

# 625 FAMILIES WITH 1,810 CHILDREN RECEIVE AID THRU MOTHERS' PENSIONS

## Total of \$160,375.64 Distributed in 1918 in 29 Counties; Payment in Agricultural Districts at Minimum.

Special to The Daily Tribune.  
Helena, March 21.—During 1918, 625 Montana families with 1,810 children received a total of \$160,375.64 in 29 of the 43 counties under the provisions of the mothers' pension act, according to figures compiled by J. E. Neville, secretary of the bureau of child and animal protection.

Silver Bow county leads all other counties in the number of widows helped and the amount of money disbursed, having 378 widows with 980 children on the pay roll, receiving a total of \$102,060. Lewis and Clark county stands second with 78 widows with 183 children, receiving \$18,637. Cascade county, with 36 widows with 132 children, receiving \$9,960, ranks third and Missoula county, with 35 widows with 71 children, receiving \$9,704.17 stands fourth. Carbon county has 24 widows with 89 children receiving \$6,154.36; Deer Lodge

county 10 widows with 25 children, receiving \$1,165; Ravalli county 11 widows with 44 children receiving \$4,453 and Yellowstone county 13 widows with 46 children receiving \$2,967.75.

The reports show that the principal payments to widows under the mothers' pension law are made in the industrial counties and counties where there is mining activity, while the payments in agricultural counties are at a minimum.

The following table shows the number of children receiving benefits, the number of widows and the amount paid out by the various counties:

County	Widows	Orphans	Amount Paid
Beaverhead	2	4	\$800.00
Big Horn	2	1	720.00
Broadwater	1	4	210.00
Carbon	24	89	6,154.36
Cascade	26	132	9,960.00
Chouteau	10	28	1,815.55
Custer	10	3	300.00
Dawson	3	8	1,165.00
Deer Lodge	10	25	1,165.00
Fallon	1	4	420.00
Flathead	7	23	1,400.00
Gallatin	4	14	1,095.00
Granite	1	1	315.00
Hill	1	29	2,190.00
Jefferson	6	183	18,637.30
Lewis and Clark	78	183	18,637.30
Fergus	2	6	600.00
Madison	3	8	650.00
Meagher	3	7	525.00
Mineral	3	8	650.00
Missoula	35	71	9,704.17
Musselshell	9	22	1,490.00
Park	5	13	945.00
Phillips	1	3	255.40
Powell	3	13	1,040.00
Ravalli	11	44	4,453.00
Richland	6	15	1,092.50
Rosebud	6	26	1,260.00
Sanders	4	15	1,092.50
Sheridan	1	3	255.40
Stillwater	1	3	255.40
Silver Bow	378	980	102,060.00
Sweet Grass	1	4	420.00
Teton	1	4	420.00
Toole	1	4	420.00
Valley	1	5	540.00
Wheatland	2	8	500.00
Wibaux	1	4	420.00
Yellowstone	13	46	2,967.75

# DAILY COUNTY ON THE WAY, ASSERTS SPOGEN OF BELT

## Movement Started on Heels of Governor's Approval of New Counties' Bill.

Helena, March 21.—Upon the heels of the approval today by Governor Stewart of senate bill No. 6, providing for the creation of new counties by residents of the affected area, the proposed county of Daly has made its appearance. Its foster father is Dominick Spogen, mayor of Belt.

Spogen called up Helena from Belt tonight, and upon being informed that the county creation bill had been passed, announced that the machinery is set for starting the new county on its way to a place in the state business.

The Daly county bill was killed early in the session.

# Woman Is Probably Fatally Injured in Automobile Crash

Billings, March 21.—Mrs. J. P. Noll of this city, was probably fatally injured when the automobile in which she was a passenger was forced off the highway by another car, and collided with a telephone pole. The other occupants of the car were uninjured.

# FEDERAL MEDIATOR ARRIVES TO ADJUST DISPUTE AT BUTTE

## Tuolumne Mine Closed Pending Settlement of Trouble Over Overtime.

Butte, March 21.—H. Davies, federal mediator of the department of labor, arrived here tonight to officiate in a dispute between electricians and the Butte Main Range Mining company involving overtime scales for electricians at the Tuolumne mine. Davies is a resident of Hollywood, Cal., and holds the position of labor administrator of Arizona. The mine is closed pending settlement.

# WOULD LOCATE BOY

Chief of Police Marcus Anderson has been asked to assist in locating 15-year-old Herbert H. Quick, who left Charleston, W. Va., January 15 for Great Falls. His mother informs the chief that it was his intention to secure work on a ranch near here, but that he has not written home since his departure. The boys' neglect has caused his parents much worry and if he can be located advice of his whereabouts will be immediately forwarded.

# Corvallis, Champion of Bitter Root Valley, Loses Its First Game

Hamilton, March 21.—The Corvallis basketball team, champion of the bitter root valley, lost its first game tonight to the Hamilton team, by a score of 32 to 26.

# Missoula High School Defeats Stevensville

Missoula, March 21.—The Missoula high school basketball team defeated Stevensville here tonight by a score of 24 to 20.

