

“ them, affect any right or privilege of the minority in
“ such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder
“ to the Governor-General in Council.”

10. Counsel for the Appellants and other Roman Catholics as aforesaid and for the Province of Manitoba appeared before the Supreme Court as did also the Solicitor-General for Canada who appeared to submit the Case on behalf of the Crown. The counsel of Manitoba not desiring to be heard, the Supreme Court pursuant to section 4 of the Canadian Act of 1891 before referred to, requested a counsel to argue the case as to the interest of Manitoba, and such last mentioned counsel thereupon appeared and argued the Case for Manitoba as did also counsel for the Appellants and other Roman Catholics as aforesaid, but the Solicitor-General did not desire to be heard.

11. Afterwards written Judgments were delivered by the five judges who heard the arguments. The result was to show a majority of three judges out of five for a negative answer to all of the questions.

The Chief Justice answered all the questions in the negative.

Mr. Justice Fournier answered the third question in the negative and all the others in the affirmative :

Mr. Justice Taschereau answered the third question in the affirmative and all the others in the negative :

Mr. Justice Gwynne answered the first, second, fourth and fifth questions in the negative, the third in the affirmative, and the sixth as follows :—“ The Acts of 1890 do not nor does either of them affect any right or privilege of a minority in relation to education within the meaning of sub-section 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act in such manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor-General in Council. The residue of the question is answered by the answer to question No. 4.”

And Mr. Justice King answered all the questions except the third and fourth in the affirmative, the third in the negative and to the fourth he replied :—“ Yes, to