

THE DIFFERENT WAYS OF LIVING.

It Should Not be All of Life to Attain Wealth.

The Subject Treated by Rev. W. S. Hoskinson in His Sermon Yesterday.

At the Sixteenth-street Church yesterday the pastor, Rev. W. S. Hoskinson, told his hearers how to live.

Preaching from John, x. 10, "I am come that ye might have life," he said:

Go up and down the streets, along Front street, through the shops of our town, or into the homes of our busy women, and draw your inference from what you see. What would it be making a living—that is what we are here for, that is what we live for. Making a living, getting through the world, seems to be the aim of our people. It is the life of their existence. This accomplished, they rest easy and think that everything has been done that should be done. They eat and drink, sleep and rest, and in indulgence, come and go, live and die—this is all.

Now, I like to see people busy; don't see any place on the pedestal for idlers. We are not born to be idle. We must provide for our own, and push enterprise and commerce, and invention and arts and trades in every legitimate way.

But when we are wholly absorbed and satisfied with these things, then we are mere slaves and drudges, and we have no more to do than to drink, sleep and rest, and in indulgence, come and go, live and die—this is all.

Such a low view of life could be fulfilled without exercising our nobler powers. It is an error, it is a grave mistake, to confine the great purpose of life to the things that so easily and quickly perish, no matter how necessary they may be. And it is a great pity that the mistake is so common. There are groveling victims to this mistake all along the way, among the intelligent and the ignorant, among the rich and the low alike. Any one who has arisen to a higher plane of living is surprised at the sad, sad waste of the noble energies of life.

We see the low and mean impulses of a vicious child and can explain them and pity the little one that has only just begun to know the difference between right and wrong. We see the man and woman all about us who have no right idea of the true impulses of life. These simply exist for some few years, and then they are gone, and the ranks of the great moving caravan and pass into eternity with the unlighted shroud of failure to go with them. Like cattle and birds and dogs and cats, they live their day and are no more. Not much wonder they think this way. Their whole life has been a waste of time.

Why, "the little child that only lived to weep and smile for a few days and then set its little feet down in the cold stream and was gone," and the man and messenger from heaven" did far more than this. That man was faithful to life, to God, to his higher purposes, who said: "If this life only we had hoped, we are of all men most miserable."

Yes, it is only a poor, fretted, fickle thing, he or she, that is called life by the common toll to which we are tied, and uses it only as a thing for getting money and spending, or drudgery, or to get rich or poor, the mistake is one and the same. It is only a low and gloomy picture of life.

Turn from this to that other vein of life which Christ brought. He said: "I am come that ye might have life." His work was not to hinder us, but to help us. He brought life, and life was light. Just as He brought immortality to light so has He brought life to light. If we have never yet learned what life is for, it would be blessing to know nothing about immortality. But each one knows that he is immortal, for a spark of God is within him. He cannot die, and God takes of God can die. This would not have much comfort to that one who is missing the great purpose of life.

Now, Jesus showed us a grander thing than life. We can think of no picture that has more beauty. "No master's song, though the rapt strains lift to the third heaven, which can compare with the music of life with noble impulses, noble spirit, noble deeds, noble outlook—it is a picture the angels might admire and covet."

And this is the more abundant life Christ brought for us. It is not a mere picture, nor a dream only—it is to be real. It is life for the living who are living only for the earthly, to say it is their lot, and cannot be changed. This would make Christ's coming of no use, for he came that we might have life, a life far above these low tasks, a life intended to sweeten and sanctify all our common duties. And even the poorest could have the highest, pressed mortal, with limited means and few opportunities, has been brightened by piety and nobleness that shine amidst misery like stars between the rifts of clouds.

These lowly mortals have lived sublimely, and they show us that if men and women will, they can have more getting of wealth or sensual indulgence, it is because they want to do so, because they choose to be of the earth earthy and will not rise to better things.

This life only is befitting. To the rich or the poor it is a down-grade road. To the great or the lowly it is little, less, nothing. While the more abundant life which Christ offers is much, more, infinity.

