

## CHAPTER XXV.

Act for Licensing Plays.—Birth of a prince, afterwards George III.—Commercial disputes with Spain.—Popular war-cry.—Jenkins's ear.—A Convention with Spain denounced in Parliament.—Walpole is driven into war.—His struggle to retain power.—Capture of Porto Bello.—Attack upon Carthagea.—Anson and Byron.—Extension of the field of war.—Motion to remove Walpole from the king's councils.—Walpole resigns.—He is created earl of Orford.—Parliamentary inquiry into his administration.

THERE never, probably, was a minister who was the object of so much personal satire as Walpole. As his master hated "boets and bainters," Walpole despised journalists and pamphleteers. He was no patron of letters. He did not look out for young men who had written University prize-poems, to make them envoys and secretaries. He left authors to rise or fall by their profession; to grow rich like Pope, or to starve like Savage. What the minister did in the way of purchasing literary aid was worse than nothing. Smollett says, "he either wanted judgment to distinguish men of genius, or could find none that would engage in his service; he therefore employed a set of wretched authors, void of understanding and ingenuity." Tindal, a more impartial chronicler, has a similar testimony to this common mistake of statesmen. "No man ever set the press to work with so little judgment as he did. He looked upon writing to be a mechanical kind of business; and he took up with the first pen that he could find in public offices, or whom he could oblige by private liberality." When Bolingbroke and Pulteney had worked "The Craftsman" as far as such machinery would go, a new set of assailants appeared in the most popular of all forms of attack. The Stage became political. Gay, in his "Polly," going far beyond the personal allusions of "The Beggar's Opera," the Lord Chamberlain revived his obnoxious power, and the representation of "Polly" was forbidden. In 1735, when sir John Bernard brought in a Bill "to restrain the number of houses for playing interludes, and for the better regulating of common players of interludes," Walpole proposed to introduce a clause to confirm and enlarge the power of the Lord Chamberlain in reference to plays. Sir John Bernard objected to the clause, and withdrew his Bill. In 1737, Henry Fielding produced

"Pasquin" at the theatre in the Haymarket. Colley Cibber ascribes to this piece the enactment for licensing plays which Walpole brought forward in that year: "Religion, laws, government, priests, judges, and ministers, were laid flat at the feet of the Herculean satirist, this Drawcansir in wit, who spared neither friend nor foe; who, to make his fame immortal, like another Erostratus, set fire to his stage by writing up to an Act of Parliament to demolish it." Walpole made no direct attack upon "Pasquin;" but having obtained, from the manager of Goodman's Fields Theatre, the manuscript of a farce called "The Golden Rump," which, says Smollett, "was fraught with treason and abuse upon the government," the adroit minister read the most obnoxious passages to the House of Commons; and then moved an Amendment to the Vagrant Act, as far as related "to the common players of interludes." Two clauses were introduced, by which the customary privilege of the Lord Chamberlain to interfere with theatrical representations was made a legal power. Under this Bill, the Lord Chamberlain might prohibit the representation of plays; and copies of all new plays, additions to old plays, prologues and epilogues, were to be submitted to that officer for the purpose of being licensed. Smollett implies that there was "a vigorous opposition" to this measure. One speech only remains to us, that of lord Chesterfield, to indicate that there was any opposition at all. This was considered one of the most brilliant efforts of the great wit and accomplished orator. His prediction that this Bill was a step for introducing arbitrary power,—“for removing or hood-winking, one after another, those sentries who are posted by the constitution of a free country for warning the people of their danger,”—may be regarded as the exaggeration of party. The Bill for Licensing Plays was not to be a precedent "to lay the Press under a general license." From that period the freedom of the Press has been surrounded by multiplied safeguards, which the declaimers for its liberty in that day would have regarded with horror. The Act for Licensing Plays still subsists amongst us. There have been many abuses of the power of the Licensor—in most cases, silly abuses. But no friend to the liberty of thought, of speech, and of writing, can wish these restraints upon the theatre wholly removed. There is a manifest distinction between the profaneness and indecency that is written, and the profaneness and indecency that is spoken. The moral corruption of an audience is like the spread of a contagious disease. The reader who gloats over a dangerous book indulges in a secret vice which shuns companionship. The improved education of all classes, and

