

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes. And answer this for me if you can. Although there may be some common law rules that would preclude it, there is certainly nothing in this bill that would preclude anybody from filing that injunction on the basis that it was not made in good faith. I mean, it wouldn't have to be a spouse or an adult child or a parent, would it? Could it be your confessor, or the parish priest?

SENATOR LANDIS: You would have to meet the standards of standing, but that means an interested party and such party could be a doctor, it could be a, you know, somebody who could establish an interest in the relationship and that could be done outside that list. We can conceive of interested parties. For example, John has a list of interested parties who can make in 696 that lists all of these and then in addition to them adds the phrase, "interested parties", and that's just a common...

SENATOR BEUTLER: And it wouldn't be your intent...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...trigger.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...to have a narrow version of interested parties in that respect, would it?

SENATOR LANDIS: No.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you. Given those replies, I think I feel very comfortable with the way that the bill is because there is a mechanism there, the good faith mechanism to get redress or remedy in the event that somebody feels that the consent is being given for the wrong reasons. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Robak. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you. Is Senator Landis still here? I want to pick up where Senator Beutler left off. Is my understanding correct that what you're saying that, and this is for purposes creating legislative history for the future. Is it your position that, or your intent that there is some court review ability involved here? And if so, what is the extent?

SENATOR LANDIS: I think there are two things that you could do, as you would be able to do under the current situation. Both of them would still remain available to you. Number one, I think