

MINUTES OF MEETING
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
January 30, 1979

The twentieth meeting of the Senate Judiciary Committee was called to order by Senator Everett R. Lensink in Room 331 of the capitol building on the above date at 9:31 a.m.

ROLL CALL:

All members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 228:

Senator Goodover gave an explanation of this bill which is an act to make persistent felony offenders ineligible for parole or to participate in the prisoner furlough program. He stated that this bill was the result of a study by a group from Great Falls called the Great Falls Crime Control Committee and they tried to find ways and means of what can be done to protect the law-abiding citizen rather than stress the rights of criminals. He said that there were several other bills that have been drafted by this group, who are interested in cleaning up on crime.

He introduced Judge Bob Nelson, representing the Great Falls Crime Control Organization, who gave a statement in support of this bill. He stated that this does not mean that the criminal is not eligible for good time. He stated that the Department of Justice of Crime in the United States says that the average person, who is in court, has a criminal record of 10 years duration, has three felony convictions, and that odds are better than 50 per cent that he is on probation or parole. He stated that this may deter some, but not the habitually anti-social.

Senator Goodover introduced Mr. Charles Follick, who represented the American Association of Retired People and he stated that in working with senior citizens, that there is great concern with these people. He gave an example of a man who had beaten up on an old woman numerous times and each time he was given probation. He said that people were starting to bet on when he would kill her.

Senator Goodover introduced Mr. James R. Burnes, who represents the Montana Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association and who gave a statement in support of this legislation.

Mr. Kent Rodebaugh, from the City of Great Falls, gave a statement in support of this bill.

Mr. Larry Zanto, Director of the Department of Justice, stated that he was not a proponent or an opponent but that the department has some concern about the sentencing bills in general. A suggestion was made that because of the number of bills covering sentences, that perhaps the committee should

Minutes - January 30, 1979
Senate Judiciary Committee
Page Two

give some thought to appointing a conference committee to consider all the sentencing bills. He stated that with more people in prison for longer periods of time, they will have to address the problem of more inmates and judges must be given some discretion in matters. He did not think that this bill denies this discretion.

Tom Honzel, representing the Association of County Attorneys, stated that they opposed section 2 of this bill and noted that it conflicts with Senate Bill 223.

There were no further opponents and no further proponents.

Senator Goodover, in closing, said that this bill tries to address some of the problems and he is trying to get something that will act as a deterrent and will let people know that Montana is not the place to fool around with people and their property. He stated that new facilities may be used for first offenders and let the criminal know that he better look for another playground.

Senator Brown questioned what is the present situation in relationship to prison population, and what would be the impact on prison population. Mr. Zanto said that he didn't have time to prepare the information that was needed. He stated that sentencing bills generally do not have much impact the first or second year. He stated that Mr. Thomas, who is the head of the computer division, could get this information for the committee.

Senator Towe wondered about striking "or a" on page 3, line 3, and wondered if the judge has the discretion to determine if dangerous or not dangerous and if there may be confusion with the habitual offender. He also wondered if the inclination of the judges would be to give lighter sentencing to make up the difference. Judge Nelson replied that in sentencing you do a kind of backward figuring and figure the time you want him to do and take off for parole, goodtime, etc. He stated that if you are going to have any degree of control, you must have "good time".

Senator Olson requested an explanation of plea bargaining and Senator Towe explained this to him.

, Senator Brown stated that the court is not bound by any offer made during plea bargaining.

Senator Towe questioned about prison population and Mr. Zanto stated that they expect the prison population to hit sometime in the next four to six months the maximum allowable with doubling up on the quarters right now. He said there were 670 inmates now, 515 two years ago and 718, which is the

maximum prison population and this will be reached in the next few months.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 223:

Senator Thomas introduced Tom Honzel, who represents the Montana Association of County Attorneys, who gave an explanation of this bill which is an act relating to the designation of offenders as nondangerous for the purposes of parole eligibility. He stated that this bill changes an "or" to an "and". He gave an example of an aggravated assault on an old man and the individual was sentenced to twenty years and just last month was picked up for armed robbery. The judge had designated him a nondangerous offender because it had been five years between each offense. He stated that a dangerous offender has to serve one-half of his sentence before he is eligible for parole, while a nondangerous offender has only to serve one-fourth the time. He also said that the committee should be aware of HB 396, which would do away completely with the nondangerous designation. It also would require that everybody would have to serve one-half time until they are eligible for parole.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

Senator Towe questioned as to how this was working at the present time and Mr. Honzel said that he did not think they paid too much attention as to how this read.