the general elevation of the condition and character of writers for the stage, as well as of all other writers, have made the office of the Licensor almost unnecessary. But the lofty tone of patronage in which lord Chesterfield speaks of "the poor author," is a sufficient intimation of the existence at that time of a wretched, and perhaps unscrupulous, class of caterers for public amusement: "Wit, my lords, is a sort of property; it is the property of those who have it, and too often the only property they have to depend on. It is, indeed, but a precarious dependence. Thank God, we, my lords, have a dependence of another kind. \* \* \* \* I must own I cannot easily agree to the laying of any tax upon wit; but by this Bill it is to be heavily taxed; it is to be excised; for if this Bill passes, it cannot be retailed in a proper way without a permit; and the Lord Chamberlain is to have the honour of being chief gauger, supervisor, commissioner, judge, and jury; but what is still more hard, though the poor author, the proprietor, I should say, cannot perhaps dine till he has found out and agreed with a purchaser, yet before he can prepare to seek for a purchaser, he must patiently submit to have his goods rummaged at this new excise-office." Thanks to the example of the "poor author" who threw the tardy patronage of lord Chesterfield in his face, the class with the "precarious dependence" of "one property only" have learnt to struggle bravely till they have tested its value; certainly they have learnt not to waste life in lamentations that they have not "a dependence of another kind."

The year 1738 was marked by an event which to many of the present day, still in life's "middle chamber," appears to be the link connecting them with generations long passed away. On the 24th of May, old style—June 4, new style,—was born George Augustus, son of the prince of Wales—the George the Third who came to the throne in 1760; who lived to 1820. When we arrive at such an historical epoch, we feel how intimately the past and the present become interlaced; and how every retrospect of public affairs involves something prospective. The birth of a grandson of George II. was an occasion of national rejoicing. It probably increased the reigning king's jealousy of his son. A notice from the Lord Chamberlain was inserted in the London Gazette, that no visitor of the prince should be admitted to the Court of St. James's. The opposition gathered more and more round the prince. The "terrible Cornet of Horse," as William Pitt was named, became one of the gentlemen of his bedchamber. The rival establishments—St. James's at one end of Pall Mall, and Carlton House at the other end—kept the town well amused.

In 1739 the foreign policy of Great Britain was driven by parliamentary faction, seconded by popular ignorance, upon a lamentable change from peace to war. For twelve years sir Robert Walpole had kept the country at peace. He had effected this great good without any compromise of the country's honour; with an accumulation of the country's resources, which made other powers respect her strength. The ambition of kings; the lust of conquest; the intrigues of ministers; the blunders of diplomatists—these are the causes ordinarily assigned when a nation is precipitated into a war, in which vast interests are endangered, and the beginners of the fray are not "thrice armed" in having their "quarrel just." Walpole was driven into a war with Spain, which quickly became a general war, by mercantile cupidity and mock patriotism. Walpole ought to have resigned his power rather than have thrown aside his principles. But he valued office more than consistency; and he consented to imperil his country, with the perfect conviction that her safety and prosperity depended upon a totally opposite policy than that which was forced upon him. He did the worst thing which a minister can do. He suffered others to conduct the war inefficiently, because he himself disliked the war. In yielding to the clamour of his political enemies he did not propitiate them; and when he falls, "never to rise again," we lose somewhat of our respect for the hero of many a well-foughten field of party, who ought to have stood to his own convictions, even though his adversaries had moved to a triumph over him with the "two-handed engine" ready to strike.

For a century and a-half, England and Spain had been more than commercial rivals—they had been commercial enemies. The trade of Spain with her vast possessions in South America was essentially a monopoly. Every English sailor, from the days of Drake, had been eager to break up the monopoly in the most effectual way, by a dash at the Spanish treasure-ships and richly freighted merchantmen. A regular participation in the trade with her colonies was jealously guarded against in every treaty of Spain with England. The right of searching merchant vessels sailing near Spanish colonial ports was always insisted upon; and the right was rarely suffered to be evaded, for guard ships (*guarda costas*) were always maintained in full activity. By the treaty of Utrecht, as we have seen, the expectation of a free trade with the Spanish coasts of South America was only realized in the permission to send one ship annually. The treaty of Seville, in 1729, did not provide for any relaxation of this restriction, or of any of the earlier prohibitions. The rapidly increasing importance of

