MESSAGE ON HAWAII.

LONG-EXPECTED ANSWER BY THE PRESIDENT.

Events at Honolulu Set Forth in Official Detail—Mr. Cleveland Says His Task Has Been Difficult One—Blount Is Indorsed.

Given Over to Congress.

The President's response to the resolution passed by both houses of Congress requesting information in Hawaiian affairs and especially as to the nature of the instructions given to Minister Willis, has been sent to Congress. The message is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives: In my recent annual message to Congress briefly referred to our relations with Hawaii and expressed the intention of transmitting further information on the subject when additional advices permitted. Though I am now able to report a definite change in the actual situation, I am convinced that the difficulties lately created both here and in Hawaii and now standing in the way of a solution through executive action of the problem presented render it proper and expedient that the matter should be referred to the broader authority and discretion of Congress with a full explanation of my action. I have deemed it made to deal with the emergency and ask them to review the considerations which have governed my action. I suppose that right and justice should determine the path to be followed in treating this subject. It national honesty is to be disregarded and a desire for territorial extension or dissatisfaction with a form of government not our own is to regulate our conduct, I shall be entirely misapprehended of the mission and character of our government and the behavior which the conscience of our people demands of their public agents.

When the present administration entered upon its duties the Senate had under consideration a treaty providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the territory of the United States. Surely under our constitution and laws the enlargement of our limits is the manifestation of the highest attribute of sovereignty and if entered upon as an executive act all the circumstances attending the transactions should be clear and free from suspicion. Additional importance is attached to the consummation of the proposed measure it contemplated a departure from unbroken American tradition in providing for the addition to our territory of contiguous land more than 2,000 miles removed from our nearest coast.

Reasons Against Harrison Treaty.

These considerations might not, of themselves, call for interference with the completion of a treaty negotiated by a previous administration. But it appeared from the documents accompanying the treaty, when submitted to the senate, that the sovereignship of Hawaii was tendered to us by a provisional government set up to succeed the constitutional queen and her cabinet, which had been dethroned, and it did not appear that such provisional government had the sanction of either the express or implied will of the people. Other remarkable features of the transaction naturally attracted attention. One was the extraordinary haste—only a few days intervening—in a terizing all the transactions connected with the treaty. It appeared that a so-called committee of safety had been formed of persons who, the revolt against the Constitutional Government of Hawaii, was organized on Saturday, Jan. 14, and that on Monday, Jan. 16, the United States forces were landed at Honolulu from a naval vessel lying in its harbor, that on the 17th the existing government was overthrown, was perfected and a proclamation naming its officers was on the same day prepared and read at the Government buildings, and immediately thereupon the United States Minister recognized the Provisional Government thus created; that within four days afterward, on the 18th day of January, commissioners representing such government sailed for this country in a steamer especially chartered for the occasion, arriving in San Francisco on the 28th day of January and in Washington on the 3d day of February; that next day they had their first interview with the Secretary of State and another on the 11th, when the treaty annexing the islands was practically agreed upon, and that on the 14th it was formally concluded, and on the 15th transmitted to the Senate.

The between the initiation of the scheme for a provisional government in Hawaii on the 14th of January and the submission to the Senate of the treaty for annexation negotiated with such government, the entire interval was thirty-two days, fifteen of which were spent by the Hawaiian commissioners in their journey to Washington.

In the next place, upon the face of the papers submitted with the treaty it clearly appeared that there was open and undetermined an issue of fact of the most vital importance. The message of the President communicating the treaty declared that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this government," and in a letter to the President from the Secretary of State, also submitted to the Senate with the treaty, the following passage occurs: "At the time the provisional government took possession of the government buildings no troops or officers of the United States were present to look any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the provisional government by the United States Minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government."

But a protest also accompanied said treaty, signed by the Queen and her ministers at the time she made way for the provisional government, which explicitly stated that it yielded to the superior force of the United States, whose Minister had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support such provisional government.

Blounding Blount to Honolulu.

The truth or falsity of this protest was surely of the first importance, but no investigation to ascertain the facts had been made. I considered it to be my duty, therefore, to withdraw the treaty from the Senate for examination and to cause an investigation to be made of the facts relating to annexation James H. Blount of Georgia. His report, based upon an exhaustive investigation, with the accompanying proofs, is now before Congress or is herewith submitted. This report justifies, in my opinion, the statement that the withdrawal of the treaty at the time the provisional government took possession of the government buildings no troops or officers of the United States were present to look any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the provisional government by the United States Minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government.