posed plan to declare a republic has been laid aside, for the present at least.

Soon after the arrival of the China a rumor became prevalent that Minister Willis would demand an instant apology from President Dole on account of the recent diplomatic communications which passed between the two Governments. The royalists seemed especially jubilant over the matter, and attempted to make as much capital out of the rumor as possible. The origin of the rumor was traced to one of the ex-Queen's adherents having received a letter from a friend in San Francisco saying it was quite probable that such a step would be taken by President Cleveland.

The proposition for the enlargement of the Advisory Council was discussed on last Saturday night by a full meeting of the Annexation Club. The plan was not endorsed by that body. Notwithstanding this action, agitation over the question still continues, and will likely be kept up until some definite announcement is made by the Government.

The first step toward the formation of a Union political party in the Islands was made through a resolution introduced by Chairman McStocker of the Annexation Club at the meeting on last Saturday night. It is proposed to reconstruct the club on the basis mentioned. There is some opposition to the movement from the American League. It is asserted that such an organization would be able to show strength sufficient to demand proper recognition at the hands of the Government.

The long communication of President Dole to Minister Willis in reply to the American Minister's request for specifications regarding the attitude taken by the Cleveland Administration in Hawaii was made public here on the 6th. This document has already been forwarded to President Cleveland, with the reply made by Willis. On Feb. 3 Minister Willis addressed a reply to President Dole's long letter, the tone of which is said to be friendly. The Government will make a reply to the last communication of Minister Willis, owing to some unintentional misinterpretations of the statements contained in President Dole's letter.

The Government is likely to meet with strong opposition from the Chinese regarding the new measure now pending to curtail the rights and privileges of that class regarding the importation of Asiatics as laborers for plantations. Party organizations strongly oppose the further importation of Chinese coolies. The new law calls for the registration of all Chinese now engaged in mercantile pursuits on the Islands, in order to prevent those likely to be imported from engaging in other pursuits than those of actual laborers. The Chinese regard the measure as oppressive and unjust, and will petition the country against the passage of the act.

Minister Willis is keeping rather quiet these days and is seldom seen upon the streets. The members and supporters of the Provisional Government are showing a tendency to let him down as easily as possible, and the local press is having a good deal to say in this direction lately. The Royalists, however, are still most bitter in their denunciation of the Minister, and to him is attributed the failure of the restoration of the ex-Queen. Up to this hour Willis has made no demand on the Provisional Government for an apology of any nature, and so far there is no official friction between him and the Provisional Government.

A gentleman closely identified with the interests of monarchy, and an especial friend of the ex-Queen, told me yesterday that Carter would sail by the Alameda to-day for Washington, and that he will go there as the personal and special representative of Liliuokalani. He is said to have in his possession a well formulated plan which he will lay before President Cleveland, bearing on the overthrow of the ex-Queen, and which asks that the Government of the United States settle on Liliuokalani a handsome pension for life as a recompense for her deposition by Minister Stevens and the Boston forces. It has been impossible to verify this information, as Carter refuses to talk on the matter. It is generally credited, however, that some such arrangement has been made between him and the ex-Queen.

THE ANNEXATION CLUB.

Its Attitude on the Question of a Permanent Government.

Copyright, 1894, by the United Press.

SAN FRANCISCO, Feb. 15.—On the evening of Feb. 3 an important meeting was held in Honolulu by the Annexation Club, which was largely attended by influential citizens. The business of the meeting was to act upon a resolution recommending the enlargement of the Advisory Council from fourteen to twenty-four members. This measure had been strongly urged in the American League. Instead of passing the resolution, however, another was substituted and carried, first by a large majority of the number present and then by unanimous vote of the officers of the club, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the officers and Executive Committee that a representative form of government be established as soon as possible, after it is ascertained that the present Congress will take no definite action toward annexation.

The speeches made were generally opposed to any attempt to make any changes in the structure of the Government until the time came for organizing a representative form in the near future. The above action was a serious defeat to the movement led by Walter G. Smith of the *Nuu*.

On the 5th inst., the arrival of the China produced a strong sensation by bringing Washington reports that President Cleveland would instruct Minister Willis to demand President Dole's withdrawal of his charges of menacing attitude, or, in case of refusal, to sever diplomatic relations. The royalists were much elated by this report. Painful anxiety prevailed among the supporters of the Government.

Minister Willis has given no indication of having received such instructions. His recent relations with the Government have been very cordial. His latest communication to the Government, apparently closing the correspondence on the attitude question, was friendly in the highest degree. An inquiry was made of President Dole, who expressed the opinion that after such a letter Minister Willis would not think of reopening the controversy.

Leading public men yesterday expressed a decided opinion that the Government and community should seek to cultivate pleasant relations with the American Minister, who was not hostile at heart, although he had been compelled by his position to appear so. Minister Willis and his family have been severely criticised by the American community since his intention to restore the Queen became apparent.

