The Sun.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1893.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION.

The President Stands on the Tariff Plank of the Chicago Platform.

From a Letter Accepting the Democratic Nomination for President, Written at Gray Gables, Sept. 20, 1892.

The dogma is now boldly presented that tariff taxation is justifiable for the express purpose and intent of thereby promoting especial interests and enterprises. *Such a proposition is so clearly contrary to the spirit of our Constitution*, and so directly encourages the disturbance, by selfishness and greed, of patriotic sentiment, that its statement would rudely shock our people, if they had not already been insidiously allured from the safe landmarks of principle.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Some Facts of History.

It has suited the purpose of Mr. GRESHAM to represent the overthrow of royalty in Hawaii as a plot contrived by Minister STEVENS and a few residents of the island, aided by naval forces from the Boston under Capt. WILTSE.

This view leaves out of consideration the facts of recent history. For many years the sentiment had been growing among the most intelligent and influential people of Hawaii that the reigning dynasty was an obstacle rather than an aid to the progress of the islands, and would eventually be discarded. The course of events had shown that the future of Hawaii was likely to be autonomy as an independent republic or annexation to the United States. The only question all along has been when this change would come.

In the revolution of 1887 KALAKAUA'S prompt submission saved the monarchy. Royalty was suffered to exist because it was a convenient temporary expedient; yet when a great popular meeting, six years ago, resolved that "the administration of the Hawaiian Government has ceased, through corruption and incompetence, adequately to perform its functions," a step may be said to have already been taken toward the result attained in 1893.

Thus even in 1887 the monarchy had been put upon its good behavior. KALAKAUA had dispelled the storm for a time, but it was certain to break out again. His successor, in coming to the throne, found the old royal prerogative hedged about in many ways, and resented the fact. A decision of the Supreme Court in favor of her authority to appoint her Ministers elated her, and she sought new stretches of power, at length venturing to seize them by force. Then came her downfall.

The history of the gradual growth of an anti-monarchical sentiment in Hawaii, Mr. GRESHAM finds it convenient to ignore. The overthrow of the Queen was really the logical development of years of experience. LILIUOKALANI might have been allowed to reign, as a matter of convenience, throughout her life; yet it had long been obvious that any reactionary and despotic conduct might cost her the throne. There is no warrant for assuming that her overthrow would not have been accomplished without the landing of marines from the Boston.

Was it a Foregone Conclusion?

The statement printed elsewhere concerning the close relationship between Admiral IRWIN, in command of the United States naval forces at Honolulu, and ROBERT IRWIN, sent by LILIUOKALANI to Japan to promote and supervise the immigration of coolies to Hawaii, is of the highest importance and significance at this time.

The reason given for the transfer of Admiral SKERRETT to another post previously to Minister WILLIS's arrival and the execution of the proposed attempt to overthrow the Provisional Government, was that Admiral SKERRETT, by his long familiarity with Hawaiian affairs, had formed social relations which might prejudice or embarrass him in the execution of orders from the White House. In plain English, SKERRETT was regarded as too friendly to the Provisional Government and republican institutions in Hawaii. In the selection of his successor, as it appears, the Administration has avoided any difficulty of that sort by picking out an American officer whose brother enjoys both the confidence of LILIUOKALANI and an income of which he would be deprived by the annexation of Hawaii to the United States.

This measure of precaution and preparation on the part of the White House planners of a *coup d'état* for dethroned Hawaiian royalty, fits in perfectly with other features of the business.

We now recall to public recollection the fact that a little more than seven months ago THE SUN printed the following letter from Washington with regard to the real character of Commissioner BLOUNT's mission to Hawaii as the President's personal representative:

"WASHINGTON, April 15.—It has come to my knowledge, in a way leaving no doubt, that Commissioner BLOUNT's instructions are to sit down on the annexation of the Sandwich Islands, and, *above all, to find a way to foil the Treaty, if it can be done. He has gone for that purpose*, and may be expected to accomplish it, all statements or hopes to the contrary, notwithstanding. So Mr. CLEVELAND's first great mistake is likely to be the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes in Hawaii."

This information came to us from a source upon which we are accustomed to rely; a source as far removed from the ordinary channels of news intelligence as from the sphere of the mere rumor mongers. The letter was written and mailed before any person in this country knew that Mr. BLOUNT had actually hauled down the American flag in Hawaii, as his first act under the instructions of Mr. CLEVELAND and Mr. GRESHAM. The news brought by the steamer which arrived from Honolulu after the foregoing prediction was made, confirmed in a striking manner the accuracy of our informant's knowledge of Mr. CLEVELAND's intentions.

Every known circumstance attending the pursuance of Mr. CLEVELAND's secret plans respecting Hawaii since he came into office in March last, points to the conclusion that our correspondent was right in affirming in April last that BLOUNT was sent out to Hawaii, not to afford the Administration a basis for a decision what to do, but to prepare the way for the Administration to do a predetermined thing: namely, to defeat somehow, and upon some pretext, the annexation of Hawaii in the manner approved by the preceding Administration.

