should say four-fifths.

Q. Of the total vote?

A. Yes. Practically speaking, they have no support. They get it simply from a business point of view. The best test as to their support would be to see their list of citizens' oath. You will find they have two oaths. One the citizen's oath, the other the official oath. They have a strong list of Government employes, Hawaiians, who say they are in favor of annexation. Certainly they would say so. The only independent body of natives was the Hawaiian Band. They are the only ones who stood out, notwithstanding my advice to sign the official oath. I signed one. I am a notary public. I did not sign the citizen's oath.

Q. Did you write the communication addressed to Mr. Stevens, the American minister, on the 17th of January, 1893, signed by Samuel Parker, minister of foreign affairs; William H. Cornwell, minister of finance; John F. Colburn, minister of the interior, and A. P. Peterson, attorney-general?

A. I did.

Q. What was done with that paper; who did you deliver it to?

A. I delivered it to Hopkins. A press copy was taken. I wrote the address myself, and Mr. Hopkins was dispatched with it, and I left the room. It was written in the marshal's office at the station house.

Q. Was there a reply from Mr. Stevens?

A. I was not there when the reply was received.

Q. A reply was received?

A. Yes; a reply was received to the effect that the Provisional Government being in possession of the Government building, treasury, and Government archives, he recognized them as a Government de facto.

Q. Up to that time was the Queen in possession of the barracks, palace, and station house?

A. She was.

Q. Up to that time had there been any effort on the part of the Provisional Government to take possession of them?

A. No effort whatever.

Q. After the reply of Mr. Stevens came was there any demand on the part of the Provisional Government for the surrender of these places?

A. I only know from hearsay. I saw Mr. Damon and others who came to the station house for that purpose, quite late, about half past six or seven.

Q. Was that after the reply?

A. Long after.

Q. Up to that time the people who proclaimed the Provisional Government made no aggressive movement beyond going to the Government building?

A. None whatever.

Q. After they issued the proclamation everything remained in *status quo* until the recognition by Mr. Stevens of the Provisional Government?

A. Yes.

Q. Subsequent to this was the proposition on the part of the Provisional authorities to the Queen to surrender?

A. Yes; I was there when Mr. Wilson surrendered. I think they had McCandles there. He made a few remarks. He said that he would only surrender on condition that the United States troops would make demand on him, or the Queen should ask him to surrender.

Q. Now, after this response from Mr. Stevens, was there a cabinet consultation on the subject of surrender?

A. I can not tell you, either from hearsay or in anyway. After receiving that reply from Mr. Stevens it fell flat like a pancake.

Q. How much time intervened between the reception of that reply and the surrender of the station house and barracks?

A. Two hours.

Q. In these two hours, where were you?

A. Around the neighborhood of the station house in my office; within a space of say, 200 yards. Business people and everybody thronged around the station house and by Bishop's bank.

Q. What was their object?

A. To hear the news as to whether Mr. Stevens had recognized the Provisional Government. I remember the news was brought to me that he had declined to recognize it. Then news came that he had recognized it.

Q. There was an eagerness obtaining in the minds of the people, both in the reform party and the native population, to know just what Mr. Stevens was going to do?

A. Exactly, it was the turning point of everything.

Q. And when that was ascertained?

A. It fell flat as a pancake.

Q. And when that was ascertained, the minds of all persons seemed to accept that as authority?

A. Oh, yes. It was Mr. Stevens' attitude in the matter to which all persons looked up. Bear in mind, Mr. Blount, that the evening before I had heard from two members of the cabinet that Mr. Stevens had told them troops were landed to protect people and to keep the Queen in office, and I was surprised to hear this.

Q. Who told you this?

A. Colburn and Parker. They said they had Mr. Stevens's word that the troops were landed to protect the Queen.

Q. Where were the troops stationed at the time of the proclamation?

A. Between Arion Hall and the Government building, with their field pieces out.

Q. At what point?

A. Right in front of Arion Hall, 50 or 100 feet from the corner of Music Hall. They faced there while the proclamation was being read faced, the Government building.

Q. Were the troops formed?

A. They were formed.

Q. Where was the artillery?

A. I can not tell you whether it was on that side of Music Hall or on the other side.

Q. What street were the troops on?

A. I do not know whether it is called Wilder's lane or Gibson's lane. It was the lane or street between Arion Hall and the Government building.

Q. Where was the artillery?

A. With the troops on the same street.

Q. They were not in the hall, but formed on that lane or street?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was the situation when the proclamation of the Provisional Government was read?

A. It was.

Q. And nothing further was done by the Provisional Government in the matter of taking possession of the Palace, the barracks and the police quarters until Mr. Stevens had formally recognized it?

