

the company with the \$250,000 as an unauthorized and illegal payment, out of the company's moneys, no such case is made on the pleadings, and the inquiry is irrelevant.

For the last of these reasons, appellant should not be required to make further answer as to the shares subscribed for by him or the discount or allowance said to have been made to him in respect thereof.

The reasons given apply to the affidavit on production as well as to the further examination.

Appeal allowed: orders set aside, and original application dismissed. Costs here and below to appellant in any event.

MEREDITH, J.

APRIL 2ND, 1903.

TRIAL.

KRUG FURNITURE CO. v. BERLIN UNION No. 112
AMALGAMATED WOODWORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA.

Trade Union—Unlawful Acts of Members—Watching and Besetting—“Boycotting”—Organized Body or Union—Parties—Question as to Incorporation—Pleading—Waiver—Acts of Foreign Member of Union—Agency—Injunction—Damages.

Action by a company carrying on business at Berlin against an association or federation of woodworkers and certain individuals, being officers, members, or agents of the Union, to recover \$2,000 damages for wrongfully and maliciously procuring plaintiffs' workmen to break their contracts and cease working for plaintiffs, and \$5,000 damages for conspiring against plaintiffs, and for an injunction restraining defendants from watching or besetting the railway station at Berlin or the works of plaintiffs, or the approaches thereto, or the places of abode of the workmen employed by plaintiffs, for the purpose of persuading or otherwise preventing persons who have or may enter into contracts with plaintiffs to commit a breach of such contracts, or persuading or preventing such persons from entering into plaintiffs' employment.

E. E. A. DuVernet and J. A. Scellen, Berlin, for plaintiffs.
J. P. Maybee, K.C., for defendants.

MEREDITH, J.— . . . “Boycotting” is, in some of its forms, very obnoxious to the law. That defendants were guilty of that crime and the wrongs complained of is, upon the evidence, very plain. Indeed it is, to a certain extent, admitted by them in their consent to the interlocutory injunction made against them in the action; for injunctions are not consented to by, and do not go against, persons who