

A CORRECT ACCOUNT OF THE HORRIBLE OCCURRENCE



THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD
THE BISHOP OF CLOGHER,
WAS A PRINCIPAL ACTOR WITH
A COMMON SOLDIER!

AS EXTRACTED FROM THE STATESMAN! 1822

A CORRECT ACCOUNT

OF THE

HORRIBLE OCCURRENCE

Which took place at a Public-house in St. James's Market,
in which it was discovered that

The Right Rev. Father in God

THE

BISHOP OF CLOGHER,

Lately transferred from the Bishopric of Ferns,

WAS A PRINCIPAL ACTOR WITH

A Common Soldier!

To the disgrace not only of the Cloth, to which he was attached, and as a Commissioner of the Board of Education, and a Dictator of Public Morals, but as a Member of that Nation which gave him Birth!



LONDON;

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY & FOR J. L. MARKS,
23, RUSSELL COURT, COVENT GARDEN.

Price Sixpence.

A CORRECT ACCOUNT OF THE *HORRIBLE* OCCURRENCE

**Which took place at a Public-house in St. James's Market,
in which it was discovered that**

The Right Rev. Father in God

THE
BISHOP OF CLOGHER,

Lately transferred from the Bishopric of Ferns,

WAS A PRINCIPAL ACTOR WITH

A Common Soldier!

To the disgrace not only of the Cloth, to which he was attached, and as a
Commissioner of the Board of Education, and a Dictator of Public Morals, but as
a Member of that Nation which gave him Birth!

LONDON:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY & FOR J. L. MARKS,
23, RUSSELL COURT, COVENT GARDEN.

Price Sixpence.

PREFACE

To hold the vicious up to odium and contempt should be at all times a particular care of the Press; but when every powerful engine is exerted to veil the vices of the privileged ranks, and to make it appear that crime is peculiar to those who constitute what *are called* the lower classes, it becomes a sacred and *imperative duty*.

We know there are some who, from a pretended regard to religion, would suppress every fact that exposes the licentious conduct of its ministers, but, nine times out of ten, this is mere hypocritical cant to support those who “bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and lay on men’s shoulders.” The mistaken infidel may connect religion with the conduct of its professors, but the truly religious person makes no distinction of vice but its comparative enormity, and the more he venerates the doctrine of Christianity, the greater abhorrence he feels towards the wretch who violates every principle of the religion which it is his duty to inculcate.

We see a certain Association evincing a most scandalous partiality, by SELECTING the objects of their prosecution from those most unable to defend themselves! we participate in the general feeling of censure against them, and believe that they have done more injury to the cause they profess to support, than the united efforts of the persecuted parties could possibly have effected. This will ever be the case when exertions are influenced only by feelings of *policy* instead of *principle*, for if as much pains were taken to keep improper characters *without* the pale of the church, as there is art exerted to defend them through thick and thin, when they have *entered* it, the CLOTH would probably never have been disgraced by the “Rev. Father in God,” whose notoriety promises to eclipse that of all former brothers in divinity.

The name of the Prelate may have appeared in the subscription columns of a newspaper, the only place where the charity of many is heard of. Nay, we have little doubt but it might be found in the list of subscribers to the *highly respectable association* the “*Bridge street gang*” or the “*Society for the suppression of vice*.” We would not rob *him* of any action of *merit* on this score, or them of any claim to *respectability* in the eye of the public; for ourselves we would say, “Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye—also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” Any comment on the case itself must be superfluous, we therefore give it to the reader as extracted verbatim from the Statesman.

From the Statesman

July 22, 1822.

Our readers have often had to oblige us by their attention to what we have said of the blessed THING. We are now going to trouble them upon an extraordinary occasion indeed, and are going to give an instance of the baseness and infamy of the London newspapers, such as we never before had it in our power to give; and such as we are quite sure will, before we have done with it, implant the character of everlasting infamy upon that corrupt press, which has so long been boasting of its independence and its honour. What a deal we have heard about the press being the *guardian of public morals*! What volumes have we read about its powers of correction of evil! We have, indeed, heard a part of it condemned, the unstamped part of it; that part of it has been pointed out the refuse part; as the vile part; as the part which required laws to restrain it, to cramp it, to load it, to destroy it if possible. We have heard honourable Members in the honourable House, make a distinction between the *respectable* part of the press and another part, which they denominated disrespectful. We have heard volumes upon volumes of commendation, praise and puffery, about this respectable part of the press. We have always denominated it infamous; we have always said that that part of it which was not absolutely in the pay of Corruption was engaged in a sham warfare, quite as serviceable to Corruption as the efforts of her own hirelings; and that with perhaps a trifling exception or two, it was a mass of infamous fraud carried on under the name of impartiality; sending forth lies, endless in number, and boundless in magnitude, vomiting forth calumnies on the defenceless, and suppressing, through the means of bribes, directly or indirectly received, every fact that could tend to expose the thing, and give the common people their fair chance in society. This has been the character of this infamous press ever since we have known it; but we shall presently have to show our readers, that it has now surpassed even its own infamy, and done a deed so black as to make its former infamies turn pale.