Mrs. Dominis Knew.

When Mr. Paramount BLOUNT arrived in San Francisco from Honolulu, he came with sealed lips; and he and all the other American parties to the conspiracy to overthrow the republican Government of Hawaii were speechless until after the elections in the United States.

The *Hawaiian Star* is a stanch annexation paper, printed in Honolulu. So long ago as Oct. 12, THE SUN reprinted from it, under the title "Has LILIUOKALANI Had a Tip from BLOUNT?" information which, in the light of recent events, is significant. We do not remember the dates of the papers containing this information; but they must have been as early as Oct. 1, for it takes about twelve days for the Honolulu mail to reach this city. The information reprinted from our Hawaiian contemporary was that the deposed Queen had been out in her gilded coach telling her former dusky subjects that she was to be restored to her throne within a brief period. Later they were seen flocking to her house as if bidden to a conference. One of the Ministers of her demolished Cabinet went a considerable distance to tell a friend that LILIUOKALANI was sure to be put in control of the islands, probably within a month, which would have been a pretty close guess had he been guessing. In the words of the *Hawaiian Star*, "he was satisfied that the next mail would bring the orders to the Admiral to hold a sort of military plebiscite, offhand, as it were, and as a means of putting Mrs. DOMINIS back on the salary list at the drop of a hat."

The impression gained from what was known of the talk of Mrs. DOMINIS was that she expected to be restored to power through some form of voting which President CLEVELAND was to bring about. Maybe she was accurate in this, since the accuracy of the other information that she possessed six weeks in advance of the people of the United States and the Americans in Hawaii, has been confirmed. Perhaps there has been some sort of an election in Hawaii under the bayonets of our marines.

To American patriots one of the most galling features of this wretched business is that the debased followers of this woman should have known and openly exulted over the outcome of it long before the people of the United States and the adherents of the new Hawaiian Government were intrusted with any information as to what Mr. BLOUNT claimed to have found out, and what Mr. CLEVELAND proposed to do.

The Gist of the Hawaiian Business.

It is important to look narrowly at the specious plea put forward on behalf of President CLEVELAND, that a wrongful act was committed in establishing the present Hawaiian Government, that to this wrong the United States were a party, and that, consequently, it is the duty of the United States to redress the wrong by restoring the deposed Queen. In any event, it is obvious that the Constitution has not made the President sole judge in the premises, but that the duty of the United States must be declared by Congress before it is discharged by the Executive. If, in Mr. CLEVELAND's opinion, a wrong had been done in the Hawaiian affair, he should have laid the evidence to that effect, together with the opposing evidence in possession of our State and Navy departments, before Congress during its recent session, or else he should have waited a few weeks until the regular session of Congress should begin. It is for Congress, not the President, to decide first, whether a wrongful act was committed by representatives of the United States last January in Honolulu; and secondly, whether that act should now be rectified by an act of war against the present Hawaiian Government.

Assuming, for the moment, that the evidence collected by Commissioner BLOUNT should be held by Congress to be conclusive proof that the United States were a party to the deposition of Queen LILIUOKALANI, it by no means follows that Congress would declare that the wrong then committed ought now to be redressed by a resort to war. In international law, as in commercial law, the redressing of a wrong is not so simple and easy a thing as the headlong defenders of the President would persuade us to believe. Between the doing and redressing of a wrong, equities may have arisen in favor of third parties, which cannot be brushed aside. Let us take, by way of example, the case of a promissory note which the maker delivers to the payee under what he subsequently believes to be false pretences concocted by the latter. Nevertheless, the maker must pay the note if it has passed into the hands of innocent holders for value. Equities have arisen which forbid the maker to redress the original wrong by perpetrating another.

That is precisely the case of the existing relation between the United States and the Hawaiian Government. Once recognized by the United States, that Government speedily secured recognition from other powers, and, among them, from Japan, which proceeded to enter into a contract with it, defining the conditions under which large numbers of Japanese should settle in the Hawaiian Islands. The United States have no right to interfere with that transaction, as they would do if without Japan's consent they compelled the substitution of Queen LILIUOKALANI for the present Hawaiian Government as one of the parties to that contract. International law is clear upon the point, that the formal recognition of a Government is not an act with which the United States or any other power is at liberty to play fast and loose, and we do not doubt that a declaration to that effect would be made by Congress. It is, in truth, an irrevocable act. A community, once admitted to the circle of independent nations, cannot be excluded from it except by an act of war; and for such an act on the part of the United States the previous sanction of Congress is required by the Constitution.

