

The Manuel Reis Case

Wray Anthony F. Jose

Sunday, January 6, 1895: Honolulu was alive with rumors of rebellion.¹ An attempt was underway to unseat the Republic of Hawaii and restore the Hawaiian monarchy, which had been ousted two years before. In the summer and fall of 1894, forces loyal to deposed Queen Liliuokalani stored arms and ammunition around Honolulu in anticipation of the revolt.² On Saturday, January 5th, bands of native Hawaiians entered Honolulu from outlying districts, concentrating at Palama and Waikiki. Led by Robert W. Wilcox and Samuel Nowlein, the uprising was set to begin just after one o'clock on the morning of January 7th.³ Arms had been landed in a small schooner off the coast of Diamond Head and cached in the Waikiki home of Henry Bertelmann, a royalist conspirator. But Honolulu police pre-empted the rebels' plans. On the night of January 6th, police Captain Robert Parker led a squad of six officers to the Bertelmann home. The police inspected the grounds until they came upon an old canoe-house in the rear. There, they encountered a band of armed men.⁴

They exchanged gunfire. Representative-elect Charles L. Carter, who had joined the posse, was shot and later died of his wounds. The man who shot him, a rebel named Jim Lane, put a gun to Parker's head and fired. But an officer poised nearby knocked the gun away in time for the bullet to barely miss its target. Lane, Bertelmann, and another rebel were captured as the rest fled along the beach and through the woods toward Diamond Head, with the police in hot pursuit.⁵

In the days that followed, fighting was reported in Waikiki, Palolo, Manoa, and elsewhere. But the government never lost control. On January 7th, Hawaii President Sanford B. Dole declared martial law and

Wray Anthony F. Jose is a student in the School of Law, University of Hawaii.

suspended the writ of habeas corpus. Within a week, Wilcox and Nowlein were captured, and more than one-hundred others were detained on charges of conspiracy.⁶

Military tribunals convened by the government pronounced sentences of death in a few cases,⁷ which prompted an outcry from Hawaii's diplomatic community. Some of those arrested were citizens of foreign countries, such as Great Britain, Denmark and Portugal.⁸ They issued pleas against the use of the death penalty. Addressing Dole as "the Philosophic Christian who is at the head of the Hawaiian nation," the Portuguese Consul General in Hawaii, Antonio de Souza Canavarro, implored: "in the name of the Government of Portugal, in the name of my country where the death penalty has long been abolished, I exhort Your Excellency not to sanction extreme measures of this kind."⁹

Public sentiment for leniency was overwhelming, and within a few months all were freed¹⁰—many being forcibly deported.¹¹ The affair soon produced a number of indemnity claims, which were pressed by foreign governments on behalf of citizens detained by Hawaiian authorities.¹² Among these was a claim by Portugal on behalf of a Portuguese subject living in Honolulu named Manoel Gil dos Reis, commonly known as Manuel Reis, who was arrested on January 9, 1895 and imprisoned for five weeks.¹³ The case became a source of friction between Portugal and Hawaii, as Hawaii refused to adjust the claim.¹⁴ In response, Portugal in 1896 decided to halt the emigration of Portuguese contract laborers to Hawaii.¹⁵

The emigration from Portugal resumed after Hawaii's annexation by the United States. But between 1895 and 1899, the remainder of Hawaii's days as an independent republic, no ships bearing Portuguese immigrant laborers and their families docked at Hawaii's shores.¹⁶ This was the legacy of the Reis case. The present article is a study of the Manuel Reis case and its effect upon Portuguese-Hawaiian diplomatic relations.

MANOEL GIL DOS REIS

Manuel Reis was a cab driver.¹⁷ Born in Oporto, Portugal on November 25, 1854, Reis came to Hawaii as a young man after signing aboard a whaler called the *Atlantic*, which cruised the Pacific Ocean. One night the *Atlantic* collided with another vessel, and though both were damaged, neither sank. Together, the two vessels sailed for Hawaii, which was four-thousand miles away. Arriving at Honolulu on September 12, 1875, the *Atlantic* discharged its cargo of whale oil. But while working the

cargo, Reis broke his left arm and was confined to Queen's Hospital. While Reis convalesced, the *Atlantic* sailed without him.¹⁸

