

A STORY OF GRAFTING

Mahaulu Passes Buck Up to One of the Boyds.

It may or may not be difficult for the jury to decide whether Stephen Mahaulu is guilty or not guilty when the case goes to them, but his trial has already established anew the fact made glaringly obvious in the trial of E. S. Boyd. That is, that for years public money in the Department of Public Lands has been regarded as private booty to the extent, no more and no less, that the stealings could be kept covered—both as to the amounts stolen and the time of concealment. As time passed, too, the aggregate of the thefts increased. When at length exposure came the spectacle was presented, which continued through the Boyd trial and is continuing through the Mahaulu trial, of the officials of the foul department swearing the guilt off upon each other.

Stephen Mahaulu yesterday afternoon took the stand in his own behalf, after an unsuccessful effort of his counsel to secure a directed verdict of acquittal as to the heaviest count in his indictment. His direct evidence was to the effect that the moneys for which he had given receipts without credits thereto appearing in the Land Office books had, as a matter of fact, been paid into the Treasury of the Territory and not converted by him to his own or any other's use, but that such moneys had been credited on the books to other accounts than those where they belonged for the purpose of covering up former shortages. The defalcations in question, the defendant testified, were all those of his superior in office, E. S. Boyd, who, according to the defendant's testimony, possessed the combination of the safe from first to last. He had access to it at all times and, on different occasions, had taken money from the safe. Moreover, Mahaulu swore he knew of a shortage in the office from the time he entered it as a clerk in 1898 until he left it as sub-agent a few months ago.

Under cross-examination Mahaulu acknowledged the entries and receipts for moneys, made and given by him respectively, which belonged to the accounts in which he had testified there were shortages to cover up which the moneys for which he was indicted had been used. He also testified that certain statements he made at an examination in the Attorney General's office upon the discovery of the defalcations, which tended to incriminate Boyd, were not true and must have been made by him in the excitement under which at that time he was laboring. His cross-examination was still in progress when the court rose for the day.

MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL.

Mr. Thompson, before opening for the defense, moved that the court instruct the jury to return a verdict of not guilty as to the second count of the indictment, relating to \$4500 paid by the Waiwale Company, because (1) the defendant never received the money, (2) it did not appear that he converted to his own use or to other's use the said \$4500, (3) no demand was made on him, (4) it did not appear that the sum was not converted by consent of the owner and (5) there was no evidence of any money received by the defendant from the Waiwale Company. Mr. Thompson argued out each point of his motion.

Mr. Prosser in reply said he did not care whether the defendant got that money or not who cashed the check, but the prosecution had evidence in defendant's own handwriting that he got \$500 which came out of that check and could prove intention to embezzle from the fact that he made the entry of the \$500 before he received the money. On the point of admissions going to the jury the Deputy Attorney General, on the authority of the Supreme Court, contended that where there are circumstances in a criminal case which the defendant might explain in his own behalf and he did not choose to explain them, the fact might go to the jury that he declined to explain the circumstances. It was for the jury to decide if they believed, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mahaulu received the money. The prosecution did not claim embezzlement of the check but that there were two receipts numbered 1206 given by Mahaulu, one of which for \$4500 was not credited on the books and the other for \$516 was credited on the books.

Mr. Thompson came again, arguing that there was still a hiatus. There was no proof that the money went into Mahaulu's hands. Judge Gear suggested the event of the jury's finding that the money could not possibly have gone into any other hands but Mahaulu's.

Mr. Thompson said it was circumstantial evidence all right, let it go to the jury, but the jury could not find evidence that was not there. Mr. Prosser said there was evidence for the jury of Mahaulu's receipt for \$4500 in his own handwriting. Judge Gear disclaimed the intention of binding the prosecution down to circumstantial evidence entirely, but said the court would have to charge the jury on circumstantial evidence as admitted. The jury having been called in, the court denied the motion for a directed verdict.

Mr. Thompson then moved that the prosecution be forced to elect on which count of the indictment it would proceed. Mr. Prosser for reply simply quoted the statute on that point and the court denied the motion. Mr. Thompson noting an exception.

LINE OF DEFENSE.