Julius A. Palmer, representing the Boston *Transcript*, expresses a decided opinion that America has no use for Hawaii, and that the best possible arrangement for all concerned would be for Hawaii to become a British dependency.

On account of the very detailed reports implicating Theophilus H. Davies in the alleged enlistment of soldiers at Vancouver for the service of Liliuokalani, Davies was summoned by the Attorney-General for an interview on the 6th inst. Several communications received on the 5th from different sources, both by the Foreign Office and by the Marshal's office, showed him to be guilty. They all testified to the organization by one C. W. S. Sausome at Vancouver, under instructions from Davies, of a force of 250 men for the service of Liliuokalani. One of these letters was from the Hawaiian Consul at Tacoma, giving long details. Another was from a man who had been to Vancouver on business and was solicited to join the force.

Davies absolutely denied to the Attorney-General all knowledge of any such undertaking. Although the Government will maintain vigilance, there is general incredulity as to Davies having undertaken such a movement, conspiracy and filibustering not having been at all in his line.

Quite a sensation was created on the 7th by the removal of Joseph O. Carter from his position at the head of the corporation of Brewer & Co. At the annual meeting of stockholders for the election of officers Carter was dropped from the offices of President and manager. F. C. Jones was elected President and G. H. Robertson manager.

Carter's recent political course was the cause of his removal. His active co-operation in the efforts of Minister Willis for the restoration of the Queen has created so bitter an antagonism with stockholders of the company that confidence and friendly relations are considered by them to be no longer possible. They also allege that Carter's zealous efforts to restore the Queen tended to the destruction of civil order and commercial prosperity. Boston stockholders were especially urgent for his removal.

Later Davies wrote to a morning paper that he resented the Attorney-General's insult of being summoned to see him like a messenger boy, and in the presence of the Marshal. It is learned that it has been the established custom of the Ministers to invite others to come to their offices on official business. It is also positively learned that Davies was very heated in his language, but was calmed down by considerations pointed out to him. President Dole seems debarred from exchanging any special courtesy with Davies on account of his accusations against the Minister of treacherous and dishonorable conduct.

On complimenting the President of the Provisional Government upon the eloquence of the closing paragraphs of his letter of specifications, Mr. Dole generously disclaimed authorship of the language of the letter, which was drafted by Minister Thurston, the President's health requiring such aid. Mr. Willis replied somewhat at length to this letter on Feb. 3. His tone was extremely friendly. He sought to point out that the preparations on board of the ships were solely in view of the need of preventing disorder. This letter was published here after the Alameda left. Dole's letter of specifications of Jan. 11 was published here on the 6th instant.

A brief reply will be made by Dole to Willis, reiterating the cause of apprehension of the use of force as being the secrecy maintained as to the purposes of the Minister, and not in any positive action taken by him. The President is confident of amicable relations with the American Minister.

The poisoning of a considerable number of the military at the Government buildings, similar to the case of last April, occurred on the evening of the 6th. Indications are strong that the poisoning was intentional. The royalists are now fully convinced that the United States Senate is hopelessly against them, and hence are trying to help themselves. Could they get possession of the Government buildings, they are certain of recognition from Wodehouse and hope for it from Minister Willis.

DOLE'S SPECIFICATIONS.

They Give Minister Willis a Complete View of the Policy of Infamy.

Copyright, 1894, by the United Press.

HONOLULU, Feb. 8, via San Francisco, Feb. 15.—This is the text of President Dole's reply to Minister Willis's request for specifications, which was made public for the first time in Honolulu just before the Alameda sailed:

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HONOLULU, H. I., Jan. 11, 1894.

His Excellency Albert S. Willis, United States Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Honolulu:

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication dated Jan. 1, in which you refer to my communication to you dated Dec. 27, as "containing statements which I am fully prepared to show are not warranted by facts, seriously affecting the President of the United States and representatives of the United States in this country, and that those charges and statements, if accepted as the official views of your Government, demand prompt answer and equally prompt action on the part of the Government of the United States to the end that the condition of affairs therein described should be removed by the removal of the alleged causes." You also refer to intervening correspondence between us stating that my above-mentioned communication "brings for the first time the official information that the warlike preparations described by you were caused by and intended for diplomatic and military representatives of the United States." You further state that believing upon further consideration that I would realize the great injustice of my statements, you on the 25th ult. wrote suggesting the withdrawal of my communication of the 27th ult. and your reply, and that no copies be given to the public or made a record of by either Government; and on the 31st stated to Mr. Damon that your note to me was "prompted by no improper or unfriendly spirit, but was intended to continue the amicable relations heretofore existing." You further state that in my letter of Dec. 29 there is "no withdrawal or modification of statements complained of, but, on the contrary, an expression of readiness, implying ability, to furnish the specifications requested." You also acknowledge the receipt of my note to you dated Jan. 1, stating that it was not my intention to withdraw any of my letters, which note you state is unsigned by me. Inasmuch as the signature was unintentional. You conclude by stating that "I now have to ask that you furnish me at your earliest convenience with the desired specifications, as I wish to make an immediate answer." I will comply with your request.

