

May 14, 1979

LB 585

that is all I have to say. I move for the adoption of this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Marsh, do you wish to be...?

SENATOR MARSH: Call the previous question.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The previous question has been called. Do I see five hands? The previous question has been called. Do I see five hands? Okay. All those in favor of ceasing debate vote aye, opposed no. Record the vote.

CLERK: 7 ayes, 16 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Motion fails. Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise in opposition to the motion that Senator Keyes presents to the body today. I think there has been a great deal of talk about gasohol and a great deal of rhetoric about gasohol and the energy problems on the floor of the Legislature but I would like you to consider several factors when you consider placing a million dollars of taxpayers' money into the gasohol program. This appears to me to be a case where some individuals who continually talk about how we should be conservative with taxpayers' funds think it is all right until you get to a program that may impact them. I would like to present some information to you from the University of Kansas from, excuse me, from Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas, a Leonard Schruben, who is a research economist in the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station in Manhattan and he says and I quote, "the present technology uses 2.87 gallons equivalent energy for one gallon of grain alcohol returned. Since the U.S. must import energy the gasohol program will require increased imports of foreign oil by a factor of 2.87 times for every gallon of alcohol used in gasohol", and then he gives some other additional information about the engineering factors that relate to the production of alcohol which would be used in gasohol. Now I think you need to consider some of this information and the economic feasibility before you put state money into gasohol so I rise in opposition. I think that it is not wise of us to put state funds and tax dollars into the development and actual grants into the production of gasohol. If this is economically feasible, if it is feasible from an energy point of view, then it is going to be done privately without state tax dollars. I urge you very strongly to vote against this particular amendment to put \$1,000,000 into the gasohol program.