

obey the Supreme Court when it was sent back or are they bound to follow the statute which has not been ruled unccnstitutional?

SENATOR LINDSAY: They would be...well, they would be bound...the Supreme Court, first of all, could not, we assume the Supreme Court is going to follow statutes, we have to make that assumption. I mean you pose an interesting question, if they completely ignore it altogether, without making reference. What they would do, and I think the practical thing is, they would either say this is constitutional or this is not constitutional in sending it back to the Court of Appeals in the first place.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But if they don't.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, if they don't, I mean they can send things back without directions and they can do that right now.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And tell them, you process this.

SENATOR LINDSAY: And the Court of Appeals could send it back up. I mean you could get into a, whatever kind of loop you call those.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And do you think that the appellate court would challenge the Supreme...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...Court directly?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers, you may continue.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think that the appellate court would challenge the Supreme Court directly?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: I guess it depends on the panel of the Court of Appeals. There's some I think that might, some that might not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and in all likelihood, but I can't say that, I don't know that what I posed to you may not happen or