We have first to insert an article from the weekly paper called *The Observer*; to which paper the public will be in great part indebted for the knowledge of the horrible affair which the article describes. We shall then offer a few observations, that may serve just for the present on the manner in which the thing has been and is likely to be illustrated by the circumstances of the transaction alluded to; and then we shall lay before our readers an account of the conduct of the “respectable” and infamous part of the press, upon this occasion; naming the several papers; and making them as notorious; as it is in our power to make them.

From the Observer Sunday Newspaper, July 21, 1822

HORRIBLE OCCURRENCE, Saturday

“It is our painful and disgusting task this day to notice a charge which has been made against a *Right Reverend Bishop*, at Marlborough-street police office, at which human nature revolts. The circumstances are of such public notoriety at the west end of the town, that it would be in vain, *if any delicacy were due* to the party accused, to attempt to keep them from general observation. The individual to whom we allude was recently promoted to an Irish bishopric, and is *nearly related to a Peer in Parliament*. He is an elderly man, and we understand was much respected in that class of society to which he belonged. On Friday night it appears *that he was detected in a back room of the White Lion public-house, in St. Alban’s place, St. James’s*, in a situation with a *private in the Foot Guards*, to which we will not more minutely allude, but which led to his instant apprehension and removal with his companion *to the watch house*. There were not fewer than *seven witnesses* to the fact; and it would seem that the Reverend Prelate with difficulty escaped the *vengeance of the populace*, who, if not prevented by the peace-officers, would have sacrificed him to their indignation on the spot. As it was, he was *severely beaten*. On being secured in the watch-house, he offered bail any amount for his liberation; but this was very properly refused, and he remained locked up in the cell during the night in a state of mind which may be more easily imagined than described. Yesterday morning he was conveyed in a hackney-coach to Marlborough street, and was soon afterwards followed by the soldier. They were both pursued by the *execrations and revilings of the crowd* which had been collected on so extraordinary an occasion. Mr. Dyer, the presiding magistrate, determined on a *private examination*, at which Mr. Alley, who attended for the Bishop, was present. The witnesses were called in separately, but their testimony was in all respects consistent, and the case established was to a *certain extent* of the clearest nature. Mr. Alley, however, submitted that as the capital charge had not been borne out, his client was *entitled to bail*; a proposition to which we understand Mr. Dyer *was obliged to accede*; and the wretched offender was permitted, in the course of the day, *to go at large*, upon *finding sureties* to the amount of *one thousand pounds*. The soldier, *not so fortunate*, was committed *to take his trial*.—For reasons which are obvious, we decline entering more minutely into the details of this most shocking affair; but we ought in justice *to a worthy prelate*, whose name has *unfortunately been mentioned* by mistake, in connection with the charge, to request our readers *to reflect* before they come to a *positive determination as to the party really implicated*.”

When our readers have gone through this article, and have heard us declare our perfect conviction of its truth; when they have heard us say, that it is agreeable, as far as it goes, with the enquiries which we have made, when they have further heard, that the scene of the brutal transaction was in a back room of the public-house above mentioned; that the parties had drawn the curtains of the room, but had left a part that the curtains did not cover but that might be seen through; that a little girl (vindictress of her sex!) happening to go into the back court into which the window looked, wondering to see the curtains drawn, had the curiosity to look in, where she saw the parties engaged in that way not to be described, that the little girl (better guardian of public morals than the respectable part of the press) ran to the landlord, who came out with other persons with him, who were all witnesses of the fact, to that certain extent, at least, of which the *Observer* speaks; that after this, the landlord and others laudably went, dashed in the door, took the parties in the state of Achilles as far as nakedness was necessary to their intentions; that they then dragged them to the watch-house, in that very same state: when our readers have heard all this, they will naturally cry aloud, “why is the *name* of this Bishop suppressed?” It is a Bishop the article says. It is a “venerable prelate;” it is a Right Reverend Father in God; and why then, is his name suppressed? The *Observer* informs us that another “worthy prelate” has been named; and unfortunately named; and the *Observer* requests its readers to reflect before they come to a positive determination as to who the party is. What, *are all the Bishops* then, to live under this imputation or suspicion? Are all the Bishops to be suspected for the sake of this wretch, as the *Observer* itself justly calls him? This would be injustice towards the Bishops in general, equal to that which the most respectable and most infamous part of the press has been guilty. We shall do our duty. And we here inform our readers: without anticipating the decisions of courts of justice; without pretending to know whether the alledged crime can be proved or not; without pretending to anticipate any thing of this sort, we inform our readers of that which they all ought to know, that the person, who was taken from the White Lion public-house above-mentioned to the watch-house, and who was afterwards taken from the watch-house to Marlborough-street, and who was held to bail as above-mentioned; we here inform our readers that that person who was so taken along with the soldier of the guards was the *Honourable and Right Reverend Father in God, PERCY JOCELYN, Lord Lord Bishop of Clogher*, (lately translated to that Bishopric from the Bishopric of Ferns,) a *Commissioner of the board of Education* (“education of the country!”) brother of the late *Earl of Roden*.

