

TERMS AND NOTICES.

THE RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER is published weekly from the office of BARNES & CO., Prince William Street, Saint John, N. B.

Terms: \$5.00 a year, in advance.

All exchanges should be addressed, RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER, Fredericton, N. B.
All communications for insertion should be addressed, REV. JOSEPH McLEOD, P. O. Box 351, Fredericton, N. B.

THE RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER.

REV. JOSEPH McLEOD, EDITOR.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., FEBRUARY 17, 1882.

—THE LEGISLATURE of this Province met yesterday (Thursday). Very little real work will be done before next week. We shall keep our readers informed of the doings of their representatives.

—THE HABITS in praying of many good Christians need correction. There is much called prayer that is really not prayer at all. If a little child (says the *Moravian*) should appreciate its father and commence addressing him thus: "O father, I acknowledge thee to be my parent, very strong, exceedingly wise, and wonderfully good; thou ownest all this house and rulest thy family with thy power; thou hast brought me up from infancy, furnished my food and clothing, etc.; and finally, after seeing on thee, telling thy father what he was, and what he had done, could do and would do, to the extent of about ten minutes or more, would end by asking for a penny—that child would be very likely to have its ears boxed. And it can be nothing but the infinite grace and long-suffering of our Father in heaven that saves some of the long-winded, pompous theological propounders of prayers, that are so frequently heard in pulpits and from receiving merited rebuke and chastisement from him. It is not praying to be heard, therefore, when you pray, do not air your theology, do not display your oratory, do not do anything else than pray.

CHRISTIAN DEVOTION.

The property of any cause depends, in a great measure, on the devotedness of those engaged in it. Where this is not found, prosperity cannot long continue; nothing can supply its place—splendid talents, flaming zeal, and an extended influence, will all fall in the promotion of the object exposed, unless they are sustained by self-denying devotion. Especially in religion it is of the first importance. It is not merely to profess to love the Saviour, while all our pursuits testify that we love ourselves far more than Him. It is to have His interests and claims first and highest; and to speak and act, to eat and drink, move and live, so as to glorify Him. It is to make Christ the center of our desires, our joys and our delights; recognizing His will as our only rule, His commands as our only direction. When we are thus devoted, talents, influence, health and wealth will be freely used for the promotion of His cause. True Christian devotedness includes the consecration of all we possess, whether of mental or material wealth, to the service of God in whatever way He may require it of us. It was this in the primitive disciples that made them so successful in extending the knowledge of Christ.

The principle of this devotedness is not miraculous influence, or great gifts, but in one simple element—the love of God. It is the love of God that fills and ennobles the soul, so that it can say with the Apostle "The love of Christ constraineth us," and it becomes easier to surrender former faith, or ease, or riches, or even life itself if necessary, if Christ can only be magnified thereby. Nothing else can do this. Whatever zeal we may have for God, if it is "the love of Christ" does not constrain us, it will soon expire and leave us more indifferent than we were before. But when this hallowed flame is kindled on the altar of the heart, it enters into its own nature and element, so that it is the fulness of our hearts we can say, "We love God, we love His cause, we love His truth, we love His people, we love the world because God loved it, and His love dwells in us." Where this principle exists, the individual will grow for God as well one time as another. If he cannot do much, he will do what he can. His life is to be the work of God.

This principle will often be sorely tried. The pure gold is only fully proved by passing through the furnace, and so the element of true religion is only really known by suffering with Christ—being baptized with His baptism. But it may be sustained. Faithful is He who has promised; and "respect to the recompense of reward" will not only cheer the believer, but enable him to rejoice in tribulation. It was this that made the Christians "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing in themselves that all things come of God, who is the author of all mercies." They were indifferent to the enduring substance. They were indifferent to the world, because they sought a "better country" to riches, because their wealth was in heaven; to friends, because their friend was above; to life, because they hoped for a better resurrection and life beyond the grave. Faith in these, keeping their eyes steadily fixed on "the mark for the prize of high calling of God in Christ" enabled them to overcome. It is only in proportion to this principle existing in the heart, that the great God can be used to which God has called her that she can fulfill her mission, or carry out the work assigned her of saving the world. A church without consecration, without devotedness, a church without the love of God, and hence without power or influence for good. Wherever we see a man or church too cold, too faithless, or too selfish to devote their all to the interests of religion and the good of the world, we see a form without the power—a body without the life. But on the contrary, where we see true devotedness, we may not see splendid nor great apparent zeal; but we will see constant working for God, attended by corresponding influence and results. Let us ask, then, in all candor, "Are we devoted?" M.