Reis received an honorable discharge from the ship's service, but was unable to sign aboard any other vessel because of the weakness of his arm. He eventually found work as a coach driver at the American Legation in Honolulu, where he made the acquaintance of the American Minister, General James W. Comly. On Comly's advice, Reis invested his savings in a livery stable-hack business, the horse-and-buggy version of a taxi company. The enterprise proved a success for Reis, who in partnership with several other foreigners operated Honolulu's "290" hackstand, located at King and Fort Streets. In 1879 Reis married Eugenia Keohookalani Mahuli Pilipo, of a prominent island family.¹⁹ By 1895, as a result of his business and social activities, Manuel Reis was one of the best known men in Honolulu.²⁰

Manuel Reis was a royalist. His wife, whose great grandparents had been Custodians at the City of Refuge at Hoonau, was prominent in royal social circles. She had attended Mililani, the royal school for girls, where her playmates were members of the royal family. Later, Queen Kapiolani even placed her ward, the young Princess Kalaniana'ole, in Mrs. Reis' care. Eugenia Reis eventually joined Rosalie Blaisdell in founding the Daughters and Sons of Hawaiian Warriors, a monarchist cultural organization.²¹ Also, Manuel Reis often chauffeured such royal notables as Kalakaua, Kapiolani, Liliuokalani and others, as part of his business.²² Finally, as a Portuguese subject himself, Reis may have inclined toward the monarchy out of a sense of tradition.

Many of Reis' customers were also prominent supporters of the monarchy. Indeed, the 290 was often called the "Royalist Hackstand" because of the number of known royalists it served.²³ Edward G. Hitchcock, Marshal of the Republic of Hawaii, reported that he himself had patronized the stand and observed that many of the government's most vociferous opponents were regular customers. This aroused the suspicions of the government. In the summer of 1894, with word of the intended revolt already leaking out, Hitchcock ordered Reis watched by Secret Service detectives. On the basis of their reports, Hitchcock became convinced that Reis was a conspirator in the rebellion.²⁴

THE CASE AGAINST REIS

Three detectives were assigned to the case: C. J. Johansen, John Dunn, and a man named "Topaz." According to their reports, Reis drove the conspirators around to clandestine meetings, usually at odd hours of the night. Johansen alleged, for example, that Reis had driven



Manuel and Eugenia Reis. From the *Honolulu Advertiser*, 1 December 1929, Society Sect., p. 6.

Clarence W. Ashford, former Attorney General in the Kalakaua cabinet and one of the alleged principles in the conspiracy, to rendezvous with other conspirators around Honolulu. Johansen testified that Reis drove Ashford

to School Street close to a place where a kanaka royalist lives . . . [then] to Waikiki, stopped at Bertelmann's place for a short time . . . [and] to Mrs. Bachelder's, and there I left them.²⁵

In late September a meeting was held in Kakaako "for the purpose," wrote Johansen, "of making an attack on the Hawaiian Government. . . ."²⁶ "I was at that meeting," Johansen declared. "[Reis] spoke very strong against the Government and Missionaries, and wished them all in hell. . . ." Johansen said Reis was very outspoken, and bragged about his courage. He allegedly told a Hawaiian man the next evening that he was willing to risk everything he had for the royalist cause, to see the government "licked to hell." Reis reportedly swore and cursed the government and allegedly told two men in conversation about the arms gathered by the rebels. "We have plenty of it," he said, "and we know how to use it."²⁷

Finally, two days before his arrest, Reis reportedly told Johansen and Dunn that they had better "look out" lest they too be "blown to hell together with the Missionaries." It was Johansen's opinion that the seeds of Reis' discontent lay in the decrease in business he had experienced since the overthrow of the monarchy. "He did not make half as much money as he did under the monarchy," said the detective.²⁸ "Such being the case," said Hitchcock, "after the insurrection commenced, I . . . ordered his arrest and confinement on charges of conspiracy. . . ."²⁹

On January 9, 1895, Reis was arrested and confined to a cell in Oahu Prison. Other drivers at the 290, John Radin, Nicholas Peterson, and James Brown, were also arrested. "They appeared to be the most surprised men in town," reported the *Honolulu Advertiser* the next day. "The arrests among the hackmen gave the fraternity an unpleasant 'who next' feeling, and one was heard asking as to the fare of the prisoners, that he might know what to take with him if he were called to go."³⁰

