

## THE TORONTO WORLD.

One-Cent Morning Newspaper.  
OFFICE: BICKING ST. EAST, TORONTO.

DESCRIPTION: EATABLE,  
One-Year ..... \$1.00 Four Months ..... \$1.00  
Six Months ..... 1.50 One Month ..... 25  
Niches for city buildings, postages, and  
expressions payable in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES:  
FOR EACH LINE, OF NONPARADE;  
Ordinary commercial advertisements, 6 cents;  
Mentioned advertisements, 10 cents;  
Financial statements as reading,  
matter, ..... 12 cents;  
Announcements, 10 cents;  
Condensed advertisements, a cent a word;  
Dated notices, 1 cent a word;  
Special rates for contract advertisements/  
or reading notices, and for preferred positions;  
All our Communications to THE  
WORLD, Toronto. W. F. MACLEAN.

TUESDAY MORNING, OCT. 7, 1884.

ITEMS FOR SALE:  
The double cylinder Hoe machine, on  
which The World is now printed.  
Will print a sheet 31 x 54 inches or any  
thing smaller. In first-class condition.  
Also two sets of folding chairs, which will  
be sold with the machine or separately.  
The whole at a bargain.

Sir John Macdonald's Trip.

It is naturally a good deal of speculation as to the cause of Sir John's sudden departure for England, and the general remark is: "What is he after?" We venture to make a few suggestions.

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

A third matter occupying Sir John's attention is the proposed annexation of Jamaica. To have this island annexed to Canada would please the British government, as Lord Derby virtually admitted in his recent public remarks on the subject; but would it be profitable for Canada to assume such a responsibility? Whether it would or not, the conservatives will all say so, if Sir John asks them to do it, and he would not be without reasons for making the request, inasmuch as there is a widespread feeling that such an addition to the territories of the dominion would give us just that variety of climate and products in which alone the United States now excels us.

Then there is some talk of closer commercial relations with Cuba, and of a visit to Madrid by Sir Charles Tupper in that connection. A personal interview between Sir John and Sir Charles touching this project would not be unprofitable.

Perhaps, too, the imperial government desires to consult with the premier upon the advisability of an amicable understanding between the federal and provincial governments, whose continuous wrangling and frequent appeals to the law lords must be a source of some surprise to the colonial secretary.

And on top of all these, a baronetcy for Sir John himself! The acceptance of this, if it be offered, will detract from rather than add to the value of any service that the premier may do for Canada during his visit. It is high time for Canadian statesmen to seek their reward in the esteem and confidence of their fellow Canadians, and not in Downing street.

The TRY in Wolsey's Ointment.

Gen. Gordon is open to the suspicion of having timed his movements so as to wet the powder in Mr. Wolsey's firework, although the outcome may only be what is called, for want of a better name, a singular coincidence. Up to the time that the captain of the relief expedition was half seas over or more, after having taken his departure from England with much pomp and circumstance, the defender of Khartoum had given no assurance that he was at all able to take care of himself. At that critical juncture he burst upon the gaze of a waiting world, triumphant over difficulties which had himself, previously represented almost insuperable. The effect has been to make Wolsey look tame, if not ridiculous, and it is only crediting him with the possession of the average knowledge of human vanity to say that he would probably rather have marched to Khartoum over dead bodies than to have been relieved of his responsibilities in this inconsequential manner. He has been deprived of the opportunity of shining as a military Stanley, with Gordon for his Livingstone. Gordon is a man who disappoints all calculations,

and grows great by defying all the odds of prudence, and all the laws of warfare. His exploits in the Soudan have eclipsed anything ever achieved by his would-be rescuer. He is the first fly that has ever settled in Wolsey's ointment.

The License Laws.

Summarize that the decision of the supreme court will be to the effect that the manufacture and importation of liquors is a work the wholesale trade—its master of trade and commerce, and, as such, constitutionally under the control of the central government; but that the retail trade, being subject to police regulation, is within the cognizance of the provincial authorities.

This certainly impresses the lay mind as a fair and reasonable interpretation of the British. Now, however, set, and the only fault to be found with the federal government in "signing with the devil" is that the Mr. Party act was called into existence to clash with the Crooks act, increase the number of barrooms, and confuse the confusion in which the liquor question has been kept by the politicians of both parties for years past.

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866. From 1866 to 1871 they pushed on our three miles limit and often suffered the poacher's fate—forceful expulsion. From 1871 to 1884 they have been again allowed to fish freely in Canadian waters. Believing that under the Halifax award they paid too much for this privilege, they will not quietly withdraw, and if our government were to be in a position to expel them, imperial concurrence will be necessary. Under existing circumstances—that is with the Gladstone government in power, and troublous foreign complications on Mr. Gladstone's hands, in China, Egypt, Australasia, and South Africa—what prospect is there of getting imperial assent to keep our waters free from poaching fishermen?

During the past few months the Chinese question has assumed most formidable proportions as a question of home politics. British Columbia is warming with these Celestials, and they are streaming over from Canada into the United States. Sooner or later an international complication will arise out of this migration if it is not stopped. On the other hand, "England's best" allowed in China only under treaty stipulations, and as Canadians are only Englishmen in Chinese eyes, any anti-Chinese law we may pass must have imperial sanction. Are we likely to get it, with matters as they are at present in China? And if not, must we submit to have our country made a dumping ground for these people, in order that English traders may be allowed to supply the Chinese at home with opium?

It is quite probable that no matter what the "decision" of our "so-called" supreme court may be, it will be challenged by either one litigant or the other before the privy council unless the amending of the Canadian boundary case received a different effect. It is an open secret that Lord Shelburne who, as the lord chancellor, the ruling and master spirit of the law lords, comported himself towards Mr. Mowat and Mr. Christopher Robinson and Mr. McCarthy in a way that almost as plainly as words could have said it: "What brings you here with your parochial politics? Cannot you settle your differences?"

The Washington treaty expires a few months hence, and its termination response the whole fisheries question. Americans were entitled to the same privilege as Canadians on our coasts under the reciprocity treaty