

GOD IS EVERYWHERE.

During the ravages of the plague in London, Lord Craven, whose house was situated where Craven Street now stands, alarmed at the progress of the disease, determined to retire into the country. His carriage was at the door, and he was passing through the hall to enter it, when he heard a negro servant saying to another domestic, "I suppose by my Lord's quitting London to avoid the plague that his God lives in the country, and not in the town." The negro said this in the innocent simplicity of his heart, really believing in the plurality of gods. The speech, however, struck Lord Craven forcibly. "My God," thought he, "lives every where, and can preserve me in town as well as in the country. I will even stay where I am. The ignorance of that negro has preached a useful sermon to me. Lord pardon that unbelief, and that distrust of thy Providence, which made me think of running away from thy hand." He countermanded his orders for the journey, he remained in London, he was remarkably useful in administering to the necessities of the sick, and he was saved from the surrounding infection.

TO MR. M'KILLICAN.

BREDALBANE, July 17, 1838.

MY DEAR SIR,—Truth is a native of heaven, and needs not expect great justice or kind treatment on a visit to such a world as this; and often, like her author, is she found wounded in the house of her friends. I have read your remarks in the *Baptist Magazine* on the account I had given of a visit to Osgood. I acknowledge the statement refers to your labour; and both the truth and design of it I still support; but I am pained to be forced to use a freedom before the public that can give no pleasure to the feelings of either of us. I could and should bear a good deal of abuse for the truth's sake; but when a professed preacher of the Gospel holds me up to public contempt as a stumbling-block—a vender of falsehood and mis-statement—speaking evil of my neighbours—like the Pharisee in the temple—giving dishonest or

garbled extracts, &c. &c., I humbly hope the public will excuse me, although, in justice to my own character and the cause I profess, I should not bear all in silence.

In regard to the public teaching on the subject of baptism contained in the remarks, and which you deny, let me observe that I was told on the spot, by persons whose veracity I could not call in question, that you did preach on the subject on your first visit. But I have been informed since that you only reasoned on it before a number of the congregation that remained in. Now, for my part, should I see a public character reasoning on a public matter, and that before a number of the public, I certainly would call that a public act. Hence it was so far public, though not so public as I at first understood. However, not a line left my house till you preached to a full congregation on the same subject a few days afterwards, and I have not learned that in either case you were called to administer the ordinance. As for my design, I humbly hope it was no ill-will to any man on earth; but that which Paul had when he withstood a fellow servant to the face, because he was to be blamed. You say you would be ashamed of such conduct as the remark imputes to you, and in a few lines acknowledge to have done the thing, but it was on the 28th, the day after the date of my letter. What does this amount to? If we are to consider any thing as a matter of shame on the 26th, is it not so on the 28th? You say you leave such conduct to me and others, who, as you suppose, are in such a *feverish heat upon this subject*. But, my dear Sir, I deny the charge; for although I give my views on the subject occasionally when I am called to administer the ordinance, I do not follow any man, Priest or Minister, to oppose him; neither do I preach over all the country, or the field of my labours, in opposition to any party on baptism or any other outward ordinance, *&c.* connected with the administration of the same. Although I feel sorry to be obliged to say it, this you do, Sir. Did you not preach in this way at Bredalbane, and two or three sermons in the Indian Land, besides what was done in Osgood? How many more I cannot say. Did you not, as a certain meeting was ended, follow us to the water, or the house next the bank chosen to attend to this ordinance, and as I finished my remarks, did you not, to our no little annoyance, publicly announce your opposition appointment for the evening, disturbing the minds of the worshippers, and intercepting more than one of the candidates, after shifting their clothes, and oppose them between the house and the water. Let the public judge whether this is a *feverish heat* on the