kama was inclined more to appoint natives. I was made a noble in 1860. I sat in the house when there were two houses for several sessions.

Q. Well, the complaint in the revolution of 1887—one of the complaints—was against his exercise of that power of appointing nobles, was it not?
A. I do not remember.
Q. The constitution of 1887 took it away?
A. Yes. That is, the power which he got partly through the appointment of nobles. They felt he was abusing the power which he had. They complained of him for interfering in the elections and for getting people who he thought would favor any schemes of his, and also in interfering in the appointment of all the minor officers—like tax assessors, tax collectors, and district justices—getting everything as much as possible into his own hands, and of his extravagance. Through such a legislature he could get appropriations made to suit him.
Q. The revolution of 1887 was to change that?
A. Yes; it was to change that. Now, a man can not be elected who is holding any office at all. Giving men these minor offices was one way of paying them.
Q. Has there been discontent with the constitution of 1887 on the part of the Crown and native population more or less since then?
A. Yes; but I do not think the people generally were discontented if they had been let alone. The Crown was discontented all the time from the time of the revolution. It wanted to get power back again.

The shorthand notes of the foregoing have been read to me by Mr. Mills, and it is a correct report of my interview with Mr. Blount.

CHAS. R. BISHOP.

(Mr. Bishop was on the point of leaving Honolulu for the United States.)

No. 9.

Interview with Sereno E. Bishop, Honolulu, Tuesday, April 11.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Bishop, will you be kind enough to tell me—be cause I know you are a thoughtful man—the causes immediate and remote which led to the recent revolution?
Mr. BISHOP. The immediate cause was a succession of aggressions upon liberty and good government by the Queen, and the final act of attempting to overthrow the existing constitution by violence.
Q. Will you be kind enough to refer to these acts specifically?
A. The first definite act was the refusal of the Queen to appoint a cabinet in accordance with the choice of the legislature.
Q. What day was that?
A. I can not give you the precise date. There was a series of these proceedings from, I think, August to November, during which time the legislature rejected, successively, three Cabinets which she had appointed by vote of want of confidence, she persisting in sending in again and again men that the legislature considered unfit for the office.
Q. You mean by that that the individual members of a cabinet were repeatedly rechosen and rejected?
A. In some cases the same individuals were rechosen, but generally not more than one at a time. Other men equally objectionable were substituted in their places. They were men in whom the business