States. Accordingly, on the 21st of May following, Mr. McCook, on behalf of the United States, and Mr. Harris, on the part of the Hawaiian Government, concluded a treaty of reciprocity at San Francisco, which received the approval of the President, but failed of ratification by the Senate. (Appendix.)

In a private note of June 7, 1867, Mr. McCook adverted to the subject of annexation, and asked leave of absence to visit the United States the following November, when the reciprocity treaty might be expected to become the subject of consideration in the Senate. This leave was granted by Mr. Seward, who thus instructed Mr. McCook:

You are at liberty to sound the proper authority on the large subject mentioned in your note, and ascertain probable conditions. You may confidentially receive overtures and communicate the same to me.

I will act upon your suggestion in that relation in regard to a party now here.

Mr. Seward's "large subject" was annexation, and Mr. Seward's "party now here" was the Hawaiian minister to this country, Mr. C. C. Harris. (Appendix.)

It is probable that a conference was held on the subject by Mr. Seward and Mr. Harris, but notes of it do not appear. On the 12th of September, however, Mr. Seward, writing confidentially to Mr. McCook, said:

Circumstances have transpired here which induce a belief that a strong interest, based upon a desire for annexation of the Sandwich Islands, will be active in opposing a ratification of the reciprocity treaty. It will be argued that the reciprocity will tend to hinder and defeat an early annexation, to which the people of the Sandwich Islands are supposed to be now strongly inclined.

He advised the minister to remain at Honolulu and abandon his earlier plan to visit Washington, and he added—

That if the policy of annexation should conflict with the policy of reciprocity, annexation is in every case to be preferred. (Appendix.)

During the spring and summer of 1867 some apprehension was created in the mind of the King by the presence in Hawaiian waters of the U. S. S. Lackawanna, Capt. Reynolds. This was based upon the fact that the commanding officer had been formerly a resident in Hawaii and was interfering, or had the purpose to interfere, in political affairs. It is not impossible that the King's minister for foreign affairs, de Varigny, was really responsible for the royal apprehensions. The presence of the ship delayed ratification of reciprocity, and it was not until after her departure that the King convened the legislature to consider the subject.

His Majesty stated to me [writes Mr. McCook] that he would like to discuss its [the treaty's] provisions with me, but did not deem it consistent with his dignity, etc., to enter into any such discussion while the Lackawanna remained here; I will do His Majesty the justice to say that I do not believe this idea was an original one, but was suggested to, and forced upon him by his ministers, they hoping that the Lackawanna could not, or would not leave, and that this might prove an insuperable obstacle to the ratification of the treaty. (Appendix.)

The treaty was ratified July 30, 1867. Our own Senate had received the treaty early the same month; it was reported in February, 1868, but was not finally acted upon until June 1st, 1870, when it was rejected. (Appendix.)

Very soon after his ratification of the reciprocity treaty the King sent a commissioner to Japan to negotiate a commercial treaty. This project the American minister at Honolulu earnestly antagonized, upon the ground that such a treaty would deflect trade from the United States and encourage English competition. (Appendix.)