the British colonies of North America rendered it impossible that the commerce of the Settlements of the New World with Europe, or with each other, the North with the South, could remain upon the exclusive footing established by the treaties of 1667 and 1670. If the Spanish government would not relax its narrow policy, English adventurers would not scruple to evade it. When the annual South Sea ship sailed with its cargo, other vessels followed in its wake; and the cargo of the one ship became almost inexhaustible. Ships driven by stress of weather into Spanish ports might refit and refresh their crews. The inconstant wind was very favourable to a little honest trading. When a population wants to buy, and ships are at hand to sell, prohibitory decrees are weapons "hung by the wall." Smuggling was carried on without much concealment, by pleasant trips of shore-boats to English vessels, and to North American vessels, lying off the harbours which they could not enter. The English merchants grew bolder with success, and the Spanish government more angry and violent. The right of search on the high seas was asserted by the Spanish guarda costas. Ships were often illegally detained, and their crews sometimes treated with severity. The British people, generally, heard only of the cruel tyranny of the Don, and knew little of the systematic offences against the Don's commercial jealousy which so moved his wrath. Walpole had been denounced of old by Atterbury as "the cur-dog of Britain and spaniel of Spain;" and when Walpole, in 1738, was successful in asserting his pacific policy by a parliamentary majority, the opposition appeared more and more determined to drive him into a war with Spain. The minister admitted that English merchants and seamen were unjustly and inhumanly treated by the Spanish guarda costas, and that the honour and interest of the country required that there should be reparation for the past and security for the future. He was negotiating to obtain redress in a peaceable manner, and he therefore resisted the motion for the production of papers which would embarrass this endeavour. In the House of Lords, an Address to the Crown of a very warlike tendency was carried. Petitions from merchants of various ports, complaining of Spanish outrages, were daily presented to the Commons. Captains and seamen were examined at the bar of the House, and related grievous stories of cruelties and oppressions exercised upon British crews. One narrator of a grievance, which dated back seven years, stirred the parliament and the people into a rage which Pulteney could not increase, and which Walpole could not control. On the 16th of March it is ordered by the Commons that "Captain Robert Jenkins do attend this House

immediately; and by a second order "That Captain Robert Jenkins do attend on Tuesday morning."

The English newspapers of June, 1731, had related that captain Jenkins, with his owners, had been to Hampton Court, to lay before the duke of Newcastle a statement of the wrongs which he had received from the Spaniards. He was homeward bound with a cargo from Jamaica, and on the 20th of April, not far from the Havanna, was boarded by a guarda costa and rigorously searched. No contraband goods could be found. He was threatened with death if he did not confess where his gold and his unlawful merchandize were hidden. He had no contraband goods, he again and again averred. The Spaniards slashed him with their cutlasses: they hung him up to the yard-arm. Before he was quite exhausted they let him down, and again bade him confess. He spoke of his Britannic Majesty's flag—of the high seas—in a mild assertion of the injustice he was receiving. His ear had been half cut off when the ship was boarded; and now the miscreants tore the ear out of his head, exclaiming, "carry that to your king." Poor Jenkins got no redress from the duke of Newcastle in 1731. On Tuesday, the 21st of March, 1738, when the captain stood at the bar of the House of Commons, he produced his ear out of a box in which he always carried it about him, wrapt up in cotton. "Ridiculous story," cries the biographer of Walpole. "The fable of Jenkins's ear," says the author of "A Regicide Peace." "He lost his ear in the pillory," exclaim official skeptics. "The ear of Jenkins is a singular thing. Might have mounted to be a constellation, like Berenice's hair," observes Mr. Carlyle, "had the English people been of poetic turn." Pope has given a couplet to the famous ear:—

"The Spaniards own they did a waggish thing,  
Who cropt our ears and sent them to the king."

Whether a truth or a myth, the ear of Jenkins drove England to war.

