

as the judges would have jurisdiction to enact as rules of Court under section 10 are brought into force, and the judges would not have power to make such a rule as the one sought to be invoked, which would be something more than a rule of practice or procedure. *The Queen v. Powlett*, L.R. 8 Q.B. 491, is very much in point." On appeal to the Court of Appeal the above judgment was upheld.

*O'Connor and Blackwood*, for petitioners. *A. J. Andrews*, for respondent.

---

## Province of British Columbia.

---

### SUPREME COURT.

---

Hunter, C.J.] REX v. FOUR CHINAMEN. [Nov. 23, 1907.

*Criminal law—“Disorderly house” defined—What constitutes  
—Inmates—Criminal Code, section 228.*

The term “disorderly house” includes any house to which persons resort for criminal or immoral purposes, and it is immaterial that the house is conducted quietly so as not to disturb the neighbours. *Queen v. France*, 1 Can. C.C. 231; *Ex parte Cook*, 3 Can. C.C. 72, and *Rice v. Rice*, 1 Can. C.C. 2, considered.

*Killam*, for the Crown. *Farris*, for the accused.

---

Hunter, C.J.] WILLIAMS v. HAMILTON. [Nov. 24, 1907.

*Vendor and purchaser—Contract for sale of land—Offer—acceptance—Correspondence.*

Defendant, being in Montreal, and owning property in Vancouver, instructed his agents to obtain a purchaser at \$1,400, offers to be first submitted to him. They received an offer and gave a receipt for a deposit of \$25, price \$1,400, \$900 or \$950 cash, balance C.P.R. subject to owner's confirmation, and telegraphed defendant, “Deposit on lot Kitsilano, \$1,400. Wire approval and instructions.” Defendant wired in reply, “\$1,400 O.K. letter instructions,” at the same time writing that his