

Alabama Baptist.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., JAN. 6, 1887.

J. G. HARRIS, Proprietor and Editor.
J. B. HENDERSON, D.D., Ed. & Manager.
S. HENDERSON, D.D., Associate Editor.

BUSINESS ANNOUNCEMENTS.
Terms: \$2.00 per year in advance.
Special terms will be made with agents soliciting subscriptions.

Extra copies of a single issue, which should be ordered in advance, are worth six cents each; if more than ten are ordered, five cents each. Remit with order.
Remittances should be made in money or order on Montgomery, or bank check on Montgomery or New York. When neither of these can be procured, send the money in a registered letter.

The date against your name on the margin of the paper shows when your subscription expires. If it serves both as a receipt and a request for payment, if proper credit has not been given within two weeks, notify us at once. All subscribers who do not send express notice to the contrary, will be regarded as wishing to continue their subscriptions. Notice to discontinue should be given at least a week before and not after the subscription has expired. Both the new and old post office should be given when your address is changed.

Obituaries of one hundred words will be inserted free. For each word over one hundred, two cents will be charged. Remit with order for publication. Send the words and see just what the bill will be; also, include money for extra copies at five cents each if more than ten are wanted, otherwise six cents each. If money is not enclosed, we reserve the right to condense to one hundred words.

Advertising rates quoted on application. You will confer a favor by mentioning this paper when you answer an advertisement. Write only on one side of the paper. Always give your post office. Anonymous communications go to the waste basket. We are not responsible for the return of rejected manuscripts nor for the opinions expressed by correspondents.

All communications on business or for publication should be addressed, and all checks and money orders made payable to THE ALABAMA BAPTIST, Montgomery, Ala.

For special use we want fifteen copies of our last paper, that of December 23rd, in which Dr. Tichenor's article on the Home Board, was published. Will our subscribers return that number to us? We will remember it and reward it.

The enterprising and eminently successful and wealthy firm, Brn. Smith & Marbury, of Bozeman, a few days since, presented the South Side church at Birmingham with a \$500 lot as a site for a parsonage. It is a beautiful lot.

While last in Birmingham we spent a Sabbath evening and night with Capt. W. C. Ward and family. His old Selma friends ought all to call to see him. Far up on the highlands of South Side he has an ideal home—one of those homes that you read about in romance.

As CHRISTMAS presents we had a coincidence of the coming of two charming shadows. The pictures of Mrs. Curry, wife of the Hon. J. L. M. Curry, United States Minister to Spain, sent to us by herself, and the picture of our own daughter, wife of Prof. J. R. Sampey, of the Theological Seminary at Louisville; both arrived on the same day.

We had the pleasant privilege of taking our Christmas dinner with many friends at the home of Bro. Felix M. Wood, of Woodlawn, near Birmingham. We were not surprised to see a very fine dinner, for we have participated in a countless number of dinners prepared by the lady of the house—before she went there. She knows all about it.

The best lecture we ever had delivered to us on pastoral work, we received at a street corner in this city a few evenings since from Dr. Wharton, of the First Church. It was about 30 minutes in length, and as graphic and instructive as anything of that length could be. The Doctor seemed to be impressed with the idea that we were likely to again turn to that business. He is a genius.

On an afternoon of last week we had, at our office, a call from Rev. J. S. Jones, formerly of Rockford, now of Fayetteville, with his accomplished bride, recently Miss Mollie Ham, of Sylacauga, daughter of Bro. J. S. Ham. They were married on the 29th of December by Dr. Henderson, of this paper—the uncle of the bride. The lovely young lady was deeply saddened in this her bridal day by the recent death of her mother.

We are forced to say to our correspondents that we must have shorter articles. Thus far we have made but little use of the waste basket, but the crowded condition of our columns will not admit the publication of articles of more than two columns in length, and very few of that length. And we are not willing to publish a sermon of over four columns. Now, we are making no iron rule which can not be varied, but the paper can not find room for so much matter.

