

them to use every source of revenue available to them, or the law would have said so. Let's say that a county is involved in a gambling operation, or a city, or a village. The argument could be made that this money is already obligated for other things, so we don't want to touch any of the gambling revenue to pay off these other expenses that are extraordinary that would justify the subdivision in trying to get the state to help bail them out. I want this bill to be as tight as possible, as restrictive as possible, and as limiting on these counties, cities, and villages as possible. We are not, as a state, in the business of conducting a charity. With all of the talk of cuts in property taxes and the state being asked to give more assistance to all political subdivisions, it is not wise to create an additional avenue by which a drain can be placed on the treasury. That's what this is that we're creating. We're punching a hole in the bucket that holds the state's funds. And I want that hole to be as small as possible, so as little can drip out as possible. So I will continue to look at trying to do something about that term "viable". But I'd like to ask Senator Vrtiska a question. When we're talking about disaster, first of all this is based on an amendment that I had offered, which was adopted, and it takes the language that is found in those statutes dealing with civil defense. And some items have been left out so that it narrows the definition for our purposes here. On page 1 of Senator Vrtiska's amendment, starting in line 15, it says, "Disaster means the occurrence of widespread or severe", then it mentions "damage, injury" and so forth. I want the record to be clear what my intention is. My intention, that the two words "widespread or severe" would apply to every one of the words that follow. So there would have to be widespread or severe damage, widespread or severe injury or loss of life or property, all of those would have to be widespread or severe, that's what my intention would be. Now I would like to ask Senator Vrtiska a question. Senator Vrtiska, would that be the meaning you want the definition of "disaster" to have also?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I don't...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: ...I don't have any problem with what you're saying, and certainly I want to do...I want to keep this, as you've indicated, as narrow as it could possibly be.