A. Nothing was done by it.

Q. And when that was made known, the recognition by Mr. Stevens, there was a feeling on the part of the native population and of foreigners that this determined the controversy?

A. Yes; the Provisional Government had a few men around the Government building.

Q. Where?

A. Around the Government building. I think there were about 30 or 40 in the inclosure of the Government building.

Q. They didn't come out of the inclosures?

A. No.

Q. Were there any guards at the entrance of the inclosure?

A. No.

Q. Do you know anything of a visit of Mr. Parker and Mr. Colburn to Mr. Stevens on Monday?

A. I do not know of my own knowledge, except that we often sent them there.

Q. Were they sent on Monday?

A. Two or three times.

Q. What report did they bring back?

A. That the troops would be landed. That they would be landed to protect the Queen.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Mr. Blount.

A. ROSA.

Interview with M. M. Scott.

HONOLULU, Monday, April 10, 1893—9:20 a. m.

Mr. BLOUNT. Please tell me the causes, the surface and the bottom causes of this movement, the action of the people here in establishing the Provisional Government.

Mr. SCOTT. There has been a conviction since I have been here—ten or eleven years—that under the reign of Kalakaua, with his methods of controlling legislation under the old constitution, that with the irresponsible voting and irresponsible legislators, being controlled by the royal power, that that form of government could but lead to disastrous results here under his reign.

Mr. BLOUNT. You are referring to the condition before the constitution of 1887?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; and his notorious corruption of members of the Legislature, especially Hawaiian members.

Mr. BLOUNT. You now speak of prior to 1887?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; that was the cause of that movement in 1887. Well, of course after his death (Kalakaua) the present Queen came on the throne, and, as you are perhaps aware, the first thing she did was the dismissal of the ministers who had been appointed by Kalakaua; I believe the supreme court giving a decision that she was not bound to retain them, although this ministry had a majority in the Legislature. I think the court decided that by his death the ministry went out.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who were the judges of the court then?

Mr. SCOTT. Judd, Bickerton, and Dole.

Mr. BLOUNT. Was it a unanimous decision?

Mr. SCOTT. I think it was; no, I am inclined to think, perhaps, that Dole dissented on the grounds—well, I have forgotten what. I will not testify about that. Then the people who had known the former Queen here—Liliuokalani, as she was called—while recognizing the fact that she was a very headstrong woman, thought that by giving her the support of the better element of the community she might change her course for the better, and they did flock around her, all the foreign community and the missionaries.

A missionary here means, in the political slang of the day, anyone who is not affiliated with a few of what I conceive to be the worst elements of demagogues. It makes no difference what he is, a non-believer or a Buddhist, if he affiliates with the party for good government he is generally called a missionary. They related around here, and a paper published here by Bush and a number of his followers declared, that the Queen had ignored the claims of her own people, paid no attention to them. His paper was nasty, as it usually is, and said all manner of disagreeable things about the Queen. The paper was the strongest advocate of annexation.

Mr. BLOUNT. What is the name of the paper?

Mr. SCOTT. Ka Leo (this means "The Truth"). He even advocated taking her off her throne. Then came the election for the last Legislature, and of course they voted out the old ministry. This man Bush joined in with the opposition. The Queen positively declined having anything to do with Bush or Wilcox. She would not consent to give them any place because of the way in which they had assailed her personal life. Everyone knew she could not very well do it. Then they

went along very slowly, this Legislature did, and voted out minister after minister.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will you please state how many ministers were voted out?

Mr. SCOTT. About the middle of the session they voted out the whole ministry which she had appointed when they went in—Widdeman, Whiting, Parker, and Spencer.

Mr. BLOUNT. When was that?

Mr. SCOTT. About the middle of the session, after they had been going about two months.

Mr. BLOUNT. Of 1892?

Mr. SCOTT. Then, after a vacation of two or three weeks, after political log-rolling, they tried to get her to listen to the appointment of a good ministry. All at once there was the appointment of another ministry, consisting of Macfarlane, Neumann, Parker, and Gulick.

Mr. BLOUNT. The former had been voted out?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. They immediately took a vote of want of confidence against it after they went in and failed by one—24 to 25. They then went on not more than two weeks more, and brought up a vote of confidence and carried it largely—35 to 15. The natives voted against them.

Mr. BLOUNT. Against the cabinet?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, against the cabinet.

Mr. BLOUNT. What cabinet was that?