The Baptists of Alabama will universally regret to learn that the Rev. Geo. B. Eager, D.D., of the St. Francis Street church in Mobile, has accepted the call to Danville, Va. We have known for three weeks that this was very probable, but for reasons did not feel at liberty to refer to it in our paper, but as we have seen it in many papers we make the announcement to our readers.

We understand that Dr. Eager will remain with his work in Mobile until the first of April. As he feels it his duty to go, we rejoice that so charming a man, and preacher, and pastor, has a field so grand as Danville to go to.

A LAST SABBATH IN MONTGOMERY.

Since we came to Montgomery, the last of August, we have spent but three Sabbaths in the city. Circumstances being such that we could not meet our engagement at Lowndesboro last Sabbath, which we regret very much, we found opportunity to witness the services at some of the churches in the city. At the First Baptist church in the morning Dr. Wharton had a good congregation, and he gave them an excellent sermon from the text, "This year thou shalt die."

1st. What is life?
2nd. What is death?
These two questions were forcibly and instructively discussed in the early part of the discourse, and then followed an impressive and touching discussion of the propositions:

1st. This year you may die.
2nd. This year some of you are almost certain to die.

3rd. There is a sense in which we all die daily, which will soon bring us all to the end.

4th. How infinitely important that we work, and watch, and pray, and be ready!

He made touching reference, in conclusion, to the fact that on the first day of the new year death had removed one of the most useful and most important members of the church—Mrs. Hatchett.

At 4:30 p. m. we attended a communion service at the Adams street church, conducted by the pastor, Rev. E. A. Stone, assisted by Dr. Wharton. It was an edifying service.

At 7 p. m. we were at the Court Street Methodist church to witness the closing service of Dr. J. O. Andrew, who has been pastor here for four years, and now goes to Selma. It was a tender, sensible, and moving sermon, sustained by some of the precious songs of Zion, as for instance, "Shall we gather at the river?" "The sweet by and by," and as a song of tender friendship that with the following chorus was grand:

"The heart feels most
When the lips move not,
And the eye speaks,
A loving good-bye."

This service was not an inquest of speeches and resolutions over the mortal remains of a defunct pastor, but a tearful and loving farewell between pastor and people at the close of a most fruitful work.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

To our excellent sister Harris at Gaylesville we have to say, as touching her two questions:

1st. We do not know why our Lord said to Mary, "Touch me not," as it is clear that some did touch him after his resurrection. (See Matt. 28: 9.) Jesus seems to give a reason for forbidding it, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Possibly just then they two were alone and for that reason he rejected; for though he was infinitely above contamination, the tongues of those who might know of it were not above slanderous assaults. Possibly she seemed violent as she approached him, and he would teach her that this was no time for that.

2nd. We understand the passage, "Feed my lambs," to have regard to the treatment of tender believers—young Christians. We do not understand it as having reference to little children as such. Still Jesus was not inattentive to little children, nor would he have his ministers and people to neglect them. "Suffer the little children to come unto me." "Train up a child in the way he should go." "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Therefore if we concede that "Feed my lambs" has reference to little children, it still gives no encouragement to infant baptism or infant church membership. It is our duty to give children the bread of eternal life, to instruct them in the truths of the word of God; and this cannot be too early. As we see their little minds begin to develop in perception and thought, we should make haste to have them know the holy Scriptures. Timothy knew the scriptures from a child, and seems to have gotten the knowledge from his mother and grandmother. We should not flinch at the proper application of scripture passages to little children. We should never concede that any people can make a more ready or a more hearty application of the divine word to children than we can. We do not suppress the spirit and life of the word with unmeaning rites and ceremonies. If they may be called lambs we do not feed them with "hay and stubble," but with those lessons of the word of God suited to their condition, and when they show that "the root of the matter is in them," we administer to them that ordinance which symbolizes their faith in Christ, and thus on their own profession admit them to church membership and to all the privileges of church membership. With us baptism and church membership are not suspended on a

question of age but on a question of faith in Christ. Hence if the passage, "Feed my lambs," be claimed for little children, we should not seriously object, but we should insist on the feeding, and would resist any ceremony which may supplant the feeding.

