

since that \$2,000,000 was spent we have to pick it all up. We were selective in what we chose to do, and the only thing we put in the main line appropriations bill is this amount of money which we felt developed and had to be spent because of a calculation error in terms of the assessment of other income sources that the University had. I think we'd be very safe to say that if we had had and the error was made on our side and not the University's, if we had not made that error, that the Appropriations Committee would have put that \$400,000 in general fund in the budget last year and it would already be in the base. So essentially what we're doing is putting something in that probably if we had had the information correctly last year we would have put in the base anyway. We did not pick up all of the money for faculty salaries and none of that cash fund money used for faculty salaries is in this bill. It's in another bill and we only agreed to pick up half of it. So we have said to the University, well we will not automatically pick up how you spend cash funds, and you cannot use cash funds to start programs and then come back and create a crisis situation and expect us to fall for that and replace it completely. So I would say that Senator Newell is correct in raising the question about manipulation of cash funds to create programs and then force us to pick those up, much like federal government sometimes uses funds as start-up money. I think the Appropriations Committee looked at that, looked at these cash fund monies and said, okay, this amount of money, this 400 some thousand dollars we do see a legitimate reason to pick that up, but the rest of it we questioned and we did not include. So I would oppose Senator Newell's amendment, in this particular case. I would urge him though to continue to watch the use of cash funds, to cooperate with the Appropriations Committee in terms of the annual accounting that we ask back from the University as to how they've spent funds, and appreciate his interest in this area, but I can't support the amendment.

SENATOR NICHOL PRESIDING

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I think I'd like to have a rule about now that only two, maybe three members of the Appropriations Committee can only speak against any single amendment. It's kind of obvious that the Appropriations Committee is standing very solid together in this situation, and I appreciate the gentleness with which Senator Fowler disagreed with me.