There is no principle of international law more undisputed than that the formal recognition of a government cannot be annulled but by an act of war. When, immediately after the *coup d'état* of Dec. 2, 1851, Lord PALMERSTON, then the head of the British Foreign Office, instructed the British Ambassador at Paris to recognize the usurping Government of LOUIS NAPOLEON, he aroused furious indignation on the part of Queen VICTORIA and of the British nation. Lord PALMERSTON was summarily removed from his post, but neither his successor nor any other English statesman or diplomatist pretended for an instant that the recognition of LOUIS NAPOLEON could be recalled. The act was accomplished and irrevocable, and its consequences could be averted only by war against the usurper, to whose firm establishment Great Britain had by that recognition signally contributed. Another example may be drawn from American history. It will be remembered that Texas was formally recognized as an independent republic by the United States many years before its admission as a State into the Union. Let us suppose that President TYLER had come to the conclusion that the recognition of Texas had been made on a misconception of the facts; that the movement which resulted in her independence had been largely brought about by American citizens invading the territory and assailing the Government of a friendly power, and, in their wrongful acts, secretly encouraged and supported by leading American politicians. Would such a conclusion on the part of President TYLER have justified him in recalling the recognition of Texan independence by the United States? Obviously not, for international equities had in the mean time arisen. Once recognized by the United States, the republic of Texas had secured the recognition of other foreign powers, and, in the capacity of an independent State, had made treaties and had borrowed money.

We observe that some of the more cunning defenders of Mr. CLEVELAND perceive the difficulty of recalling the recognition of the Hawaiian Government, considered as a question in international law, and that they also acknowledge the constitutional incapacity of the President to upset that Government by an act of war, without the previous sanction of Congress. They endeavor to evade these difficulties by the curious argument that, when Minister WILLIS shall announce that the United States reject the proffer of annexation, that Government must, by the terms of its declaratory instrument, immediately cease and determine. For, they say, that instrument sets forth that the present Hawaiian Government shall remain in existence until annexation to the United States shall have been brought about. Annexation once refused, they argue, the fundamental condition of the existence of the present Hawaiian Government fails, and there remains nothing in sight to treat with, except the Government of the deposed Queen LILIUOKALANI. The clause in question will bear no such construction. It does not make the existence of the present Hawaiian Government dependent on the acceptance or rejection of annexation by President HARRISON, or by President CLEVELAND, or by President CLEVELAND'S successor. On the contrary, the declaratory instrument establishes the present Hawaiian Government for an indefinite period, terminable only by annexation to the United States. No date is mentioned, and it matters nothing, from the viewpoint of the instrument, whether the annexation shall take place in 1893, or ten years hence, or twenty.

So far as the instrument in question is concerned, the existence of the Hawaiian Government cannot be terminated by one rejection of annexation or by a dozen rejections. It can be terminated only by an acceptance of the offer; that would end it, as a matter of course.

The Executive as a Readjuster.

Aside from the question of the constitutionality of the exercise of the power recently assumed by the Secretary of State in reference to the Sandwich Islands, the interesting question arises as to the respect which should be paid by the Executive department of the Government to the acts of a former Executive even when such acts may be open to criticism.

The views of that great lawyer, WILLIAM WIRT of Virginia, when acting as Attorney-General under President JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, are apposite at this time. In an opinion of Oct. 1, 1825, Mr. WIRT said:

"The preliminary question is, 'how far the present Executive is authorized to review and unsettle the acts of its predecessor?'

"If it has such authority, the Executive which is to follow us must have the like authority to review and unsettle our decisions, and to set up again those of our predecessors; and upon this principle, no question can be considered as finally settled.

"I have understood it to be a rule of action prescribed to itself by each Administration to consider the acts of its predecessors as conclusive, as far as the Executive is concerned. It is but a decent degree of respect for each Administration to entertain of its predecessor, to suppose it as well qualified as itself to execute the laws according to the intention of their makers, and not to set an example of review and reversal, which, in its turn, may be brought to bear upon itself, and thus keep the acts of the Executive perpetually unsettled and afloat.

"In conversing with President ADAMS on this subject, I understood him to concur in the general rule of considering all acts of the preceding Administrations as final; and, although partial injuries may now and then remain unredressed by the operation of this, in common with all other general rules, yet it is better to bear that partial evil, or leave it to legislative redress, than to introduce the more extensive and incalculable evils which must result from considering all the past acts of all the past Executives as open to reconsideration and readjudication at the pleasure of the individuals who were interested in them."

The views of WILLIAM WIRT and JOHN QUINCY ADAMS concerning Executive limitations, are opposed to the acts of WALTER Q. GRESHAM and GROVER CLEVELAND.

How to Proceed in the Gravesend Affair.

Mr. RIDGWAY, the District Attorney of Kings county, in his letter to Governor FLOWER asking the Governor to propose the names of one or more capable and honest lawyers whom he could appoint as his assistants to prosecute the Gravesend criminals, said of these proposed assistants:

"They will have access to the Grand Jury, will act for the District Attorney before the Grand Jury, and will undoubtedly cooperate with committees of citizens in bringing all offenders to justice."

It is obviously essential that any special counsel who are to be employed in these matters shall be in a position to appear before the Grand Jury and to present evidence to that body.