Mr. Thompson opened the case for the

defense to the jury, saying in substance: "We are not going to deny that Mahaulu received from Mary E. Clark the sum of \$525. We are not going to deny that this amount is not shown by the books to have been credited to Mary E. Clark. We are not going to deny that \$4500 came into the Land Office from the Waiwale Company. We are going to show that for a long time prior to the receipt of these moneys there had been an indiscriminate handling of money in the Land Office. We are going to show that every dollar of these moneys had been paid into the Treasury, and that Stephen Mahaulu never received a dollar of them or converted the money to his own use. When we prove that, we have proved all we want to."

MAHAULU TESTIFIES.

Stephen Mahaulu, defendant, being called and sworn testified to the following effect:

Am married. Have been in government employ since 1890, in the Land Office since 1898. Was clerk in 1891, sub-agent after that, under E. S. Boyd. Those in the office were myself, Boyd and George Rosa. I was appointed in 1891 as sub-agent. Boyd was Commissioner. I took in the cash during the time I was sub-agent. Put it in the safe.

Myself and Boyd had access to the safe. "H. K. B." was the combination when I went into the office. Prior to the time I was in Boyd was sub-agent. When I went into the office the combination was not changed. Initials in combination were those of Mrs. Boyd. The combination on the safe when I went into the office was continued all the time I was there. Boyd did know the combination of that safe, he did go into the safe. Boyd did not make a demand on me in August, 1903, for the combination as he testified. He never made such a demand. He knew the combination all the time. Besides myself Boyd went into the safe.

Q. Boyd testified in answer to a question of the court—"Did you ever open that safe and take any money out of it yourself?"—"No, sir." Is that true?

A. It is not true.

Q. Did Boyd at any time take money out of that safe?

A. Yes.

Had conversation with Boyd about \$925 paid by Mary E. Clark. There was a shortage and that money had to go in to balance the books. Boyd said: "Take out that Waiwale payment and deposit it in the Treasury." It was deposited with the Treasury, some time in June (consults book), the 20th. There was no official receipt given for that \$925. Boyd told me not to give an official receipt until the land had been inspected. He inspected the land himself. There never was an official receipt given for that money.

Had a conversation with Boyd about the \$4500 from the Waiwale Company. He told me to issue a receipt for that money and charge it up to the Honokaa Sugar Co. I got the money from the bank on the check, it was endorsed by Boyd. It was paid into the Treasury of the Territory of Hawaii. It does appear in the general cash, Jan. 23, deposited with the Treasury \$9800. The Waiwale check is included in that. He told me to charge it up to Honokaa Sugar Co.

Q. Did he give any reason why the \$4500 should be credited to any other than the Waiwale Company?

A. He told me there was a shortage on the Honokaa Sugar Co. It was cashed by me and turned over to the Treasury. The \$480 of Mam Sing Wai was turned into the Treasury. The \$500 of T. E. Lansing was also turned into the Treasury, but is not shown on the books because it went to cover up a shortage. I never received a dollar of these moneys. The shortage was Boyd's.

I remember a conversation Boyd had with me when he was going out of office. It was in November, 1903. He said:

"Stephen, you had better apply for my position and I will apply for the position of bookkeeper, so we can cover up the shortages."

He told me later he had applied for my position, he told me he saw the Governor, and that he had applied to the Central Committee. He told me that the \$4500 was part of the shortage he wished to cover up.

UNDER CROSS FIRE.

Cross-examined by Mr. Prosser the defendant testified as follows:

I first learned there was a shortage in 1900, before I became sub-agent. I was only a clerk then. Boyd had gone off on a vacation and I had the collecting of the money in the office. Mr. Brown wanted to see the cash. We went over the books and found there was a \$3000 shortage. I did not do a thing about it. Do not know if it was made up when Boyd came back. Brown knew when Boyd was away that there was \$3000 short. What explanation Boyd may have made to Brown I do not know.

I found there were other shortages when I became sub-agent. Cannot tell what was the total amount, think it was about \$9000. Do not know what other shortages there were. They amounted to a considerable amount, cannot state if they amounted to \$6000. I knew there were other shortages. Did not inform Mr. Brown. Knew there was a shortage by the books. Even when Brown went out and Boyd came in I never informed anybody. I knew Boyd took that money. He did not deposit it in the Treasury. He told me he would pay it by and by, he was my superior officer. All these moneys were finally paid into the Treasury to make up those previous shortages.

Mahaulu was shown the two receipts with the same number, 1206, and asked if the first one shown corresponded with the stub. He began fitting the receipt to the stub, when Mr. Prosser with a laugh asked:

"Is that the only way you can find out, by comparing the edges?" Mahaulu said one of the papers was "a loose receipt."

