

SENATOR BEUTLER: And what was the problem with the bill last year in committee? Which committee was this?

SENATOR ABOUD: I believe it was the Agriculture Committee.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Agriculture? And what was the...well, let me ask the chairman of the Ag Committee then, what was the problem with this bill. Senator Johnson, obviously I don't want any bad baggage on the bill and if it was killed in committee it causes me some concern.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: I understand what you're saying, Senator Beutler. It is my understanding we thought all of the things in Senator Marsh's bill could be done under the current statutes without putting them actually in...language in the bill itself, so that is basically the reason the committee did not take action on that bill. I can't recall specifically verbatim why the committee chose not to, but that, in talking with Senator Sieck as we were discussing this, that was the reason we thought that many things could be done right now without actually tacking this onto this particular bill.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So it was not that it caused any detriment, but simply that it was unnecessary?

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: We thought it was, if I recall. We just thought it was unnecessary at this particular point.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Marsh, if I may ask you, what is the purpose of the...is it necessary or what is the purpose of the bill?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you. Thank you for asking. The amendment follows the original legislation in providing the definition of flammable liquids and it provides an exemption for locations where a high water table makes underground storage impracticable. The amendment is necessary primarily, since the original legislation was repealed and county attorneys are refusing to prosecute violations. There is an administrative rule dealing with underground storage, however, the rule is not as restrictive as the original legislation and as a practical matter, county