

commentaries were written sixty years ago, and in the interval much new material has accumulated and had to be dealt with. The plan of the work is very elaborate. The author takes up each clause of the Constitution in its order; explains its origin; narrates the proceedings in the Federal convention leading to its adoption; compares it with the provisions upon the same subject in the constitutions of the different States and foreign countries; gives the historical precedents upon its construction; and finally collects all the judicial decisions on the point. The present volume terminates with the subject of impeachments. Although the work is especially interesting to the people of the United States, the subject is so ably and elaborately treated that Canadian lawyers and politicians can hardly afford to dispense with it.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

Quebec.]

OTTAWA, 21 May, 1896.

DUFRESNE V. GUEVREMONT.

Appeal from Court of Review—Appeal to Privy Council—Appealable amount—Addition of interest—C. C. P. arts. 1115, 1178, 1178a R. S. Q. art. 2311—54-55 Vic. (D) ch. 25, s. 3, sub-sec. 3—54 Vic. (Q.) ch. 48.

Under 54-55 Vic. (D.) ch. 25, sec. 3, sub-sec. 3, there is no appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from a decision of the Court of Review which would not be appealable to the Privy Council.

In determining the right of either party to an appeal to the Privy Council, in cases decided in the Court of Review where the judgment of the Superior Court has been affirmed and no appeal lies to the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada, the provisions of art. 2311 R. S. Q. (making the amount in dispute depend on the amount demanded and not on that recovered, where they are different), will not permit the addition of interest *pendente lite* to the original demand in order to raise the amount in controversy to the appealable amount.

Stanton v. The Home Insurance Co. (2 Legal News, 314) followed.