"Then when you gave that receipt for \$4500 you intended to use that money for purposes other than that for which it was paid to you?" Mr. Prosser asked.

Mr. Thompson objected to the question. (Continued on page 5.)

COUNTY ACT SUBSTITUTE

Text of Two of the Achi District Bills.

Following are two of the seven acts prepared by Senator Achi to take the place of the County law:

AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE ELECTION OF DISTRICT MAGISTRATES.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Section 1. District Magistrates shall be elected by electors in each District, where such Magistrates have jurisdiction. They shall be electors of the District at the time of the election. Their salaries shall be appropriated by the Legislature.

The duties of District Magistrates shall be the same as are now exercised by District Magistrates, or may be provided by law.

Section 2. The term of office of District Magistrates elected under this Act shall be two years from the first day of January next after the election. Provided that all Magistrates in office at the time of the first election shall be allowed to serve for the balance of such terms, or thereafter until their successors are elected and qualified unless previously removed.

Section 3. A District Magistrate may be removed from office for cause by the Supreme Court.

In case of removal of any District Magistrate as aforesaid, or in case of vacancy in office for any cause, the Chief Justice or any Judge of the Supreme Court may appoint one in his place for the unexpired term of said Magistrate.

Section 4. An election for such Magistrates shall be held on the first Tuesday in June, A. D., 1905, from 8 o'clock a. m. to 5 o'clock p. m. at such polling places as now are provided or shall hereafter be provided according to law; and according to the rules and regulations of election for Representatives; and after that they shall be elected at each general election.

The election of such Magistrates shall be managed, conducted and controlled by the Inspectors of Election (or "who served at the last general election") in and for such District or in office at the time of such election.

The Governor is hereby directed to arrange the polling precincts so that voters or electors in each District shall have a chance to elect their Magistrates.

Section 5. In case of illness, temporary absence of any District Magistrate from the District for which he is appointed, or when for any cause any District Magistrate is disqualified to hear and determine any case which would by law come under his jurisdiction, it shall be lawful for the Chief Justice or any Judge of the Supreme Court to appoint some other person to perform the duties of such District Magistrate, who shall be called an Acting District Magistrate, and shall not exercise any judicial functions except in the contingencies above mentioned.

Section 6. This Act shall not be construed to repeal Section 937 of the Civil Code, nor Section 6, of Chapter IX., of the Laws of 1874, but it shall be optional for parties bringing suits, either civil or criminal, to take them before such Acting District Magistrate, or to the Circuit Judge, or Justice of the Supreme Court, as the case may be.

Section 7. The compensation of such Acting District Magistrate shall be such as may be agreed upon between him and the District Magistrate for whom he may act, and shall be paid out of the appropriation for salary of such District Magistrate.

Section 8. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Section 9. This act shall go into effect on the first day of April, A. D., 1905.

AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE ELECTION OF DEPUTY SHERIFFS.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory: Section 1. Deputy Sheriffs shall be elected by the electors in each District. They shall be electors of the District at the time of the election. Their salaries shall be as appropriated by the Legislature. The duties of Deputy Sheriffs shall be the same as are, or may be provided by law. They shall appoint policemen in their respective Districts, whose salaries or wages shall be as appropriated by the Legislature.

Section 2. The terms of office of Deputy Sheriffs elected under the provisions of this Act shall be two years, from the first day of January next after the election, except the first terms which will begin from the first day of July, A. D., 1905, to and including the 31st day of December, A. D., 1905.

Section 3. A Deputy Sheriff may be removed for cause by the Sheriff of each island, or the Sheriff of any Judicial Circuit, with the consent and approval of the High Sheriff of the Territory. In case of removal, death or resignation of any Deputy Sheriff, the Sheriff of each island or any Judicial Circuit shall appoint one in his place from among the police officers at the time in the District for the unexpired term of said Deputy Sheriff.

Section 4. An election for such Deputy Sheriffs shall be held on the first Tuesday in June, A. D., 1905, from 8 o'clock a. m. to 5 o'clock p. m. at such polling places as are now provided, or hereafter be provided according to law, and according to the rules and regulations of the elections of representatives; and after that they shall be elected at each general election. Provided, however, the time of proclamation in this special election shall be made only for thirty days before election.