In a deposition filed later, Reis vigorously denied the accusations: "I solemnly swear that the information laid against me is false in every particular so far as it connects me, directly or indirectly, with intriguing or interfering with the Government. . . ."³¹ Reis charged that Marshal Hitchcock and his officers had mistaken his identity. He denied ever having driven Hitchcock in his cab, as the latter had claimed, and

charged that in an interview with Hitchcock after his arrest the Marshal could remember neither Reis' name nor occupation. Reis also denied having driven Ashford to the places named by Johansen, or having attended any political meetings as claimed. Represented by Paul Neumann, a Honolulu attorney secured for Reis by the Portuguese Consul General, Reis declared:

I never attended any political meetings in connection with the revolution of any kind, nor have I by word or in deed interfered with Hawaiian politics. I only drove C. W. Ashford once, and that was months before the revolution. His driver was generally Charles Nelson of our hackstand. I had no choice in the selection of my patrons, and no interest in their political affiliations.³²

Ashford also disputed the detective's claim. In an affidavit filed from San Francisco, Ashford declared that while he may have hired Reis to drive him between his office and the courthouse in Honolulu, "on some occasion," he had not been driven beyond there by Reis, "either to School Street, or to Waikiki, at any time . . . for any purpose. . . ."³³ Ashford attested to having known Reis for the length of his fourteen-year residence in Hawaii, but insisted that the charges made against Reis were "untrue in every particular."³⁴

Reis' attorney vigorously attacked the detectives' credibility. He produced John Mitchell, an American living in Honolulu, who claimed to be "intimately acquainted" with Johansen. Mitchell said that the detective's reputation was that of a "low-down scoundrel," and that "no one ever believed his word, even under oath."

He never hesitated to catch his man the best way he could, and he always made his money by pleasing his employers. It was not always necessary to stick to the truth to do this, and he would make money from both sides if he could. Lies or truth made no difference to him. . . . Among his occupations was that of enticing deserters from ships and hiding them until the usual reward was offered, when he would surrender them for the reward.³⁵

As for Topaz and Dunn, the other detectives assigned to the case, Dunn was alleged in documents filed with the Marshal's office to have been an ex-convict who had served prison terms in Maine, Oregon, and elsewhere before fleeing to Hawaii to escape trial for perjury; and Topaz subsequently committed suicide.³⁶ Although there was no offer of proof of the allegations against Dunn, nor any indication that Topaz's suicide had anything to do with his work as a detective, Reis nevertheless cited these as evidence of their lack of reliability.

After two weeks of imprisonment, however, formal charges still had not been filed against Reis, who remained confined in Oahu Prison, in a

cell five by seven feet in dimension. Neumann demanded to know the charges, but was told only that the government was not yet ready to press any. At about this time, Reis became ill with a fever. Neumann appealed for Reis' release, arguing that even under martial law, the government had no right to hold Reis indefinitely, especially in view of his illness. But Neumann's pleas were ignored.³⁷

On January 25th, Reis received a visit from his physician, Dr. John Brodie. Brodie found Reis in a hot, enclosed cell with an atmosphere "impregnated with foul and offensive odors."

He was then in a high state of fever and completely prostrated by the shock to his nervous system caused by the confinement in an unwholesome atmosphere and anxiety of the mind for the welfare and safety of his family coupled with his ignorance of the causes and motives which led to his arrest and of the intentions of the government towards him.³⁸

Reis was not yet delirious, said the doctor, but his condition was bad enough to warrant hospitalization.

