

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And they're designed to correct problems with this bill?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, the next amendment is going to specifically address the economic versus noneconomic issue so that the Legislature can decide if, in fact, they want to provide noneconomic damages to the injured party in all cases.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why should we jump through all these hoops with all these amendments and still come up a bill where the innocent third party might be cut out? And from the sensing I get, and it could be inaccurate, the body is not of a mind to take away that which is not available to innocent third parties. So why should we go through all these amendments?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Well, Senator, I don't know that that's the case yet or not. I assume that we will...we will at some point in time determine that. But it all, you know, boils down to the question that you've raised relative to non- versus noneconomic (sic) damages and the question dealing with, are we going to treat those injured parties that are hurt...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...by a police pursuit different from those that are injured by other emergency vehicles in other emergency situations.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Does one of your amendments strike the negligence requirement? Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. The big problem will still be there. I'm opposed to Senator Maurstad's amendment, but I'm in favor of the one Senator Lindsay's offering, which will bring truthfulness to this bill and it will take away that element which could result in the innocent third party receiving next to nothing for the noneconomic damages suffered.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Pedersen.