THE C. T. ACT CONTEST.

The Canada Temperance Act Campaign in this City is being carried on with great vigor. The opponents of the movement did the cause good by bringing Mr. Dadds here. He is not likely to make any converts to his view of the matter; but he has succeeded in arousing the temperance men, and they are devoting themselves to the work of the contest with a zeal and enthusiasm that give promise of success. The first meetings of the campaign were held in the Mechanics' Institute on Sunday. Prof. Foster was expected, but the great snow-storm of the last of the week delayed him; the editor of the *Intelligencer* was also expected, but the snow-blockade prevented him, too. But we do not believe the meetings or the cause suffered anything by the failure of these speakers to be present; admirable speeches were made at both meetings by Rev. Mr. Betts of Sussex, and several of the City ministers. On Monday evening Prof. Foster commenced his work, speaking to a large audience in the Leicester street Baptist Church. He also, on the same evening, went to a meeting held in the Carleton Church, and confronted that gentleman. It is agreed on all sides that he made short work of the run champion. He challenged Mr. Dadds to meet him at any time and discuss the question, but the doughty champion would rather be excused.

On Tuesday another meeting was held in the Queen Square Methodist Church, addressed by Rev. Jos. McLeod and Prof. Foster. It was an enthusiastic meeting. There will be a meeting every evening till the vote is taken.

The Committees are at work. They must not forget that the real burden of the work rests on them. Public meetings are necessary, and will, no doubt, do great good in arousing the temperance forces and persuading those who may be in doubt about the wisdom of bringing the law into operation, but unless the Ward Committees carry on a faithful and persistent personal canvass great loss will be suffered. A perfect organization and a faithful

carrying out of the plans of the organization, are essential to the success so devoutly desired. Let there be no slackness, no collection of earnest face to face work till the last vote is cast.

The *Telegraph* is still anxious that "all parties should agree to await the decision of the highest tribunals on the Temperance Act before enrolling the citizens in a contest over it." It says, "We think this a most reasonable conclusion," and asks, "Does the editor of the *Intelligencer* say it is not?" We have said, and now repeat it, that it is not a reasonable conclusion; nor has the *Telegraph* yet been able to show the reasonableness of its view. No reader of that paper can be in doubt as to the party in whose interest the delay is urged. It has said many things against the law, but it has not said anything in its favor. If its objection is only to the time of bringing on the vote and not to the law itself, why is it that it has so much to say against the law and nothing in its favor? If, as is very clear, it is opposed to the law whether voted on now or twelve months or ten years hence, it ought not to endeavor to put its opposition under cover of a plea for delay out of "respect for the higher tribunals," etc. Fair, frank opposition is expected and is not unwelcome by the friends of the law; they are prepared to meet it and to satisfy the majority of thinking unprejudiced people that the law is good. It will be more creditable to opponents to do this instead of putting forward such poor pleas as that of delay.

The other matters in the *Intelligencer's* article were not touched by the *Telegraph* except in the following paragraphs:

Before concluding its article the *Intelligencer* makes a statement, which no gentleman exchanging the ordinary courtesies of life with another would make face to face with the reasonableness of its views. It involves a moral charge of a very grave character, without any reasonable ground for making it, but the editors deal with it as properly. There are some other matters referred to by the *Intelligencer*, one in particular, as to the extent of liquor selling in a certain parish, which we shall not carry out with our readers. We are not at all disposed to deny what it is that we have written that "involves a moral charge of very grave character." The *Telegraph* has not yet enlightened us. Nor has yet given the facts we asked for in the challenge of its statement concerning the increase of rum sale in an unnamed community. Probably it is still hoping "to deal with it on another occasion." We hope it may.

