publication of such information "to allay any such apprehension." Furthermore, as frankly admitted by you in this correspondence, "your Government did not itself entertain this apprehension."

As to the "crowds of people among them, many prominent Royalists" at the wharves "for several days," you will recall the fact as set forth in your subsequent paragraph (23) that the British minister and the Japanese consul-general at this time, December 18, "asked permission to land troops." As much publicity had been given these facts in the daily press, I respectfully suggest that the crowd was most probably assembled out of harmless curiosity to witness the anticipated landing of the English and Japanese troops and not that of the United States "to enforce the execution of the President's policy."

Touching the statement in paragraph (22) that your Government was refused permission to forward "Hawaiian Government dispatches" by the dispatch boat Corwin it is only necessary to remind you that the naval officers of the United States and the public generally were denied such privilege and that no inference of unfriendly feeling should therefore have been drawn. Moreover, at the time your letter was written, you were aware of the fact that for the accommodation of your Government the Corwin had been delayed over half a week.

As to the requests referred to in paragraph (23) of the British minister and Japanese consul-general, for permission to land troops, they were, I am informed, precautionary measures against possible mob violence. This permission is still outstanding and is not now and was not then, in my judgment, proper evidence of a hostile purpose on the part of our Government.

In reply to paragraph (24) and also to a clause in your letter of the 27th, I have the honor to state upon the authority of a letter now in my possession from the diplomatic agent of Japan that it is a mistake in supposing that his offer of protection was confined to "prominent American supporters of the Provisional Government," or was based upon the fear of "American invasion." Mr. Fujiy says in his letter: "Many of my neighbors were nervous and excited, being afraid of some sudden acts of lawless people, and I deemed it proper to say to them that in case of immediate need [his residence being in a somewhat distant part of the city] my consulate was always at their service as a good friend and neighbor."

My answer to paragraph (25) is set forth in my reply to paragraph (19), which shows that all the communications with the Queen were fully, and, I trust, satisfactorily explained to your Government.

In paragraph (26) you quote from my address of December 19, submitting the views of the President upon the Hawaiian question. I respectfully suggest that there is in this address no intimation as to the use of force and that even had there been no prior information to you upon the subject, there is enough in its tone and terms to show that, as stated in the opening words of the address itself, "the President's action is now and has been from the beginning, absolutely free from resentment and entirely consistent with the long-established friendship and treaty ties which have so closely bound together our respective Governments."

Your paragraph (27) states "Upon the 23d December I replied to the foregoing communication in the negative. Up to the time of sending you my communication of December 27 no further communication had been received by me from you, and no assurance had been received that force was not to be used, nor what your further instructions were concerning this Government."

Let me call your attention to the fact that at the time your answer was delivered I notified you that I would forward it to Washington, and that nothing would be done by me until further instructed. To this your reply was: "That will be very satisfactory to our people."

The Corwin, which, as herebefore stated, had been delayed for the purpose of receiving your answer, left at 4 a.m. Sunday, December 24. The next day being Christmas no communication could be sent to you, but on the following day, December 26, I acknowledged, in writing, the receipt of your answer to President Cleveland's decision, notifying you that it had been sent to Washington. This communication was delivered at the executive building before 3 p.m. of date above named, December 26. On the following day, December 27, at 4 p.m., I received the letter out of which this correspondence has arisen.

Your paragraph (28) states: "During your nearly two months' residence in this city you and your family have declined the customary social courtesies usually extended to those occupying your official position, on the specified ground that it was not deemed best, under existing circumstances, to accept such civilities."

In reply permit me to say that the course of conduct referred to was prompted by the friendliest motive, had no official significance, was adopted, not toward the Provisional Government alone, and was intended to leave all persons, after the disclosure of the views of my Government, free and unembarrassed to determine for themselves the relations they desired to hold to me and to my family. The only