

January 27, 1992 LB 125

policy. And we should enact those sound public policies so that they apply to the people we may hate the most, just as they'll apply to those that we may care the most about. There was a wise,...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...elderly lady who was giving advice to some lovesick youngsters. And she said, love is similar to temporary insanity, it lasts longer periods of time based on a person's weakness or strength of mind. But she said, if you love this person, love this person today as though you will hate them tomorrow. If that moment comes when you feel like you hate them, hate them today as though you will love them tomorrow. In other words, get some perspective and some balance. And what we need to balance this scale, which would be unjust if we left it the way it is, is to accept this amendment, advance the bill, so that if a person in violation of the Constitution is put through a criminal prosecution initiated by the state, remember, not another private citizen, he or she can recoup those costs.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Anyone else wishing to speak to the amendment offered by Senator Elmer? Seeing no one, Senator Elmer, do you wish to close?

SENATOR ELMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've spent an inordinate amount of time visiting about this particular bill. The amendment is the bill. I think it does something that is, in my mind, just and right for the individual out there who is being subjected to our judicial system and all its aspects by government. And there have been arguments that there are high fiscal costs, but that...and you know that's irrelevant because those cases only come up in multiyear type scenarios. And also remember that the person must apply to the Supreme Court for it, if he does not there would be no award. And after it's been discussed by the Supreme Court they may pay none, part, or all of what's been asked, at their discretion. And I would think that that could be based on whether there was an outright and very obvious violation of a person's rights weighed against an obscurity in the law that none of the cities, or the subdivisions, or the state itself, for that matter, might have recognized as a part...as a possibility of being unconstitutional. I think this is a proper thing to do, to protect the people that we represent against the heavy hand of government. And I would ask your adoption of the amendment and