

cases, the officer is or the law enforcement...

SENATOR ROBAK: So you also...

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...agency is negligent.

SENATOR ROBAK: Oh, so...

SENATOR MAURSTAD: So in a majority of the cases, the first aspect is going to take...

SENATOR ROBAK: You also say that the innocent party should be fully compensated but not compensated in an excess of actual losses. I don't know how you can determine what the actual losses are because, in the one instance, we heard during committee the paraplegic would have losses the rest of her life. She'll have medical bills for the rest of her life.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Yeah, and as Senator Lindsay indicated, you know, there's already a monetary cap on the damages for municipalities at a million dollars. So, I mean, here again we're not making drastic changes in that aspect of how we're handling innocent victims. This will take care of innocent victims just like they're being taken care of now.

SENATOR ROBAK: Without this bill?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: This would take care of innocent victims, will not reduce the likelihood that innocent victims will not be taken care of

SENATOR ROBAK: They won't. Okay, I'll give my time back to the main person.

SPEAKER WITHEM: You have one minute left.

SENATOR LINDSAY: My, how things change? Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I, first, I wanted to address some other issues but I have to address Senator Maurstad's last statement. If this didn't affect innocent victims' compensation, this bill wouldn't be here and nobody would be interested. It is designed, it is intended and it will result in innocent victims getting less dollars and not being compensated. If it didn't, why would the cities be interested in it? If the cities didn't have to put out more money, or if they were going to put out the