

we raised judges salaries and it was deemed at that time that in order to raise judges' salaries it was important to raise court fees and that was an appropriate sort of judgment the Legislature made at that time. The two were certainly germane to one another. To say that we should make our spending decisions totally removed from where the dollars come from is a...is a terrible precedent to set. A ruling like that is a terrible precedent. I would reiterate that I disagree with the Schmit amendment because I don't think that it's necessary in this particular case. I don't think it's appropriate, policywise, to put it on here but I think it is certainly within the prerogative of Senator Schmit to offer an amendment of this kind. It's certainly within the prerogative of the body to make a determination of where their dollars come from when they fund the program. Spending dollars and raising dollars, there is nothing in the world more germane than that and I think that it would be a bad precedent, although, personally, it would expedite what I want to accomplish here today. If the President would rule this out of order, I think it would be an inappropriate precedent to set.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, at first I was going to reserve my comments till after your ruling but since the discussion is going to occur prior to that, I will go ahead and get mine in at this point. Senator Withem and those who followed this particular discussion, what I have done is to look, as you say you try to do, at the nature of the amendment and even if it's an amendment that I don't like, since I have always pushed for a broad interpretation of the germaneness rule, I will support the germaneness of an amendment, even if I don't like it, if I think it's germane. But I'm trying to bring into focus the body's insincerity when it talks about the germaneness rule. Speaker Barrett has indicated on occasion that even if an amendment amends a specific section of statute that the particular bill deals with, it might be not germane because the original intent of the bill, when introduced, did not touch that. So if you're going to go to an entirely different chapter, then now are you going to say that's germane? I would and I could, because I think if you amend a criminal statute, you open the whole criminal code and I've stated that before. I'm talking about the way the rest of you all have been voting. If you accept Senator Withem's argument that any time a bill is offered for any purpose, then you can amend it to raise taxes and say you