The announcement made yesterday, however, that the approval of the County Judge of Kings county was necessary to give force and effect to the appointment of Messrs. GEORGE G. REYNOLDS and EDWARD M. SHEPARD as special counsel, shows perfectly plainly that these gentlemen are not to be Assistant District Attorneys at all in any official sense, and that they will not have the power, to go before the Grand Jury, of which Mr. RIDGWAY spoke in his letter to Governor FLOWER.

They appear to have been appointed under section 204 of the County law, which is in these words:

"The District Attorney of any county in which a capital or other important criminal action is to be tried, with the approval in writing of the County Judge of the county, which shall be filed in the office of the County Clerk, may employ counsel to assist him *on such trial*; and the costs and expenses thereof, to be certified by the Judge presiding at the trial, shall be a charge upon the county in which the indictment is found."

This section apparently relates to the services of counsel upon a trial, whereas the conduct of a prosecution before the Grand Jury is a proceeding prior to the trial.

The true way to proceed to take the prosecution of the Gravesend offenders out of the hands of the District Attorney and to place it absolutely under the control of others, would rather seem to be under the provisions of the Executive law relating to the Attorney-General. This law provides that the Attorney-General, whenever required by the Governor or by a Justice of the Supreme Court, shall attend the Courts of Oyer and Terminer for the purpose of managing and conducting a criminal action or proceeding therein.

The Attorney-General is also expressly authorized by statute to appoint not only his two regular deputies, but such other deputies as he may deem necessary. The Attorney-General himself is a sworn officer, and so is each of his deputies. Under the Executive law they could attend before a Grand Jury in a Court of Oyer and Terminer, inasmuch as that law authorizes the Attorney-General to attend such a court, not only for the purpose of participating in a trial, but "for the purpose of managing and conducting a criminal action or proceeding therein;" and the Grand Jury is a constituent part of such court. In that event there would be no danger of such failures of justice as have occurred more than once in the history of this State by reason of the fact that unauthorized persons have been permitted to go into the Grand Jury room. A little more than a year ago Judge CULLEN was obliged to dismiss an indictment on Staten Island because special counsel had been allowed to go before the Grand Jury.

The course which we suggest would make the Gravesend prosecution wholly independent of the District Attorney of Kings county. The course that has been adopted leaves the prosecution absolutely under his control. For while he may follow the advice and suggestions of the able and accomplished gentlemen whom he has selected as special counsel at the instance of the Governor, he is under no legal obligation to do this; and even his consent that they should go before the Grand Jury would not make it lawful for them to go there.

Free Speech but Honest Politics.

Our esteemed Republican contemporary, the *Springfield Union*, as a last rabid attempt to avert the impending annihilation of protection and tariff robbery, delivers the opinion that the Democratic party last year "adopted a fool platform."

This is a free country, alive always to the fact of liberty of speech, and ever ready, thank Heaven, to listen and reflect. Every American newspaper—Republican, Prohibition, Single Tax, or Populist—is free to praise or condemn, to glorify or to rage at the existing rule of national policy regarding the tariff, or at any other matter which commands its attention.

That has no relation to the supreme verdict of the people in the year 1892, that this same platform, wise or foolish, good or evil, drunk or sober, as free and untrammelled individual judgment may view it, was right, and should be adopted and made good.

The high contracting party of execution is now in power, and the time for the performance of its contract and the fulfilment of its instructions has come. A tariff for revenue only, with its necessary destruction of the anti-Democratic robbery of protection, is morally as sacred a law of the land as though it were already on the statute books with the Supreme Court's final seal of approval. The Democratic Congress and President still have the perfunctory but immensely important duty to carry out the national behest squarely, honestly, without trickery to catch private influences or sneaking evasion to avoid criticism.

There is no place for disregard of good faith, or contempt of party obligations, or for the betrayal of a solemn and popularly approved promise, within the Democracy.

An official with whom the President has talked said to me: "If any one imagines that the action of the Administration is based on Mr. BLOUNT's report alone he is greatly mistaken.—*New York Herald.*

Of course. Besides BLOUNT's report there is SPRECKELS's.

It is a queer complaint that comes to us from St. Mary's parish in Louisiana, that the Jewish traders there "sell goods below cost," and that they must be driven out of the parish on that account. We cannot suppose that the complainants are people who buy goods below cost, or who desire to pay more than the very lowest prices for goods. We must suppose that the Jew baiters of the parish are traders who sell goods for far more than cost, who ask a bigger profit than their Jewish rivals, and consequently lose trade. If they ask more than a fair price for goods, the Jewish traders ought to cut them out, and receive popular favor. A large proportion of the population of St. Mary's are blacks, and we feel sure that they want to buy things as cheap as they can; they are like white buyers in that respect.