# BUTTE HIGH WINS

Butte, March 21.—Butte high school basketball team tonight defeated the Park county high school team of Livingston by a score of 35 to 8.

# ZBYSZKO THROWS LEWIS

New York, March 21.—Wladek Zbyszko won the world's heavyweight wrestling championship by defeating Ed (Strangler) Lewis of Lexington, Ky., in 1 hour 34 minutes and 32 seconds at Madison Square Garden tonight. He threw Lewis with a body hold after squirming out of a headlock which Lewis had held for nearly a minute and a half.

# Who Will Get Germany's Forfeited Trade in South America?

It would seem from information in The Literary Digest this week that the toss-up is more or less even between Britain and the United States, with urgent invitations coming to the latter from South America herself. What is the answer?

See "Captured by Cannibals" at the Alcazar today.

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

While his message of veto of house bill 430 is very similar to that of senate bill 91, the following paragraphs therein are worthy of consideration:

"It has been urged that the laboring people of the state require a beverage such as is defined in these bills. However, on the other hand, it has been urged that the beverage is as 'harmless as water.' Both of these contentions cannot be true. If the beverage is as innocuous as some claim, it will not afford the relief which its proponents claim it will bring to the people of this state. In my opinion, the beverage is not a particularly harmful one, but I am also convinced that if the breweries and other manufacturing plants of this state confine their products within the limits prescribed by the law the manufacture of such a beverage will neither be profitable nor slake the thirst of those who desire something stronger than a drink 'as harmless as water.'

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

While his message of veto of house bill 430 is very similar to that of senate bill 91, the following paragraphs therein are worthy of consideration:

"It has been urged that the laboring people of the state require a beverage such as is defined in these bills. However, on the other hand, it has been urged that the beverage is as 'harmless as water.' Both of these contentions cannot be true. If the beverage is as innocuous as some claim, it will not afford the relief which its proponents claim it will bring to the people of this state. In my opinion, the beverage is not a particularly harmful one, but I am also convinced that if the breweries and other manufacturing plants of this state confine their products within the limits prescribed by the law the manufacture of such a beverage will neither be profitable nor slake the thirst of those who desire something stronger than a drink 'as harmless as water.'

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be done by the legislature or by any other representative body of people not selected for the specific purpose. I am convinced that the people of this state do not want 'booze' in any form. It may be said that the various liquors containing not over one-half of one per cent of alcohol could not fairly be termed 'booze'. They may not be 'big booze', but the best one can say for them is that they would be the little brothers to the big booze, and we all know from experience that little boys grow into big men. Some manufacturers, by careful concealment and other artifices, might cause the alcoholic content standardized by the statute at not more than one-half of one per cent to surreptitiously grow to a larger quantity, herein other percentages might be sold, given away, and perhaps drunk without knowledge of the fact that they contained unlawful proportions in the matter of the alcoholic content.

"The people of the state have adopted prohibition. Any subterfuge or shield behind which those who are opposed to the enforcement of the law may hide will only serve to retard and confuse a realization of the consummation sought by the people at the polls. Sooner or later we must give the law adopted by the people a trial. We might just as well do it now as at any other time. I regret exceedingly that some citizens of the state will have inflicted upon them serious monetary loss by reason of the failure of this measure to become a law. However, it is not possible to accomplish any serious and substantial reforms without either a real or apparent injury to someone. In this case, however, I am convinced that the long waiting period contained in the Montana law gave everyone an opportunity to get on of the business with the least possible financial loss. There can be no excuse now for a modification of the prohibition

"Provided, that it shall be lawful to manufacture, sell and dispose of beer containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume, or fermented or malt liquors or imitations thereof containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume; and provided further that nothing contained in this act nor in any other law of this state shall be construed as to prohibit the same."

"If the language just quoted does not constitute a repeal of the prohibition law of the state of Montana, then I do not understand the English language. Mr. Justice Holloway, speaking for the supreme court of the state of Montana in the Centennial Brewing company case, makes it clear that the law adopted by the people in 1916 prohibits the use in the manner indicated in the law of the liquors enumerated therein, among

which are malt liquors, one of which is beer. All these liquors are declared to be intoxicating within the meaning of the law and, to quote the language of the court:

"and that too without reference to the amount of alcohol contained in them."

"Senate Bill No. 91 would make it legal in the state of Montana to manufacture and sell beer, fermented and other liquors or imitations thereof, containing not more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol, measured by volume. If this bill should become a law we would find ourselves in a position where we would have to do just what the supreme court said we would not have to do under the law adopted by the people. We would find ourselves supervising the liquor traffic rather than prohibiting it. The question would then be not a matter of the prevention of the manufacture and disposal of liquors, but rather a matter of seeing to it that the various liquors manufactured and disposed of should conform to the standard established by the law, to wit: that they should not contain more than one-half of one per cent of alcohol measured by volume.

"I am not willing to become a party to the repeal of the prohibitory laws under such circumstances. The people adopted prohibition, and if it is to be repealed they are the ones to do it. It should not be