

went out of his way to insult the United States on the floor of this House, and their organ carried on the same thing to-day. It was useless to deny government ownership in this organ. Government ownership did not alone make an organ. The New York Tribune was the organ of the Republican administration, but it was not owned by the government. It was immaterial whether the paper was controlled by the cabinet, or as he was informed, partially owned by them. He had reason to believe that the cabinet did have something to do with the Bulletin, and that its late apology, which apologized and then rubbed it in alternately, was written with their cognizance, and that the anti-American tone of the paper was an expression of the attitude of the cabinet. He did not propose to inquire whether the minister of finance had good reason for his resolution, etc. It was sufficient to point out the fact that there was the antagonism of the cabinet toward the representative of the American interests here.

With the fact staring us in the face, was it not perfect folly to go home and let the cabinet stay there expecting them to do anything for Hawaiian agricultural interests? He was not talking on an annexation basis, but was speaking on the same basis as the attorney-general on the late want of confidence debate, who had expressed his views to a dot. The United States would never take possession of this country against the will of its people. It was not a live issue now, and when it was introduced it was done solely with a view to mislead. Annexation was brought up and trotted out regularly, and was simply a substitute for the old missionary cry. When an election, etc., was over it would not be heard of again until a similar occasion arose. Before being frightened by the annexation scarecrow it was well to stop and think. All history belied the idea that the United States would ever take this country against the will of the people. It had^d been the first to recognize its independence. Follow the history down. When Lord George Paulet hauled down the Hawaiian flag, what was the position of the United States? A United States frigate appeared here, refused to acknowledge the foreign usurper and, in defiance of him, fired a royal salute.

Passing over this episode, which the British Government right royally retrieved, what was the position taken by the United States at the time of the French usurpation? A treaty of cession was signed and sent to Washington, where it lay for four solid months untouched, and when the danger was over it was returned without pretence of any right to retain what had been freely given without solicitation. The French have gone on until they now own a hundred islands. Daniel Webster said that if the French took the islands they would take them back and restore their independence if it took the whole power of the United States to do it. That was their position, and it had been consistently maintained ever since.

Again, it had not been foreigners who proposed all this. Kamehameha III himself proposed to cede the islands, and just before he was going to do so he was taken sick and died. The treaty lies in the foreign office ready for his signature, and may be seen by anybody. It was unnecessary to come down to the events of the last twenty years. They were within the knowledge of everybody. The United States had, out of its bounty, given us a treaty for which it received almost no monetary return, which had put millions into the pockets of this country. The advantages of this treaty were now gone, and additional ones must be sought. Not only was it a fact that the United States had stood between Hawaii and France, between Hawaii and England, had held our independence in their hands, had given us a treaty, but during the reign of the present sovereign a ship of war had been asked by Her Majesty's Government if it would assist in preserving order against internal enemies. Apart from these financial and material interests, common decency and common gratitude should prevent these slurs and insinuations on the United States. It was an insult to the opposition which was not less loyal than the cabinet, and the ideas were advanced simply to keep the cabinet in power. In conclusion, the speaker said it made no difference on what ground members united against the cabinet if they agreed in having no confidence in it.

Rep. Bipikane said it had always been his practice to scrutinize every cabinet. He had watched this one. He saw no advantage to be gained by delay. If there was a majority in favor of the cabinet, the resolution would not pass; if there were not, it would, and that was the sum of the matter. The resolution brought in before was carried, so far as numbers go. He voted for the cabinet then to give them a chance to do something. They had done nothing at all. If the cabinet had not power enough to remove the marshal, they had better remove themselves. There was no use in delay. The question did not need any discussing. He had been watching cabinets for thirty years, and never seen anything like this before. Why did not the attorney-general put out the men whom the people wanted put out? This was the fourth resolution of want of confidence which had come in. That ought not to be so. A few small branches had been lopped off, but the stump—the marshal—was still there. They voted a want of confidence, and the marshal was there still. If they voted another, he would still be there; and if that was the way