

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...I take it.

SENATOR HUDKINS: Yes, I believe I would because I don't think it's necessary.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, the language in your statute says the cost of maintenance of the accused while under commitment shall be paid by the state, period, which would indicate that 83-376 would not be operative. Anyway, Senator, this is not a big enough deal. I was just trying to suggest that maybe we can talk about it in the next round of debate of whether there might not be a little more balance than the approach.

SENATOR HUDKINS: We can certainly talk about it. I'd appreciate that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Madam President and members, excuse me, I would like to ask Senator Hudkins some questions and I tried to give you some resources over there, but...

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Hudkins.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...when you...because I am concerned about this. It was kind of my intent, frankly, to support this at least for General and, perhaps, Select and put it into the mix at the end for Final Reading because it does...I am concerned about the cost. But under your fiscal note, and, Senator Hudkins, that's the question I wanted to ask you, well, there is two places in the fiscal note that I wanted to question and one is in the middle of the fiscal note it says, additionally the Department of DPI projects that admissions and length of stay for this population would potentially increase, which then would throw our estimate off, you see, on what this may cost us if we use the two hundred and twenty some thousand. It says the counties would no longer be responsible for the maintenance cost. My concern is what do you envision, apparently the counties control this cost to some degree because they're paying at this point. I am concerned that if the state were to pick up these costs, who, in reality, would control the length of stay, thusly, the cost, if the state were to pick it up? You may want