Why should a Jew sell goods below cost in St. Mary's? How can he afford to do it? How can he keep up that sort of thing all the time? Where does he get a living, and by what means does he grow rich? The complaint against the Jews of the parish is too thin. We are pleased to see that the District Judge is determined to protect them against the assaults of their rapacious enemies, the anti-Jewish traders. We cannot believe that they will be driven out this week, though we learn by our despatches from New Orleans that the Jews have recently been ordered out of several parishes of Louisiana. If we were to expel from New York all the dealers who sell things pretty cheap, what a sweet price we should have to pay for our supplies!

FRANK HATTON of Washington is the right kind of a man.

Not Aliens.

From the Chicago Daily Inter-Ocean.

One of the charges of Secretary Gresham is that the Provisional Government is composed of aliens. The friends of Hawaiian independence insist that the Secretary of State cannot destroy the Provisional Government with an epithet; that, moreover, Secretary Gresham has no right to use the epithet, for it is untrue. On the contrary, it is maintained that in the entire Provisional Government there is not a single alien. Mr. Dole, the President, is a native of the country. He is neither actually nor constructively an alien. Mr. Hatch, the Vice-President, is a naturalized citizen; Mr. Damon, the Minister of Finance, is a native; Mr. King, Minister of the Interior, is a naturalized citizen, and Mr. Smith, the Attorney-General, is a native. Of the Commission sent here last winter to submit the overture of annexation, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Castle, and Mr. Carter were natives, and the other two, Messrs. Marsden and Wilder, were naturalized citizens. As we understand the term in this country, there was not an "alien" in the list.

A Constitutional Tariff Is the Thing.

From the Chicago Herald.

Now is a better time than we shall see again in many years for a thorough and radical reform of the tariff upon the only just principle—the principle that it is not the proper function of government to help anybody in his business at the expense of other people.

From the Atlanta Constitution.

The free list is the screen behind which the monster of protection hides. It is not a definite part of a tariff for revenue only. Those who are sincerely anxious to carry out the demands of the Democratic platform need not bother themselves about the free list. A tariff for revenue only, levied solely for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Government, is a level and an equitable tariff—a tariff that discriminates against no interest and in favor of none. To the adjustment of such a tariff the party must address itself.

Abolish the Inheritance Taxes.

From the Golden Rule.

The inheritance taxes involve robbery, and their enlargement would be a curse instead of a blessing to the State. They should be repealed. Revenue raised by robbery dishonors the plunderer more than it discommodes the plundered. Crucifying thrift and prosperity in behalf of idleness, intemperance, and improvidence is idiotic as well as immoral.

Every Time.

From the Springfield Union.

THE SUN believes in Americanism and republicanism, and in this represents the best sentiment of the people of the United States.

The Climax Omitted.

From the Chicago Record.

Professor in History (in the young ladies' seminary)—Having finished the sad story of this episode in the life of Marie Antoinette, I should be glad to answer any questions you may feel inclined to ask.

The Class (in unison)—What did she have on?

Hoke Still Serene.

From the Atlanta Journal.

Rural mail delivery is clearly impracticable at this time.

Kindly Criticism.

From the Minneapolis Journal.

Prof. Moon says the American teachers are too young, and the schoolma'ams raised no objection to this criticism.

Overacted.

From Brooklyn Life.

She (in the background)—I wonder who those people at the other table are? I'm sure it's a bridal couple.

He—Why?

She—Well, they look as if they didn't know each other.

THE NEW NAVAL COMMANDER AT HONOLULU.

Admiral Irwin's Brother was Liliuokalani's Minister to Japan and is Now Chief Promoter of Coolie Immigration to Hawaii.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16.—Admiral John Irwin is a brother of Robert Irwin, Hawaiian Minister and Immigration Commissioner in Japan, appointed by Liliuokalani originally, and continued by the Provisional Government in the same place. He is also a brother of the late Richard Irwin of "Addition, Division, and Silence" fame.

Robert Irwin, the Admiral's brother, has made a fortune and is in the receipt of a princely income yet, from sending Japanese coolies to the islands.

This may account for the belief "that Admiral Irwin will be more in harmony with Mr. Willis, the new Minister to Hawaii, than his predecessor, in carrying out the policy of the Administration in regard to those islands."

Admiral Irwin is believed to be an officer of excellent character and standing, but there is nothing in his family history to indicate that he is likely to voluntarily do anything which will interfere with the lucrative business of his brother, the Minister.

It is sufficient to add that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States would knock the business of importing coolies or contract laborers into the islands, after they became dependencies of the United States, higher than the Beecher-Tilton scandal "knocked the Life of Christ."

It is very probable that Mr. Claus Spreckels, who is a large employer of coolie labor, knows both Commissioner Irwin and the Admiral, and for their common interest has not been a "deadhead" in the enterprise in which they are now engaged, under the patronage and protection of the Administration.

The foregoing facts, taken in connection with the announcement, made several months ago, that Mr. Paramount Blount had been sent to the Hawaiian Islands with instructions to "sit on annexation," sufficiently account for the secrecy with which the Administration has surrounded all its actions in connection with this important matter.

