

explicitly in this bill. So even if under a general law something is the case, the specific rules the general. And you here are setting up a specific basis by which recovery is to be made. And based on what you're saying, there can be one type of recovery if the officer is negligent; there can be another type of the officer is not negligent. If the officer is negligent, then the non-negligent part cannot come into play,...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...it is short circuited.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So what you told me is not accurate about the way your bill operates.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, I beg to differ with you still because as I...in Section 1, at the tail end, cites the statutes that we're going to provide the proportional split under, and that statute is what indicates that they would cover the economic damages.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you and your bill are establishing when economic damages are to be recovered.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Only in those situations where you have an absence of negligence.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Otherwise it's already established by law.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you are saying to recover economic damages in connection with a chase there must be no negligence on the part of the officer.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, sir, I don't believe so.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's not what your bill says.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, sir, I don't believe you're accurately characterizing it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I think your bill says that in the