A WORD OR TWO.

The controversy concerning the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, which we have regretted as much as any one, had its origin in a set of circumstances over which we had no control. It began in the Liberty (East) Association between two brethren who are held in the highest esteem and affection by us; and in some notes which we wrote and published, of that meeting, we were so unfortunate as to fail to give satisfaction to Bro. Brewer and other brethren of that body who have written to us about it. His first article was entirely respectful as it seemed to us, and therefore we thought proper to publish it, but we had no idea the discussion would reach the magnitude to which it has gone. One article seemed to open the way for another, and thus it went on. But it seems that we are blamed for allowing the discussion at all, and have been rebuked through our own columns for it. There seems to be an opinion that when the Southern Baptist Convention pronounces its judgment, that among Southern Baptists must be the end of all inquiry on that subject. To this, we have two things to say:

1st. We yield nothing to any brother in devotion to agencies within the organized lines of denominational enterprise.

2nd. Still we have been accustomed to believe that every article of faith held by Baptists, and every organization among them, and every agency, and every interest, and all their plans, and all their work, are legitimate subjects of prudent newspaper discussion. But once a controversy begins it is beyond the power of an editor to direct it. Brethren who are every way more important in the denomination than the editor, will write in their own way, and he is powerless unless he closes his columns against them, and under some circumstances he can not afford to do that. We are not apologizing to any one, but are wishing our readers in Alabama to view the matter in its proper light.

We insist that we have done right in the premises, and would pursue the same course again under like circumstances. We had expected that all issue of our paper would end the discussion, but from a source which can not be ignored, we learn that the end is not yet.

THE WORK OF THE HOME BOARD.

If any one wants arguments to sustain the operations of the Home Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, they can easily be gratified in the following array of facts, all of which have marked the history of that Board during our last conventional year. It supported 255 missionaries in whole or in part, who preached in 649 places, more than 27,000 sermons, to about 100,000 people. The missionaries baptized 3,812, received by letter 2,344, making a total of 6,256 persons. They had 326 Sunday-schools with 12,500 pupils and teachers. They constituted 79 new churches, and built 49 new houses of worship. To do this the Board had to outdraw its receipts \$3,500, which amount it asks the denomination to make up the current year. This must be done to keep the Board in its present working order.

Now, reader, calmly look these facts in the face, and say if we are wrong when we affirm that every missionary appointed by that Board, every sermon that every appointee preached, every destitute field he occupied, every person converted under his ministry or added to the church, every Sunday-school organized, every new church constituted and house of worship built, in fact everything done by the agencies of this Board to advance the cause of Christ, is a living, potent argument that appeals to the confidence and support of the denomination. No living agency bears more unmistakable evidences of a divine endorsement. It embodies the very spirit of the great commission. The advancing tide of emigration southward and westward is constantly enlarging its field of operations, emphasizing its claims upon our benevolent sympathies. It is the driving wheel of our whole philanthropic machinery, stationed as it is in the very centre of all our mission work at home and abroad to keep alive, through its many agencies, the mission spirit in all our churches. How far other agencies might do the work of this Board if it were out of the way, we never could determine. From a might be in the premises to a must be in the conclusion, is a long stretch in logic. We never were a sufficient adept in guessing what a sturdy oak would have been if it had not been an oak. We simply accept the Board as a God ordained agency, the grateful echo of our Lord's command, "Beginning at Jerusalem."