... His condition was so serious and alarming that it was absolutely necessary to have him promptly removed to the prison hospital where the air would be somewhat purer and cooler and the surroundings more favorable for his recovery.³⁹

Brodie appealed to the Oahu Prison Jailer, J. A. Lowe, for Reis' immediate release to the prison hospital. Lowe refused, explaining that such a move would be "impracticable"; there were too many prisoners already in the hospital, he said, and "while there actually was room for Reis in it, the authorities did not consider it advisable to place him there with the other prisoners." Brodie saw Reis again the next day and found him "much worse," suffering from "Jail Fever" and "nervous prostration." "His condition, in fact, was such that the closest attention and vigilance was necessary in order to restore him to health, or even to insure his life."⁴⁰

Later that day, Reis received a visit from an associate of Brodie, Dr. H. V. Murray. The doctors both asserted that they would hold prison authorities responsible for Reis' life, and Reis was finally transferred to the prison hospital.⁴¹ Drs. Brodie and Murray attended Reis alternately thereafter throughout his ordeal.⁴² Finally, on February 13, 1895, five weeks after his arrest, Reis was released from Oahu Prison, but still held amenable to the orders of the Marshal.⁴³ In March, martial law was lifted. No formal charges had ever been brought against Reis, nor trial afforded by which his guilt or innocence might have been proved.⁴⁴

The experience left Reis shaken. Drs. Brodie and Murray testified that Reis' imprisonment had "permanently weakened his general constitution." They said Reis was unable to take charge of his business, or to engage in his former activities as a cab driver.⁴⁵ Neumann obtained permission from the Marshal for Reis to leave Honolulu for the island of Hawaii, and at the request of the Portuguese Consul, studied a claim for indemnity against the Hawaiian government. Neumann concluded that under the Indemnity Acts passed by the Hawaii legislature after the revolt, Reis could not be indemnified through the ordinary courts of the Republic. ". . . His only recourse," said Neumann, "is by diplomatic appeal to the country of which he claims citizenship."⁴⁶

PORTUGAL SEEKS INDEMNITY

The Hawaii Indemnity Acts of 1895 were designed to protect the Hawaiian government from suits resulting from its use of force in suppressing the rebellion. The Acts were "almost a carbon copy" of a measure adopted in Jamaica after an uprising there in 1865, which gave the government broad powers to act in the event of emergency. Even if its actions resulted in injury to the innocent, the government could not be held liable.⁴⁷

With diplomatic intercession the only avenue of redress left for Reis, Portugal initiated a \$50,000 indemnity claim against the Hawaiian government on his behalf.⁴⁸ The Portuguese Consul General termed "undesirable" Hawaii's use of its martial powers, charging that the government had gone too far in demonstrating that it was in control.⁴⁹ ". . . A plausible explanation cannot be found which would justify [Reis'] prolonged imprisonment," wrote Canavarro to Hawaii Foreign Minister Henry Cooper, "and moreover the omission of all trial and all judgement would indicate a lack of impartiality in the exercise of this abnormal jurisdiction. . . ." Canavarro said all this would "justify a reasonable demand for compensation."⁵⁰

But Reis' claim was large in comparison with most others arising from the revolt. Claims pending for nine British subjects, for example, totaled only \$6,400, one demanding as little as \$200. The only claims to rival Reis' were those of two Greek citizens, one of whom, like Reis, claimed \$50,000; the other wanted \$75,000.⁵¹

Hawaii rejected the claims. Reis and the others were not entitled to reparations because they had participated in "seditious and treasonable acts," said Cooper. In a letter to Canavarro, the Foreign Minister intimated that since the claimants had chosen Hawaii as a residence, diplomatic intervention was inappropriate. He also complained, in spite

of the Indemnity Acts, that Reis had not taken the matter through Hawaii's courts.⁵²

Moreover, Cooper said Reis' detention was justified regardless of whether or not he was actually guilty. It was enough that the government had "probable cause" to suspect him of complicity in the uprising. Just because Reis was released without trial didn't mean he was not in fact guilty. Cooper pointed out, for example, that Reis' associates, who were arrested with him, were all released without trial after signing stipulations to leave the country. "This in itself must be looked upon as a confession of guilt on their part," he said. Reis was not deported because "the authorities were satisfied that he was not in good health," and so he was "practically released on parole."⁵³

Citing legal precedents established after the Jamaica uprising in 1865, Cooper asserted the right of a government to use force to suppress rebellion. He quoted from *Phillips v. Eyre*, a case decided in the Exchequer Chamber, stating that Phillips, the plaintiff, "was arrested in his own house and wrongfully imprisoned there . . .

