matter coming before the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Taschereau also held, for the same reason, that the appeal must be dismissed. Justices Sedgwick, King and Gwynne were of the same opinion, but Chief Justice Strong was in favor of the suppliant. In view of the facts he had brought to the notice of their Lordships, he asked for leave to appeal.

LORD WATSON, after consultation with the other members of the Committee, said their Lordships were of opinion that this was a case in which leave to appeal should be allowed. Leave was, therefore, given.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

OTTAWA, 20 May, 1896.

GUEVREMONT V. DUFRESNE.

Appeal from judgment of Court of Review to Supreme Court of Canada -54-55 Vict. (D.) c. 25, section 3, sub section 3—Amount in dispute.

Held :—An appeal does not lie to the Supreme Court of Canada from a judgment of the Court of Review, P.Q., where no appeal would lie from the Court of Review to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

In determining what is the amount in dispute the Court is bound by art. 2311, R.S.Q., which enacts that such amount shall be understood to be that demanded, and not that recovered, and therefore interest accrued during the pendency of the suit cannot be added to the original demand in order to make the case appealable.

TASCHEREAU, J., in rendering judgment, said :--This case comes up on a motion to quash. It brings up a question upon which this Court has not yet passed, though it was noticed by some of the judges in *Couture* v. *Bouchard* (21 Can. S.C.R. 281). The point to be determined is whether, under sub-section 3 of section 3, 54-55 Vict., c. 25, an appeal lies to this Court from the Court of Review in cases were no appeal lies from the Court of Review to the Privy Council. We find no difficulty in holding that it is impossible to construe that sub-section otherwise than it has been done in the case referred to of *Couture* v. *Bouchard*, by Gwynne and Patterson, JJ. If the party aggrieved by the

182