

the men. The origin of this feeling is probably found in the refusal of this government to give recognition to the Congressional party before it had established itself, in the seizure of the "Itata" for alleged violation of the neutrality law, in the cable incident, and in the charge that Admiral Brown conveyed information to Valparaiso of the landing at Quintero. It is not my purpose to enter here any defense of the action of the government in these matters. It is enough for the present purpose to say that if there was any breach of international courtesy or duty on our part, it should have been made the subject of official complaint through diplomatic channels, or of reprisals for which full responsibility is assumed. We cannot consent that these incidents and these perversions of truth shall be used to excite a murderous attack upon our unoffending sailors, and the government of Chile go acquitted of responsibility. In fact, the conduct of this government during the war in Chile pursued those lines of international duty which we had so strongly insisted upon on the part of other nations when this country was in the throes of civil conflict. We continued to establish diplomatic relations with the government in power until it was overthrown, and promptly and cordially recognized the new government when it was established. The good offices of the government were offered to bring about a peaceful adjustment, and the interposition of Egan to mitigate its severity and shelter the adherents of the Congressional party were effective and frequent. The charge against Admiral Brown is too base to gain credence with any one who knows his high professional character.

SEVERAL ASSAULTS AT ONE TIME.

Recurring to the evidence of our sailors, I think it is shown that there were several distinct assaults and so nearly simultaneous as to show that they did not spread from one point. The press summary of the report of the Procurator Fiscal shows evidence that the Chilean officials and others are in conflict as to the place of origin, several places being named by different witnesses as the locality where the first outbreak occurred. This, if correctly reported, shows that there were several distinct outbreaks and so nearly at the same time as to cause this confusion. *La Patria*, in the same issue from which I have quoted, after describing the killing of Riggin and the fight which from that point extended to the mole, says:

"At the same time in other streets of the port Yankee sailors fought fiercely with the people of the town, who believed to see in them the incarnate enemies of the Chilean navy."

The testimony of Captain Jenkins of the American merchant ship "Keeweenaw," which had gone to Valparaiso for repairs, and who was a witness to some part of the assault upon the "Baltimore's" crew, is strongly corroborative of the testimony of our own sailors when he says that he saw the Chilean sentries drive back the seamen seeking shelter, upon the mob that was pursuing them. The officers and men of Captain Jenkins' ship furnish the most conclusive testimony as to the indignities practiced towards Americans in Valparaiso. When American

sailors, even of merchant ships, can only secure their safety by denying their nationality, it must be time to readjust our relations with a government that permits such demonstrations.

PARTICIPATION OF THE POLICE.

As to the participation of the police, the evidence of our sailors shows that our men were struck and beaten by the police officers before and after arrest and that one at least was dragged with a lasso about his neck by a mounted policeman. That the death of Riggin was the result of a rifle shot fired by a policeman or soldier on duty is shown directly by the testimony of Johnson, in whose arms he was at the time, and by the evidence of Charles Langon, an American sailor not then a member of the "Baltimore" crew, who stood close by and saw the transaction. The Chilean authorities do not pretend to fix the responsibility of this shot upon any particular person, but avow their inability to ascertain who fired it further than that it was fired from the crowd. The character of the wound as described by one of the surgeons of the "Baltimore" clearly supports his opinion that it was made by a rifle ball, the orifice of the exit being as much as an inch or an inch and a quarter in width. When shot, the poor fellow was unconscious and in the arms of a comrade, who was endeavoring to carry him to a neighboring drug store for treatment. The story of the police that in coming up the street they passed those men and left them behind them, is inconsistent with their own statement as to the direction of their approach, and with their duty to protect them, and is clearly disproved. In fact, Riggin was not behind, but in front of the advancing force, and not standing in the crowd, but unconscious and supported in the arms of Johnson when shot.

CONCLUSION.

The following is in the concluding portion of the President's message on the Chilean question. After summarizing the correspondence up to a certain point, he says: Communication from the Chilean government in relation to this cruel and disastrous attack upon our men, as will appear from the correspondence has not in any degree taken a form of manly and satisfactory expression of regret, much less apology. The event was of so serious a character that, if the injuries suffered by our men had been wholly the result of an accident in the Chilean port, the incident would have been grave enough to have called for some public expression of sympathy and regret from the local authorities. It is not enough to say that the incident is regretted, as long as it is coupled with the statement that it was an affair not unusual in ports where foreign sailors are accustomed to meet. It is not for a generous and sincere government to seek for words of small or equivocal meaning in which to convey to a friendly power an apology for an offense so atrocious as this. In the case of an assault by the mob in New Orleans upon the Spanish consulate in 1851, Webster wrote to the Spanish Minister, Calderon, that the acts complained of were a "disgraceful and flagrant breach of duty and propriety"

and that his government "regrets them as deeply as Minister Calderon or his government could possibly do," that "these acts have caused the president great pain and he thinks a proper acknowledgment due to her majesty. He invited the Spanish consul to return to his post, guaranteeing protection and offering to salute the Spanish flag, if the consul should come in a Spanish vessel. Such treatment by the government of Chile of this assault would have been more creditable to the Chilean authorities, and much less can hardly be satisfactory to a government that values its dignity and honor.

IN OUR NOTE OF OCTOBER 23RD, LAST, which appears in the correspondence, after receiving the report of the board of officers appointed by Captain Schley to investigate the affair, the Chilean government was advised of the aspect which it then assumed, and called upon for any facts in its possession that might tend to modify the unfavorable impressions which our report had created. It is very clear from the correspondence that, before receipt of this note, the examination was regarded by the police authorities as practically closed. It was, however, reopened and protracted through a period of nearly three months. We might justly have complained of this unreasonable delay, but in view of the fact that the government of Chile was still provisional, and with a disposition to be forbearing, and hopeful of a friendly termination, I have awaited the report which but recently has been made. On the 21st inst., I caused to be communicated to the government of Chile by the American minister at Santiago the conclusions this government, after a full consideration of all the evidence and every suggestion affecting this matter, and to these conclusions I adhere. They were stated as follows:

First—That the assault is not relieved of the aspect which the early information of the event gave to it, viz.: that it was an attack upon the uniform of the United States navy, having its origin and motive in a feeling of hostility to this government, and not in any act of the sailors or any of them.

Second—That the public authorities of Valparaiso flagrantly failed in their duty to protect our men, and that some of the police and Chilean soldiers and sailors were themselves guilty of unprovoked assaults upon our sailors before and after arrest. He (the President) thinks the preponderance of the evidence and the inherent probabilities lead to the conclusion that Riggin was killed by the police or soldiers.

Third—That he (the President) is therefore compelled to bring the case back to the position taken by this government in the note of Mr. Wharton of October 23rd last, and to ask for a suitable apology and for some adequate reparation for the injury done to this government.

THE OFFENSIVE MATTA NOTE.

In the same note the attention of the Chilean government was called to the offensive character of the note addressed by Matta, the minister at this capital, on the 11th inst. This dispatch was not officially communicated to this government, but, as Montt was