that he was beaten and flogged by defendant; that he was taken to Ordinance Wharf and there placed on board a ship . . . and conveyed away, and that his goods and chattels were disposed by defendant to his own use.⁵⁴

The defendant, who was the "Captain General and Governor of Jamaica," explained that he had declared martial law in response to an uprising, and that his actions were reasonable and "done in good faith" to bring the revolt to an end.⁵⁵ The Exchequer ruled in favor of the Governor, declaring that he "may have saved lives and property out of all proportion to the mistakes he may honestly commit under information which turns up to be erroneous or treacherous."⁵⁶ Thus, concluded Cooper, "the rights of individuals must yield to the obligations of a Government to protect the lives and property of persons under its protection."⁵⁷ "It is respectfully submitted," wrote Cooper, "that the arrest and detention of Mr. Reis was justifiable, and that he has shown no ground for complaint."⁵⁸

Portugal wasn't satisfied. To impress Hawaii with the gravity with which it viewed the affair, Portugal indicated that it would discourage the further emigration of Portuguese contract laborers and their families to Hawaii.⁵⁹

THE PORTUGUESE EMIGRATION TO HAWAII

This was not the first time that emigration had lapsed after Portugal had been angered by the actions of Hawaiian authorities. The emigration,

which had begun in 1878, had continued largely uninterrupted for ten years. But in 1886, the Portuguese Consul General complained about Hawaii's failure to provide authorized interpreters for the Portuguese in court.⁶⁰ Matters came to a head in 1887 when Canavarro, citing various instances of police and judicial abuse, submitted to his government "all that has passed" in order that it may "take such steps as may be deemed proper."⁶¹ Between 1888 and 1895, no ships bearing Portuguese immigrants called at Hawaii's ports.⁶² High costs also contributed to this hiatus.

In 1894, Hawaii tried to renew the immigration from Portugal. Lorrin A. Thurston, Hawaii Minister to Washington, traveled to Portugal to secure a treaty that would formally re-initiate the emigration.⁶³ A Provisional Convention had been concluded in 1882 for the purpose of maintaining the emigration,⁶⁴ but was denounced by Portugal in 1891.⁶⁵

In December 1894, Thurston held talks with the Portuguese, but failed to win a treaty.⁶⁶ He nevertheless succeeded in re-inaugurating the emigration from Portugal on an informal basis—by an arrangement he described enthusiastically. "I think the Oporto connection an especially valuable one," Thurston wrote confidentially to Foreign Minister Francis M. Hatch, "as the number of Government officials who have a finger in the pie renders us reasonably secure. . . ."⁶⁷

As Thurston left Portugal for Washington in January 1895, on the eve of the abortive royalist revolt, prospects for the renewed emigration from Portugal appeared good. In April, the steamship *Braunfels* arrived with 657 Portuguese immigrants aboard, the first such ship in seven years.⁶⁸

But at a meeting of the Executive Council in March 1896, Immigration Commissioner C. Bolte revealed that the Portuguese Consul General had "intimated to him that he would discourage any further immigration of Portuguese laborers to Hawaii. . . ." This revelation thus "put an end to any hope of obtaining any more Portuguese emigrants."⁶⁹

In other words, barely had the emigration from Portugal been re-opened than it was again stalled indefinitely, as Portugal continued to demand an indemnity in the Reis case.

ARBITRATION

Hawaii protracted the affair. In 1898, as annexation by the United States approached, Cooper told Canavarro that Hawaii would have considered arbitration in the matter if it had remained an independent nation, but in view of the imminent transfer of sovereignty, the Governor

felt that Hawaii had “no longer the authority to take further steps in the matter.”⁷⁰

With that, Canavarro brought the affair to the attention of the Portuguese Minister in Washington, Viscount de Santo Thyrso, who in turn took it up with the U.S. Secretary of State, John Hay.⁷¹ Thyrso termed “ridiculous” the charge that conspirators in the 1895 revolt had used Reis’ cab: “patrons select the cabmen whom they employ,” he said, “but cabmen do not select their patrons.” Imploring Washington’s intercession in the case, Thyrso expressed confidence that the United States government would settle the affair in a “speedy and just manner.”⁷²

