

decisions? Is that what the lawyers are going to rely on, this bill?

SENATOR LINDSAY: They're...well, yeah, they're going to take it into consideration. Are they going to rely on it totally? Probably not. As it develops it...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, why won't they rely on it totally? Because there's something in opposition to it that is out there?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Oh, sure.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And what is that other thing?

SENATOR LINDSAY: It's the Supreme Court Opinion and some uncertainty.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, without this there is no uncertainty, is there?

SENATOR LINDSAY: There is...that they do not have binding precedential authority is, is very clear, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. And this law then introduces uncertainty rather than certitude, doesn't it?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, no, because it...it helps to clarify or clear up some of that uncertainty because right now, it's not a certainty, it's a complete total vacuum because there is...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...no precedent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that's the certainty. The certainty is that there is no precedential value. If you get this law passed, then the uncertainty comes in because you ask yourself, do you rely on what the Legislature said or do you rely on what the Supreme Court said.

SENATOR LINDSAY: And you rely...when you say, would you absolutely rely on, that's what I'm saying. Most lawyers would not absolutely. You never rely completely on one authority. But we do know, laws of the Legislature or bills passed by the