

at least leaving me my dignity, because she was compensated enough that she could live in a house that she can get around in, instead of spending, as she did the first two years after the accident, in her bedroom because the wheelchair couldn't get out of bedroom. Who do we think is going to pay for that? It's going to be the state. So let's not kid ourselves into thinking that we're getting out from something. All we're doing is saying this body is going to struggle with it instead of those local municipal and county bodies. The second thing we talk about, as Senator Bromm accurately states, it takes some time to get paid. It does take some time to get paid. Rose Cappiello was injured on October 3, 1990. When did she receive her last payment under that judgment awarded. judgment awarded against the city? Two days before we pulled this bill out of committee, 1996, five and a-half years after the accident, and that's under strict liability, that's under, as we said, you just got to prove that the city was involved or proximately caused it. Now we're going to add parties. We're going to add the fleeing driver, the vehicle owner, all public entities whose law enforcement officers initiated, participated in, or terminated the pursuit. And then we're going to go over to another section of statute and we're going to divide those out by fault, a percentage here, a percentage there, and we're going to have all these parties arguing with each other about who's liable for how much. Is this going to streamline things? Seriously, if you have two lawyers involved and it takes five and a-half years, let's get five or six lawyers involved, and that should shorten it? Come on! I think we know better than that. This is going to make it much longer, much longer. We have a limited... we have an injured person. And I know this has been a question among several of you. You have an injured person who is damaged, already limited by statute, already limited by statute to a million dollars. And that sounds like a lot of money and it is a lot of money, unless you've got medical bills of \$4 million, which has occurred in these cases. Then that doesn't... it isn't a drop in the bucket. But they're already limited to that \$1 million. They're already limited to that \$1 million. Now if we have that limited amount of money and we want to reduce what the city has to pay, who's going to bear the brunt of that? Do we really think the fleeing driver is going to? If that's the case, why would the city be in here worrying about it? They've got a \$1.5 million judgment in the Cappiello case, a \$1.5 million judgment against the fleeing driver.