But in 1899, after an opinion by the U.S. Attorney General, all such outstanding claims were referred back to Hawaii for “consideration, determination and payment.”⁷³ Washington was also under pressure from Great Britain to settle the claims it had pending against Hawaii as a result of the 1895 revolt.⁷⁴ But Britain had refused to arbitrate the claims of American citizens deported from South Africa during the Boer war, and so the United States was now not prepared to arbitrate British claims arising under similar circumstances.⁷⁵

The British got the message. In 1901, Great Britain set up a commission to adjust the American claims, and agreed to pay a lump sum of £6,000. Calling the settlement a “liberal one,” Hay told Dole he would be “pleased if a similar course could be reached by the Government of Hawaii and an arrangement reached which you might find to be just and satisfactory, and even liberal.”⁷⁶

In his 1903 message to the territorial legislature, Dole asked for the authority to set up a three-person commission to examine and ultimately settle the claims. Such a bill passed the Senate and survived two readings in the House of Representatives before being tabled on the third. “God knows on what reconsideration,” grumbled the Portuguese Minister.⁷⁷

Dole, who was stepping down as Governor, promised the State Department that he would bring the matter to the attention of his successor.⁷⁸ But the new Governor, George R. Carter, refused to provide for a commission to consider the claims. Declaring that the territory was operating on a monthly deficit of \$93,131.25, Carter proposed a policy of fiscal austerity. He asked the legislature to authorize no spending beyond anticipated revenues, and proposed a variety of cuts in the territorial budget.⁷⁹

But Britain disputed the American contention that the claims were Hawaii’s responsibility to settle. In the British view, when the United States annexed Hawaii, it also assumed its obligations. Britain thus insisted that the U.S. adjust the claims.⁸⁰

In 1908, the United States concluded arbitration conventions with Great Britain, Portugal, and many other nations in an effort to settle various outstanding claims.⁸¹ The conventions were authorized under terms of an agreement concluded at The Hague in 1907, proposing the peaceful settlement of international disputes.⁸² In 1911, Britain and the United States agreed upon a schedule of claims for consideration. The Hawaiian claims were listed under Class 3, "personal wrongs . . . alleged to be due to the operations of the military or naval forces of the other Government or to acts of negligence of the civil authorities. . . ."⁸³ But with Europe soon embroiled in war, efforts to settle the claims were reduced to periodic extensions of the arbitration conventions. The matter was finally submitted to a three-man arbitration panel in Washington in 1925, thirty years after the claims were first initiated.

Wishing to expedite the process, the tribunal avoided the issue of the propriety of the arrests, and concentrated instead on the question of whether or not one country, in annexing another, is liable for the latter's prior obligations. Britain argued that it was; the United States countered that it was not. On November 10, 1925, after three days of deliberation, the tribunal sided with the United States: "We decide," declared tribunal President Alfred Nerinx, "that these claims must be rejected."⁸⁴

By avoiding the issue of the propriety of the arrests, the tribunal left open the possibility that the Hawaiian government could still be held responsible for the indemnity claims. But because Britain had contended that responsibility for the claims rested with Washington, no further claims against the Hawaiian government were pressed. By 1929, Manuel Reis was satisfied that the case was closed.⁸⁵

MANUEL REIS IN LATER YEARS

Manuel Reis remained a well-known figure in Honolulu. The Reises, who owned a home on Queen Street, purchased some land in Makiki where they planned to build a new house. In 1896 Reis bought another lot on Punchbowl, for the purpose of speculating in real estate. But Mrs. Reis liked the new place so much that they decided to build there instead. "I knew the minute I set eyes on it that it was to be our home," she said.

By 1900, the house was finished. In a day when automobiles were still unknown, an imposing house on such a hill was an attraction and soon became the focal point of important social functions. Decorated in royal Hawaiian motif, the house frequently served as the site of ceremonials

hosted by the Daughters and Sons of Hawaiian Warriors. It stood as a reminder of Hawaii's regal past. "You are transported back years to the times of monarchical splendor," wrote the *Star-Bulletin* in 1934, "for here stand gorgeous kahilis, a score of them, their feathers gently waving in the breeze from Punchbowl. . . ."⁸⁶