Some people who talk against the C. T. Act, and some papers which are giving it persistent opposition, do not like to be regarded as opposed to temperance. They are excellent temperance men they say. It may be unfair in this instance to judge them by the company they keep, but it is not regarded ordinarily. Suppose the rum-sellers of St. John had not offered any opposition to the C. T. Act, would the editors and other citizens claiming to be temperance men who say they do not believe it have organized to defeat its adoption? We do not believe they would. The rum trade leads to the C. T. Act, it would not be at all for the rum trade, and the C. T. Act is really its follower. We are not at all surprised that they dislike to be regarded as the helpers of so vile a thing; and they do not complain it when they resent the charge of being its advocates and defenders. But there they are—the traffic leads off in opposition to the law, and the editors fall into line and help them. They have nobody but themselves to blame for the position they occupy; if they do not enjoy it they had better break the trade's impact.

The *Weekly Telegraph*, as other weeklies published in connection with daily papers, is made up of the matter—editorial, correspondence, news, etc., which appears in the dailies. But a strange thing happened in the *Weekly Telegraph* of the 8th inst. Though the daily editors for the week prior to that date had contained several editorials in opposition to the C. T. Act, not one of them, except the one referring to the Göttingen system, appeared in the weekly. Why? People can scarcely be blamed for supposing that the editor is anxious to keep himself right with the opinion of his readers, and the majority of whom are in favor of temperance laws. To the readers of the daily he gives repeated doses of opposition to the law, but to the readers of the weekly he does not give a particle of it. Of course the *Telegraph* has a right to do just as it pleases; we will be told that it is the business of nobody outside the *Telegraph* office how that paper is made up. Yet the fact remains that the thing is not well. It is not well, and it is not well on both sides at the same time.

The Methodist ministers of the City have received replies to the inquiries they made in the various places where the law is in operation. They say: "We have received reliable information, which enables us to make the following statement:—In some parts of the Province the Act is being carried out, and the results look for by its friends are being seen. The 'better country' to which the world, because they sought a 'better country' to riches, because their wealth was in heaven; to friends, because their friend was above; to life, because they hoped for a better resurrection and life beyond the grave. Faith in these, keeping their eyes steadily fixed on 'the mark for the prize of high calling of God in Christ' enabled them to overcome. It is only in proportion to this principle existing in the heart, that the great God can be used to which God has called her that she can fulfill her mission, or carry out the work assigned her of saving the world. A church without consecration, without devotedness, a church without the love of God, and hence without power or influence for good. Wherever we see a man or church too cold, too faithless, or too selfish to devote their all to the interests of religion and the good of the world, we see a form without the power—a body without the life. But on the contrary, where we see true devotedness, we may not see splendid nor great apparent zeal; but we will see constant working for God, attended by corresponding influence and results. Let us ask, then, in all candor, 'Are we devoted?' M.

They publish also extracts from letters received, and make the following recommendation:—In view of the facts before us, and of the considerations involved, we recommend the voters of this City to ballot for the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act.

Their report was published in the dailies of Wednesday. The *Telegraph* made a characteristic reference to it thus:

We publish to-day, by desire, a statement of facts collected by the Methodist ministers, of the working of the Act. Many of our readers reside in localities where the law has been in operation, and they can judge for themselves how far the results were correctly informed. Both sides of that matter will be fully looked into; the other at another time.

That it should be freed from any cause it might possibly receive from the men whose cause it is advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions its readers against receiving too readily the statements of the ministers. Why is it that the *Telegraph* is so unwilling to accept the statements of ministers, or to believe that the information they collect is other than facts? Are they more likely to commit with unreliable parties than they are in advocating it is careful to say that the publication is "by desire." But not satisfied with that it cautions