On the other hand, was it not natural for the white race to vaunt their wealth and intelligence, their Christian success in rescuing the native from barbarism, their gift of a Government regal in name but containing many of the principles of freedom; to find in the natives defective intelligence, tendencies to idolatry, to race prejudice, and a disposition under the influence of white and half-white leaders to exercise political domination; to speak of their thriftlessness in private life and susceptibility to bribes in legislative action; to proclaim the unchasteness of native women, and to take at all hazards the direction of public affairs from the native?

With such a powerful tendency to divergence and political strife, with its attendant bitterness and exaggerations, we must enter upon the field of inquiry pointed out in your instructions.

It is not my purpose to take up this racial controversy at its birth, but when it had reached striking proportions and powerfully acted in the evolution of grave political events culminating in the present status. Nor shall I relate all the minute details of political controversy at any given period, but only such and to such extent as may illustrate the purpose just indicated.

It has already appeared that under the constitution of 1852 the legislature consisted of two bodies—one elected by the people and the other chosen by the King—and that no property qualifications hindered the right of suffrage. The King and people through the two bodies held a check on each other. It has also been shown that in 1864 by a royal proclamation a new constitution, sanctioned by a cabinet of prominent white men, was established, restricting the right of suffrage and combining the representative and nobles into one body. This latter provision was designed to strengthen the power of the Crown by removing a body distinctly representative. This instrument remained in force twenty-three years. The Crown appointed the nobles generally from white men of property and intelligence. In like manner the King selected his cabinet. These remained in office for a long series of years and directed the general conduct of public affairs.

Chief Justice Judd, of the supreme court of the Hawaiian Islands, in a formal statement uses this language:

Under every constitution prior to 1887 the ministers were appointed by the King and removed by him; but until Kalarakana's reign it was a very rare thing that any King changed his ministry. They had a pretty long lease of political life. My father was minister for seven or ten years and Mr. Wyllie for a longer period. It was a very rare political occurrence and made a great sensation when a change was made. Under Kalarakana things were different. I think we had twenty-six different cabinets during his reign.

The record discloses thirteen cabinets. Two of these were directly forced on him by the reformers. Of the others, six were in sympathy with the reformers and eminent in their confidence. The great stir in cabinet changes commenced with the Gibson cabinet in 1882. He was a man of large information, free from all suspicion of bribery, politically ambitious, and led the natives and some whites.

It may not be amiss to present some of the criticisms against Kalarakana and his party formally filed with me by Prof. W. D. Alexander, a representative reformer.

On the 12th of February, 1874, Kalarakana was elected King by the legislature. The popular choice lay between him and the Queen Dowager.

In regard to this, Mr. Alexander says that "the cabinet and the American party used all their influence in favor of the former, while the English favored Queen Emma, who was devoted to their interest."