The Reises often hosted visiting royalty such as the Prince of Wales, and Lord Jellicoe of Britain who greeted the couple aboard his yacht.⁸⁷ The Reises also entertained the Crown Prince and Princess of Sweden, who were made honorary members of the Warriors Society, as well as other royal figures. Besides royalty, the Reises met such visiting dignitaries as William Howard Taft, who was then a member of President Theodore Roosevelt's cabinet, and Senator Warren G. Harding. Both men later served as Presidents of the United States. Indeed, it became customary that distinguished visitors to Honolulu be escorted by Reis in his cab.⁸⁸

In 1908 Reis became the first cab driver in Hawaii to introduce automobiles into his operation, earning him the unofficial title "Honolulu's Number One Taxi Driver."⁸⁹ For years Reis received the first license plate issued by the city, number 1000, and later 50,000 when that number denoted the first license plate. In 1929 Reis retired from his active business career.⁹⁰

The Manuel Reises left their mark on the city. Eugenia Reis, who remained active in community affairs, was elected Mo'i of the Warriors Society, its highest office, and later served as President of the Trustees of Kapiolani Maternity Hospital.⁹¹ In addition, Prospect Street, which today is a major thoroughfare along Punchbowl, was originally opened by the Manuel Reises as a private road.⁹²

On December 4, 1929 the Reises celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary with a gala party at their Punchbowl home. They talked and laughed again with old friends such as Fred Harrison and T. B. Walker, who like Reis had been held as political prisoners in 1895. They made "a merry group," the *Advertiser* wrote the next day.⁹³ On September 25, 1939 Manuel Reis died at his home in Honolulu. He was eighty-four.⁹⁴

NOTES

¹ PCA, 7 January 1895, p. 1.

² Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day, *Hawaii: A History* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976), p. 185.

³ PCA, 11 January 1895, p. 2.

⁴ PCA, 7 January 1895, p. 1.

- ⁵ PCA, 11 January 1895, p. 2.
- ⁶ PCA, 7-16 January 1895, pp. 1-2.
- ⁷ Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii: A History*, pp. 185-86.
- ⁸ *Report of the Governor to the Secretary of State*, 20 November 1900, Territorial Departments-State, AH, p. 2.
- ⁹ Letter, Canavarro to Dole, 26 January 1895, Consul General for Portugal File, AH (hereafter CGP).
- ¹⁰ Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii: A History*, p. 186.
- ¹¹ Letter, Hay to Dole, 11 May 1903, FO & Ex.
- ¹² *Report of the Governor*, 20 November 1900, p. 2.
- ¹³ Letter, Canavarro to Cooper, 30 December 1895, CGP.
- ¹⁴ Letter, Cooper to Canavarro, 4 August 1898, FOLB, p. 284.
- ¹⁵ *Minutes of the Executive and Cabinet Councils*, 11 March 1896, pp. 99-100, AH.
- ¹⁶ John H. Felix and Peter F. Senecal, *The Portuguese in Hawaii*, (Honolulu: Sturgis Printing Co., 1978), p. 29.
- ¹⁷ Letter, Thyrso to Hay, 25 November 1898, CGP.
- ¹⁸ HA, 3 December 1929, p. 7.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁰ *Report of the Governor*, 20 November 1900, p. 60.
- ²¹ HSB, 20 April 1942, p. 2.
- ²² HA, 3 December 1929, p. 7.
- ²³ HSB, 30 June 1934, Sec. 3, p. 1.
- ²⁴ Hitchcock Deposition, FOLB 76, pp. 656-58.
- ²⁵ Johansen Deposition, FOLB 76, p. 660.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 661.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ Hitchcock Deposition, p. 658.
- ³⁰ PCA, 10 January 1895, p. 2.
- ³¹ Reis Deposition, 1900, CGP.
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ Ashford Deposition, 1900, CGP.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*
- ³⁵ Mitchell Deposition, 1900, CGP.
- ³⁶ Reis Deposition.
- ³⁷ Neumann Affidavit, 1900, CGP.
- ³⁸ Medical Certificate of Dr. John Brodie, *Report of the Governor*, 20 November 1900, p. 70.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ Letter, Thyrso to Hay, 25 November 1898, CGP.
- ⁴² Brodie Certificate, p. 71.
- ⁴³ Neumann Affidavit.
- ⁴⁴ Letter, Thyrso to Hay, 25 November 1898, CGP.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