In opening the Session of Parliament in February, 1739, the king announced that, supported by the resolutions of Parliament, he had made such representations to Spain of the hardships and injuries sustained by his trading subjects in America, and had so strongly demanded reparation and security, that he had been enabled to conclude a Convention, under which a payment would be made to compensate his subjects for losses, and all matters in dispute would be settled by plenipotentiaries as regarded the future. Violent were the debates in both Houses. All the papers

connected with these negotiations were demanded to be laid upon the table; and the demand was of course resisted. Smollett, who rarely admits any merit in the administration of Walpole, very justly says, that "no government could act, either in external or domestic affairs, with proper influence, dignity, and dispatch, if every letter and instruction relative to an unfinished negotiation should be exposed to the view of such a numerous assembly, composed of individuals actuated by motives in themselves diametrically opposite." All historical experience—the experience even of the passing hour—shows how embarrassing is the task of the ministers of a mixed monarchy to conduct delicate negotiations with absolute governments. The freedom of speech in a British Parliament is embarrassing enough; but perfect unreserve on the part of an administration is absolutely impossible. It is, come to be understood by all practical and judicious representatives of the people, that a large confidence must be placed in ministerial responsibility. Walpole had a majority in refusing to produce the papers moved for. But when the Convention was laid before Parliament, and was published to the nation, an outcry burst forth—against the amount of indemnity to be paid to Spain—against the omission of any mention of the right of search, referring that and other questions to subsequent negotiation—against the non-punishment of the captains and crews of the guarda costas—which must have overthrown the ministry in the storm, had the ministry been typified by the oak instead of by the willow. Lyttelton and Pitt put forth all their oratorical strength against the Convention. The surpassing fame of Pitt may be dated from his effort on that 8th of March. He concluded his speech by describing the Convention as a stipulation for national ignominy; an illusory expedient to baffle the resentment of the nation; a truce, without a suspension of hostilities on the part of Spain; a surrender of the rights and trade of England to the mercy of plenipotentiaries. "The complaints of your despairing merchants, the voice of England, have condemned it. Be the guilt of it upon the head of the adviser." But the eloquence of Pitt produced no effect upon the nation, comparable with the war-cry of sir Thomas Sanderson: "The court of Spain, being resolved to grant nothing that might any way contribute to our future security, resolved not to allow the word satisfaction to be so much as once mentioned in this treaty; even the Spanish pirate who cut off captain Jenkins's ear, making use at the same time of the most insulting expression towards the person of our king, an expression which no British subject can decently repeat, an expression which no man who has

a regard for his sovereign can ever forgive; even this fellow, I say, is to live to enjoy the fruits of his rapine, and remain a living testimony of the cowardly tameness and mean submission of Great Britain, and of the triumphant pride and stubborn haughtiness of Spain." The ministerial majority was only twenty-eight—260 against 232. Walpole stood up for some time against the parliamentary opposition and the popular outcry. The great philosophical politician of the generation which succeeded Walpole, says, "I have seen, and with some care examined, the original documents concerning certain important transactions of those times. They perfectly satisfied me of the extreme injustice of that war, and of the falsehood of the colours which Walpole, to his ruin, and guided by a mistaken policy, suffered to be daubed over that measure." Some years after, it was my fortune to converse with many of the principal actors against that minister, and with those who principally excited that clamour. None of them,—no, not one,—did in the least defend the measure, or attempt to justify their conduct. They condemned it as freely as they would have done in commenting upon any proceeding in history in which they were totally unconcerned.\*

The majority of the government, small as it was, induced a change of tactics in some of the leading members of the opposition. On bringing up the Report upon the Resolution which the ministers had carried, there was another division, which was also in favour of the ministerial measures, the majority being twenty-eight. Sir William Wyndham then announced the determination of himself and his friends to secede in a body from the House of Commons. "Here, sir, bid a final adieu to this Parliament. Perhaps, when another Parliament shall succeed, I may again be at liberty to serve my country in this capacity. \* \* \* \* Meantime I conclude with doing that duty to my country which I am still at liberty to perform, to pray for its preservation: may, therefore, that Power, which has so often and so visibly interfered in behalf of the rights and liberties of this nation, continue its care over us at this worst and most dangerous juncture; whilst the insolence of enemies without, and the influence of corruption within, threaten the ruin of her constitution." Wyndham, as the consistent adherent of the Jacobite party, was not an adequate representative of the opinions of those who were honestly opposed to Walpole's system of government, but were not desirous to replace it by bringing back the Stuart dynasty. He exposed himself to the bitter reproof of the minister, that, as the mouthpiece of a faction that never sate in

\* Burke. "Thoughts on a Regicide Peace."

the House but to distress the government, and serve a Popish interest, "he was looked upon as the head of those traitors, who twenty-five years ago, conspired the destruction of their country, and of the royal family, to set a Popish Pretender on the throne." Walpole added, "I am only afraid that they will not be as good as their word." Sixty members seceded with Wyndham; and the secession left the minister at his ease for the rest of the session. Walpole was thus enabled to carry a very questionable measure—that of subsidizing Denmark for a Hanoverian object, instead of for the interest of Great Britain. The Parliament was prorogued on the 14th of June.

