

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*Ninety-Ninth Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1959

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**SENATE**

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Alfred H. Ives of Gardiner.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Waldo, Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Out of Order and under suspension of the rules, Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot presented the following Order:

ORDERED that the son of Senator Thurston of Oxford, John A. Thurston, be permitted to act as assistant page of the Senate during the remainder of today's session.

Which was read and passed.

The Sergeant-at-Arms escorted John A. Thurston to his position. (Applause, members rising.)

**House Committee Reports****Ought to Pass**

The Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act Relating to Formation and Operation of Mutual Trust Investment Companies Under Supervision of Bank Commissioner." (H. P. 740) (L. D. 1059) reported that the same Ought to pass.

The Committee on Education on Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Municipalities of Limestone and Caswell Plantation to Form a School Administrative District." (H. P. 604) (L. D. 864) reported that the same Ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill, "An Act Creating Game Management Area of Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington, Hancock County." (H. P. 608) (L. D. 868) reported that the same Ought to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Relating to Financial Responsibility of Vehicles Insured by Automatic Coverage." (H. P. 6960) (L. D. 990) reported that the same Ought to pass.

The Committee on State Government on Bill, "An Act Increasing Compensation of Clerks of the Law Court." (H. P. 506) (L. D. 719) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the

ills read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Ought to Pass — N. D.**

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Regulating Fishing in Richardson Lakes, Upper and Lower, and Their Tributaries, Oxford County." (H. P. 719) (L. D. 1024) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 942) (L. D. 1334) under same Title, and that it Ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, the bill in New Draft read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Ought to Pass — as amended**

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Relating to School Taxes in Unorganized Townships." (H. P. 466) (L. D. 684) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 258)

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Replace and Repair Songo Locks, Cumberland County." (H. P. 601) (L. D. 861) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 259)

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill, "An Act Relating to Pension for Members of Police and Fire Departments of City of Waterville." (H. P. 898) (L. D. 1267) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 255)

The Committee on State Government on Bill, "An Act Increasing Salary of Commissioner of Education." (H. P. 318) (L. D. 465) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 256)

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence and the bills and resolve read once. Committee Amendments A were read and adopted in concurrence, and the bills and resolve as so amended were tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Majority — ONTP****Minority — OTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill, "An Act

Relating to Appropriation for Support of Public Schools for City of Portland." (H. P. 399) (L. D. 582) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

MARTIN of Kennebec  
CHARLES of Cumberland

Representatives:

GOOD of Sebago  
LINNELL of So. Portland  
TRUMBULL of Fryeburg  
BROWN of Cape Elizabeth  
HUTCHINSON of Carthage

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

MacDONALD of Oxford

Representatives:

COTE of Lewiston  
KELLAM of Portland

In House, Majority Report Accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Majority report "Ought not to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

#### Senate Committee Reports

Majority — ONTP

Minority — OTP

The Majority of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill, "An Act to Repeal the Westbrook Sewerage District." (S. P. 38) (L. D. 36) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

MARTIN of Kennebec  
NOYES of Franklin

Representatives:

HAUGHN of Bridgton  
PHILBRICK of Bangor  
PIKE of Lubec  
WALTER of Waldoboro  
DOW of Eliot

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator

HUNT of Kennebec

Representatives:

KILROY of Portland  
CYR of Fort Kent.

On motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, tabled pending acceptance of either report and especially assigned for tomorrow.

Majority — OTP — N. D.

Minority — ONTP

The Majority of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill, "An Act Relating to Source of Supply of Bangor Water District." (S. P. 43) (L. D. 41) reported same in New Draft (S. P. 476) (L. D. 1342) under the same Title, and that it Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

MARTIN of Kennebec  
NOYES of Franklin  
HUNT of Kennebec

Representatives:

KILROY of Portland  
HAUGHN of Bridgton  
CYR of Fort Kent  
PIKE of Lubec  
WALTER of Waldoboro  
DOW of Eliot

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the bill Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Representative:

PHILBRICK of Bangor

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Majority Report "Ought to pass".

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion by Mr. Martin to accept the Majority Report.

#### Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following Bills and Resolves:

#### House

Bill, "An Act Relating to Duties and Powers of Department of Labor and Industry." (H. P. 209) (L. D. 300)

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot: Mr. President, after reading this bill over very carefully, I move that it be indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The motion prevailed.

Bill, "An Act Clarifying Laws Relating to Secondary Schools." (H. P. 281) (L. D. 412)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Residence Requirement for Voters in City of Lewiston." (H. P. 865) (L. D. 1233)

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. President, the general law has now been changed and a bill as a matter of fact has been signed by the Governor which takes care of this matter for Lewiston as well as the rest of the state. I therefore move that the bill be indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The motion prevailed.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Itinerant Vendors." (H. P. 937) (L. D. 1324)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Lighting All Places Licensed to Sell Liquor to be Consumed on the Premises." (H. P. 938) (L. D. 1325)

Bill, "An Act Designating Certain Dermatitis Diseases as Occupational Diseases." (H. P. 939) (L. D. 1326)

"Resolve Opening Hancock Pond, Oxford County and Cumberland Counties to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 493) (L. D. 706)

"Resolve Opening Sand Pond, Oxford County to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 494) (L. D. 707)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

#### House — as amended

Bill, "An Act Relating to Definition of Fish Weirs." (H. P. 367) (L. D. 526)6

Bill, "An Act Increasing Burial Expenses Under Workmen's Compensation Act." (H. P. 862) (L. D. 1230)

Bill, "An Act Providing for Civil Service for the Old Orchard Beach Police Department." (H. P. 899) (L. D. 1268)

Bill, "An Act to Create the Berwick Water and Sewerage District." (H. P. 931) (L. D. 1317)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Qualified Assistant Pharmacists." (H. P. 926) (L. D. 1308)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence. (The Senate Indefinitely Postponed House Amendment)  
Sent down for concurrence.

#### Senate

Bill, "An Act Exempting Certain Fraternal Societies from Property Taxes." (S. P. 473) (L. D. 1338)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.  
Sent down for concurrence.

#### Senate — as amended

Bill, "An Act Repealing the Tax on Quahogs." (S. P. 298) (L. D. 822)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed as amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and especially assigned matter being House Report from the Committee on Transportation: "Ought to pass in new draft, same Title (H. P. 870) (L. D. 1215) on bill, "An Act Relating to Splash Guards for Certain Trucks." (H. P. 513) (L. D. 726) tabled on April 27 by the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President, I move that we indefinitely postpone House Amendment A. My reasons are that with the amendment, it is too broad and it does exempt trucks that in my opinion should be adequately supplied with splash guards for the protection of motorists.

The motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A prevailed.

The same Senator then presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment A.

Senate Amendment A was adopted in non-concurrence and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Carpenter of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table the 7th tabled item being House Report from the Com-

mittee on Inland Fisheries and Game: "Ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act Relating to Temporary Fish and Game Wardens and Warden Commissions to Permanent Employees of Fish and Game Department." (H. P. 85) (L. D. 132) tabled by that Senator on March 3 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the ought to pass report was accepted in concurrence, the bill read once, House Amendment A read and adopted and the bill as amended, tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Bates of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 89th tabled item being bill, "An Act Relating to Distribution and Sale of Publications Depicting Crime and Torture." (S. P. 249) (L. D. 632) tabled by that Senator on April 23 pending motion by Senator Martin of Kennebec that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment A.

Thereupon, Senator Martin of Kennebec was granted permission to withdraw his motion and on further motion by the same Senator, Senate Amendment A was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Martin of Kennebec presented Senate Amendment B and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment B.

Which amendment was adopted and the bill as amended passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mrs. Lord of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table the 6th tabled item being Senate Report from the Committee on Judiciary "Ought not to pass" on bill, "An Act Concerning Liability of Parents for Damage by Children." (S. P. 58) (L. D. 91) tabled by that Senator on February 26 pending acceptance of the report.