S. H.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

Ever and anon there arises a certain type of piety, (and let us hope that it is sincere,) that is greatly concerned about uniting the entire Christian world in one body. The last move in this direction has been made by our Episcopal brethren. The platform they suggest is, in substance, their own faith. So long have they cherished their peculiar sentiments that they have come to regard them as embracing "the faith once delivered to the saints." Meantime the great body of Christians moves on the even tenor of its way, doing what can be done to advance the common cause. We remember about thirty-five years ago, a pedestrian turned up where we then lived, who had walked already several hundred miles, and who proposed going to Mexico to convert the priesthood of the Roman Catholic church in that country to the true faith, and through them to reach the Pope of Rome, and by converting him the balance of the job would be easy. He was as sincere in his convictions as any man we ever saw, for he had given evidence of this by the distance he had traveled on foot, and also in pursuing his journey in due time in the same way, as intent on his mission as ever Martin Luther was. When last heard from he had reached the borders of Mexico; but since then, well, results have not been reported. The only difference between the late conclave of Episcopal dignitaries in their plan of union, and that of our friend thirty-five years ago, is, that they only aim to unite the Protestant world, whereas he, in the exercise of a broader philanthropy, embraced the whole Catholic world in his sympathies, and hence deserves the more credit for his benevolent regards. The only noteworthy thing about both is, that they put one in the predicament of an old poet we wot of, who speaking of something in that line says:

"To laugh were want of goodness and of grace,
And to be grave exceeds all power of face!"

Something over fifty years ago, Alexander Campbell, a man that made his mark on his generation, sloughed off from the Baptist denomination, and threw his whole energy into a "reformation" that aimed at the same thing—the consolidation of Christendom upon one platform. He proposed the word of God as the basis of union, both in faith and practice. The only difficulty about his theory was, that it had been adopted by all Protestant denominations. So that while warring with all other sects he simply established another sect—for in the course of a few years he found it necessary to publish a formula of doctrines called a creed, as heavered, for the information of others. The present condition of the "current reformation" indicates the progress this sect has made in uniting the Christian world on its platform. The truth is, as human nature is at present constituted, the very best of men must content themselves with substantial unity with circumstantial variations. Unity we mean in the essential elements of piety, in doctrine and duty, with such shades of difference in the interpretation of God's word as leaves vital piety untouched. Bearing this in mind, we shall find in all denominations much to commend and love—that faith in the crucified One and that godly life to which God has affixed salvation.

S. H.

THE MIDWAY HIGH SCHOOL.

Prof. W. T. Hendon, as was to be expected, has made quite a success of his school at Midway. The Christmas entertainment was given on Dec. 23rd, and has received much praise from the public, and it was a source of gratification to principal and patrons. The programme embraced recitations, music, and the presentation of two dramas, "Love of a Bonnet" and "Little Brown Jug." The school, after a brief holiday, opened anew on Monday, 3rd, and we bespeak for the worthy principal a full roll.

S. H.

An Excellent Lady Gone.
Mrs. Mary Gwen Dean, relict of Mr. Hosea J. Dean, of Spartanburg, S. C., was born in London, England, Sept. 20th, 1822, and died at Spartanburg, South Carolina, Dec. 3, 1886. Joined the Baptist church at Spartanburg in 1840. Three children survive her, viz., Mrs. C. E. Fleming, of Spartanburg, S. C., Mrs. Dean, Esq., of Washington, D. C., and Hosea J. Dean, of Calhoun Co., Ala.

We were very sorry to hear of the death of the above mentioned Christian woman and eminently accomplished lady. She was the mother of the late E. J. Dean, of Talladega, and of those mentioned in this note. Her husband was in his day a celebrated Spartanburg lawyer. She was a woman of fine estate, and we understand that Bro. Hosea J. Dean, of Weaver's Station, her son, inherits by will her property, and will leave Alabama at once to make his home in Spartanburg.

Meeting of the State Mission Board.

The regular quarterly meeting of the Board will take place in Selma on Tuesday, January 11th, at 7 p. m. W. B. CRUMPTON, Cor. Sec'y.

Dr. Tupper's Respects to Dr. I. T. Tichenor.

