

being lawful the injury occasioned to the plaintiff company, no matter how great, was an injury against which no Court could afford redress.

The injunction was sustained by the appellate court, which held that the combination amounted to a conspiracy to wrongfully deprive the plaintiff company of its right to manage its business according to the dictates of its own judgment, and that the action of the members of the combination to prescribe the manner in which the company should do its manufacturing, and to attempt to enforce obedience to its orders by a species of intimidation no less harmful than actual violence, could not be allowed. The Court also referred to the further consideration that another result of the conspiracy would be to deprive the public at large of the benefits to be derived from a labour-saving machine of great utility.

There can scarcely be a doubt as to the soundness of this decision and it is somewhat of a surprise that there should have been a dissenting judge. This consisted largely of a vigorous indictment of trusts and all the villainies following thereon. This judge, who was apparently talking to the galleries, held that a boycott is a legal weapon if used in a peaceable, orderly manner, in which expression he was, perhaps, partly right and partly wrong, but in fact it was simply begging the question. Most certainly any view other than that expressed by the majority of the Court would result, as one of our exchanges says, in the institution and perpetuation of a system of tyranny, the evil consequences of which it would be difficult to over-estimate.

Another decision of recent date on the subject of boycotting is *Hartnett v. Plumbers' Supply Association*, decided by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. In this case an attempt was made to coerce an alleged debtor into paying a disputed bill by procuring suspension of his credit among persons in the same line of business with the creditor. The Court held that the facts constituted a conspiracy to coerce persons through a species of business duress which could not be permitted. This case is reported in 47 N.E. Rep. 1,002.