Mrs. LORD of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would like to state to the Senate with all the earnestness at my command that I think this is a good bill. This bill gives to the owners of private and public property a right to action for damages not to exceed \$250 against

parents of minors under the age of 18 who commit malicious and wilful acts of vandalism. The bill calls for civil action and is in no way a criminal proceeding.

At least ten other states have some phase of such a law: Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Michigan, New Jersey, Oregon, South Dakota. Some call for parents to be subject to a fine. Others call for a collection of the full damage. Still others call for collection of twice the actual damages where school property is involved. In Maine we do have the law that a city or town may collect for damages to schoolhouses. I don't see any good reason why we should not give citizens the same privilege. It is only failure in bringing up our kids and believe me, it should be corrected. If a man's car or dog wrecks some person's property, the man is responsible. Why should he not be at least as much responsible for a child whom he's supposed to teach the difference between right and wrong. If this legislation results in increased parental supervision, it is only logical to assume that it will eventually have a deterrent effect upon these forms of delinquency.

The bill is a departure from the old common law custom of shielding parents from the costs of a child's acts. It is based upon the theory that the control of the child is by law placed in the parent. The liability of the parent is based upon the rules and negligence rather than the relationship of parent and child. The primary responsibility for the proper training, discipline and upbringing of the child rests with the parents.

In the words of an editorial in a local paper as to who shall pay the bill for acts of vandalism by children: "If it has to be somebody, we would say the parents—not because it represents perfect justice, but because it involves the least injustice. As a matter of fact, it is amazing to hear that parents haven't been financially responsible all along."

Of course Michigan was one of the first states to adopt this law. They adopted it in 1953 and since that time the instances of vandal-

ism have decreased markedly. Under the new law action is sometimes brought directly against the parents in civil court by the injured party; but more often the act is cited when the youngsters are brought into court and parents pay up without waiting to be sued. L. Eugene Sharp, presiding judge of common pleas court in Detroit calls the law its own enforcer.

In the two years since the Parental Responsibility Act became effective, Michigan youth workers have noted significant improvements. "Parents we formerly had trouble with are now much more cooperative," reports James Hunt, director of children's services in Oakland County. "Before their children roamed wild. Now they know where their youngsters are, especially at night. And they take a more active interest in their leisure hour activities."

Michigan law has recognized that neither the police, the schools, nor the social agencies can take on the job of raising children. This job and privilege belongs to the parents. Mr. President, I move that the bill be substituted for the report.

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoogin: Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Judiciary Committee to defend the action of the committee. Now the committee unanimously reported this bill "Ought not to pass." I could go on with a lengthy discussion of the legal aspects of this bill so far as the words "wilful" and "malicious" are concerned. However, I will not bore you with that laborious talk, but I think we should discuss it as an economic situation, because that is about what it is.

Now those who can afford it, those who have the means, should perhaps pay for damage done by their children. There are those who, because of their economic situation can give closer supervision. However, there are a great many of our citizens in the State who are not able financially and economically to afford constant supervision of their children so that perhaps they are not as closely watched as they might be, because the parents are not able to hire people or maids to do it. There are many families

in the State where it is necessary, in order to meet their economic needs, that both the mother and the father are employed, and there is a period of time perhaps when school is out and during the time of their return from employment when their children are not under direct supervision. All you are doing to these people is saying that if the child maliciously or wilfully damages property that they are going to pay for it.

I do not think that is a good law. I do not think that these people, because of their economic situation, should be placed in the position where they are going to be responsible and liable for the acts of their minor children. We do have statutes on our books which make parents responsible for damages to automobiles by minors, and that is proper, because parents should be responsible if they place cars in the hands of their children.

In order to really justify this law, it would require that parents would have to be in constant supervision of their children in order not to be liable for any wilful and malicious acts. From "wilful and malicious" the next step would be for any negligence. Children will be children and they will continue to do damage from time to time no matter what legislation we pass. As I say, we who are perhaps a little more fortunate economically can take care of these damages, but this law is just aimed at those who do not have the means to take care of them. For that reason, I am against the motion of the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord.

