

intended, for immediate effect. It was not like the brilliant cross-examination of the witness Baignet by Mr. Hawkins (now Mr. Justice Hawkins), in which the observer could follow the point and object question by question; but it was one the full force and effect of which could only be appreciated when the facts, as they ultimately appeared in the defendant's case, were finally disclosed. When, indeed, the subsequent prosecution for perjury took place, it was then seen how thorough and searching that cross-examination had been; how in effect, if I may use a fox-hunting metaphor, all the earths had been effectually stopped. I am glad to find that my opinion of that cross-examination has recently been corroborated by so eminent an authority as the Master of the Rolls, Lord Esher. I must not be understood in what I have said to depreciate his great speech in the *Tichborne Case*. A more masterly exposition of complicated facts combined with a searching criticism of the Claimant's evidence has rarely, if ever, been delivered."

The judicial powers of Lord Coleridge are thus described by Lord Russell: "He is undoubtedly entitled to be described as a strong judge; and when the case was sufficiently important to prompt him to take pains, his judgments showed a broad, masterful grasp of the principles of the law he elucidated. I do not think he possessed the great synthetical and analytical powers of Sir Alexander Cockburn at his best, nor the vigorous common-sense of Sir William Erle, nor the wide, legal erudition of the late Mr. Justice Willes, nor the intimate knowledge of the various branches of commercial law of the late Lord Bramwell, nor the hard-headed logic of Lord Blackburn (I do not refer to eminent judges still on the bench); nevertheless he cannot be said to have lacked any quality essential in a great judge. Some of his judgments may well take rank with the best of his time, and many of them are marked by an elegance of diction and possess a literary merit not often met with in judicial records. His judgments in the litigation of the Duke of Norfolk in relation to the Fitzalan Chapel, in the case (commonly known as the *Mignonette Case*) of the seamen Dudley and Stephen (charged with murder in having, under stress of hunger, killed and eaten a boy, one of their crew), and in the remarkable commercial case known as the *Mogul Boycotting Case*, may be referred to as good examples. His direction to the jury on the trial for blasphemy of Ramsey