Before doing so, however, I desire to say in reply to your communication of the 1st instant, that I have made no charges against the President of the United States, or its representatives. On the contrary, in order that there might be no misapprehension concerning the matter, I specifically stated to you in my communication of the 27th ultimo that I do not claim or intimate that the unfortunate situation has been intentionally created by you or any other Government which you represent."

I still disclaim any intention of charging you or your Government with intent to produce results and conditions described in my communication of Dec. 27. The object of my communication was to formally bring to your attention certain facts and conditions existing in this country, which, in my opinion, were the causes of the same, and to obtain from you such information and assurances as would tend to allay the prevailing excitement and apprehension.

Concerning your statement above referred to, that my communication of Dec. 27 contains statements which you are fully prepared to show are not warranted by facts, I would say that it would give me great pleasure to become convinced that alleged conditions and facts referred to did not in truth exist. Matters herein after stated constitute the basis for my belief in existence of conditions referred to and causes producing the same, but I shall be glad to receive from you any evidence tending to remove from my mind the belief that they or any of them did exist, and assure you that upon becoming convinced that I am under the misapprehension concerning any of such alleged facts, allegations concerning same will be immediately withdrawn. Concerning your statement that my letter of Dec. 29 contains "no withdrawal or modification of statements complained of," you will pardon me if I say that I was not aware that any complaint had been made concerning any statement made by me, your reply having been primarily directed to eliciting more specific information concerning certain points.

Referring to the suggestion contained in your note of the 29th and your interview with Mr. Damon, that I withdraw my communication of Dec. 27, I would say that to do so would have been in the nature of an admission that the statements therein contained were incorrect, which, unfortunately, in the absence of information which you are now asked to present and which certain other evidence before me, it was impossible for me to do.

Allow me to assure you that it was with deep gratification that I received your assurance that your communication to me of the 25th of December was not prompted by no improper motive or unfriendly spirit, but was intended to continue the amicable relations heretofore existing and to further assure you that this and all other communications from this Government will be written in the same spirit, and I trust that no statement presenting the claims and views of this Government concerning any matter of law or fact may, by reason of its directness and distinctness, be construed as otherwise than of a similar character.

In compliance with your request for certain specifications concerning my letter of Dec. 27, I reply thereto as follows:

First—You inquire as to the meaning of the word "attitude" as used in my letter. I reply that the word was used by me in its ordinarily accepted sense, meaning bearing, posture, as indicating the purpose of those referred to. You further say: "Will you point out where and when and how the representative of the United States assumed any attitude toward the supporters of the Provisional Government, or that Government itself, other than the one essentially and designedly expressive of peace?" In reply I would say that the attitude of the person is to be ascertained only by inferences drawn from the known words and acts of such person, and the conditions and circumstances under which they take place. Some of the words and actions of the United States and its representatives in this connection, and the conditions and circumstances attendant thereon, from which its intentions and attitude toward the Provisional Government must be inferred, are as follows:

First—A treaty of annexation had been negotiated between the Provisional Government and the United States Government and presented to the Senate for ratification. This treaty was withdrawn by President Cleveland immediately on his entering office without prior notice to this Government or its representatives of his intention to do so, or of his reasons for such action.

Second—Immediately thereafter the President appointed the Hon. James A. Blount a special Commissioner to Hawaii to investigate the condition of affairs at Hawaii. Knowledge of such appointment was withheld from the representative of this Government at Washington. The press having announced the appointment, the Hawaiian representative applied to the State Department for information concerning the same. The Secretary of State refused to state the objects of the mission, or even to admit that a Commissioner had been appointed.

Third—On the 19th day of June, 1893, Mr. Thurston, Hawaiian Minister at Washington, addressed a communication to Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, in which the following language is used, viz.:

"I am directed by my Government to represent to you that, while the Hawaiian Government has full confidence in the good faith of the United States toward Hawaii in and concerning its treatment in the relations between the two countries, it seems proper that it should be informed as to the effect the present uncertainty as to the ultimate course to be pursued has upon the situation in Hawaii. Long-continued delay and uncertainty keeps the entire community in a feverish state of mind, by reason of which business is seriously affected, capital is withheld timid, thereby hampering all enterprises which are conducting their business on credit; the Government's credit and ability to borrow are prejudiced; the expenses of the Government are largely increased by the necessity of maintaining a considerable armed force for the protection of public order, and the enemies of the Government are encouraged to conspire against law and order, all of which is highly prejudicial and injurious, not only to the Hawaiians but to the very large amount of American capital invested in Hawaii and the mutual trade now being conducted between the two countries.

"It is important for the Hawaiian Government to know at the intention of the United States Government concerning annexation at as early a date as possible, as, if annexation is not to take place, the methods of treating local conditions in Hawaii must be radically different from those to be pursued if annexation is to take place. It is also important that, whatever the intentions of the United States Government may be concerning the subject, the Hawaiian Government should know what such intentions are before t[illegible] made public, in order that it may consider the situation with a full knowledge of all its aspects, and decide upon such course of action as may be necessary to preserve order and protect the interests of the people of Hawaii."

"For the reasons above stated, I respectfully request that the decision may be arrived at and communicated as speedily as is consistent with the interests of the United States."

No reply has ever been made to such communication.

Fourth—Upon arrival of Mr. Blount in this country he did not communicate or in any manner intimate to the Hawaiian Government that his investigations were to be directed toward the right of existence of the Government to which he was accredited. All of his investigations and examinations were private, and such persons only were examined as he chose to call.

Fifth—An examination of his report since published shows that there are statements by approximately sixty Royalists and twenty supporters of the Provisional Government; that he had obtained no statement from the four members of the Cabinet who went out before the revolutionary attempt of the Queen, although he has obtained exhaustive statements from their Royalist successors; that he has examined only two of the thirteen members of the Committee of Safety, one of the original four members of the Executive Council of the Provisional Government, three of the original fourteen members of the Advisory Council, two of the eight speakers who addressed the mass meeting called by the Committee of Safety on the day prior to the establishment of the Provisional Government, and but one of the eight field and staff officers, and none of the eleven line officers in command of the forces of the Provisional Government, and none of the five Commissioners sent to Washington. All of such men omitted to be examined were witnesses of and active participants in the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of the Provisional Government, and all men of character and standing in the community, while a number of those examined on the Royalist side are irresponsible characters.

Sixth—Upon the 16th day of May, 1893, Mr. Blount, without first communicating to this Government what his instructions were or his intentions so to do, published his official instructions in a Honolulu paper in the form of an address "to the people of the Hawaiian Islands," and concluded with the following words:

"While I shall refrain from any interference between conflicting forces, of whatever nationality, for supremacy, I will protect the American citizens not participating in such conflict."

Seventh—Although Mr. Blount's report is official in character, it vitally affects this Government and is distinctly hostile to it in tone and conclusions. No request or statement from this Government was in any instance made was received nor an opportunity to reply thereto or notice of its contents was given prior to its publication. The first information concerning the contents of the report was obtained by this Government through published extracts in American papers dated Nov. 20 last, no official copy thereof being furnished the Hawaiian Minister at Washington until Nov. 25, and none received by the Government at Honolulu until Dec. 22 last, such copies having been furnished only after several applications therefor to the State Department.

Eighth—On Nov. 7, you, having arrived in Honolulu, presented your credentials to this Government as American Minister with the usual declarations of friendship and regard, and were duly received and acknowledged. Simultaneously therewith, Admiral Skerrett was suddenly and unexpectedly removed and Rear Admiral Irwin appointed to the command of the American naval forces in Honolulu. Such changes was universally interpreted by the press of the United States as having a bearing upon the contemplated execution of the announced policy of the President concerning Hawaii. Extracts herewith contained from the New York *Herald* give a sample of the interpretation placed thereon by the press of your own country, favorable to such policy. You yourself claim to intimate that the personnel of commanding officers of United States forces is of any concern to this Government, nor to suggest that the interpretation placed thereon by the American press is correct, nor that your Government is responsible for such interpretation. This incident is mentioned simply as part of the *res gestæ* of the case, which this Government had before it, and is one of the many things which it was obliged to consider in drawing inferences as to what the intentions of your Government were.

Ninth—Upon the 8th of November last the New York *Herald* published a statement from its Washington correspondent from which I make the following extracts:

"A diplomatic bombshell will burst within the next few days, and the report will be heard throughout the entire world. The bomb will be thrown by the accredited representative of the United States Government, and it will burst against the badly conceived and worse managed Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands. * * * If Minister Willis and Admiral Irwin arrived in Honolulu on scheduled time, they will have lively times in the little capital city of the Hawaiian Islands today than there is in the metropolis of the United States. * * * Briefly stated, the present Administration will do all in its power to restore the conditions in the Hawaiian Islands to Hawaii at the time Minister Stevens * * * brought about the overthrow of Queen Liliuokalani. * * * The same force, that of the United States Government, which made the Provisional Government possible, has sustained them in power to this day. They could not have made the revolution, of which they were the head centre, a success but for the support given them by the Administration in Washington, and it is reasonable to believe that the Provisional Government would have gone down long ago but for this same support. * * * The fact that the new Minister has been sent to Honolulu to succeed Minister Stevens and that Rear Admiral Irwin has been sent to relieve Commodore Skerrett, has been accepted in many instances as an inkling of the Administration's policy toward Hawaii.

"The message that Queen Liliuokalani will be restored to her throne, and the Provisional Government, representing only a small part of the people of Hawaii, will soon be a thing of the past."

