

that it lives up to its word, but that in giving its word or in its treatment of all citizens that it treats them equally. Our miscellaneous claims process has traditionally allowed for the payment of moral obligations and that has so gotten to the conscience of the chairman of that committee in light of the position that he has taken on this particular bill, that he now has an interim study to restudy the whole process. I want to go back with you and prove to you how time and time again you have paid on the basis of a moral obligation. You did it in 718 as Senator Wesely pointed you to you, but I want to go back over the last ten years and point out to you some of the other situations where we've paid so that you understand the circumstances, some circumstances very similar to those in Commonwealth, circumstances in which you have allowed claims. I want to start out with the Joseph Soukup claim and that particular claim allowed for the payment of \$50,000 to one Joseph Soukup and Joseph Soukup had the claim that he had been admitted to our mental institutions without a due process hearing. But at that the time that that occurred he had no right to a due process hearing. It wasn't in our law. It probably should have been. The Legislature probably erred in not requiring it, but there was no such requirement. And not only was there no such requirement, but he failed to submit his claim in time, that is, the statute of limitations had run. Clearly for two reasons there was no obligation to Joseph Soukup and our Attorney General told us as much in an Attorney General's Opinion and yet this Legislature ignored it and paid him \$50,000. In fact, it increased the amount recommended by the committee from \$30,000 to \$50,000 and they did it because we felt a moral obligation. Senator DeCamp is the one who so diligently pursued that repayment. His bill recommended a half a million dollars to Joseph Soukup and yet he stands before you today and talks about legal liability. That's one case. There are literally hundreds of cases. I want to go on to some more in so much as I have the time. Perry Maze in 1978 was required to take down his advertising billboards. Well he wasn't really required to do it, but he thought he had to. He really had an additional two years, but he made a claim against the Roads Department because he took them down because he thought he had to take them down, because he thought he was complying with the Federal Highway Beautification Act. So what did we do? We allowed the claim. We allowed the claim in the amount of \$14,000 and the reason was the Claims Board felt that the claimant