The election of such Deputy Sheriffs shall be managed, controlled and conducted by the Inspectors of election (or

HAMAKUA FOREST

Reserve Recommended to Governor Carter.

Among the principal topics of consideration at the meeting yesterday of the Board of Agriculture was the recommendation to the Governor to set aside the Hamakua forest reserve as reported upon by Superintendent of Forestry Hosmer. The matter was brought to a conclusion by the presentation of the following resolution by Mr. Giffard which was adopted:

Resolved, that the forest reserve at the north end of district of Hamakua, Island of Hawaii, between the Waipio Valley and the district of Kohala as recommended by the Committee of Forestry, based on the report of the Superintendent of Forestry, be approved, and that the Board recommends to the Governor that the land within said described boundaries be set apart as a forest reserve, subject to all private rights and titles lying within said boundaries. Passed.

HOSMER'S REPORT.

Oct. 31, 1904. The Committee on Forestry, Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry, Honolulu, T. H.

Gentlemen: I have the honor to submit the following report on the proposed forest reserve at the extreme northwestern end of the District of Hamakua, Island of Hawaii, consisting of the section of steep, pail country, between the gulches of Honokane and Waipio.

Under the date of April 3, 1903, Mr. E. E. Olding, the local consulting forester, reported to the Board as follows: "As forestry agent for the District of Kohala, I beg to submit the following lands as reserves: all government lands lying between Honokane and Waipio valleys (from the headwaters to the sea) as well as government land known as Puukapu, and also all that portion of Kawalhai I, lying between Puupill and Waimanu, on expiration of the present leases to Parker Estate."

Upon a request from Mr. Thurston for more definite information, as to metes and bounds, Mr. Olding replied, on May 8th, 1903: "As suggested I enclose herewith tracing from Government map showing forest lands to windward of Kohala District, which all parties here are willing and desirous to have reserved, proposed reserve is shown and included within 'red lines' and is bounded as follows: On the west by the Awini Ranch and Bishop Estate lands, on the south by the Hamakua boundary line, or lands of Puukapu and Bishop Estate lands, on the east by the Bishop Estate lands of Waipio, on the north by the sea. Land known as Laupahoehoe owned by the Booth Estate is not included."

"As this is in the heart of the forests of Hawaii and joins other government lands it can be added to from time to time as government and private parties desire. It is in a great measure protected from cattle at the present time and should not cost the government much for fencing."

"No settlement has been reached with regard to lands known as Puukapu and Kaialhai I, so these lands are not included at this time in proposed reserve."

While I have not personally explored the area in question—a task rendered almost impossible from the nature of the country—I have carefully considered the question of making this section, with other adjoining lands, a forest reserve. This I believe should be done, for the following reasons:

The chief value which this section now has, or so far as can be foreseen is likely to have, is on account of the streams which head therein, and which can be utilized for irrigating the adjoining agricultural lands, and in the development of power.

To insure the protection of the watersheds of these streams, so that as much as possible of the water falling upon the area be made available for use, it is desirable that the lands be set apart as a forest reserve.

The creation of the forest reserve would in no way hamper the development of water and power. On the contrary it is primarily to maintain and insure this use of the streams that the reserve is proposed to be set apart.

At the present time there is little or no objection to the creation of this reserve; there is, with the exception of certain areas in the Waimanu Gulch—excluded in these recommendations—no agricultural land; nor from the nature of the country is it a region which could be so developed.

There are several privately owned lands adjoining the proposed reserve which should be included therein, and which the owners thereof are willing to turn over as a part of the forest reserve, if the Government will set apart its lands.

I therefore recommend that the Board request the Governor to set apart, after the public hearing provided by law, the government land described below, as a forest reserve; and I further suggest that negotiations be entered into with the owners of the adjoining lands (who served at the last general election) or in the office at the time of such election.

The Governor is hereby directed to arrange the polling precincts so that the voters, or electors in each District shall have a chance to elect their Deputy Sheriffs.

Section 5. They shall give bonds as are or may be provided by law.

Section 6. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent herewith, are hereby repealed.

Section 7. This Act shall go into effect on the first day of April, A. D., 1905.

joining lands, with the exception of those under cultivation in the Waimanu gulch, with a view of extending the reserve to include them also.

The following description of the proposed forest reserve, in the district of Hamakua, Island of Hawaii, furnished by the Survey Office, with a map of the same, is now on file in my office.

