

monies in other ways, only...of the money that they provided, only \$887,784 went to the faculty salaries; \$660,000 went to miscellaneous usage and partial inflation coverage, and \$460,000...by the way, those two figures the 887 thousand was stricken from the budget by the Appropriations Committee and the 660 thousand was stricken by the Appropriations Committee, but the Appropriations for some reason, Committee, for some reason did not choose to strike the 460 thousand dollars from the appropriation... from their appropriation. Basically, what the University has done is taken money which the Legislature has not specifically authorized because of their recent Supreme Court decision, one that authorizes them to do whatever they darn well please with money, and add additional dollars which we then are duty bound to fund. What I mean by that is simply this. The 1.5 percent increase that the University provided for faculty salaries will be passed on in terms of additional appropriation requests in the future. That's just factored right on in there. I think the Appropriations Committee was wise in taking that 887 out. The 660 thousand, I'm not very clear on. It's miscellaneous inflation coverage, and the 460 thousand is what I'm trying to strike. That's what the Appropriations left in. Now let me make some very general points here that I think are most important. Last year the University's increase was approximately 7 percent. It was, in fact, a lump sum appropriation due to the Supreme Court decision. All appropriations are, in fact, lump sum. This \$2,000,000 was taken out of the cash funds and the University is requesting that the 460,000, which I am attempting to strike, be replaced. Now the rationale is not very clear, but what is clear is this, that of a budget of 107,100... 107,000,000, excuse me, 107,000,000 in '78-'79, 107,800,000, the University knew full well that this 460,000 which they have chosen to rationalize that they should be getting back, they knew full well that that was in fact an under-estimation of cash receipts by the Appropriations Committee, and as an underestimate...an underestimate, or overestimate of what they would receive from these cash receipts, the University realizing this before the budget bill ever hit the floor, did not ask for that \$460,000 to be added at that time. So they're coming back this year and saying, well you should have added that and for that reason we deserve to have this \$460,000. I'm saying that those \$2,000,000 that the University has fought long and hard to get this "lump sum budgeting" so that they can make priorities, they can make decisions on their own, and the University ought to make their case ahead of time and not in retrospect and for that reason I think these...this \$460,764 can easily