have not done, and do not intend to do, any wrong: see Quinn v. Leathem, [1901] A. C. 495; Reed v. Friendly Society. [1902] 2 K. B. 9; Lyons v. Wilkins, [1899] 1 Ch. 255. Because of some disagreement between plaintiffs and their "finishers," the woodworkers left the plaintiffs' employment and began a sympathetic strike." They had a right to do so, so long as they broke no contract; and no complaint is made in that respect; what is complained of is the subsequent conduct of defendants. Their main purpose in striking was to compel plaintiffs to accede to the demand of the finishers. Their plan to force plaintiffs to submit was to prevent other workmen taking the places of the strikers, and to constrain such of plaintiffs' workmen as had not left, to leave their employment, and to prevent the sale of the goods made by them, so that plaintiffs would be put in the position that they must submit or close their factory. So long as the workmen resorted to lawful means only to accomplish a lawful object, they were within their right; but any unlawful object, or unlawful means to obtain a lawful object, should meet with prompt prevention and punishment. One of the first acts of the workmen who struck and of other members of the organized body to which they belonged, was to organize watchers to beset and watch every day all trains with a view to intercepting any one who might have the appearance of a workman employed or seeking employment by plaintiffs, and to beset and watch plaintiffs' factory and premises for the purpose of preventing new workmen from entering plaintiffs' employment and of constraining their workmen to leave such employment. The conduct of those who beset and watched the factory was often of an offensive and highly reprehensible character. In regard to boycotting, that mainly relied upon and proved was the intimidation of persons who bought and sold the product of plaintiffs' factory. The result has, in one case at least, been an intimidation of the dealer to such an extent that he is afraid to disclose the facts except secretly. The defendants must be held to really intend that which is the plain effect of their actions, the injury of the plaintiffs by intimidation. Quinn v. Leatham, [1901] A. C. at p. 38, and Shilton v. Ellersby, 6 E. & B. 74, referred to.

It is too late for the defendant union, the organized body, to contend that they are not incorporated, and therefore that the action should be dismissed as against them. They have, without objection, appeared, pleaded, and consented to the interloctuory order against them, by the name under which they are sued. The Rules of the Court