

lies in the fact that after fixing upon the article to be sold its full price, at the highest valuation, it is sought to add thereto a charge of more than double the amount for the inconvenience it would be to us if we did not possess it! If we pay to avoid international irritation, the sum determined upon includes, of course, the value of the fish caught, for otherwise why should we trouble the British waters at all? If, on the other hand, we pay for the fish caught at their full valuation, that is the whole of it—the beginning and the end—the one includes the other.

INDIRECT ADVANTAGES NEVER COMPENSABLE.

We compared just now indirect advantages to indirect damages, but there is in reality no parallelism between the two. Indirect advantages are far less justly entitled to compensation than indirect damages; for if, on principle, indirect damages may not be allowed, yet, in fact, they are often as palpable and as demonstrable as direct damages; nor are they covered by the compensation made for direct damages, since they may often be wholly distinct both in their subject, and in the persons who suffer them.

But the indirect advantages, which may spring incidentally from a commercial transaction, are included in and closed by it. The seller receives his sure price for the article as it is. He cannot be a loser; nor is he entitled to be a sharer in the future gain; all such is the affair of the buyer only. The seedsman sells his seed as seed, at the price of seed. He does not count the number or the size of the possible cabbages which your cultivation may develop.

ADVANTAGES TO GREAT BRITAIN.

We have thus seen that the British case, which is their own statement of their claim, and must include all they can claim, only makes up, by actual show of figures, \$3,360,000, and this by conceding to them their own data, and by taking no account of the deductions to be made by reason of the advantages accruing to Canada under the treaty. And what