There being no further questions, the hearing on this bill closed at 10:23 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 202:

Senator Van Valkenburg stated that he introduced this bill with the signatures of virtually all the senators from the fourth district. He stated that the judges in this district face a tremendous workload - the highest workload in the state and also one that involves a substantial amount of driving on the highways in this district. He introduced Judge Jack L. Green, a judge in the Fourth District.

Judge Green gave statistics which supported the bill and commented that civil litigants are being neglected, particularly the bench trials.

Dexter Delaney, practicing lawyer in Missoula and President of the Western Montana Bar Association, stated that if this was not remedied in the near future, that it might become catastrophic. He said that there was a tremendously congested trial calendar and that he felt that the only solution was to add another additional judge. He passed out statistics (see attachments) for

the senators. He stated that they now handle almost 2 1/2 times as many cases as they handled before and on the average they drive 11,000 miles a year.

Senator Van Valkenburg introduced Mike Abley, the court administrator of the Supreme Court, who handed out additional statistics showing the case load was much greater than what was testified. (See attachments).

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

Senator Turnage felt that in section 2, the date of January, 1981 should be taken out as he felt that this would delay any benefit in the bill for nearly two years and he stated that he hoped that the committee would see the problem this district has.

Senator Van Valkenburg questioned as to where the fourth judge would be housed and Judge Green stated that this could be anywhere in the district and that it would not necessarily have to be in Missoula.

There were no further questions and the hearing on this bill was closed.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 215:

Senator Ryan stated' that he introduced this bill, which is an act to punish the commission of an assault upon a youth less than 12 years old by an adult by imprisonment in the state prison for a term not to exceed 5 years, at the request of eight county attorneys. He introduced Carroll Blend, deputy county attorney in Cascade County.

Mr. Blend gave an example of a case wherein a child was beaten and the offender was charged with a misdemeanor as they could not charge him with aggravated assault because there was no serious injury. He stated that this statute would provide that if the victim is less than 12 years old and the offender is more than 18 years of age, and if convicted, then the offender shall be put in prison for no more than five years. He felt that this would give more control over people who do beat children. He stated that this, of course, would not insulate children against corporal punishment.

Mr. Douglas Allen, representing himself, gave a statement in support of this bill.

There were no further proponents and no opponents. Senator Ryan made a closing statement and asked serious consideration for a serious matter.

Minutes - January 30, 1979
Senate Judiciary Committee
Page Five

Senator Turnage commented that he felt that there should be a more severe punishment for assaulting a child under 12 than for an adult, but he was concerned about a school teacher or a neighbor who shakes a child, and he wondered if they could be found guilty. He was concerned about the way the bill reads. He felt that it should be narrowed down some.

There were no further comments or questions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

Everett R. Lensink.

SENATOR EVERETT R. LENSSINK, Chairman
Senate Judiciary Committee

Date Jan 21 1929

ROLL CALL

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

46th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - 1979

Each Day Attach to Minutes.

Please advise whether the following

SB-202

SENATE

COMMITTEE

BILL 58 223

VISITORS' REGISTER

DATE 1/5/24

Please note bill no.

Please sign & return this document

SB-197
204
205
HB-163
" 167

SENATE Subcommittee COMMITTEE

VISITORS' REGISTER

DATE 1/30/29

Please note bill no.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY

Please sign and return to me today

SB-147
204
BILL 205
HB-165-
" 167

SENATE

Picasso

COMMITTEE

VISITORS' REGISTER

DATE

~~1/30/~~

Please note bill no.

