cially stated that negotiations are preliminary in their character, of a nature necessary to bring the question up for discussion and action by the legislature, and that no final action is to be taken without full submission to and the approval of the legislature.

The published statement of the objects sought is a full enumeration of all that the cabinet has in view. The treaty sought is, we believe, a like preservative of the honor, dignity, and independence of the two countries, and conducive to their mutual commercial prosperity.

Without foundation therefor, regardless of the grave consequences of interference with the cordial relations existing between the two countries and solely for partisan influence upon the coming election, the gentlemen constituting the opposition to the present administration have for months tilled the ears of the public, more particularly the native Hawaiians, with violent appeals and false statements concerning the intentions of the cabinet and of the United States. This has been the keynote of their whole campaign. They have placed their whole reliance upon the ignorance of the people of the facts and the prejudice which their misrepresentations have produced. They have worked up and are still working up, by every disingenuous method, a strong distrust, prejudice, and antagonism in the minds of many of the native people toward the United States upon a wholly false basis and by an entire perversion of facts and history.

Under these circumstances it was due the United States and essential to the welfare of Hawaiians that the long suppressed, and more than generous friendship of the United States toward Hawaii should be stated, and the most signal and complete illustration of it, heretofore secret history, made public.

In order to do this intelligently it was necessary to state the historical facts which in logical sequence led up to it. For this purpose, and thus far only, was reference made to early history and the relations of Hawaii with other countries.

The Herald charges that I have "purposely and knowingly garbled and misstated Hawaiian history for political purposes," and that the demands of the French in 1849 and 1851 were based upon the differences existing between the two countries in 1839. In proof, and as sole proof, of these charges and statements, it prints a letter, dated 1839, signed by the "Hon. J. C. Jones, then American consul," and five other foreign residents, laudatory of Laplace and his actions in 1839.

The reference to the occurrences of 1839 in my argument at the armory was simply incidental in its nature; those events chronologically preceding the events of '49 and '51, and being illustrative of the arbitrary methods employed in those days in settling differences with this country in its weakness, the approved method being to submit peremptory demands and require immediate compliance therewith, with the alternative of the loss of independence. Otherwise the occurrences of 1839 are entirely unconnected with the events of '49 and '51, which led up to and were the direct cause of the treaty of cession to the United States of 1851.

I again affirm, and the evidence hereafter cited proves, that the events of 1839 were not the moving causes of the action of any of the parties in '49 and '51, and that the incidents and moving causes of the former are unessential to an understanding of the events of the latter period, except to illustrate the fact that redress for real or imaginary wrong was obtained in those days by force.

The religious intolerance displayed by the Hawaiian Government during its early history toward the Catholic faith and its believers is a portion of the history of this country which every lover of the good name of the nation and of religious liberty regrets. It is no more and no less excusable than have been much more serious acts of religious intolerance perpetrated at different periods of their history by enlightened England, France, and New England.

Suffice it to say that the letter published by the Herald is a mere chip upon the stream of literature concerning the subject, which occupies hundreds of pages of diplomatic correspondence and volumes of contemporaneous history, written by the immediate parties interested upon both sides. Had my object been to discuss the religious differences of the time, there is far stronger documentary evidence on both sides concerning the subject than the letter referred to by the Herald.

In proof of the fact that the difficulties with France in 1849 and 1851, which caused the execution of the treaty of cession to the United States, I cite the following facts:

1. The further merits or demerits of the Laplace controversy are not germane to this issue. It is sufficient to say that, whatever the feelings of the Hawaiians on the subject, the French were satisfied and Laplace sailed away, which the Herald itself cites a letter to prove.

2. In 1839, a month before the arrival of Laplace, the Government had discontinued the policy of intolerance towards the Catholics, and in 1840 the King promulgated a constitution, guaranteeing religious liberty to all.

3. In 1843, England and France executed the famous “recognition” treaty, which was distinctly looked upon as a mark of friendly approval of the Hawaiian Government by those two countries.