supervision of Government lands. I have always endeavored to look out for the interest of the people as against the grasp and greed of other parties—that is in respect to fair figures for rentals, and setting apart such lands as I think should be set apart for homestead settlers, so as to give the experiment of small farming in the country a fair trial. Of the lands set apart for homestead purposes on the island of Hawaii there are about 7,000 acres in all, which have been laid out in tracts not exceeding 20 acres.

Q. Now, going from the land question, do you know anything about the causes which led to the dethronement of the Queen and the establishment of the Provisional Government?

A. I believe I have kept myself posted on the events of the day. I believe I understand to some extent how the crisis was brought about.

Q. Please give me your views.

A. Since the forcing of the new constitution upon Kaulakana there has been a constant endeavor on the part of the Sovereign to undermine those constitutional checks which were set against the royal prerogative. That of course led to constant collision.

Q. You mean force?

A. No; constitutional collision. In many instances the constitutional side of the question, as I understand it, was set aside. That is to say, by opinions and decisions from the highest court in the land—the supreme court. The sovereign was generally sustained. All these different results and different tendencies finally combined in making the issue very plain and broad. Then again the Hawaiian looks upon the Government and upon official position as a legitimate source from which to fill his pocket. In other words, he is naturally corrupt. The younger generation have only the one ambition—to become Government employés. For this reason the sovereign has generally been able to depend on that element in its encroachments on constitutional liberty. These different streams all converged into that revolution of a few months ago, which set aside the Queen. I know, of course, that at times there must have been a private understanding and differences of opinion which were adjusted in order to maintain a peaceful condition of affairs.

Q. Who were these private understandings between?

A. In this statement I am giving my own individual opinion. I have nothing authoritative, but events have occurred at times which any lover of constitutional liberty, or anything which meant the independence of white men, would grit his teeth over and still find things would remain the same.

Q. Did these differences run along the race line generally?

A. I could answer that in this way—that what differences there have been have generally resulted in the race line being sharply drawn, and the Hawaiian would of course use his vote in strengthening his side of the case. There has been no working in harmony between the two races for the last ten years.

Q. The difference then practically has been between the whites and the Crown and the natives on such questions as you have already indicated? Is that true?

A. It is undoubtedly so.

Q. Did there seem to be a general sentiment amongst the whites for annexation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did that get to be pronounced?

A. You mean as a public enunciation?