Mr. COFFIN of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I think if we are going to teach our children respect for law we need a law similar to this. I brought my children up with the idea they should have respect for other people's property. If we are lax in our laws, I would like to know what sort of children we are going to bring up, whether we are wealthy or whether we are poor. We all know that it is an expensive proposition to bring up a family whether they destroy property or not. I feel that my children cost me about a dollar a day while I was bringing them up, but I was

glad to pay the dollar for the damage they did. I feel that I have got to support the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Mrs. Lord, on this bill.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Cumberland Senator Lord, I am very conscious of the fact that we do have families that are financially able to pay for damages done by their children, and I realize that we have families that are not so situated that it will not be a hardship for them to pay for any damages their children may cause; but I also believe that if such a law as the one that is contemplated here is enacted that it will serve a real purpose in making some of our families attempt, at least, to do something they are not doing at the present time, and that it control their children.

This law is working in many other states, as was brought out by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord. I know that this is a change in our attitude in the State of Maine, but I believe it is a change in the right direction, and I hope that the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord, prevails.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I had not thought anything about this bill until I heard the debate, but it does remind me of one day when my younger daughter, who was old enough to know better, threw a rock through the windshield of a car which did not happen to be mine. I told her she would have to earn money to pay for the windshield. She didn't earn it working for me or her mother but she did earn the money and she paid for the windshield, and I can tell you she never broke another windshield. It seems to me that this is a step in the right direction. I think there are parents who feel they have no responsibility for their children and do not let things like this bother them, so I think this proposed law is a good measure and I certainly hope that it passes.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: Two years ago I voted against this measure and I will do so this morning.

I notice that the Senator from Cumberland County, Senator Lord, mentioned some of the states that recognize this law, but she did not mention the State of New Hampshire which has been fighting this for the past two years and fighting it on the same grounds.

I will state my position as a family man. We have ten children and of course you know we go through a lot with them. Maybe from the time they leave for school and before they come back a baseball has gone through someone's window, but there is a mutual friendliness between the people in the community in which we reside and there is usually a mutual agreement so the mothers and fathers can take care of the situation. When it comes to damage to windshields of cars, most every car is insured, so that can be taken care of by the insurance company.

We have today in the State of Maine, and I imagine they have the same thing in New Hampshire, mothers who have to go out and work in order to meet the family bills, and their children probably do go a little astray. I think if you tie the law down fine enough so the parents of children are going to be responsible to the tune of \$250 for some minor thing, or maybe \$25 or \$30, that it will be unfortunate. I do think that under the laws of the State of Maine there is full protection for anybody, and I think that the laws are generally respected by the parents in the State of Maine.

I am going to vote against the bill as I did two years ago, and I think that every family man should take the same stand, because as they are working during the week things like this may happen and they may have to give up their week's pay to someone they cannot have an understanding with. I think this is a poor law to put through.

Mrs. LORD of Cumberland: Mr. President, in answer to the remarks by the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard, and also Senator Farley of York, I would say that these parents are with the children at times and that is when they can teach the children to be responsible rather than be ir-



responsible children or people when they grow up. I think that there is plenty of time when the parents are at home at night with the children, and at times during the day, and I think that they should teach the children then that they should be responsible.

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I will try to be brief.

Do you honestly think that you can go to children who are about to play baseball and say to them, to my son or your son: "Son, there is a law on the books that says I can be sued in an amount up to \$250. Be careful where you hit that baseball or throw that basketball"? Do you actually think that is going to stop him from hitting a baseball or throwing a basketball or whatever article he may have and causing damage? If you think so, o.k., but I really do not think it is going to happen that way, and neither do I think that the child is going to read this law.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I did not intend to speak on this bill, but as these thoughts have progressed here I will say that I do not believe that this is a question of economics as much as it is a question of morality. While some of the senators were speaking, I was thinking back to the time when I was judge of a municipal court, and I have also served as county attorney. That was some ten or fifteen years ago, perhaps. But since that time there has been more wanton and malicious mischief on the part of our children.

Now I am not talking about putting a baseball through a windshield or similar things. I think you and I who have read the newspapers have seen a great trend across the country, and I am sure we have seen it somewhat in this State, and I am sure I have seen it in my locality, where we have children who, for perhaps want of something else to do, are creating mischief and wanton damage. Now I think we have got to return the responsibility for children to their parents. For too long we have asked the churches to take care of our problems, and the schools and boy scouts and other organizations.