The plenipotentiaries under the Convention had met; but the Spaniards had been moved by the threatening denunciations of the English Parliament to make a stand upon what they thought *their* national honour. There was a dispute about a trumpety money payment of ninety thousand pounds. Cardinal Fleury offered to guarantee the payment, provided an English squadron was withdrawn from the Mediterranean. The public temper was for war. The king was for war. Walpole was urged to demand an express renunciation of the right of search, and an acknowledgment of the British claims to disputed territory in North America. Spain unceremoniously rejected the demands; and on the 19th of October a declaration of war against Spain was proclaimed in London. When the heralds rode into the City to declare the war, the prince of Wales and a numerous body of opposition leaders accompanied them; and whilst every steeple sent forth a joyous peal, the prince stopped at a tavern at Temple Bar, and set the multitude huzzaing by calling for a tankard, and drinking "success to the war." Walpole heard the peal of the bells, and exclaimed, "They may *ring* the bells now; they will soon be *wringing* their hands."

When the Parliament met on the 15th of November, 1739, the king said, "I have, in all my proceedings with the court of Spain, acted agreeably to the sense of both Houses of Parliament; and therefore I can make no doubt but I shall meet with a ready and vigorous support to this just and necessary war." "Just and necessary" are the epithets which every government applies to every war into which it rushes. The seceders from Parliament had returned. The altered policy of Walpole had failed to secure him popularity with the people, or adequate support from their representatives. He was regarded, truly enough, as the secret friend of peace. He had now to bear all the odium of the increased taxation which is the inevitable result of war. When he wished to conduct war with the necessary vigour, he was opposed. The

royal navy was short of seamen. Walpole proposed that there should be a general registry of seamen serving on board merchant vessels, that they might be called upon in a case of emergency. This was held to be despotism; and he abandoned his measure. That real power which he derived from being firm to his own principles was gone. Old friends and enemies, new friends and enemies, saw that the commanding superiority of the man who had carried the vessel of the state through many a troubled sea was dwindling away. The duke of Argyle deserted him. The great Scottish chief was dismissed from his employments. Walpole had been dared by Pulteney to strip of his posts "one military person, great in his character, great in his capacity, great in the important offices he had discharged;" but he did dare. "Mr. Keith, a Jacobite, was with the duke when this dismissal came. 'Mr. Keith,' the duke said, 'fall flat, fall edge, we must get rid of these people,' which Mr. Keith interpreted might imply both master and man."\* Wyndham ceased to trouble Walpole. He died in 1740. But Pulteney was still ready to do battle against him; and "the terrible Cornet of Horse" was prepared for any onslaught. There were divisions in the Cabinet. The duke of Newcastle, whose name Walpole afterwards declared was synonymous with "perfidy," was growing jealous of the man who had so long treated him as a subordinate. Newcastle complained that measures were agreed upon before others were allowed to give an opinion. "What do you mean?" cried Walpole; "the war is yours. You have had the conduct of it. I wish you joy of it." They differed about ships being sent to America. Walpole objected to leaving our own coasts defenceless. Newcastle maintained his own view, and Walpole exclaimed, "I oppose nothing; I give in to everything; am said to do everything; and to answer for everything; and yet, God knows, I dare not do what I think right. I am of opinion for having more ships of the squadron left behind; but I dare not, I will not, make any alteration. Let them go! Let them go!" †

On the 17th of March, 1740, both Houses went up with an address of congratulation to the king, "on the glorious success of your majesty's arms in the West Indies, under the command of vice-admiral Vernon, by entering the port, and taking the town, of Porto Bello, and demolishing and levelling all the ports and castles belonging thereto, with six men-of-war only." Vernon, a member of parliament, was strongly opposed to the administration of Wal-

\* Extract from the "Stuart Papers," given by Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 10.