TESTIMONY REGARDING SB 215

Whether or not child abuse is more prevalent now than it has been, it is certain that we are more conscious of it than ever. While such abuse can take many forms, the most common form is the direction of physical violence toward a physically small and emotionally and economically dependant person by an adult whether natural parent, step-parent or girl-friend or boyfriend of the natural parent. In terms of the criminal law this would be an assault. Yet young children, as can be observed from their normal activities and play, have an enormous ability to absorb physical abuse without permanent injury. The same abuse directed to an adult would surely result in hospitalization and permanent injury.

The result of the nature of the victims of these assaults is that only bodily injury as defined in Section 45-2-101(5), MCA 1979, results and rarely serious bodily injury as defined in Section 45-2-101(53), MCA 1979. Thus the assailant is usually charged with Assault, a misdemeanor, which carries a maximum penalty of six months imprisonment and a \$500 fine and not Aggravated Assault, a felony, which carries a penalty of not less than two nor more than twenty years in prison. In other words, the parent who beats his or her child is exposed to the same punishment as a person who runs a stop sign.

It is submitted that child abuse is more repugnant than running a stop sign and more dangerous to society. The purpose of Senate Bill 215 is to increase the possible penalty to five years in prison where the assailant is 18 years or older and the victim is less than 12 years old. The imposition of more severe penalties when there is a difference in the ages of the assailant and the victim is not new. In both the crimes of Sexual Assault, Section 45-5-502, MCA 1979, and Sexual Intercourse Without Consent, Section 45-5-503, MCA 1979, the penalty is increased where the victim is less than 16 and the offender 3 or more years older.

We do not promise that enactment of this bill will put an end to assaults on children. However, such enactment would officially recognize and publicize the concern of the State that assaults on children are serious matters. Practically, not only would it increase the amount of imprisonment which could be imposed by a factor of ten but would allow for considerably more intervention by the State into the particular problem. A justice of the peace or police judge can only place an offender on probation for a year and rarely requires supervision of that probation. On the other hand, a district judge can place an offender on probation for three or, here, five years, and customarily requires supervision by the Bureau of Probation and Parole.

We respectfully request your earnest consideration of Senate Bill 215 and that you recommend its passage.

Douglas Allen
3305 Antelope Drive
Great Falls, Montana 59404
Tel: 761-3181 (home)
761-5335 (business)

Carroll C. Blend
2323 3rd Avenue South
Great Falls, Montana
Tel: 761-6110 (home)
761-6700 (business)

EXPLANATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The statistical summaries reflect District Court caseload for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1978. Case type filings are provided in seven (7) categories. These categories include the following types of filings:

CRIMINAL: Felonies; high misdemeanors; extraditions; criminal appeals (City and J.P.).

CIVIL: Personal injury; property damage; condemnation; lien; foreclosure; eviction; partition; quiet title; agreement suits; injunctions; declaratory judgments; certificate of amount due; warrant of distress; abstract of judgment; transcript of judgment; mandamus; habeas corpus; habitual traffic offender; note; wage claim; amount due; unlawful detainer; zoning; taxes; workman's compensation; and water rights.

DOMESTIC RELATIONS: Marriage dissolution; invalid marriage; legal separation; URESA (outgoing); URESA (incoming); paternity.

JUVENILE: Youth in need of care (YINC); Youth in need of supervision (YINS).

PROBATE: Formal probate; informal probate; supervised probate; guardianship; conservatorship; trust.

INSANITY: Mentally ill; inebriation (commitments).

ADOPTIONS: Adoptions (minor or adult).

Column 1 (Original Filings) in each of the Caseload Tables reflects an actual count made by either the Clerk of the District Court or staff of the Court Administrator's Office for the previously mentioned period. Column 2 (Reopened Filings) is an estimated figure based on a statistical extrapolation from a 14 county sample, in which a physical court of case reopenings was made by either the Clerks of the District Court or Court Administrative staff. Column 3 (Total Filings) is again an estimated figure representing the addition of Columns 1 and 2.

Column 4 (Case Dispositions) is an estimated figure based on the statistical extrapolation of the 14-county sample. Column 5 (Dispositions -- Average Time in Days) are actual time averages based on actual cases filed and disposed by the District Courts during the previously mentioned period of time. Some 25,000 District Court Cases were analyzed by computer. None of the caseload figures attempt to reflect those cases handled by judges out-of-district through substitutions (disqualification) provisions.