Mr. SCOTT. That was the second one—Neumann, Macfarlane, Spencer, Porter, and Gulick. After a vacation of some days, it is said, she came to her senses, and really was desirous of putting in a ministry that would please the Legislature and a majority of the property-holders of the country. They put in then this ministry: P. C. Jones, minister of finance; Cecil Brown (an Englishman) attorney-general; George Wilcox, of Kanai, one of the largest property-holders in the country, minister of the interior, and a half-white man, Mark Robinson, also a large property-owner, minister of foreign affairs. That was a ministry suitable to all classes of the community. All the better element joined in expressing satisfaction—English, German, Americans—all were perfectly satisfied with them.

That went on, and it was supposed, until a few days before the adjournment of the Legislature, that that would hold. In the meantime they declared a policy—the first ministry that had had nerve enough to say anything about what their policy was going to be. The other ministry was afraid to say whether they were opposed to the bank bill or the lottery bill. They did not know how to please the Hawaiians. They said they should fight for retrenchment and make the expenses of the Government come within the income. They were opposed decidedly to the lottery scheme, to the Horner bank bill, and to the opium bill. Then it was thought that they would hold until a few days before the adjournment, when it was found there had been a majority got for the lottery bill and the opium bill also. The Queen said if she could pass these two bills her ministry would have to resign.

Three days, I think it was, before the adjournment they passed the lottery bill and the opium bill. They let the bank bill go, because the natives were not so particular about that. They wanted the lottery. So that passed, and then the better element of the community here got around these ministers and said: "Do not resign; leave it to the Legislature to vote you out." They did not resign. I had talked with some of them. They said they could not afford to resign, and then the day

before the adjournment—the next day after they passed these bills—she signed them immediately, although delegations here from the Woman's Temperance Union and the churches called upon her and asked her not to do so. Then, the night after they passed them, they went around to Mr. C. A. Berger, a son-in-law of Mr. Widemann, to get him to vote to put out the ministry. They told him if he would vote for putting out the ministry they would let his father-in-law form a cabinet for the Queen.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me ask you a question on that point. What is the evidence of this promise?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Berger's own statement to various gentlemen around here.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who are they?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know that I can mention any. It was put out at the club by Mr. Cecil Brown. I do not know that he told me so himself. It is certainly true. It is common talk. Perhaps, however, you do not wish to take this.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to take all you have to say.

Mr. SCOTT. I am positive all this is true. So far as my feelings go in the politics of this community I have no interest. After they voted them out Mr. Widdeman was sent for. She began to name the cabinet she had chosen. She said the office of minister of the interior was filled by Mr. Colburn. "Oh, then," said Mr. Widdeman, "I will have nothing do with it. I should do all the work and get all the blame. I will have nothing to do with it."

Mr. BLOUNT. Was the minister of the interior the only one named?

Mr. SCOTT. The minister of finance, Mr. Cornwell.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, any others?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know of any others.

Mr. BLOUNT. It was at this point that he, Widdeman, declared he would have nothing to do with it?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLOUNT. How did you get that information?

Mr. SCOTT. I got it from people to whom Mr. Widemann told it. I got it from several people who visited his house, whose veracity I can certainly vouch for.

Mr. BLOUNT. That's enough.

Mr. SCOTT. Then immediately she appointed Mr. Colburn, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Cornwell, and Mr. Parker. Then came the morning of the prorogation. A majority of what is called the Reform party—that is, I think, all of them in fact did not appear at the prorogation.

Mr. BLOUNT. What was their idea for absenting themselves?

Mr. SCOTT. They were so disgusted, Mr. Blount, with the last week or ten days of the Legislature, the means used to get the ministry out and the substitution of a ministry that nobody had confidence in. They made no concerted action. I do not think they went together, but each one resolved within himself he would not appear there any more. They saw the futility of having worked four or five or six months of this session; they wanted to get to their business. They had large business interests out on the Islands. They got tired and disgusted with this idle talk.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will you allow me to ask you there—the men who absented themselves—what class of people did they belong to?

Mr. SCOTT. They belonged to what is generally known as the Reform party—that is, to reform the methods of politics and legislation. Such men as Young, of the iron works; Walbridge, of Waliuku, manager of

a plantation; Anderson, one of the nobles of Waliuku, and Al Wilcox, of Kuai, owner of a plantation. That class of men. The most responsible men in the community.

Mr. BLOUNT: Generally large property owners?

Mr. SCOTT: Yes, and representatives of property interests.

Mr. BLOUNT: Who made up the other side; what class of men?

Mr. SCOTT: About fifteen natives, whose names you could not write down, coming from various outer districts. Did not, perhaps, represent \$500 worth of property in the country. The men on this side who did represent property were Cummins, who had a large property once, but, like all other Hawaiians, wasted it and is heavily in debt, and Peterson (he was in the ministry).