- ⁴⁶ Neumann Affidavit.
- ⁴⁷ *Minutes of the Executive and Cabinet Councils*, 13 March 1895, p. 84.
- ⁴⁸ Letter, Dole to Crabbe, 5 March 1903, *Governor's Letterbook 5*, p. 288.
- ⁴⁹ Letter, Canavarro to Dole, 26 January 1895, CGP.
- ⁵⁰ Letter, Canavarro to Cooper, 30 December 1895, CGP.
- ⁵¹ Letter, Dole to Crabbe, 5 March 1903, *Governor's Letterbook 5*, p. 288.
- ⁵² Letter, Cooper to Canavarro, 27 August 1896, FOLB 76, p. 639.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 632–33.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 635–36.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 636.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 637.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 639.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 655.
- ⁵⁹ *Minutes of the Executive and Cabinet Councils*, 11 March 1896, pp. 99–100.
- ⁶⁰ Letter, Canavarro to Gibson, 10 May 1886, CGP.
- ⁶¹ Letter, Canavarro to Gibson, 17 February 1887, CGP.
- ⁶² Felix and Senecal, *Portuguese in Hawaii*, p. 29.
- ⁶³ Letter, Hatch to Thurston, 15 September 1894, Hawaiian Officials Abroad, AH.
- ⁶⁴ Letter, Carter to Green, 8 May 1882, Hawaiian Officials Abroad, AH.
- ⁶⁵ Letter, Canavarro to Parker, 4 March 1891, CGP.
- ⁶⁶ Letter, Thurston to Glade, 13 December 1894, document no. 168, Hawaiian Officials Abroad, AH.
- ⁶⁷ Letter, Thurston to Hatch, 13 December 1894, document no. 159, Hawaiian Officials Abroad, AH.
- ⁶⁸ Felix and Senecal, *Portuguese in Hawaii*, p. 29.
- ⁶⁹ *Minutes of the Executive and Cabinet Councils*, 11 March 1896, pp. 99–100.
- ⁷⁰ Letter, Cooper to Canavarro, 4 August 1898, FOLB 81, p. 284.
- ⁷¹ Letter, Canavarro to Cooper, 7 April 1898, CGP.
- ⁷² Letter, Thyerso to Hay, 25 November 1898, CGP.
- ⁷³ Letter, H. M. Sewall to Mott-Smith, 23 October 1899, FO & Ex.
- ⁷⁴ Letter, Pauncefote to Hay, 14 August 1900, Territorial Departments-State, AH.
- ⁷⁵ Letter, Adee to Cooper, 2 August 1901, Territorial Departments—State, AH.
- ⁷⁶ Letter, Hay to Dole, 23 December 1901, Territorial Departments-State, AH.
- ⁷⁷ Letter, Duarte to Hay, 28 August 1903, Territorial Departments-State, AH.
- ⁷⁸ Letter, Dole to Hay, 17 June 1903, *Governor's Letterbook 7*, p. 2B.
- ⁷⁹ PCA, 7 April 1904, pp. 4, 5.
- ⁸⁰ HA, 14 November 1924, pp. 1–2.
- ⁸¹ *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1908*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1909), p. 702.
- ⁸² *Ibid.*, 1907, p. 181.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.*, 1911, p. 270.
- ⁸⁴ *American and British Claims Arbitration, Claim No. 84*, U.S. Pamphlets, AH, p. 2.
- ⁸⁵ HA, 3 December 1929, p. 7.
- ⁸⁶ HSB, 30 June 1934, Sec. 3, p. 2.
- ⁸⁷ HA, 3 December 1929, p. 7.

- ⁸⁸ HA, 27 September 1939, p. 9.
- ⁸⁹ HSB, 30 June 1934, Sec. 3, p. 2.
- ⁹⁰ HA, 27 September 1939, p. 9.
- ⁹¹ HSB, 15 January 1942, p. 7.
- ⁹² HSB, 30 June 1934, Sec. 3, p. 2.
- ⁹³ HA, 5 December 1929, p. 6.
- ⁹⁴ HA, 26 September 1939, p. 5.