THE POLICE OF INFAMY.

It Has Some Defenders, but Few or No Supporters.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16.—It is noteworthy that no prominent man, Democrat or Republican, has yet appeared before the public to undertake the Administration's justification in the Hawaii business, though two or three Democrats have tried to excuse its course as the Gresham document indicates it. Public opinion on all sides is overwhelmingly condemnatory of the President and Secretary of State. Jurists and others whose learning and experience are great agree that the Administration has no ground to stand upon; but they do not wish as yet to be quoted to the public, preferring to wait until everything is known.

But the American spirit is outspoken and practically unanimous. To this should be added that THE SUN'S course, and the reasons it gives for it, are everywhere applauded. Whoever is able to recall the manifestation of public opinion when Fort Sumter was fired on is at once reminded of that event by what people say now when speaking of the Administration in connection with the Hawaii business.

HAWAII AND THE CANADIANS.

Restoration of Monarchy Causes Profound Astonishment.

OTTAWA, Nov. 16.—Much interest is taken by the Canadian Ministry in the development of events at Hawaii. The islands are a place of call for the new steamship line running from Vancouver, B. C., to Australia in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railroad. That company's line to China and Japan receives yearly subsidies from the British and Canadian governments, and when thoroughly organized the Australian line will also be subsidized. Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, the Canadian Minister of Customs, is now in Australia endeavoring to form arrangements for enlarging trade between the two colonies and for constructing a cable between them. The British Government is doing its best to bring the negotiations to a successful issue. It is felt that if Queen Liliuokalani is restored through the good offices of Mr. Cleveland's Administration, British influence in the islands, which has been on the wane, may once more become considerable, and Canada may perhaps be able to conclude a treaty for closer trade relations with them. In 1890, after the passage of the McKinley tariff, the sugar clauses of which knocked the Hawaiian treaty with the United States on the head, the late King made overtures to Canada for closer trade, but nothing came of them. Now that Canada is in direct communication with the islands something may be done in that way, with Australia as one of the parties to the bargain.

I had a talk yesterday with a British official who has been familiar with events at Hawaii for the last twenty years. He said:

"I don't know what to make of Mr. Cleveland. He seems to have turned Quaker or something. Just imagine what they would do in England if an English Premier were to upset a brand-new monarchy in a country not far remote from it which had always been republican. They would hoot him. Yet, change the noun and the adjective, and that's what Mr. Cleveland is apparently going to do. Fifty years ago the sovereignty of these islands was offered to Britain, but declined by the Admiral of our Pacific squadron. That, I suppose, was perfectly proper. They belong to the United States by the law of geography rather than to us. But I can't for the life of me understand what Mr. Cleveland means by bowling over the Provisional Government and bringing back the Queen. Perhaps he thinks that is equivalent to restoring peace and quietness. If so, he is mistaken. It will be necessary for him to support the Queen by armed force; that is, if he wishes to keep her on the throne. Great Britain will be glad to welcome the Queen again. It is a crying shame to keep that lovely corner of the world under a régime of royalties of one or two degrees removed from Cecil Rhodes's friend, Lo Benguela; but if Mr. Cleveland is bound to have a royalty there, Liliuokalani is about as good as any for British purposes. She has all along said that Mr. Cleveland would put her back. I wonder where she got the information.

"The case of Fiji has perhaps escaped Mr. Cleveland's attention. Sixty years ago the missionaries appeared there just as they appeared at Hawaii. The two islands gradually got a thin veneer of civilization, but this only rendered stable native government impossible. In 1859 King Thakambau, a sort of Kalakaua, except that he couldn't play poker, offered the sovereignty to Queen Victoria. The British Government sent a Commissioner—his name was not Blount—to the islands, and he reported that Thakambau had been pursuaded to make the offer by Europeans who controlled sugar lands and were thinking of planting cotton, and that if England assumed the sovereignty there might be trouble with the natives. The King's offer was accordingly declined. A series of rows ensued. The Europeans could not put up with a semi-savage ruler with unlimited authority, and so they formed a Cabinet, or Government, to act as a check upon him. Then they framed a constitution and created a parliament. But before long there was a triangular duel between the Parliament, the Cabinet, and the King. There was a 'revolution' every week, and a crisis all the time. At length Thakambau, who was a bit of an orator, sent for a British naval officer and said: 'For God's sake, take possession; Fiji cannot govern herself; the Europeans, who have the money and brains, cannot be expected to kneel before us natives; the archipelago has become a piece of drift wood in the sea to be picked up by the first passer-by, and I want England to get it.' The upshot was that England annexed Fiji in 1874. With settled government things improved. The islands will yet be a valuable way station for a steamship line between Vancouver and New Zealand. They do a large trade in sugar and fruit with Australia, and cotton is coming to the front again. England tried honestly to put the new wine of European civilization into the old bottles of barbarism in Fiji, but the thing would not work. Mr. Cleveland is trying the same experiment in the Hawaiian Islands, and is bound to fail as we did."

