was no new cabinet appointed until the 12th of September. That was E. C. MacFarlane, minister of finance; Parker, foreign affairs; Gulick, interior, and Neumann, attorney-general. On the 15th of September there was another vote of want of confidence in this MacFarlane cabinet. It received 24 votes against 21. The question as to whether that was a sufficient constitutional number to pass it was referred to the judges of the supreme court, who decided that 25 votes were necessary.

Meanwhile, on the 4th of October, there was a special election held on this island, and Maile, a native from the fish market, and Hopkins, a half-white, were elected as nobles, by a very large majority, over two very respectable men, M. P. Robinson and H. Waterhouse, by the so-called lottery faction; that is, people who were bound to carry the lottery bill through.

On the 17th of October there was another vote of want of confidence introduced in the MacFarlane ministry, and it passed 32 to 15. On the 1st of November, at 10 o'clock in the morning, the Queen appointed Cornwell minister of finance, Gulick minister of the interior, Nawahi minister of foreign affairs, and Creighton, attorney-general. At half-past 12 they were voted out—26 to 15, the same day. The 4th of November, rumors prevailed that the Queen would agree to appoint G. N. Wilcox minister of the interior, Cecil Brown attorney-general, P. C. Jones minister of finance, and M. C. Robinson minister of foreign affairs.

On the 8th of November this cabinet was appointed and sworn in. Then the country felt easy. The next important event was on the 6th of December, when the Legislature sent a request for an opinion to the justices of the supreme court upon the question whether an amendment to the constitution which had passed two successive Legislatures required the approval of the Queen. We answered that it did not.

Q. What was the constitutional provision?
A. It was something with reference to allowing legislation restricting the residence of Chinese here. The idea was that any laws that might be passed restricting terms of residence or rights of Chinese here would not be held unconstitutional.

Q. At that time was there any restriction on Chinese immigration?
A. Oh, yes; there were restrictions that had passed the Legislature with reference to their entering the Kingdom, but when once in the Kingdom they had the rights of all residents under Hawaiian law, and by our constitution no class legislation would be permissible under the constitution. The object of this amendment was to allow legislation of that character.

Q. Do you have reference to legislation providing that the Chinese should not reside here after the contract term had expired?
A. Yes; I think also as to the character of the employment they should engage in. It was the desire to pass that law which gave rise to this submission to the court. The constitution of 1887 left out all the provisions which had previously existed as to the sovereign signing an amendment to the constitution. The only popular reference was that any amendment that had passed one Legislature would have to be published three months previous to the election, and then if it passed the second Legislature it became a law.

Q. Was there no direct submission to the people?
A. Only in that way. On the 21st of December this ministry, which had the confidence of the people, began to have difficulty with the Queen with reference to the appointment of circuit judges under the new act.