^{agree} that they will by molestation, annoyance, threats, intimidation, or any other influence the minds, wishes, other manner of coercion,—not by persuasion,—influence the minds, wishes, and win and wills of others as to the modes in which they should or should not bestow their in a criminal offence." their labour, the persons who so act are guilty of a criminal offence."

In 1868 came the Fenian trials. Here the Attorney-General (Sir J. B. Karslake), the Solicitor-General (Sir Balliol Brett, now Lord Esher, Master of the Rolls) Rolls), and Mr. Giffard appeared for the Crown; but only a single conviction Was obtained. Mr. Giffard appeared for the Crown and Clarke now a Knight and Was obtained. Montague Williams and Edward Clarke, now a Knight and Solicitor of the defense Solicitor-General, had been retained for the defence.

 M_{r} , Giffard was a member of the Welsh Circuit, and at the Glamorganshire Assizes held at Cardiff in July, 1869, he was pitted against Mr. Grove, Q.C., in the stran the strange case of "Esther Lyons." This was an action raised by Barnett Lyone – Welsh dissenting minister $L_{yons, a}^{strange}$ case of "Esther Lyons." This was an action raised by and h_{is} and h_{is} money-lender in Cardiff, against a Welsh dissenting minister the daughter Esther with the view of con-^{and} his wife, for having enticed away his daughter Esther with the view of con-verting 1 ^{verting} wife, for having enticed away his daughter Estner with the the having her to Christianity. Mr. Grove was an eminent man of science; his have is n_{ame} is associated with a galvanic battery of some notoriety; he is the author of a work. $of_{a Work}^{e is associated}$ with a galvanic battery of some notoriety, inclusion $b_{eing the 1}^{e is associated}$ with a galvanic battery of some notoriety, inclusion $b_{eing the 1}^{e ing the 1}$ the correlation of physical forces; he enjoyed the reputation of the was for many years a Justice of the being the best patent lawyer of his day; he was tor many years a Justice of the High Comments and the set patent lawyer of his day and the set patent lawyer of his day is a nisi brius advocate he was High Court, and is now a Privy Councillor. But as a nisi prius advocate he was helpless : $h_{e|p|_{ess}}^{su}$ Court, and is now a Privy Councillor. But as a *nusi prius* auvocate and $h_{e|p|_{ess}}^{su}$ in the hands of Hardinge Giffard; and the money-lender got a verdict f_{so} the hands of Hardinge Giffard and the presiding judge, Mr. Baron $f_{ot}^{\text{pless in}}$ the hands of Hardinge Giffard; and the money-relies ξ_{0} . Channell

In the same year Giffard, together with Karslake, Coleridge, Hawkins (now ⁴ Judge of the High Court), and other celebrities, successfully defended the Directory of the High Court). On the first Tichborne Directors in the famous Overend Gurney prosecution. On the first Tichborne tial he appeared, with Sergeant Ballantine, for the plaintiff, who was afterwards Represented by Dr. Kenealey.

In 1871 Boulton and Park were tried for frequenting theatres and other places Public of public resort in women's clothes. Hardinge Giffard prosecuted with the law ^{Public} resort in women's clothes. Hardinge Giffard prosecuted with Belt, v I the day and Sir Henry James, but failed to secure a conviction. In Belt. v. Lawes Sir Hardinge Giffard was matched against Charles Russell, now the unchallenged leader of the common-law bar. Not without dust and heat do Such rivals engage, ----

But Ilardinge Giffard remained master of the field. The plaintiff, for whom appear he appeared, got £5,000 damages; and the Court of Appeal declined to disturb verdict Belt v. Lawes was an action of libel. the verdict, at least to his disadvantage. Belt v. Lawes was an action of libel. the defend $h_e^{verdict}$, at least to his disadvantage. Belt v. Lawes was an action of the defendant had alleged that certain busts and pieces of sculpture attributed $h_e^{verdict}$. Relation of the defendant had alleged that certain busts and pieces of sculpture attributed big own, had in fact been executed by perto Mr. Belt, and claimed by him as his own, had in fact been executed by per-be his in his sons in his employ. The case was tried before Mr. Baron Huddleston at West-st tries there is the present Attorney-General h_{inster}^{vis} in his employ. The case was tried before Mr. Baron Huddleston at h_{inster}^{vis} ; the trial lasted for forty-three days, and the present Attorney-General $h_{ared in th}$ trial lasted for forty-three days, in The Green Bag. ^{shared} in the defeat of Sir Charles Russell.—A.W.R., in The Green Bag.

243