"Beginning at the mouth of the Honokaa gulch by the sea, being the boundary of the lands of Awini and Honokaa, in the districts of Kohala and Hamakua, respectively, run thence up the center of Honokaa gulch, and along Awini homesteads to the land of Honokane; thence along said land of Honokane in a southerly direction to its junction with the lands of Kawalhai 1st and Puukapu; thence in an easterly direction along the land of Puukapu and the north side of Kawalhai branch of Waipio Valley, crossing the head of Waimanu Valley to the west side of Waipio Valley; thence down along said west side of Waipio Valley to the sea; thence along the sea to the point of beginning.

Very respectfully,
RALPH S. HOSMER
Superintendent of Forestry.

HILO RESERVE.

In the matter of the Hilo forest reserve it was reported to the meeting that Mr. Loebenstein did not have all the data in Honolulu necessary to describe the upper boundary and he has returned to Hilo to secure the same. Upon his return the line will be marked on the map especially prepared to show the Hilo reserve, and it will then be forwarded to the Governor with the recommendation that he set aside all the lands between the upper and lower lines to be known in future as the Hilo Forest Reserve.

SHEEP AND MAMANI.

Mr. Holloway reported that he had received a letter from Land Commissioner Pratt in regard to a lease of lands wanted near Humuula and Kachi, on Hawaii, and the Board was asked to make what reservations in the matter it desired. Mr. J. F. Brown stated that Mr. Pratt was about to leave for the mainland, December 6, and he hoped the Board would be able to act on the matter at the meeting so that Mr. Pratt could have time to advertise the lands before his departure. He stated the land in question was located at an elevation of about 8000 feet.

Mr. Hosmer stated that Kaohi adjoins Humuula on the south side of Maunakea and was above the lava flow in that section. He thought the land could be used for grazing up to 8000 feet. Any one taking a lease should be compelled to fence in the property at the upper boundary to protect land planted with forest trees from ravages by cattle. He stated there was quite a bunch of wild cattle roaming around in that vicinity.

Mr. Thurston recommended that there be inserted in all such leases a clause that no sheep should be raised in such places. So far as the Board of Agriculture and Forestry was concerned there was nothing against public interest in permitting cattle there but he had a strong objection to sheep which would destroy forests. He wanted to go on record as against putting any of the mamani lands aside for sheep raising.

Mr. Giffard stated that as Mr. Hosmer had not placed his recommendation before the Board in writing he was disinclined to vote on the proposition. Mr. Thurston said that the Board was taking its first step in leasing such lands, and for that reason it should act slowly and only upon reports gained from the superintendent of forestry.

Mr. Hosmer stated that a certain section above the ohia, koa and mamani belt should properly be used for grazing purposes.

The matter was then referred to the Committee on Forestry.

BISHOP ESTATE AND KOA.

A request was made by letter by F. S. Dodge on behalf of the Bishop Estate asking permission to have Superintendent Hosmer go to Hawaii next week to examine an extensive koa forest back of the Volcano House and make a report on the same. It was reported to the Board that the Estate contemplated lumbering some of the mature koa trees and selling them to parties in Hilo.

It was suggested that this would probably be unwise at present owing to the fact that the Board was making strenuous efforts to get as many private forest lands into the reservation as possible.

Mr. Thurston thought it was a matter of internal policy with the Bishop Estate and that it would be better for the Estate to have an expert forester's opinion on the question than to go ahead without it, no matter what the Estate decided to do with the trees. He said that it was probably the intention of the Estate to get a conservative report from Mr. Hosmer as to just what should or should not be done in the forest.

"We want to put our forests on a commercial basis," said Mr. Thurston. "It is my opinion that mature koa should be lumbered under expert observation rather than that it should rot and go to ruin."

He added that there were miles and miles of koa rotting between the Parker Ranch and Hamakua. There were millions of cords of koa all over Hawaii going to ruin because it was not being lumbered. Provided that reasonable methods were pursued in lumbering koa, the trees would be of great commercial value to their owners. By giving owners expert aid, those who controlled koa forests could lumber their forests without injuring them.

On condition that Mr. Hosmer had no other important duties requiring his presence in Honolulu next week he was given permission to go to the Volcano House for the purpose above described.

Mr. Hosmer stated that he was strongly of the opinion that the first piece of lumbering done should be under expert forestry methods. It was a part of the policy of the Board to give advice to private owners, but not much had been done in outside districts owing to lack of men and money.

GEAR NOT IN CONTEMPT

Appeal to Federal Court Not Operative As Supersedes.

The Supreme Court has denied the motion to put Judge Gear and J. S. Low on their defense for contempt of court in the Parker litigation. Justice Hatch writes the unanimous opinion of the court, of which the following is the syllabus:

"A preliminary order of prohibition expires when the court after hearing makes a final order disallowing the writ of prohibition prayed for. The preliminary order cannot be revived, in the absence of a new exercise of judicial power, by a supersedeas allowed on the suing out of a writ of error."

As stated in the opinion the contempt proceedings were as follows:

"This is an application for an order to the Honorable George D. Gear, Second Judge of the Circuit Court of the First Circuit, and J. S. Low, next friend of Annie T. K. Parker, a minor, to show cause why they should not be adjudged guilty of contempt of this court for disregard of a preliminary writ of prohibition heretofore issued on the application of Alfred W. Carter, guardian. On September 7, 1904, Alfred W. Carter, as guardian, applied for and obtained from the Chief Justice of this court a preliminary writ of prohibition restraining said Circuit Judge from proceeding on a motion pending before him made by said J. S. Low, next friend of Annie T. K. Parker, a minor, for the removal of said Alfred W. Carter as guardian until the further order of this court. On November 7, 1904, this court rendered its decision, dissolving the temporary writ of prohibition and denying the application for a permanent writ. On November 8, 1904, the petitioner obtained a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States, the order granting it stating that it was to operate as a supersedeas. A bond was filed and the papers connected with the writ of error perfected on the same day. The motion for the order to show cause sets out that said Circuit Judge is about to proceed with the trial of the application for the removal of said A. W. Carter as guardian on its merits, notwithstanding the writ of error and supersedeas."

Kinney, McClanahan & Cooper, Bailou & Marx and Robertson & Wilder appeared for the petitioner; J. Alfred Magoon and J. Lightfoot for the respondents. The contention of the petitioner is stated by the appellate court thus:

"It is contended by the petitioner that the suing out of the writ of error and the order allowing the same containing the words of supersedeas resulted in suspending the judgment of this court disallowing the writ of prohibition prayed for, and has revived the preliminary order of prohibition granted on the filing of the original application. The petitioner seeks to establish a distinction between law and equity in the operation of a supersedeas on any restraining process which had been issued prior to the allowance of an appeal or writ of error; it being contended that a supersedeas revives a restraining process issued at law, such as a writ of prohibition; but that it does not so operate in equity upon an injunction upon an appeal being taken, is conceded."

"We do not find," the Supreme Court decides, "that this distinction can be maintained. The conclusion to be drawn from the cases is rather that the difference in effect of operation of a supersedeas depends upon the nature of the judgment or decree appealed from. A supersedeas always operates as a stay of execution and suspends the enforcement of a judgment or decree by execution or other process. But the judgment or decree appealed from may itself have an intrinsic effect which can only be suspended by an affirmative order, either of the court which makes the decree, or of the appellate tribunal."

Several authorities are cited and the following is the conclusion of the opinion: "As a further reason why the preliminary order in the prohibition proceeding cannot be held to be now in effect, it will be noted that it was by its terms to remain in force only until its further order of the Supreme Court. When the court acted as it did in rendering its decision denying the writ prayed for, the preliminary order became functus officio. It could not be revived by anything short of a new judicial order."

"As the threatened action of the Circuit Judge would not constitute a violation or disregard of the preliminary order," (Continued on page 5.)

BLUEFIELDS FOR HILO.

Jared Smith, Director of the United States Experiment Station, in a letter to the Board stated he had secured five acres of land near Hilo for growing bananas, and he recommended transferring half of the Bluefields bananas now under cultivation here to this land, it being well adapted for the growing of such bananas. The Board agreed with Mr. Smith.

MINUTES TOO LONG.

The Board met at 4 p. m. yesterday but it was twenty minutes to five before the reading of the minutes had been concluded. J. F. Brown said the report of the previous meeting was undoubtedly most accurate, but it was altogether too voluminous and took up too much valuable time in its reading. The Board generally agreed with Mr. Brown and hereafter only a skeleton report of the previous meeting will be had.