The Christ life is a beautiful pattern, a bright example. Everywhere it touches is brightness, and then heaven's at the eventide of such a life are all aglow with its reflected splendor. Then a safe path has been made for the children in coming days to walk in. Steps have been taken which all the

CHILDREN MAY SAFELY FOLLOW. CHRIST WOULD URGED UPON PARENTS TO ACCEPT AND WALK IN THE NEWNESS OF LIFE IN HIM—FOR THEIR SAKES AND FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKES.

Children follow the parents, repeat the lives of the parents. Only this, those parents that do not live the Christ life, like their children repeating their lives on a lower plane. Children copy and repeat as artists and sculptors copy the great masters, but may overdo it, like their children. Only when we study Christ's life and live it will ours be a worthy example.

Then will our habits be good and fit to be repeated. Habit is a mighty power in human life. None knew this so well as Christ. If the habits be good, a large stream of blessings flows from it; if evil, who can tell the harm it will do.

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

We can think of no sadder, more wicked evil of our times than this. Ah! pity the children, the sons and daughters, that are born into this world, by precept and example, have not taught them to go to God's house. Who shall straighten out this account in the judgment day?

See about you many fathers and mothers who may be faithful teachers in their homes, but by their more power in the habit of staying away from God's house. Some of these may be in the Sunday-school, but the Sunday-school is not to be a substitute for the place of the church. Soon these will drop from the Sunday-school and then their only church will be the wide, wide world.

THE VAGRANT ACT AND INDIANS.

What the Superior and Police Courts Hold.

Superior Judges Give Reasons for Interpretation of the Law as They Hear It.

It is very unfortunate when any contention as to the true meaning of the law arises between courts. But one has arisen between the Superior and the Police Court in this city, and it is one that, unless it is adjusted, will result in friction that will be costly for the city and county, and may tend to defeat the ends of justice.

The Police Court tries charges of vagrancy. The vagrancy law excepts from its operation California Indians. This exception is in a parenthesis in the body of the section. The Superior Court, by which appeals are taken from the Police Court, holds that the fact that one charged with vagrancy is a California Indian must be proved affirmatively. That it is a jurisdictional fact, so to speak, and that if it is not proved by the prosecution the case of vagrancy is not made out.

On the other hand, the Police Court holds that it is not necessary, probably because the magistrate has to see whether the defendant is or is not a California Indian. Or, possibly, because it holds that it is for the defendant to set up and prove that he is a California Indian.

Judge Davis of the Police Court is reported to have said in a recent case: "If Judge Hinkson's decision is affirmed it would result in the discharge of all vagrants, and render the Police Court absolutely powerless. It is absolutely impossible to prove that the vagrants are not California Indians. The law does not require impossibilities."

At the same time in that court an attempt was made to make the affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

The Superior Court feels that it is not understood in this matter. It holds that it is easy to prove the fact that an Indian is an Indian, and that the defendant is not an Indian. The fact that the defendant is not an Indian is not an affirmative proof, but the police officers would not swear positively that the defendant, a white man, was not an Indian, although from appearances they believed he was not.

where a statute provided that if a person unlicensed should retail spirituous liquors, except in corporate towns and cities, he should be guilty of a misdemeanor. (Elkins vs. The State, 13 Georgia, 435.)

The insufficiency of this form of pleading was recognized in the following cases: Jones vs. Aven, 1 Lord Raymond, 119; Commonwealth vs. Maxwell, 2 Pickney, 138; Commonwealth vs. Hart, 11 Cush, 130.

This is necessary in order that the description of the crime may in all respects correspond with the statute. (Robertson vs. The City of Lambertville, 38 N. J. Law, 73.) The question was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.

The rule is well settled in all these cases (and also by Justice Mansfield, in Myers vs. Carr, 12 Michigan, 63) that "in declaring on a statute where there is an exception in the enacting clause, but where there is no exception in the proviso to the enacting clause, it is matter of defense and must be shown by the defendant." In the California law the vagrancy Act (Section 447, as amended in 1891) was expressly ruled in Tornley vs. The State, 3 Haw, 311.