RICHMOND, VA., Jan. 1, 1887.
Rev. I. T. Tichenor, Atlanta, Ga.
Rev. and Dear Sir—I am sorry to see in the ALABAMA BAPTIST of the 3rd of December that you have felt yourself at liberty to introduce my name, without just cause, into the controversy that has been waging for a long time between the Rev. George E. Brewer, of Alabama, and the Home Board. This gentleman declares, in a telegram before me, that he has made no charge against the Secretary of the Foreign Board. And if he had made any charge, why should the Home Secretary feel called upon to defend the Secretary of another Board, even though the sentiments of the former be so fraternal as to induce him to make for his brother Secretary the swift confession, "What ever may have been his mistakes of judgment?" While making this vicarious confession, let me ask here, why did he not make a clean breast of his brother's errors and confess, into the ear of the public, that the Foreign Secretary was guilty of the grave "mistake of judgment" of having no sympathy with some of the purposes, plans and principles of action of the Home Secretary, of which he can hardly be ignorant.

When the Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions needs to be defended, he can defend himself, or be defended by his Board, as the Home Secretary has good reason to know.

But this is a small matter compared with the statement of the Cuban question by the Home Secretary, which is so full of misleading misstatements, unintentionally made, that, constrained by allegiance to my Board and to the truth, I shall make a statement of the facts of the case, establishing each assertion, opposed to the misstatements of the Home Secretary, with documentary evidence. As this letter is not unofficial, I shall speak of the Secretaries in the third person.

First: On August 3rd, 1885, the Home Secretary informed the Foreign Secretary, who was sick in the mountains of North Carolina, of the work of Grace in Cuba, and wrote: "I call your special attention to the brother who has gone to New York for ordination. The Home Mission Society may seek to secure his services. Bro. Wood is our missionary in Key West. Havana is in your field, and I would not like to see it pass into the hands of others." Not dreaming that the Home Mission Board had any idea of entering the field, the Foreign Secretary, replied, August 13th, freely, thus: "Cuba, being out of our country, belongs, as you say, to our part of the world to cultivate; but, really, we are afraid to open more fields. How is it with your Board? We are fearfully pressed. I feel much interest in Cuba, and our Board has reported on the subject to the Convention. At that time the U. S. Government did not give much encouragement in the way of protection."

** But if things are changed in this regard, and the times should improve, I know not what our Board might do, if the Missionary Union [mistake for the "H. M. Society" above] does not get ahead of us."

This is the letter on which the Home Secretary bases his assertion: "Dr. Tupper's letter, in reply, stated that it was impossible for the Foreign Board to do it"—to occupy Cuba. Does this assertion correspond with the statements of the letter? Does not the letter express hope that the Board would enter the field? The reasons he puts into the mouth of the Foreign Secretary, for the "impossibility," are foretold; but they are not found in the Secretary's letter, and remind us of Minerva, full-armed, springing from the cranium of Jupiter.

Secondly: On the 13th of September, 1885, the Home Secretary, enclosing a report of Bro. Wood, wrote, with regard to the Cuban field:

"We trust you will be able to occupy it at once. But, if you should not, as your last letter leads us to fear, then I am authorized to ask your Board whether they will give their approval to our attempting such an arrangement as will enable us to hold it until you shall be in condition or desire to take it." This was a startling letter. In the worst season of the year, the Foreign Board is called upon by the Home Board, who had nothing to do with foreign missions, to enter a new field "at once," or to turn it over to the Home Board! The final clause, "to hold it until you shall be in condition or desire to take it," implying superior resources of the Home Board, would have been amusing, had not some dim apprehensions flashed on the mind, though none dared to say: "Timio Danaos et dona ferentes."

"To this request," says the Home Secretary, "the Foreign Mission Board made no reply." Do these words convey the idea that his letter was not responded to? Besides, an acknowledgement of it, in September, in which was asked permission to retain Bro. Wood's letter for the use of the Board, on October 13th, the Home Secretary was informed that his communications had been presented the evening before to the Board, who had referred them to their standing

committee on New Missions and Missions. The Foreign Secretary wrote, at the same time: "The Board has kept this work (in Cuba) in mind, and reported it to the Southern Baptist Convention in 1881. The Convention reported against it then. Things seemed to have changed since that time, and who knows but that the Lord calls us to go up and possess the land?"