I do not intimate that the United States Government is responsible for the utterances of the *Herald*, but I cite the above as one of several instances in which information or intended acts on the part of your Government vital to this Government has been denied to this Government and first made known to it through the public press.

Tenth—On Nov. 11 the papers of the United States published a letter from the Secretary of State to the President, dated Oct. 18, 1893. No previous notice had been given to this Government of the contents of such a letter, or the intention to make it public. In that letter the Secretary, referring to the intention of this Government, says:

"They relied on no military force of their own, for they had none worthy of the name. The Provisional Government was established by the action of the American Minister, and the presence of the troops landed from the Boston, and its continued existence is due to the belief on the Hawaiians that if they made an effort to overthrow it they would encounter the armed forces of the United States. Earnest appeal to the American Minister for military protection by the officers of the Provisional Government after it had been recognized shows the utter absurdity of the claim that it was established after a successful revolution of the people of the islands. These appeals were a confession by the men who had made the revolution, unarmed men who had made it courageous men, conscious of their strength and the justice of their cause, do not thus act.

"Should not the wrong done to a feeble but independent State by an abuse of the authority of the United States be undone by restoring the legitimate Government? Anything short of that will not, I respectfully submit, satisfy the demands of justice. Our Government was the first to recognize the independence of the islands, and it should be the last to acquire sovereignty over them by force and fraud."

You have intimated in your communication, dated Dec. 2, that the foregoing letter, being a domestic transaction, is not the subject of diplomatic representation, which statement you have reiterated in your communication of Jan. 17. I must submit, however, that an official communication from the Chief of the Department of State to the President, in which he charges this Government and its officers with conspiracy, weakness, timidity and fraud, and recommends its subversion, which letter is officially furnished to and published by the public press to the world, forms an exception concerning the same being afforded to this Government, is not a "domestic transaction," and is preeminently a proper subject for inquiry on the part of this Government, as to the intentions of your Government concerning the subject matter.

Eleventh—On Nov. 13 Mr. Thurston, Hawaiian Minister at Washington, called upon the Secretary of State and inquired if the above letter was authentic, and was assured by Mr. Gresham that it was. Mr. Thurston said:

"I wish, then, to further ask whether it is the intention of the United States Government to carry out the policy therein indicated, by force, or, in other words, whether, if the Provisional Government declines to accede to the request of the United States Government, to vacate in favor of the Queen, the United States troops will be used to enforce the request."

To which Mr. Gresham replied: "I am not at liberty at present to answer that question. It is a matter concerning which I will speak to the President and talk with you more fully this afternoon."

In the afternoon of the same day Mr. Gresham further said to Mr. Thurston: "I have already answered your first question to the effect that the letter published Secretary Gresham and the President was intended as a correct statement of the policy of the United States. As to your second question, as to whether force is to be used by the United States to restore the Queen, all that I am at liberty to state is that Mr. Willis has no instructions to do anything which will cause injury to the life and property of any one on the islands. Further than that, I am not at liberty to state what his instructions are. You can draw your own inferences from my statement and allay any apprehension which may have been caused by what has been published."

Mr. Thurston further said to Mr. Gresham: "Your answer does not convey the information which I requested. What I desire is to obtain information which will guide my Government in their action. If they know that force is to be used by you, their course of action will necessarily be different from what it otherwise would be. Definite information from me that you intend to use force may be the means of preventing them from using force and causing bloodshed."

To which Mr. Gresham replied: "Our relations in the past have been pleasant, and I want them to continue to be so in the future, and to be perfectly courteous to you, but I cannot at present assure more fully than I have."

Twelfth—On the 16th of last November there was published in the Hawaiian *Star* an interview with you with the accompanying statement that the proofs had been revised by you. The following are extracts therefrom, purporting to be statements made by you:

"You are authorized to say from me that the change in the present situation will not take place for several weeks. I brought with me certain instructions. Since my arrival here certain contingencies have arisen about which neither the United States Government nor myself was aware when I left Washington. I forwarded my despatches to Washington by to-day's steamer, and until I receive an answer to them no changes will take place in the situation, nor will they be allowed.

"What do you mean by the expression, 'nor will they be allowed'?

"I mean just this: That until the time comes for me to carry out my instructions the peace and good order of the community will be kept undisturbed in the interests of humanity. That an attempt made by any person or persons to make trouble will be promptly checked and punished. You may put the matter more plainly, say that even if the Provisional Government discharged the whole of its troops to-day, no lawlessness would be allowed for one moment under the present situation of affairs.

"The whole Hawaiian question is now in abeyance, and nothing that newspapers can say or do will alter the situation one iota. There is not the slightest necessity for any one to stay out of bed nights for fear of any trouble of any kind, for none will be permitted.

In the Honolulu *Bulletin* of Nov. 17 last there is published what purports to be a letter signed by yourself, in which you state concerning the above interview:

"The interview in the *Star* was submitted to me, but I did not scrutinize it carefully. It contains several expressions which are misleading, due, I am sure, not to any intention on the part of the writer."

