

Commission, we may presume, would not have been called into existence. Two hundred and eighty dollars per vessel is then more than twice as much as Great Britain herself asked for this privilege before she came to bring in her bill before this Commission. Two hundred and eighty dollars apiece for 1,000 vessels is \$280,000 a year, which for twelve years is \$3,360,000.

This, then, so far as any positive showing of figures goes, is the extreme statement of Great Britain's case. With the exception of fixing the proportion to which she would consider herself entitled of the net profits of the business—a point which she leaves indefinite—it is her own statement. In the case of Newfoundland, further on, (page 108,) she claims one-tenth only of the net profits. The other data—the number of vessels, the amount of their profits, are her own.

But we have seen that the total of her claim for the Dominion of Canada alone, and that, too, over and above the value of the concessions made under the treaty by the United States to Canada, is \$12,000,000. How is this very great difference of many millions accounted for? On what does this enormous balance of the claim rest? The following sentences, quoted from the summary of the "Case," exhibit in her own words her method of swelling \$3,360,000 to \$12,000,000:

INDIRECT ADVANTAGES TO AMERICA.

"These privileges profitably employ men and materials representing in industrial capital several millions of dollars; the industries, to the advancement of which they conduce, support domestic trade and foreign commerce of great extent and increasing value."

We were told a few years ago, upon occasion of another international Commission called to assess damages, how monstrous a thing it was to include in a claim for damages any demand whatsoever for *indirect damages*. But when it is a question of paying for advantages, other laws, it seems,