Was this not a virtual reply, even to the request of the Home Board? And in view of this language, held by the Foreign Secretary, October 13, 1885, how could the Home Secretary, with good conscience, impress the public mind, in December, 1886, with the idea that the Foreign Secretary thought it was "impossible" to enter Cuba?

Prominent members of the Florida Convention urging the Foreign Secretary to attend that body in November, 1885, in the interest of this Cuban matter, and the Foreign Board feeling it their right and duty to be as deliberate as they deemed best in making their decision, the Corresponding Secretary attended the Convention, as he publicly stated to the body, to obtain all information necessary for a wise decision of the matter by the Board. The Convention passed unanimously the following without one word of dissent: "We conceive that this Convention is able to undertake this work at once, i. e., the preliminary or provisional work, to go and prepare the way, to lay foundations, to throw up breastworks, and to hold the fort till the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention can come to the rescue, which we hope will not be later than the next meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention."

The Foreign Secretary stated the difficulties in the way of the Board's immediate acceptance of the work, but promised an answer, which he hoped would be favorable, at the Southern Baptist Convention, according to the terms of the report adopted. On December 7th, the Board passed the following:

"Resolved, 1. That the field in Cuba seems to be ripe for missionary effort, and the appeals are certainly very urgent.

2. That this field properly belongs to the work of this Board, and would be undertaken by it at once, if it could see its way to do so, with the prospect of holding it permanently.

3. That this matter be referred to the Southern Baptist Convention at its session next May, and that the Corresponding Secretary be instructed, in the annual report, to represent to the Convention that this Board regards this field as legitimately its own, and will undertake the work if so instructed."

A copy of this action was sent to the President of the Florida Convention, and another to the Home Secretary. Hence sprang a painful correspondence with the Home Secretary, who complained of what seemed to him in the above resolutions—strange to say—a threat to arraign his Board before the Convention. The Foreign Secretary's reasons for sending these resolutions to the Home Secretary, being requested, were given as follows:

"1. It seemed courteous and fraternal for me to do so; * * * it seemed due to you that our response to the Florida Convention * * * should be communicated to you also.

2. It was done because it was regarded as the most complete and satisfactory reply which I could make to your official communication on the subject of the Cuban mission.

"* * * An earlier response was impracticable. * * * I am aware that you requested an answer at once; but such a request could not have precedence of the uniform custom of our Board with regard to the conduct of its business. * * * This was a matter that related to our territory, and we had the right to take such time as was needful for a judicious response."

Only a word or two of comment here: 1. Why should the Home Secretary be grieved—as he was most grievously—as the prospect brightened of our Board taking the Cuban mission, when his Board proposed to hold it only until our Board could take it? 2. How could he say, as answered above, "To this request the Foreign Board made no reply?" How could he say this, when, in one of the papers of the "painful correspondence," occur these words: "If the time had not passed for a direct reply, we would not hesitate to say that, in our opinion, each Board should confine itself to the work its name indicates it was appointed to do; but that this Board has no right to object to, nor any authority to give its assent to, the Home Board assuming, temporarily or permanently, charge of the Cuban mission."

3. How could he say in the ALABAMA BAPTIST of December 23d: "In November [1885], Dr. Tupper attended the Florida Convention. This body urged him to occupy Cuba. He replied he could not. Then the Florida Convention resolved that it would itself organize a mission in Havana and sustain it until the next meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention?" Is there a Christian gentleman that was in attendance on the Florida Convention

who would endorse this statement of the Home Secretary? The Home Secretary himself was not present.

So far from refusing Cuba, the Foreign Secretary wrote, December 7th, to Senor Diaz, in Havana, requesting information of the field in view of the proposed relation of the Foreign Board to it. His reply was not received. But he told the Foreign Secretary at the Southern Baptist Convention that he had responded the same month, and that he had expressed the opinion in his letter that the Cuban mission should be in the hands of the Foreign Board; and he was willing to express this opinion in the Convention. He expressed the same opinion to others. That, however, is the way. As to the refusal of Cuba, how can the statement be reconciled with the fact of the committee of the Convention asking a conference with the President of the Foreign Mission Board, and, after such conference, bringing in a unanimous report recommending that the Foreign Mission Board should take Cuba? How can it be reconciled with the fact that, when an amendment was proposed on the floor of the Convention substituting Home for "Foreign" Board, the President of the Foreign Board addressed the Convention, arguing earnestly against the amendment?

