

haranguing each other with a parade of horrors. We are now down to the question of what kind of public policy are we going to live with? I think the body has read the street, knows that there's votes for a parental notification bill. I recognize that that's true. What I also am heartened by and it's something that I have listened for in the past and only recently have heard, and I'm grateful for hearing it, and I hear it in the line of debate that Senator Lindsay is pursuing in which he is trying to sift through the real problems from what might be the illusory problems, the ones that are brought up for rhetorical excess, the ones that are a shotgun approach, trying to pick through them to find the ones that are genuine problems with how the judicial bypass will operate as opposed to other kinds of situations. I think there are four or five issues that are open. First, how are we going to protect confidentiality? We had a question raised about a judge who doesn't act in three days, good faith or bad faith. What do you do? If you've got a mandamus, yes, there's an opportunity for confidentiality but no order for confidentiality. Is there a way we need to examine the issue of confidentiality for this process? Secondly, whatever the time frame is, and my guess is we don't have the expertise on this floor today to find out what that number is. Should it be three? Should it be four? Should it be seven? Should it be different for the highly populated areas and a little different for rural areas? Joe Steele could probably help us out. A court administrator could help us out but that's another area that I think is open. I thought John was giving a good faith answer for what happens if a judge doesn't act in three days but, frankly, there is a couple of things that are open on that score. A mandamus that does not have a priority action or a priority claim, which it would not under our statutes, would fall into the same difficulty of doing...of timely decisions so that if you've got a judge who is reluctant, accepted the case, sitting on the decision, if you went in for a mandamus, the confidentiality is questionable and certainly the time frame is questionable. We would need to nail that down. And the last place is to whom should this process apply? I thought Senator Crosby raised a good point. There are areas where people who disagree with each other on whether or not the whole process is a good idea, nonetheless could compare their points of view in identifying a workable judicial bypass process. We have yet to do that and we need to do that. If we adopt the Lindsay amendment or the Bernard-Stevens amendment, we will make a temporary decision but there are other issues that remain open. What I would suggest is this. I would suggest,