"There is no specification of what the "misleading" portions are, although you have since verbally informed me in substance that you did not intend to use such words and had no intention of exercising authority inconsistent with that of the Government."

Thirteenth—On Nov. 17 last the Hawaiian *Star* published a statement purporting to be a report of remarks made by you to a delegation of the American League, in which report occurred the following words attributed to you:

"We have, by my instructions, which I cannot divulge, * * * But this I can say: That the policy of the United States is already formulated regarding these islands, and that nothing which can be accomplished, either here or there, can prevent anything now. I do not come here as did Mr. Blount. I come here as an executive officer. I come to act. When the proper time comes I shall act. * * * I wish to state positively that any outside interference will not be tolerated by the United States."

I am not aware that you ever disavowed the correctness of this report.

Fourteenth—On Nov. 29 last, having that day for the first time received information through the Hawaiian Minister at Washington of the contents of Mr. Gresham's letter to the President and of his statements concerning the same and his refusal to state whether it was or not his intention of your Government to carry out its policy by force, I called upon you in company with the Attorney-General, stated to you the substance of my information, and asked you what the intentions of your Government were in relation to Mr. Gresham's recommendations. You replied that you were not at liberty to tell us, but would do so as soon as you could.

Fifteenth—Immediately thereafter I addressed a communication to you revoking the general permission granted to the United States forces to land for drill, and a further communication formally stating to you the information received by me concerning said letter of Mr. Gresham and asking you the following question:

"I desire to inquire of you whether the published reports of such letter of Secretary Gresham are substantially correct? If they are, I feel that it is due this Government that it should be informed of the intention of your Government in relation to the suggestions contained in the said letter of Mr. Gresham."

On Dec. 2 you replied to such letter:

"As to the letter of Mr. Gresham, I have the honor to call your attention to the fact, as shown by you, that it is a communication from a member of the Cabinet to the President of the United States, and being a domestic transaction is not the subject of diplomatic representation. Answering your second letter, I must express my sincere regret that it is not in my power at present to inform you of the views or intentions of the United States."

Sixteenth—On December 4th last, President Cleveland transmitted his annual message to Congress, in which the following language was used concerning Hawaii: Referring to Mr. Blount's report he said:

"Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us, and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result without in the constitutional limits of executive power our present Minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end."

Seventeenth—On Dec. 14 last the United States despatch boat Corwin arrived at Honolulu from San Francisco bringing despatches for yourself. No mail was allowed to be brought by her, but the press of Honolulu obtained from persons on board of her and published the above extract from the President's message. But for such accidental information no information concerning the same would have been obtained by this Government until the arrival of the Alameda on Dec. 22.

Up to the time of the arrival of the Corwin the United States naval officers in port were in the habit of coming ashore in citizens' dress, the crews received the usual liberty on shore, and no unusual warlike preparations were visible on board. Immediately after the arrival of the Corwin the liberty of the crews was stopped, as was that of most of the officers. Those who came on shore were in service uniform. Rifles were stacked, cartridge belts filled with ball cartridges, and knapsacks packed, ready for immediate use, were conspicuous on the decks of the ships, and were seen there by visiting citizens, who, in reply to inquiry as to the meaning of such preparation, were informed by the officers that they were ready for a moment's notice. When asked if the landing would be to protect or fight us, the reply of the officers of the Philadelphia was that no one on board knew what orders would be received.

Eighteenth—It was known at this time that several of the wives of the United States naval officers temporarily in Honolulu were packing up their baggage, preparatory for immediate removal, in view of possible hostilities.

Nineteenth—It was also known that you were in frequent communication with the ex-Queen, and that royalists were constantly reiterating that you were going to immediately restore the Queen by force. A sample of innumerable assertions of this character is the following made by Mr. D. C. Carter, the ex-Queen's most confiding counsellor and confidant, a gentleman who was then known to be in consultation with you and the ex-Queen, and who appears as the attesting witness, to the exclusion of the former members of her Cabinet, to her proposition of amnesty hereunder referred to.

Mr. Carter warned his nephew, Mr. C. L. Carter, a supporter of the Provisional Government, that restoration was certain; that force would be used by the United States for that purpose, and that he ought to consider the rights of his family and not risk his life in opposing the inevitable.

This information was from one of the sources from which numerous prophecies of future action on the part of the United States had emanated, with almost invariable correctness.

Twentieth—It was the almost universal belief in the city that you would cause to attempt to land the naval forces of the United States to enforce the execution of the President's policy. In anticipation thereof, for a number of days the wharves were lined with crowds of people, among them prominent royalists, waiting to see the United States troops land to restore the Queen.

Twenty-first—On Dec. 18 Mr. H. F. Glade, Consul for Germany, called upon you, and, in substance, asked if you could not devise some way to relieve the public from the state of extreme tension they were in, which was becoming unbearable; to which you replied, in substance, that you were aware of the conditions and were making every effort to bring the matter to a speedy determination and would act within forty-eight hours.