Thirdly: The resolutions of the Foreign Board, quoted above, were not reported to the Convention as was intended, because the Home Secretary construed them as a "threat" against his Board—a threat of what? What had his Board done? Such an idea never entered the brain of a member of the Foreign Board. How it entered the brain of the Home Secretary, the expert casuist may decide. In the interest of peace, the action of the Florida Convention alone was reported to the Southern Baptist Convention with the words: "The means of doing all that Providence indicates should be done are in the hands of God's people; and the question of duty in the premises is respectfully submitted to the wisdom of the Convention." In the report of the Home Board on "the Cuban Mission" appeared several references to the Foreign Board. The Home Secretary was informed at the Convention that this report misrepresented the Foreign Board. For honor's sake, the honorable Home Board should retract the misstatements of their report, at the next meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention. And should it not direct its Corresponding Secretary to beware of the danger, if not the discourtesy of attempting to report to the Convention the affairs and views of the Foreign Board? The Home Secretary says: "The Home Mission Board did not ask the Southern Baptist Convention for Cuba nor intimate a desire to have it. The question never came before the Board at any of its meetings." Yet it is on record in the Foreign Mission rooms as stated above, that the Home Secretary, by the express authority of his Board, requested of the Foreign Board permission to enter Cuba; and the impartial historian will not have to read between the lines of the Home Mission Board's report to decide whether Cuba was not desired, by at least the writer of that report. A comparison of the reports of the two Boards, on the Cuban Mission, will readily decide the question: What is the truth?

Fourthly: The Home Secretary says the President of the Florida Convention "seemed to think his Board should take it." But what was the fact, the unanimous action of the Florida Convention? The Convention agreed to await the answer of the Foreign Board until the Southern Baptist Convention. And strangely enough did it sound when brethren from Florida declared, on the floor of the Southern Baptist Convention, that it was the wish of the Florida Convention that the mission should be committed to the Home Board! How did they get the mind of the Florida Convention, which had no existence after the session that recorded its unanimous vote that the Foreign Board should take the work? And had it existed, would this honorable body have thus changed its mind and given no notice to the Foreign Board who were considering their proposition in good faith? What influence changed the minds of individuals of Florida it is not for us to say; but we know that there was, on the part of some, that Cuba going to the Richmond Board might alienate from Florida the patronage of the Board at Atlanta. Our simple point is, that the statement of the Home Secretary, that the President of the Florida Convention "seemed to think his Board should take it," has no force nor value, and is very misleading.

In the above not one tithe of what is recorded and filed in the Foreign Mission rooms, on this subject of the Cuban mission, is given. But what is written is sufficient to refute the statements of the Home Secretary about the Foreign Board, and that is all that was proposed.

Now, that there be no misunderstanding of the position of the Board of Foreign Missions, let it be asserted that they did not covet Cuba, as all their actions proved; but they were ready for the orders of the Convention. The Convention ordered the

Board not to enter Cuba, and they have never uttered an adverse word on the subject. The Foreign Secretary congratulated the Home Secretary on his new work. The Foreign Mission Journal said an error had been committed, but it gave a fraternal God-speed to the novel enterprise. And perpetual silence would have been observed, but the Home Secretary's article in the ALABAMA BAPTIST, so full of misstatements, forces the rupture of the self-imposed silence, and demands the publication of the facts as proved by the records. To none is this publication more painful than to the writer; but, "before pleasure is duty."

And now, since the silence is broken, let us face some of the consequences of this new departure of the Convention:

1. If Foreign fields are to be given to the Home Board, home fields may be given to the Foreign Board, and why not the Foreign Board look out for the Indians or the Negroes to be put under their charge?