The Methods of Disposition Table reflects an actual percentage calculation based on the 25,000 District Court cases analyzed by computer. The figures derived for judicial district population, population density and square miles were obtained from tables provided by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Montana. The figures compiled for Attorney population were derived from the Montana Directory of Attorneys 1977-78. Excluded from this compilation were attorneys who were judges or high-ranking government officials.

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

SUMMARY BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 115500
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 10488
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 11.013

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 194

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS			THRUPUT X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)		
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	414	57	471	474	118		100
(2) CIVIL CASES	3187	179	3366	2671	122		79
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	1794	49	1843	1419	136		76
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	1393	130	1523	1252	102		82
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	781	59	840	629	305		74
JUVENILE (DJ)	156	19	175	145	108		82
ADOPTION (DA)	107	0	107	101	33		94
PROBATE (DP)	498	38	536	363	533		67
INSANITY (DI)	20	2	22	20	6		90
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	4382	295	4677	3774	144		80

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL --	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 3		ACQUITTED 0
GUilty PLEA 75	FOR DEFEND 1	GUilty PLEA 5
GUilty VERD 7	FOR PLAINT 11	GUilty VERD 0
DISMISSED 11	DISMISSED 17	DISMISSED 4
DEFAULT 0	DEFAULT 42	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	CH OF VENUE 2	CH OF VENUE 0
OTHER 4	OTHER 28	OTHER 89
NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 1	NOT KNOWN 2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF LAKE
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 17600
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 1494
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 11.780
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 15

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPUT \$/100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	78	6	84	66	89	78
(2) CIVIL CASES	426	27	453	342	92	75
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	240	8	248	194	86	78
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	186	19	205	148	99	72
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	141	5	146	81	173	55
JUVENILE (DJ)	26	1	27	20	54	74
ADOPTION (DA)	24	0	24	24	37	100
PROBATE (DP)	88	4	92	34	275	36
INSANITY (DI)	3	0	3	3	7	100
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	645	38	683	489	114	71

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL ---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	4	ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	75	GUILTY PLEA	1
GUILTY VERD	7	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	9	DISMISSED	3
DEFAULT	2	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	2	OTHER	94
NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	1

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF MINERAL	JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4
POPULATION(7/1/1977) 3400	COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5
AREA IN SQUARE MILES 1222	JUDGES ASSIGNED 3
DENSITY PER SQ MILES 2.782	
ATTORNEY POPULATION 2	

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPUT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	7	0	7	7	119	100
(2) CIVIL CASES	79	2	81	68	89	83
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	37	2	39	38	98	97
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	42	0	42	30	77	71
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	16	1	17	10	180	58
JUVENILE (DJ)	1	0	1	1	14	100
ADOPTION (DA)	5	0	5	4	10	80
PROBATE (DP)	10	1	11	5	349	45
INSANITY (DI)	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	102	3	105	85	103	8

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL --	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 0		ACQUITTED 0
GUILTY PLEA 100	FOR DEFEND 0	GUILTY PLEA 0
GUILTY VERD 0	FOR PLAINT 22	GUILTY VERD 0
DISMISSED 0	DISMISSED 7	DISMISSED 0
DEFAULT 0	DEFAULT 4	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	CH OF VENUE 4	CH OF VENUE 0
OTHER 0	OTHER 62	OTHER 100
NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 0

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF MISSOULA	JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO	4
POPULATION (7/1/1977) 66800	COUNTIES IN THE DIST	5
AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2612	JUDGES ASSIGNED	3
DENSITY PER SQ MILES 25.574		
ATTORNEY POPULATION 158		

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPUT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	223	40	263	305	140	115
(2) CIVIL CASES	2131	117	2248	1803	108	80
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	1241	31	1272	947	120	74
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	890	86	976	856	89	87
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	411	46	457	412	285	90
JUVENILE (DJ)	83	17	100	90	174	90
ADOPTION (DA)	70	0	70	65	38	92
PROBATE (DP)	248	27	275	247	484	89
INSANITY (DI)	10	2	12	10	3	83
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	2765	203	2968	2520	125	84

