

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

As there is apparently a determination to endeavor to throw discredit upon my account of the transactions connected with "the painful scene in St. Paul's vestry," I avail myself of the opportunity afforded by the issue of a second edition of the Pastoral, to state that I adhere to what I have written (p. 38) as *substantially* correct; and that while I am ready to admit, that I may have been mistaken about any particulars which I could only learn from information supplied by other persons, I have accurately stated all that occurred within my own knowledge, to the best of my recollection.

With reference to the essence of the charge alleged against me, I repeat that I never ordered the *introduction* of any thing new, and that I merely desired the *continuance* of what had existed, for several years before the date of my first acquaintance with St. Paul's, whether as a closet, as a chair, or in any other way that might be more pleasing to the Rector and Congregation. And *even if I had* been endeavoring to *introduce* a closet, such as was introduced by my predecessor, or any equivalent, I should still maintain that I had neither ordered, nor urged, the introduction of a "Credence Table," and would refer in support of my assertion, to the letter of Rev. G. Hill, (see p. 26), where he insists upon the distinction between the closet in St. Paul's, and a "Credence Table."

Moreover, all attempts to contradict my statement will be futile, until *that* can be proved which no one has ventured to assert, that any arrangements for compliance with the Rubric, before the Prayer for the Church Militant, have at any time been made, with which I have refused to be satisfied, or that I have ever denied the sufficiency of any such arrangement without a Credence. While I have to remind both Clergy and Laity, that whenever the bread and wine are placed upon the Communion Table, before the beginning of the service, the Law so lately interpreted is deliberately violated, and that no plea can be admitted in justification of a practice, formally condemned by the highest Court in the Kingdom, I again repeat, in order to prevent the possibility of misconception, that so long as the Law, expounded by the Committee of Council, is obeyed, I do not wish to urge the adoption of any one mode, of giving effect to their decision, in preference to another.

Dec 10, 1866.