Twenty-second—On Dec. 19, it being reported that the Corwin was at an early date to return to San Francisco, the Attorney-General called upon you, stating that there would be no regular mail for nearly three weeks, and asked permission to forward Hawaiian Government despatches by her, which permission you refused, stating that your instructions would not permit it.

Twenty-third—On Dec. 18 Major Wodehouse, the British Minister, and Mr. Fujii, the Japanese diplomatic representative, both asked permission to land troops from their respective war ships for the purpose of protecting their respective legations, which permission was granted by this Government.

Twenty-fourth—In view of the existing conditions, Mr. Fujii, the Japanese diplomatic representative, sent word to a number of prominent American supporters of the Provisional Government, offering the use of the Japanese legation as a refuge for their families in case of hostilities.

Twenty-fifth—On Dec. 18 last I addressed to you a communication containing the following words:

"I am informed that you are in communication with Liliuokalani, the ex-Queen, with a view to reestablishing the monarchy in the Hawaiian Islands, and of supporting her pretensions to the sovereignty. Will you inform me if this report is true or if you are acting in any way hostile to this Government. You will pardon me for pressing you for an immediate answer."

Twenty-sixth—On Dec. 19 you called upon and made a verbal address to me, furnishing me with a manuscript copy of your remarks, from which I make the following extracts:

"The President regrets, as I do, that any secrecy should have surrounded the interchange of views between our two Governments. I may say this, however, that the secrecy thus far observed has been in the interest and for the safety of all of your people. * * *

"Upon the facts embodied in Mr. Blount's reports, the President has arrived at certain conclusions and determined upon a certain course of action, with which it becomes my duty to acquaint you.

"The Provisional Government was not established by the Hawaiian people, or with their consent or acquiescence; nor has it since existed with their consent. Other reasons are set forth for the conclusions reached.)

"In view of these conclusions, I was instructed by the President to take advantage of an early opportunity to inform the Queen of this determination and of his views as to the responsibility of our Government. I was instructed at the same time to inform the Queen, when reinstated, that the President expected that she would pursue a magnanimous course by granting full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her. In obedience to the command of the President, I have secured the Queen's agreement to this course.

"It becomes my further duty to advise you, sir, the Executive of the Provisional Government, and your Ministers, of the President's determination of the question which your action at that of the Queen devolved upon him, and that you are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority. And now, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Provisional Government, with a sincere and solemn sense of the gravity of the situation * * * In the name and by the authority of the United States of America I submit to you the question: Are you willing to abide by the decision of the President?"

Twenty-seventh—Upon Dec. 23 I replied to the foregoing communication in the negative. Up to the time of sending you my communication of Dec. 27, no further communication had been received by me from you and no assurance had been received that force was not to be used, or what your further intentions were concerning this Government.

Twenty-eighth—During your nearly two months' residence in this city you and your family have declined the customary social courtesies usually extended to those occupying your official position on the specified ground that it was not deemed best under existing circumstances to accept such civilities. I do not for a moment intimate that such action is improper, or that it is a subject for criticism. It is simply referred to by me as an existing fact bearing upon your relations to this Government, and germane in considering the question of your attitude thereto, which must have been inferred to by me except in response to your inquiry.

In the absence of specific, definite information as to the intentions of your Government, the foregoing are some of the facts from which the inferences that has been obliged to infer what such intentions were, and which, considered as a whole, constitute the "attitude" toward this Government. It may be that the proper logical deduction and inference from the facts stated, that the "attitude" of the United States and its representatives toward the Provisional Government is, and has been, "one essentially and designedly expressive of peace." It will give me the greatest pleasure to receive assurances to that effect, but I must submit that, under the circumstances and in the absence of such assurances, they are capable of another construction, to a sufficient extent at least to warrant the question which I have asked you in my communication of Dec. 27.

Your second request for information is as follows: "You assert that at the time of my arrival in this country the forces of this Government were organized and amply sufficient to suppress any internal disorder. Will you inform me on what this statement has or is designed to have with the Government of the United States or with the future action of its representative?"

I reply that there are two reasons for the statement first, that already stated in my letter of Dec. 27, that "In consequence of your attitude the enemies of the Government, believing in your intentions to restore the monarchy by force, have become emboldened." &c.; second, that it was your duty to ascertain whether your Government proposed to use force in support of its policy of restoration. I was obliged to act as though it did so intend; as a result of which this Government was obliged to keep its forces and vessels, and has been subjected to the necessity of increased watchfulness and large additional expense, which but for such attitude would have been unnecessary.

The effect which I had hoped this communication might have upon the future action of the representative of the United States was that he might give such assurances that such additional watchfulness and expense might be avoided.

Your third request is for the time, place, and subject matter of the "language" used by yourself in public and in communication to this Government. The answer to this is covered by my reply to your first inquiry.

