

Government, and by that alone, or it could be acquired by conquest. This I understand to be the American doctrine, conspicuously announced from time to time by the authorities of your Government.

President Jackson said in his message to Congress in 1836: "The uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to the internal government of other nations, and eventually to recognize the authority of the prevailing party, without reference to the merits of the original controversy."

This principle of international law has been consistently recognized during the whole past intercourse of the two countries, and was recently reaffirmed in the instructions given by Secretary Gresham to Commissioner Blount on March 11, 1893, and by the latter published in the newspapers in Honolulu in a letter of his own to the Hawaiian public. The words of these instructions which I refer to are as follows: "The United States claim no right to interfere in the political or domestic affairs or in the internal conflicts of the Hawaiian Islands other than as herein stated (referring to the protection of American citizens) or for the purpose of maintaining any treaty or other rights which they possess." The treaties between the two countries confer no right of interference.

Upon what, then, Mr. Minister, does the President of the United States base his right of interference? Your communication is without information upon this point, excepting such as may be contained in the following brief and vague sentences: "She (the ex-Queen) was advised and assured by her ministers and leaders of the movement for the overthrow of her government that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterward be fairly considered by the President of the United States. The Queen finally yielded to the armed forces of the United States, then quartered in Honolulu, relying on the good faith and honor of the President, when informed of what had occurred, to undo the action of the minister and reinstate her and the authority which she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands." Also, "it becomes my further duty to advise you, sir, the Executive of the Provisional Government, and your ministers, of the President's determination of the question which your action and that of the Queen devolved upon him, and that you are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority."

I understand that the first quotation is referred to in the following words of the second, "which your action and that of the Queen devolved upon him" (the President of the United States), and that the President has arrived at his conclusions from Commissioner Blount's report. We have had as yet no opportunity of examining this document, but from extracts published in the papers and for reasons set forth hereafter, we are not disposed to submit the fate of Hawaii to its statements and conclusions. As a matter of fact no member of the executive of the Provisional Government has conferred with the ex-Queen, either verbally or otherwise, from the time the new Government was proclaimed till now, with the exception of one or two notices which were sent to her by myself in regard to her removal from the palace and relating to the guards which the Government first allowed her and perhaps others of a like nature. I infer that a conversation which Mr. Damon, then a member of the advisory council, is reported by Mr. Blount to have had with the ex-Queen on January 17, and which has been quoted in the newspapers, is the basis of this astounding claim of the President of the United States of his authority to adjudicate upon our right as a government to exist.

Mr. Damon, on the occasion mentioned, was allowed to accompany the cabinet of the former Government, who had been in conference with me and my associates, to meet the ex-Queen. He went informally, without instructions and without authority to represent the Government or to assure the ex-Queen "that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterwards be fairly considered by the President of the United States." Our ultimatum had already been given to the members of the ex-cabinet who had been in conference with us. What Mr. Damon said to the ex-Queen he said on his individual responsibility and did not report it to us. Mr. Blount's report of his remarks on that occasion furnish to the Government its first information of the nature of those remarks. Admitting for argument's sake that the Government had authorized such assurances, what was "her case" that was afterwards to "be fairly considered by the President of the United States?"

Was it the question of her right to subvert the Hawaiian constitution and to proclaim a new one to suit herself, or was it her claim to be restored to the sovereignty, or was it her claim against the United States for the alleged unwarrantable acts of Minister Stevens, or was it all these in the alternative; who can say? But if it had been all of these, or any of them, it could not have been more clearly and finally decided by the President of the United States in favor of the Provisional Government than when he recognized it without qualification and received its accredited commissioners, negotiated a treaty of annexation with them, received its accredited envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, and accredited successively two envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to it; the ex-Queen in the mean-