OUTRAGED PATRIOTISM.

Democratic and Independent Opinion as to Cleveland's Work as a Throneamith.

From the Hartford Times.

We see no more good cause for putting the Queen back upon her throne than there was in 1845 for our Government, by force of arms, to drive Texas back to Mexico. Our Government cannot logically go into the business of setting up monarchies, whether they be of the good or bad-egg pattern.

From the Chicago Record.

It is an amazing, cruel, hateful position which the Administration has taken. Its talk of "force and fraud" is melodramatic bosh. Its course savors of trickery and of contempt for public opinion in America. It is an insolent denial of the truth on which this nation was founded, that a people have the right to overthrow a tyrant and rule themselves.

From the St. Paul Daily Globe.

Of course, Claus Spreckels, the sugar king of the Sandwich Islands, is delighted at the proposed restoration of the Hawaiian Queen. Claus practically owned the islands under her benignant reign, and the natives were his slaves. But he should curb his rejoicing. "There's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip," and there is every prospect that Congress may upset his kettle of fish.

From the Atlanta Constitution.

Mr. Walter Q. Gresham wants the Democratic party to restore the monarchy in Hawaii. The Democratic party has not been in the habit of restoring monarchies anywhere, and as Mr. Gresham is not a Democrat, he may have made a mistake in this matter.

From the Lynchburg News.

Nothing could have created greater surprise either in this country or abroad than the announcement that the new republic is to be overthrown and the old monarchy restored by the authority and under the protecting flag of this Government.

From the Washington Evening Star.

The invitation of the successful revolution, recognized as the de facto Government by all the great powers, was that the United States annex Hawaii, not that the United States serve as arbitrator between the revolution and the ex-Queen. The United States can accept or reject the offer of annexation and that is all. It has no right to add to a rejection the overthrow by force of the Government which makes the offer.

From the Utica Daily Press.

That the prevailing public sentiment is opposed to Cleveland's and Gresham's view of the Hawaiian situation is evidenced by the fact that they have caused to be published statements from a "close friend" or "a citizen well informed," to the effect that when the whole matter is understood and appreciated, public opinion will be on their side. If they have any such documents they will be wise to put them out early, because it is certainly true that general sentiment is running against their policy at present. If they have any facts in their possession which will give the public new light on this interesting question, the papers will be glad to publish and the people to read.

From the Springfield Daily Republican.

The idea of restoring a monarchy, albeit of no more consequence than that recently in power on the Hawaiian Islands, is repugnant to the instincts of the American people. Therefore, if this Administration aims to replace or has replaced Liliuokalani on her rickety throne, it can expect to be condemned by public sentiment. That is the truth of the matter, which any discussion of this question may as well recognize at the outset.

From the Boston Pilot.

Suppose Liliuokalani put back on her throne by the power which, we are told, removed her, does the President mean to use the same power in keeping her there? It is bad enough to use American soldiers for the upsetting of a foreign dynasty; it would be infamous, say the critics, to use them in upholding it. If we withdraw entirely from the field, after restoring the monarchy, what right have we to interfere, or even to protest, in case a less conscientious nation sees fit to grasp the rich prize? The Monroe doctrine is an elastic creed, but it can scarcely be said to cover territory 2,000 miles beyond the shores of the American continent, for whose protection alone it was first designed. A *laissez-faire* policy may work passably well so long as we are free from foreign or domestic trouble. Should any such trouble arise, Mr. Gresham's contention for the independence of Hawaii would protect that country only against its nearest neighbor and best friend.

The whole case appears to be hopelessly muddled, and it is likely to remain in that state until, some fine day, we shall see it settled by the nation which has no nice scruples about taking what it wants. Honolulu is the missing link in England's chain of strongholds encompassing the United States in two oceans. When that link is added and another "pistol pointed at the head of San Francisco," we shall have at least the moral satisfaction of knowing that we spared the native gnat of the Pacific after gorging ourselves with the aboriginal camel of the continent. Somehow, Mr. Gresham seems to be gifted with a faculty for such nice distinctions.

From the Providence Journal.

If President Cleveland will have the unbiased newspapers of the country read to him for a few days he will learn that the shedding of a few drops of blood in the streets of Honolulu by the forces of the United States will be sufficient to incarnadine the whole of his Administration.

From the Washington Star.

There is a division of sentiment among Americans as to whether we should annex Hawaii, but hardly any as to whether the corrupt Liliuokalani should be restored as Queen.

From the Boston Post.

It is not the business of the United States to interfere for the restoration of monarchies in any part of the world, whether on the Pacific Islands or the continent of Europe. The true policy of the United States—the duty of the United States Government—in all matters of this sort is to keep hands off the affairs of an independent people. If our declared principles mean anything, they mean that the people should make their own Government and rule their own affairs.

From the Los Angeles Herald.

