

popularity, else you must place yourself in a very unenviable position: for I doubt not you say with me that the cause you have steadily and nobly advocated for nineteen years has been all along the same good cause—though it was far from being as popular nineteen years ago as at present. In this instance you take the tenable ground that the cause is to be regarded upon its own intrinsic merits, being precisely as valid when unpopular as when popular. May I hope therefore that you will give me a candid hearing, and offer your objections candidly. I promise that your arguments and objections shall be laid before the thousands who read the *Christian Banner*, and if commented on (as probably they will be,) my strictures will be forthcoming in a spirit designed to elicit truth and not blindly to gain a victory.

Up to this date I have had one and only one opponent, as it respects what I plead on the subject of *Christian temperance efforts*. He is a gentleman well known at your office, a great friend of temperance and a man of much worth in many respects—a friend whom I highly esteem—Mr. A. Farewell. He gave me two brief letters sometime ago upon my temperance heresy; but either his logic or his patience failed him after the second running fire.

You will permit me to say in closing, that the perseverance and assiduity you have shown in pushing forward the cause of Temperance in the face of all opposition, claim not only my respect but my admiration.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Yours, D. OLIPHANT.

The *Temperance Advocate* in laying before its readers the seven cardinal points in the above letter, thus speaks:—

Early last year we published some strictures on certain sentiments quoted by the *Watchman* from a religious paper, edited by the Rev. D. Oliphant. Not until the January of 1853 did our remarks come under the notice of Mr. Oliphant, and now in a communication received from him, justice is claimed at our hands. Mr. O., thinks himself misrepresented. Perhaps he is, but after carefully considering the matter, we do not think our friend orthodox, or prepared to go our length of orthodoxy. We believe Mr. O. to be a good temperance man in his way, and may do good to the extent of his influence. But his platform is not large enough to include in one common effort, all who agree with him and with ourselves, on the one important principle of entire abstinence from the sale and use of intoxicating drinks.

Diversity of opinion on other matters separates Mr. O. from us, and although he may work well in his own harness, it seems to us he would work better could he manage to put on ours, or one of a similar pattern.

Mr. O. will excuse us in not printing the whole of his communi-