† Letter of Newcastle to Hardwicke, quoted by Lord Mahon, vol. iii. p. 31.

pole; but the principle of concession procured his appointment to the command of the expedition, whose success was popularly reckoned as a wonderful triumph. The "six men-of-war only" was a phrase carried by the opposition in the Commons, to mark what could be done by a resolute commander. Admiral Hosier had hesitated to attack the same place with twenty ships, in 1726. The famous ballad of "Admiral Hosier's Ghost" was written by Glover, to point this contrast; and to insinuate that Vernon, as he had informed his friends, was not properly seconded at home. The forced inactivity of Hosier enabled the government to avert a war. Yet the patriotic ballad of the author of "Leonidas," true to the politics of its time, sees no honour and safety but in fighting. The shade of Hosier thus apostrophises Vernon:

"I, by twenty sail attended,  
Did this Spanish town affright:  
Nothing then its wealth defended  
But my orders not to fight.  
Oh! that in this rolling ocean  
I had cast them with disdain,  
And obey'd my heart's warm motion,  
To have quell'd the pride of Spain."

The ministry determined to let Vernon, the popular hero, have a fair opportunity to obey his "heart's warm motion." In the course of the summer and autumn they sent out an armament to join the popular admiral at Jamaica. Some great attack was to be made upon the Spanish possessions; but the precise destination of the expedition was to be determined by a council of war. The whole force consisted of 115 ships, 15,000 sailors, and 12,000 soldiers. It was resolved, upon the advice of Vernon, to attack Carthagená, the strongest fortified place in Spanish America. The command of the land forces had devolved upon general Wentworth; for lord Cathcart, an experienced officer, had died on the passage. Smollett, the historian, has related the assault upon Carthagená with the vague generality which was once considered to be the only proper historical style. Smollett, the novelist, who at the age of twenty was serving in one of admiral Vernon's ships as a surgeon's mate, has brought the scene before our eyes in far more vivid colours. After various delays, the fleet was before Carthagená. The one narrow entrance to the harbour, called the Boca Chica, was defended by several forts and batteries, one principal fort being known as the Castle. The troops had been landed, and had erected batteries to fire upon this castle on one side, whilst the large ships should attack it on the other side. The signal, says the surgeon's mate, was given for his ship to engage.

"Our ship, with others destined for this service, immediately weighed, and in less than half-an-hour came to an anchor before the castle of Boca Chica, with a spring upon our cable; and the cannonading (which, indeed, was terrible) began. The surgeon, after having crossed himself, fell flat on the deck; and the chaplain and purser, who were stationed with us in quality of assistants, followed his example, while the Welshman and I sat upon a chest looking at one another with great discomposure, scarce able to refrain from the like prostration. And, that the reader may know it was not a common occasion that alarmed us thus, I must inform him of the particulars of this dreadful din that astounded us. The fire of the Spaniards proceeded from eighty-four great guns, besides a mortar and small arms, in Boca Chica, thirty-six in Fort St. Joseph, twenty in two fascine batteries, and four men-of-war, mounting sixty-four guns each. This was answered by our land battery, mounted with twenty-one cannon, two mortars, and twenty-four cohorts, and five great ships of seventy or eighty guns, that fired without intermission." A sailor whose hand was shattered by a grape-shot is brought down to the cock-pit: "While I was employed in dressing the stump, I asked Jack's opinion of the battle, who, shaking his head, frankly told me he believed we should do no good; 'For why? because instead of dropping anchor close under shore, where we should have had to deal with one corner of Boca Chica, we had opened the harbour, and exposed ourselves to the whole fire of the enemy from their shipping and Fort St. Joseph, as well as from the Castle we intended to cannonade; that, besides, we lay at too great a distance to damage the walls, and three parts in four of our shot did not take place; for there was scarce anybody on board who understood the pointing of a gun.'" The Boca Chica is at length abandoned by the Spaniards, and the men of war enter the outward harbour. Vernon wrote home to announce his "wonderful success." Carthagená was held to have fallen; and, as Voltaire states, a medal was struck in honour of "the avenger of his country,"—of the gallant Vernon,—who had made himself master of the rich city hitherto deemed impregnable. The fleet tardily overcame the obstacle of sunk ships, and penetrated to the inner harbour. The author of "Rodrick Random" again throws interest into the usual dry narrative: "After having put garrisons into the forts we had taken, and re-embarked our soldiers and artillery, a piece of service that detained us more than a week, we ventured up to the mouth of the inner harbour, guarded by a large fortification on one side, and a small redoubt on the other, both of which were deserted before our ap-