2. If Cuba is given to the Home Board, why may not it be given Mexico? An effort in this direction has been predicted. Will those best informed say that the prediction is not well founded? Do not covet for the Home Board the motto of the Home Mission Society—"North America for Christ?"

3. The name of the Home Board will be soon regarded a misnomer, to be changed to suit its changed work. And with the confusion of work which must follow, will begin the confusion of ideas about missions. The absurd idea will be taken up that missions are "one"—an idea that nullifies the organic division of the Convention into Home and Foreign Boards; that violates the distinction between home and foreign, which is ineradicably fixed in the human mind; that flies in the face of the unbroken precedent of the Convention from 1846 to 1886; and that has no other value than to lead to the equal distribution of mission funds among several departments of missions, while some times vaster and more needy, may justly demand ten or a hundred times as much assistance as other departments. Confound Home and Foreign Missions! Let the plea be for "missions" only, and the heathen of China will be sacrificed for "the heathen at our doors."

I doubt not that the Home Secretary will adjudge this a "mistake of judgment"—a mistake of judgment in preventing him from trusting the Foreign Secretary in front of the darts of Bro. Brewer as a shield for his own breast; a mistake of judgment in stopping his assertions that the Foreign Board refused the Cuban mission, as a justification of the Home Board having it; a mistake of judgment in showing the absurdity of the studiously calculated notion that all missions are "one," whereby so many of the Foreign Mission Societies have divided their funds with the Secretary of the Home Board, as to lead an eminent woman worker for missions to pen the caustic words: "His sagacity is in reading where he has not seen!" But our best judgment is that nothing is better than the vindication of truth—save the truth itself.

This is the first criticism on the conduct of the Home Secretary made by the writer outside of the Foreign Mission rooms; and the severest ever made there is this: "Many are my obligations to the Home Board; but the greatest is for the occasion its Secretary has given for infinite patience."

I am obediently,
Your humble servant,
H. A. TUPPER.

Association Minutes Wanted.

The Statistical Secretary needs Minutes of the following associations, and would be thankful to any brother who can send him either. If you can furnish, please mail at once, to—
WM. A. DAVIS,
Statistical Sec'y, Montgomery, Ala.

Arbacochee, Clear Creek,
Carey, Macdonald,
Evergreen, Pea River,
Indian Creek, Sandy Creek,
Mud Creek, Town Creek,
Rock Mills, Zion,
Southeastern, Yellow Creek,
Troy.

A Sluggish Liver

Cause the Stomach and Bowels to become disordered, and the whole system to suffer from debility. In all such cases Ayer's Pills give prompt relief.

After much suffering from Liver and Stomach troubles, I have finally been cured by taking Ayer's Cathartic Pills. I always find them prompt and thorough in their action, and their occasional use keeps me in a perfectly healthy condition.—RALPH WOODMAN, Andover, Mass.

Twenty-five years ago I suffered from a torpid liver, which was restored to healthy action by taking Ayer's Pills. Since that time I have never been troubled with indigestion, and I have been able to eat and drink with pleasure. They regulate the bowels, assist digestion, and increase the appetite, more surely than any other medicine.—PAUL CHURCHILL, Haverhill, Mass.

IN VIGORATED.
I know of no remedy equal to Ayer's Pills for Stomach and Liver Disorders. I suffered from a Torpid Liver and Dyspepsia for eighteen months. My skin was yellow and my tongue coated. I had no appetite, suffered from Headache, was pale and emaciated. A few boxes of Ayer's Pills, taken in moderate doses, restored me to perfect health.—WALDO MILES, Oberlin, Ohio.

Ayer's Pills are a superior family medicine. They strengthen and invigorate the digestive organs, treat all ailments of the Liver, and remove the horrible effects of Liver Complaint. I have used these Pills, in my family, for years, and they never fail to give entire satisfaction.—OTTO MONTGOMERY, Oshkosh, Wis.

Ayer