I think that as a psychological and moral proposition the bill as proposed by Senator Lord should pass.

Mr. HUNT of Kennebec: Mr. President, I think perhaps one angle in considering this bill is the angle of the school committee or the church or other organizations, or the individual person whose property has been damaged by children, and I think that the words "wilful" and "malicious" certainly do not include a child who broke a window in a baseball game. I interpret the words "wilful" and "malicious" to mean intentionally, or something of that nature. But at the present time let us suppose that some of these children out in the nighttime broke a series of windows in a schoolhouse and let us suppose that they were found out afterwards. Now the school, for instance, certainly could not collect from the children, and I am not sure, as the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard, pointed out, that they could collect from the parents; but at least a civil action could be brought against the parents, which would bring to the attention of the children involved the fact that somebody has to pay for this damage. If we do not pass this law and the children break the windows in a schoolhouse, apparently nothing can be done except to talk to them about it. Now I think it would probably save them a great deal of trouble in the future if they found out right then and there that somebody has to pay. It could also very easily happen that if this civil action was not brought against the children's parents at the time that sometime later they would be brought in on a criminal complaint for a more aggravated action.

It seems to me that this is more a question of pointing out to the children in what will be only a civil action and therefore no record against them, that if they do wilful and malicious damage — and I do not anticipate that means breaking one little window; I think it obviously means some serious amount of damage — that someone has to pay. This civil action will be no record against the children, and I think it is a warning which may prevent them from having more serious trouble later. For that

reason, I support the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord, that the bill be substituted for the ought not to pass report of the committee, and a division has been requested.

A division of the Senate was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and twelve opposed, the motion prevailed and the bill was substituted for the ought not to pass report, read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

---

On motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 39th tabled item being House Report from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions "Ought not to pass" on "Resolve, Providing for a Pension for George A. DeWitt of Bradford" (H. P. 698) (L. D. 998) tabled by that Senator on April 3 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the ought not to pass report was accepted in concurrence.

---

On motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 43rd tabled item being "Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Recreational Purposes." (S. P. 178) (L. D. 422) tabled by that Senator on April 3 pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, the resolve was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

---

On motion by Mr. Ross of Sagadahoc, the Senate voted to take from the table the 60th tabled item being House Report from the Committee on Taxation: "Ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act Exempting Hospital Thrift Shops from Sales Tax." (H. P. 700) (L. D. 1000) tabled by that Senator on April 14 pending motion by Senator Wyman of Washington to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. ROSS of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, on April 14 our good friend the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, presented a thorough and lengthy argument exempting hospital thrift shops from the Sales Tax and even though we have in the city of Bath just such a thrift shop, his argument was so convincing that he completely sold me and I now move that we concur with his motion to indefinitely postpone.

The motion to indefinitely postpone in non-concurrence prevailed. Sent down for concurrence.

---

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 24th tabled item being bill, "An Act Relating to Fees of Licensed Milk Dealers on Certain Milk" (H. P. 526) (L. D. 761) tabled by that Senator on March 24 pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

---

On motion by Mr. Stilphen of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table the 111th tabled item being bill, "An Act Permitting Ferry Service for Long Island Plantation." (H. P. 55) (L. D. 77) tabled by that Senator on April 27 pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

---

The PRESIDENT: At this time the Chair would like on behalf of the members of the Senate to thank John Thurston for performing his duties as honorary page so efficiently in the Senate this morning. I am sure the Senate will join me in a nice round of applause for young John Thurston. (Applause)

The Chair would like to state that with reference to the proposed possibility of afternoon sessions on Wednesday and Thursday, it now appears that there are numerous committee chairmen who are planning to hold executive sessions on those afternoons in order that they may report all bills out. So at this time we do not plan to have any Wednesday or Thursday afternoon

sessions, in order that the committee chairmen can hold executive sessions with the thought in mind of reporting out all bills.

On motion by Mr. Stilphen of Knox,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.