Mr. BLOUNT. These were both natives?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. I do not know of any white men on that side. I think perhaps a few, three or four, did remain just for appearance's sake.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me ask you, were they all natives on that side?

Mr. SCOTT. The side that stayed in?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. Generally natives.

Mr. BLOUNT. What else besides natives?

Mr. SCOTT. They were nearly all natives. Some few half-castes like Mr. White, of Lahaina. They were nearly all natives or half white men. The English, I think, and the Americans, the nobles and the representative men, all absented themselves to a man. At the time I was at Wakiki, I moved out to Wakiki, I think it was about 2 o'clock.

Mr. BLOUNT. What day?

Mr. SCOTT: The same day. I think it was about 2 o'clock Saturday. I have forgotten the day of the month. We were startled at Wakiki—we were all there on Saturday afternoon. We heard that the Queen had proclaimed a new constitution. I do not know whether the message was that she had or was going to proclaim a new constitution. Everybody was on the *qui vive*. I did not go up at all. It seems that she had invited a number of legislators, I do not know how many, over to the palace to partake of some kind of a collation, but before the collation came around, I believe it was before, she sent for the ministers. She was dressed in her robes of state. She said she had proclaimed this constitution or was going to and wanted them to sign it, I was told, without reading it.

I was told by men who were there. This is hearsay. When they said they had not read it she said, "Why do you say so, when you have had it in your pocket three weeks." She told them she did not want to hear any more advice. She said, "You know if I go out and proclaim it to my people they may come in and tear you limb from limb."

Mr. BLOUNT. How did you get that information? Just in the same way?

Mr. SCOTT. I got it from Chief Justice Judd. He said she looked like a fiend.

Mr. BLOUNT. Please go on.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I believe it was told me, two or more were inclined to sign. Peterson and Colburn refused, and asked for time. They went over to the Government building. Colburn went down to W. O. Smith's office and asked what support they could get from the community if they refused to sign it. He advised them not to sign it; said that they would have the support of all the better element of the community.

Mr. BLOUNT. What do you mean by what support they could get from the community?

Mr. SCOTT. In case they refused to sign it. They were frightened to death—thinking of the Kalakaua riots. They went to the men they were in political opposition to for support, knowing they were the only men to be depended upon. They knew they had real backbone. This was told them by Thurston, Smith, Castle, Emmeluth, and others. Mr. Emmeluth is a mechanic. He is a man of sound sense. He told me that this constitution was coming two weeks before. Then immediately the men around the street went into Smith's office and organized this committee of thirteen.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I noticed—I did not come to town—that there was a meeting at the armory that evening.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before going on further, what was the size of the crowd at Smith's office?

Mr. SCOTT. That I can not tell. There were the thirteen there. I do not know how many more.

Mr. BLOUNT. Please go on.

Mr. SCOTT. On Monday morning I noticed there was a meeting at the armory. The notice was to the effect that all who were opposed to the late revolutionary methods of the Queen would meet at the armory. I think that was at 2 o'clock. I am principal of a school of 300 white children. A great many rumors came up, one that the meeting was going to be opposed by martial force. Mothers came in carriages after their daughters and sons, especially the small ones. I concluded it was better to dismiss the children and let them go home before the excitement commenced in the streets. I did. I went down to this meeting. It was assembled at the armory. I should judge there must have been twelve or fifteen hundred people there.

Mr. BLOUNT. Were you present at the meeting?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I was present at the meeting. I saw very few Hawaiians there. I saw one or two Chinese. It was a meeting of Americans, Englishmen, and Germans. The fact is it represented the property of the community.

Mr. BLOUNT. What institution of learning are you connected with?

Mr. SCOTT. I am principal of the Fort street school. I did not know what the procedure was going to be. I was afraid there would be trouble. I fully looked for it. I knew there was a determination on the part of the men. I knew they would do whatever they wished to do. W. C. Wilder was chairman of the meeting. There was Thurston there. Wilder stated that it was for no clique this meeting was called. It was for the whole community. He said they wanted to have this kind of thing stopped. Thurston gave an outline of the proceedings from Saturday up to the present time, what had occurred at the palace. The resolutions were read, as you know, for that committee of thirteen to take proceedings so as to insure tranquility and confidence in the community. That is the best of my recollection. I speak from memory.

The Germans were largely represented by the best Germans in the community and after several speeches by various men and after I read the resolutions over I knew perfectly well it meant some radical measures. We were not aware of just what it meant. I talked with no one. I said to myself it means business. The resolutions were passed unanimously with one dissenting voice, with Mr. S. R. Walker against it. He was vice-consul for England. He was well aware, he said, some