Having performed this duty, a duty due not less to the Bishops than to the public, we have further to observe, that a man was tried in Ireland, no great while ago, on the charge of having threatened this Bishop to accuse him of such a

crime; and, our readers will hear it with shudderings of horror, this man was *condemned to death*, and, of course, upon the oath of this Bishop! We believe the man was respited and transported. Upon this we shall make no further observations for the present. Our readers will need no observations from us, indeed, to convince them how well things like this are calculated to excite the envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world.

To return to the article in the *Observer*, we are somewhat surprised, if it be true, that Mr. Dyer should have "*found himself obliged*," and so quickly, too, and without any remanding, to let the prisoner loose upon bail; and the public will not fail to observe, and to reflect a little upon the amount of this bail of a thousand pounds, *in such a case*, and relating to such a party. The public will recollect the bail, the sureties to which Mr. Carlile is sentenced, and compare that case with this. A thousand pounds, not, probably, a tenth part of one year's produce of his Bishopric. The *Observer* may be in error about this. The fact has not been officially announced. If all the other facts stated by the *Observer* be true, what is the sum of a thousand pounds! How is that to hold such a person to stand trial! What *sureties* are there in a thousand pounds in such a case! Whether he ever take his trial or not; the thing will take its trial before the English people; and on that trial the thing is now put.

The *Observer* tell us, that the *soldier* was not so fortunate. *He could not get bail!* and was COMMITTED TO TAKE HIS TRIAL! Well said, THING! it was very hard that those who bailed the Bishop would not bail the soldier. The Bishop himself might have been bail for him. His Bishopric of Clogher was sufficient surety for a whole battalion. Very hard, indeed, that he was not to be bailed too! But there will be time enough to talk about this. The main thing is for us to keep a sharp look out, and see how the THING; to see how the "education of the country;" how the envy of the surrounding nations and admiration of the world will work this matter!

In the mean while, let us look at the conduct of the respectable and infamous part of the press of this day, just looking back in one instance to yesterday.

Our readers will observe, that the articles which we have quoted were in the *Observer* of yesterday, consequently the thing was known to the editors of all the morning papers. If such a thing had taken place between two labourers, mechanics, or tradesmen, how it would have been blazoned about through the morning papers of this day! What a cry would have been set up by these respectable and infamous guardians of the public morals! But now, what has been their conduct? The *Morning Post*, the *British Press*, the *Morning Herald*, and the *Morning Advertiser*, have given a part, and a part only, of what they found in the *Observer*.

The Morning Herald and the British Press gave nearly the words of the Observer but inserted the article in as obscure a manner as possible. The Morning Post curtails the article of the Observer to about a fifth part, and puts it at the bottom of a column, in a part of the paper likely to escape observation. The Morning Advertiser curtails the article still further; bestows no expression of horror upon the deed, and merely says, "That a person of consideration and a soldier were taken to the office, charged with a *gross misdemeanor*."

We now come to the Morning Chronicle, which fills four columns of its paper with Mr. Hume's nonsensical resolutions about the National Debt and the operations of the Sinking Fund; but which can spare only just seven lines, put in the obscurest part of all of the paper, to say that "two persons" (and not a word about a bishop!) were discovered in a public house, and so forth. But we will take the very words of the Chronicle. They will not fill up much space; and they will enable the public to judge of the real character of this paper.

"A Sunday paper states that on Friday night, *two persons* were discovered at public-house in St. James's market, in a situation which left no doubt respecting the nature of their crime, that they were taken to watch-house, and brought to a Police-office on Saturday morning, when it appeared from papers in the pocket of the one, that he filled a high station, which we will not name. The magistrate is said to have admitted them to bail."

