

bers absented themselves from the session of that day in manifestation of their disappointment in the loss of power through the cabinet for the ensuing two years.

The letters of the American minister and naval officers stationed at Honolulu in 1892 indicate that any failure to appoint a ministry of the reform party would produce a political crisis. The voting out of the Wilcox cabinet produced a discontent amongst the reformers verging very closely towards one, and had more to do with the revolution than the Queen's proclamation. The first was the foundation—the latter the opportunity.

In the legislatures of 1890 and 1892 many petitions were filed asking for a new constitution. Many were presented to the King and Queen. The discontent with the constitution of 1887 and eagerness to escape from it, controlled the elections against the party which had established it. Divisions on the mode of changing the constitution, whether by legislative action or by constitutional convention, and the necessity for a two-thirds vote of the legislature to effect amendments, prevented relief by either method. Such was the situation at the prorogation of the legislature of 1892.

This was followed by the usual ceremonies at the palace on the day of prorogation—the presence of the cabinet, supreme court judges, diplomatic corps, and troops.

The Queen informed her cabinet of her purpose to proclaim a new constitution, and requested them to sign it.

From the best information I can obtain the changes to the constitution of 1887 were as follows:

ART. 20. By adding to exceptions: Members of the privy council, notary public, agents to take acknowledgments.

ART. 22. By adding Princes Kawanakoa and Kalaniana'ole as heirs to the throne.

ART. 46. Changing the session of the legislature to the month of April.

ART. 49. That the Queen shall sign and approve all bills and resolutions, even to those that are voted when passed over her veto.

ART. 56. Pay of representatives raised to \$500 instead of \$250 for biennial term.

ART. 57. The Queen shall appoint the nobles, not to exceed twenty-four.

ART. 60. The representatives may be increased from twenty-four, as at present, to forty-eight.

ART. 62. Only subjects shall vote.

ART. 65. The term of appointment of the supreme court judges, not for life, as before, but for six years.

ART. 75. The appointment of governors of each island for four-years term.

Her ministers declined to sign, and two of them communicated to leading reformers (Mr. L. A. Thurston, Mr. W. O. Smith, and others) the Queen's purpose and the position of the cabinet. Finding herself thwarted by the position of the cabinet, she declared to the crowd around the palace that she could not give them a new constitution at that time on account of the action of her ministers, and that she would do so at some future time. This was construed by some to mean that she would do so at an early day when some undefined, favorable opportunity should occur, and by others when a new legislature should assemble and a new cabinet might favor her policy, or some other than an extreme and revolutionary course could be resorted to.

It seems that the members of the Queen's cabinet, after much urging, prevailed upon her to abandon the idea of proclaiming a new constitution. The coöperation of the cabinet appears to have been, in the mind of the Queen, necessary to give effect to her proclamation. This method had been adopted by Kamehameha V in proclaiming the constitution of 1864. The constitution of 1887 preserved this same