Your fourth request is as to what particular words in the published letter from Secretary Gresham and in the President's message, and which message of the President I referred to, I reply that certain of the words in the Secretary's letter and which I deem pertinent to the subject matter have already been quoted in my reply to your first inquiry, although there are others obviously bearing upon the same subject. I have already referred to the President's first message, my letter dated the 27th having actually been written on the 28th of December, and forwarded to you before I had knowledge of the contents of the second message.

Your fifth inquiry is as to the time and contents of your communications which were "ambiguous." I have enumerated them in my reply to your first inquiry. The ambiguity consists in the reiterated statement that you were not at liberty to carry out certain instructions which all the surrounding circumstances indicated were inimical to this Government, without stating what that act, nor what those instructions were; and, further, in your speaking and making assurances of friendship and amity, with the consent of this Government, you were negotiating with its enemies for its subversion and declining to state what your intentions were. Such utterances and conduct on the part of a friend, one with the other, with international rules of comity and the past relations and international policy of the two Governments as to be not only ambiguous, but incomprehensible to this Government.

Your sixth inquiry is as to when, where, and to whom you declared that you intended to do some act when the proper time arrived. The reply to your first inquiry covers this also.

Your seventh inquiry is as to the time and manner when this Government has sought the assurance that force would not be used. The answer is contained in my reply to your first inquiry.

You finally asked my "careful consideration" of the following statement contained in my letter:

"Your action has unfortunately aroused the passions of all parties and made it probable that disturbances may be created at any moment," and say that you "refuse to believe that upon examination you will deem it liberty to affix your (my) official signature to such an extraordinary declaration."

In reply I beg to state that I have resided in this country for nearly fifty years, and had intimate personal and official relations with the prevailing during the riot of 1874 and the revolutions of 1887, 1889, and 1893, and with all deliberation I state, of my own knowledge, that during that period there has never been a time when this country was subjected to such strain and excitement as during the eight days following the arrival of the Corwin. The business of the entire community was practically suspended and its time and energy devoted to an extended discussion of the question of the political situation and to military preparation to meet unknown contingencies, which state of things has since been fortunately allayed by advices from America, furnishing in reports of the President's Hawaiian message and his instructions to your Excellency, information which made a satisfactory and favorable response to the inquiry of my letter of Dec. 27. I also state, with equal deliberation, that such condition was produced and maintained by reason of your actions and declarations and the actions and declarations of your Government, and the circumstances and uncertainties attendant thereupon, as detailed in my letter of Dec. 27 and herein. I make this statement in no spirit of unfriendliness to you or your Government, but as a historical fact, which, if not already known to you, should, in the interests of both countries, be made known to your Government.

In conclusion I beg to refer to the statement in your communication wherein you state that it is a source of "sincere and profound regret" that my letter "brings for the first time the official information that such force was the official information that such force was actually used by you were caused by and intended for the diplomatic and military representatives of the United States." In reply I would say that unless my conduct on your part at receiving such information cannot exceed the sincerity and profoundness of my own regret that such a condition should exist.

Such regret on my part is only equalled by my inability to understand how it has come about that a Government and community which is to-day more closely connected with the United States by ties of commerce, friendship, and blood than any other lying beyond its borders, which visits yearly thousands above that of all other nations, which fully admits and appreciates the many and deep obligations which it is under to your Government and people, which has done you and your country no wrong, has been forced into a position which results in their very right to exist they have been obliged to take up arms to meet the possible hostility of that country whose flag they revere and whose principles of liberty they love. I cannot but believe that it has arisen through a misunderstanding of facts on the part of your Government and a mutual misapprehension of motives and intentions, which may, I sincerely hope, at an early day be cleared away.

Allow me, in closing to thank you, Mr. Minister, for your frequent expressions of personal regard and for the evident sincerity of purpose displayed by you under recent trying circumstances, and to assure you of my deep appreciation thereof.

I have the honor to assure you that, with highest consideration, I am your Excellency's obedient servant,

SANFORD B. DOLE.

HONOLULU, Jan. 11, 1894.

JOHN Y. M'KANE IS GUILTY.

Continued from First Page

whispered, "How is it?" and Newton replied, "I don't know; nobody knows." Another of McKane's friends whispered, "Is it all right?" and Newton responded, "I can't tell. It's too close to tell." As Lawyer Glendenning came by he said to McKane: "We are safe." And then the Judge said to the crowd, which was nervously expectant:

"The Court wishes it distinctly understood that there must be quiet and perfect order in this room. No matter what the verdict of this jury is when it is announced, if there is any demonstration whatever it will be treated as contempt of court and punished as such."

There was a wait of a few minutes more, and then it was decided to go on without Mr. Roderick. The Judge ordered that the roll be called, and that the Clerk ask the usual questions.

"Gentlemen of the jury," said Clerk Byrne, "have you agreed upon a verdict?"

Foreman Sackett arose and, facing the Judge, said:

"We have."

McKane at this moment had hold of