"Two persons!" And the *Chronicle* could find out nothing but two persons; though it had read the *Observer* as well as we, and though it would not take us much to prove that the *Chronicle* must have heard all about the matter on *Saturday night*, seeing that an Evening paper in the neighbourhood *had the intelligence actually composed and going to the press on Saturday afternoon*, and had stopped the press to cancel the matter! From what motive this cancelling took place, let the indignant public judge. The *Chronicle*, had this been an affair between two persons in common life, would have rung us such a peel upon the subject as would not soon have been forgotten; and let our readers judge how powerful must have been the motive that could have induced it, not only to abridge the article of the *Observer*, not only to tell less than it had read in the Sunday paper; not only to cram this important matter into seven lines and hide it at the bottom of a column; not only this, but to talk of *two persons*; not to name a Bishop or a soldier at all; and to be guilty of the infamous injustice of imputing by implication the crime indiscriminately to all classes of Englishmen!

Let us now come to the elect of the respectable part of the press: *John Bull*; the *New Times*; and the OLD TIMES. We have already told our readers, that these were all of the same stamp; and now we shall see. *John Bull* is quite silent. *John* came out very late on Sunday morning. There was a rumour on float

on Saturday, and we have already related, that an evening paper had actually got the matter set up; that is to say the types composed for printing an account of the transaction! and that it was induced to stop the press, take out the article, scatter the types and put in another article in its stead, probably an article from the Vice Society or from some Bible Society. What happened to John Bull we do not know precisely; but something seems to have seized John all at once early on Sunday morning, or in the middle of the night before. For, we sent to get John's paper, on Sunday morning about ten o'clock; and the vender of the paper informed us, that it would not come out till very late, because an *accident had happened to the machinery* in the office. This was the story told to those who went to buy the paper! Yes, our readers will see that John's machinery had been operated upon by something perfectly accidental, and yet of a very potent nature.

Now, we come to that brace of brothers, the *New and Old Times*. Perfectly silent both! Not a single word upon the subject,—not a single allusion to it, though the Old one has actually put forth this day two papers, which it *sells for one*, in pursuance of those desperate efforts which it is making to sustain itself. It has two papers, measuring nearly two feet square, containing 16 square feet of print, one and a half square foot of which consists of an advertisement of the Irish Subscription. In the whole of this 16 feet of square print, room was not to be found for the insertion of one single word about the Bishop and the Soldier! not a single allusion. Nothing that could let its readers suppose that such a thing had taken place. The *cause* of this need not be stated to our readers: they will all see the cause at once; and they will all despise the man that they shall in future see with one of these papers in his hand.

We could here, if we had time, refer to the statement of Dr. O'Meara, or rather to what the Times has said about the bribe of £3000, the evidence of which Buonaparte found amongst the papers of the run-away Bourbon. We must leave that to be noticed another time; and in the mean time request our readers to pay attention to the facts which we have now stated, never forgetting the sentences on Joseph Swan, Mr. Carlile, his wife and sister. We have said before and we repeat it, that the THING is now fairly on its trail. In former cases, there may have been doubts and difficulties in the way; there may have been that which blinded and deluded honest and well-meaning people; but here the matter lies in a nut-shell. Here the question is too plain to admit of being obscured and too monstrous to admit of palliation. The time cannot be distant when the decision shall take place; and in the mean time we beseech our readers to keep watch; to look at the conduct of all these papers, to contrast that conduct with that which they shewed in the case of the Vere-street gang, to compare their present conduct; their present silence with the unsparing, but just and laudable abhorrence which they then expressed: our readers are requested to make this

comparison, at the same time that they make a comparison between the rank and riches of the party now offending, and the obscurity and comparative poverty of the parties then offending. They are requested to do this, and we are sure they will exclaim with us, that this “respectable part of the press” is surely the most infamous thing that ever existed in any country in the world.

We must quit the subject for the present; but not without assuring our readers that, strong as corruption is, great as are her powers of smothering and stifling, she will not have it in her power to stifle the truth in this case. We care not how the THING acts. Let the THING do what it pleases; and let the public watch it; look sharp after the movements of the THING, and see what it will do. Thus we close our remarks for the present, leaving the public, as we trust it will, to congratulate itself on the existence of one newspaper that cannot be *hushed* into silence.

We cannot dismiss this article without observing that it is with great and unfeigned *sorrow* that we have to record this degradation of rank and dignity; but the way to uphold rank and dignity is not to be guilty of such base partiality as that which we have noticed; and the best way is to single out, as we have done, the guilty, and leave it to be supposed that it forms an exception to the mass.

FINIS.



BDFarrands.com