Mr. Gresham has thrown the whole controversy into greater confusion than ever by virtually taking the stand that it is the duty of our Government to restore Liliuokalani to the throne. This is a most extraordinary proposition, and one that cannot for a moment be entertained, even if our authority was abused by Minister Stevens. We would rather leave the islands to work out their own salvation in their own way than to see our Government commit an act of such egregious stultification, and we should protest with all our might against the United States undertaking the Quixotic task of setting up deposed and repudiated Queens upon their forfeited thrones.

A POEM FOR THE OCCASION.

The Starry Banner.

Go fling the starry banner out,
So all who come may see
Its flaunting folds unfurled above
A people who are free.

Go fling the starry banner out,
The emblem we had thought
Of all that patriots had won
And Liberty had brought.

Go fling the starry banner out!
There may be those who still
Endure the weight of tyrants' chains,
The fear of kingly will.

Go fling the starry banner out!
It knows no crown nor throne,
Which, rising in its right of might,
Demands the people's own.

Go fling the starry banner out!
For many glorious years
We've seen it proudly sweep the skies,
Undimmed by doubts or fears.

Go fling the starry banner out,
Go fling it out of sight,
In far Hawaii we have put
It in a painful plight.

Go fling the starry banner out
Among the sticks and stones,
It either is a striped lie
Or is the friend of thrones!

HAS REPEATEDLY RESIGNED IN VAIN.

A Republican Postmaster who Can't Get Rid of His $1,800 Office.

This is a story of a Republican holding an office under a Democratic Administration, who doesn't want the office in spite of its salary of $1,800 a year, and has for seven months tried his best to get rid of it. Although there are half a dozen Democrats clamoring for the position, the present incumbent's efforts to get out of the place have so far met with no success.

The office is the Postmastership of Babylon, L. I. The Postmaster is A. E. Hawkins. He was appointed by President Arthur to succeed John Robbins, under whom Mr. Hawkins served as a assistant for nineteen years.

Postmaster Hawkins was appointed cashier of the Babylon National Bank when it was organized last May. He immediately sent in his resignation as Postmaster, and, as there were several applicants for the place, he supposed he would be relieved without very much delay. In order to employ the time not occupied by his duties in the bank, Mr. Hawkins opened a stationery and fancy goods store next door to the bank. After waiting several weeks, and not hearing from Washington regarding his resignation, he sent a second letter asking to be relieved, as he had gone into other business and could not attend to the duties of Postmaster. Receiving no reply, he wrote a third letter, and failing to get an answer to that in a reasonable length of time, he despatched a fourth communication to the department. He has sent his resignation at frequent intervals since that time, but is still waiting for a reply. In his letters Mr. Hawkins has begged and implored the authorities to release him. He has even threatened to turn the key in the Post Office door and close it up, but, so far as producing any effect upon the officials, he might just as well have addressed himself to the man in the moon.

In hope of attracting the attention of the department in Washington, Mr. Hawkins has held back his returns and reports. Under ordinary circumstances this would call forth a sharp letter of reprimand from the department. In this instance, however, they took no notice of the delay.

Having exhausted all means of attracting the attention of the proper authorities to his case, Postmaster Hawkins has resigned himself to his fate, and is now waiting for the slow-moving Postal Department to relieve him at its pleasure. His commission expires on Dec. 15, and he hopes that his successor will be appointed by that time. He says, however, that he sometimes believes that relief will only come when he dies from nervous prostration brought on by his trying to run the bank, the Post Office, and the stationery store.

One of the leading applicants for the post Mr. Hawkins is so anxious to vacate is Augustine Dowden, a business man in the village. Mr. Dowden was appointed Postmaster during the latter part of President Cleveland's former term, but the Senate adjourned without confirming the nomination.

Mr. Hawkins says that he prays that a like fate will not overtake the next man chosen to succeed him.

THE WORLD MIXES THE GILROYS.

Too Anxious to Slander the Mayor to Stop to Make Any Inquiry.

Mayor Gilroy sent the following letter to the editor of the *World* yesterday:

SIR: I desire to call your attention to a great injustice done to me and to my family by the article in your issue of to-day under the headline "Gilroy's Son's Oil." The matter and manner of the false statements in this headline and in the body of the article show a lamentable lack of the fair treatment due alike to public and private individuals from a newspaper. The most ordinary precautions against inaccuracy and misrepresentation would have kept the *World* from doing this injustice. No member of the firm of T. J. Gilroy & Co., dealers in oils, is a son of mine, a relative of mine, or even an acquaintance of mine.

I trust that some evidence of a spirit of fairness will be shown in making this correction as conspicuous as the error and misstatement were. Very truly,

THOMAS F. GILROY.

The story referred to in the letter was prominently displayed on the first page of the *World* and was devoted to an exploitation of Mayor Gilroy's son as a city contractor supplying the Fire Department with oil at a high price.

**Mr. Straus to Furnish Cheap Coal