As I am reliably informed, he selected his witnesses and examined them in secret, freely using leading questions, giving no opportunity for a cross-examination, and often not permitting such explanations by witnesses themselves as they desired to make of evidence which he had drawn from them. Is it hardly necessary for me to suggest that under such a mode of examination some witnesses would be almost helpless in the hands of an artful lawyer, and might be drawn into saying things which would be only half-truths, and standing alone would be misleading or even false in effect. Is it likely that an investigation conducted in this manner could result in a fair, full, and truthful statement of the case in point? Surely the destinies of a friendly Government, admitting by way of argument that the right of arbitration exists, may not be disposed of upon an ex parte and secret investigation made without the knowledge of such Government or an opportunity by it to be heard or even to know who the witnesses were.

Mr. Blount came here as a stranger and at once entered upon his duties. He devoted himself to the work of collecting information, both by the examination of witnesses and the collection of statistics and other documentary matter, with great energy and industry, giving up, substantially, his whole time to its prosecution. He was here but a few months, and during that time was so occupied with this work that he had little opportunity left for receiving those impressions of the state of affairs which could best have come to him, incidentally, through a wide social intercourse with the people of the country and a personal acquaintance with its various communities and educational and industrial enterprises. He saw the country from his cottage in the center of Honolulu mainly through the eyes of the witnesses whom he examined. Under these circumstances is it probable that the most earnest of men would be able to form a statement that could safely be relied upon as the basis of a decision upon the question of the standing of a government?

In view, therefore, of all the facts in relation to the question of the President’s authority to interfere and concerning which the members of the executive were actors and eye-witnesses, I am able to assure your excellency that by no action of this Government, on the 17th day of January last or since that time, has the authority devolved upon the President of the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of this country through any conscious act or expression of this Government with such an intention.

You state in your communication—

“After a patient examination of Mr. Blount’s reports the President is satisfied that the movement against the Queen if not instigated was encouraged and supported by the representative of this Government at Honolulu; that he promised in advance to aid her enemies in an effort to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and set up by force a new government in its place; that he kept his promise by causing a movement of troops to be landed from the ‘Boston’ on the 16th of January, 1883, and by recognizing the Provisional Government the next day when it was too feeble to defend itself and the Constitutional Government was able to successfully maintain its authority against any threatening force other than that of the United States already landed.”

Without entering into a discussion of the facts I beg to state in reply that I am unable to judge of the correctness of Mr. Blount’s report from which the President’s conclusions were drawn, as I have had no opportunity of examining such report. But I desire to specifically and emphatically deny the correctness of each and every one of the allegations of fact contained in the above-quoted statement; yet, as the President has arrived at a positive opinion in his own mind in the matter, I will refer to it from his standpoint.

My position is, briefly this: If the American forces illegally assisted the revolutionists in the establishment of the Provisional Government that Government is not responsible for their wrong-doing. It was purely a private matter for discipline between the United States Government and its own officers. There is, I submit, no precedent in international law for the theory that such action of the American troops has conferred upon the United States authority over the internal affairs of this Government. Should it be true, as you have suggested, that the American Government made itself responsible to the Queen, who, it is alleged lost her throne through such action, that is not a matter for me to discuss, except to submit that if such be the case, it is a matter for the American Government and her to settle between them. This Government, a recognized sovereign power, equal in authority with the United States Government and enjoying diplomatic relations with it, can not be destroyed by it for the sake of discharging its obligations to the ex-Queen.

Upon these grounds, Mr. Minister, in behalf of my Government I respectfully protest against the usurpation of its authority as suggested by the language of your communication.

It is difficult for a stranger like yourself, and much more for the President of the United States, with his pressing responsibilities, his crowding cares and his want of familiarity with the condition and history of this country and the inner life of its