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL ---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 3		ACQUITTED 0
GUILTY PLEA 72	FOR DEFEND 1	GUILTY PLEA 11
GUILTY VERD 7	FOR PLAINT 11	GUILTY VERD 0
DISMISSED 15	DISMISSED 17	DISMISSED 5
DEFAULT 0	DEFAULT 49	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	CH OF VENUE 1	CH OF VENUE 0
OTHER 4	OTHER 22	OTHER 83
NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF RAVALLI JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 19300 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2382 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 8.102
 ATTORNEY,POPULATION 14

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS			THRUPUT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME (5)		
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (OC)	80	7	87	76	81		87
(2) CIVIL CASES	378	25	403	322	223		79
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	189	6	195	174	272		89
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	189	19	208	148	165		71
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	126	5	131	67	470		51
JUVENILE (DJ)	36	1	37	28	71		75
ADOPTION (DA)	0	0	0	0	13		0
PROBATE (DP)	83	4	87	32	833		36
INSANITY (DI)	7	0	7	7	10		100
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	584	37	621	465	253		

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL ---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 1	FOR DEFEND 0	ACQUITTED 0
GUILTY PLEA 87	FOR PLAINT 5	GUILTY PLEA 0
GUILTY VERD 4	DISMISSED 22	GUILTY VERD 0
DISMISSED 1	DEFAULT 7	DISMISSED 6
DEFAULT 0	CH OF VENUE 6	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	OTHER 54	CH OF VENUE 2
OTHER 4	NOT KNOWN 5	OTHER 90
NOT KNOWN 1		NOT KNOWN 2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF SANDERS
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 8400
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2778
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 3.024
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 5

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

CASE LOAD

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPUT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-UP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	26	4	30	20	109	66
(2) CIVIL CASES	173	8	181	136	85	75
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	87	2	89	66	78	74
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	86	6	92	70	93	76
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	87	2	89	59	92	66
JUVENILE (DJ)	10	0	10	6	73	60
ADOPTION (DA)	8	0	8	8	27	100
PROBATE (DP)	69	2	71	45	187	63
INSANITY (DI)	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	286	14	300	215	88	71

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL --	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 0		ACQUITTED 0
GUILTY PLEA 68	FOR DEFEND 0	GUILTY PLEA 0
GUILTY VERD 9	FOR PLAINT 20	GUILTY VERD 0
DISMISSED 14	DISMISSED 10	DISMISSED 0
DEFAULT 0	DEFAULT 28	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	CH OF VENUE 4	CH OF VENUE 0
OTHER 9	OTHER 37	OTHER 100
NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 0	NOT KNOWN 0

950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964

18	450	462	534	584	610	643	636	784	934	909	849	907	949	949	956
23	49	35	28	73	115	44	45	68	26	27	28	28	17	16	
11	499	497	562	657	682	654	688	699	936	936	877	877	190	163	
59	169	132	124	111	120	113	106	139	110	132	122	146	173	147	
12	24	20	13	11	10	12	16	10	15	23	20	28	17	16	
1	193	152	137	122	130	125	122	149	125	155	142	174	190	163	
52	84	59	74	101	104	137	129	130	101	100	87	88	87	70	
0	6	11	12	3	11	4	12	16	8	13	7	8	13	5	
2	90	70	86	104	115	141	146	109	113	94	96	100	100	75	
17	29	27	30	35	33	49	45	37	59	38	46	76	69	60	
6	5	8	6	9	2	2	5	3	4	2	4	5	11	9	
3	34	35	36	44	35	51	50	40	63	40	50	81	80	69	
8	155	163	164	154	189	196	156	222	164	153	213	211	218	170	
4	9	10	15	14	15	14	15	171	18	13	14	5	5	14	
2	164	173	179	168	204	210	204	240	177	161	227	216	224	184	
887	835	926	985	1013	1105	1079	1164	1066	1207	1402	1430	1396	1354		
93	84	76	110	153	76	93	110	153	107	71	73	75	75	93	
980	919	1000	1095	1166	1181	1172	1274	1173	1473	1321	1471	1503	1471	1447	
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26	25	24	23	22
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26	25	24	23
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26	25	24
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26	25
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27	26
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	27
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15