

April 4, 1975

closely with the committee of children and youth and all of this legislation and these were references in this bill which did not jive with the references as far as reference to adjudicatory hearing, there was no such reference to other places where they refer to the county attorney as the prosecuting attorney. So the reference is to the prosecuting attorney and to strike those sections to clarify the language to bring it all together. These were presented by Judge Macon at our hearing.

PRESIDENT: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: I would like to ask Senator Luedtke a question. I notice that there is no A bill here but that there is a general fund obligation of \$140,000, or \$70,000 depending upon which one you look at.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Well, if you will read further you will note that it says Supreme Court Administrator stated fiscal impact could not be determined. All he said was that the bill could increase the work load of juvenile probation officers. All I can say is that it is another one of these cases where your guess at estimates can run...we couldn't come in and tell you that we needed that much money because there is not a way of determining it and you get involved in actually putting out the program. I doubt that and I'll let Senator Barnett speak further concerning this point because I know that this was brought up in the committee with children and youth.

SENATOR CLARK: What my concern is here...and I did read it all is that it said that it could not be determined, but it still said a \$140,000. Could they not determine anything over that? And why is there not an A bill with it?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Because of the fact that we did not consider a need for an A bill, as far as I am concerned.

SENATOR CLARK: Anything over \$50,000 in my estimation is supposed to have an "a" abill, is that right?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Well you are talking about the 140. It is the impact, the maximum impact would be \$70,000 as I read it.

SENATOR CLARK: Well that is general fund money.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Yes, but it is doubtful....you will notice that it says down there that it is doubtful that 12 probation officers, and there isn't anything in this bill that says that they have to have them. So in other words up to \$50,000 it is my opinion that it would be taken care of very easily. I don't think that there is any need for an A bill, now if Senator Barnett wants too....

SENATOR CLARK: Well the only thing that I am questioning is the fact that it says \$70,000 but there is no A bill.