to give adequate notice. Now Senator Labedz says it's not necessary but it's not in the bill. You could solve that problem with a small amendment but we can't amend the bill. We have rules now before the Supreme Court that require should we have an appeal even though the bill says it's supposed to be expedited and anonymous and confidential, for typed transcripts to be provided, the filing of briefs and the creation of oral arguments. Those are standard practices before the Supreme Court, all by rules, all of which would have to be changed. You could do that by an amendment but we can't make an amendment because we have a motion to suspend the rules and to vote on this without amendment, that change has to occur. This bill says you could have a guardian ad litem and it's not clear who pays for that guardian ad litem. Apparently it's not supposed to be the young teenager but it's unclear. You could solve that problem if you could amend the bill, but you can't amend the bill because you've got to suspend the rules to advance it, but without amendment. The bill is deficient in that way. This bill says that judges will give their rulings on the judicial bypass in the event maturity is shown. There are no standards of what maturity is. The judges in Minnesota, when on the stand said, I have no guidance, I use my own standards, in some case subjective. In other cases, they used intelligent tests. In other cases, they said, I interviewed and decided whether or not they had considered options. There was no single practice as to what maturity was. That could be overcome with some standards in the bill, a simple amendment, but we can't amend it. Why? Because we're suspending the rules without amendment to pass the bill. There are problems in the bill even on its faith with just the language absent, the question of morality, which we can't get to because of the way this is up. There are supposedly the maintenance of anonymity rather and confidentiality with no standards of how that's done. For example, petitions are normally done in public, they're part of public records. So, too, the court is supposed to make written findings of fact. Heretofore, those have always been public records. You can't have confidentiality and anonymity and also force the judge to make written, open public records on the other end. The introducers have never made clear what that is. You could solve that problem if you could amend the bill. You can't amend the bill because we're going to suspend the rules and not allow any amendments. Usually, when somebody walks in they have to have a petition to give to the court to ask for the court's time. That is, as I said, a public record; if it's not, there would have to be forms. If, in fact, you don't want to