May 1886 and that the said Deed was void as against public policy: that the Appellants on the 12th September 1904 delivered a Rejoinder to the Respondents' said Reply: that the said Action was tried in the said Supreme Court before Holroyd J. in the months of May and October 1905 when evidence both oral and documentary was adduced on behalf of both parties: that Holroyd J. decided all the issues in the said Action in favour of the Appellants except the question whether the said Deed of the 20th May 1886 was against public policy which question he referred to the Full Court of the said Supreme Court: that on the 4th December 1905 the said Full Court decided that the said Deed was not contrary to public policy and accordingly on the 6th December 1905 Holroyd J. delivered the Judgment of the said Supreme Court dismissing the said Action with costs: that the Respondents appealed to the High Court of Australia against the said Judg-* ment of the said Supreme Court of the 6th December 1905: that on the 17th September 1906 the said High Court delivered Judgment on the said Appeal discharging the said Judgment of the said Supreme Court of the 6th December 1905 declaring the said Deed of the 20th May 1886 to be void as against persons beneficially interested in the estate of the deceased and that the Respondents as representing such persons other than the Administratrix were entitled to recover from the Appellants such sum not exceeding 5,000l. as represented the amount by which the shares of such persons in distribution were diminished by reason of the failure of the Administratrix duly to administer the said estate but so that no sum should be recoverable in respect of any diminution of the share of any such person by reason of any failure in which such person concurred and acquiesced giving certain directions as to costs and remitting the said Action to the said Supreme Court: that the Appellants feeling aggrieved by the said Judgment of the said High Court presented their Petition to Your Majesty in Council praying for special leave to appeal therefrom to Your Majesty in Council and such leave was granted to them by Your Majesty's Order in Council dated the 16th November 1906 on condition of their depositing the sum of 3001 in the Registry of the Privy Council as security for costs: that the Appellants have duly deposited the said sum of · 3001. sterling: as security for costs And humbly praying Your Majesty in Council to take their said Appeal into consideration and that the said Judgment of the High Court of Australia dated the 17th September 1906 may reversed altered or varied or for other relief in "The Lords of the Committee in obedience

"The Lords of the Committee in obedience to Your Majesty's said General Order in Council have taken the said humble Petition and Appeal into consideration and having heard Counsel on behalf of the parties on both sides Their Lordships do this day agree humbly to report to Your Majesty as their opinion that this Appeal ought to be allowed that the Judgment of the High Court of Australia dated the 17th day of September 1906 ought to be discharged with costs and the Judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Victoria dated the 6th day of December 1905 restored.

"And their Lordships do further report to Your Majesty that the Registrar of the Privy Council ought to be directed to repay to the Appellants the said sum of 3001. so deposited by them as aforesaid as security for costs.

"And in case Your Majesty should be pleased

to approve of this Report and to allow the said Appeal then their Lordships do direct that there be paid by the Respondents to the Appellants their costs of this Appeal incurred in the said High Court and the sum of four hundred and seventy pounds thirteen shillings and two pence sterling for their costs thereof incurred in England."

His Majesty having taken the said Report into consideration was pleased by and with the advice of His Privy Council to approve thereof and to order as it is hereby ordered that this Appeal be and the same is hereby allowed that the said Judgment of the High Court of Australia dated the 17th day of September 1906 be and the same is hereby discharged with costs and that the said Judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Victoria dated the 6th day of December 1905 be and the same is hereby restored.

And the Registrar of the Privy Council is hereby directed to repay to the Appellants the said sum of 300*l*. so deposited by them as aforesaid as security for costs.

And the Respondents are to pay to the Appellants their costs of this Appeal incurred in the said High Court and the sum of four hundred and seventy pounds thirteen shillings and two pence sterling for their costs thereof incurred in England.

England.
Whereof the Governor-General Lieutenant-Governor or Officer administering the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the time being and all other persons whom it may concern are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

A. W. FitzRoy.

Downing Street, December 28, 1908.

The KING has been pleased to approve of the re-appointment of George Goodwille, Esq., and Henry Albert Alcazar, Esq., K.C., to be Unofficial Members of the Legislative Council of the Colony of Trinidad and Tobago.

> Foreign Office, December 11, 1908.

The KING has been graciously pleased to appoint—

Esme William Howard, Esq., G.V.O., C.M.G., to be His Majesty's Consul-General for the Kingdom of Hungary, to reside at Budapest;

Norbert le Gallais, Esq., to be His. Majesty's Consul for the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, to reside at Luxemburg.

> Foreign Office, December 16, 1908.

The KING has been pleased to approve of— The Marchese Alessandro Faá di Bruno as Consul of Italy at London, with Consular jurisdiction over the counties of Bedford, Berks, Buckingham, Cambridge, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset,