

SENATOR HALL: And if it says "expressly provides", okay, explain to me, I guess, the question is rather for purposes of the amendment, why, when we're talking about the audit and the working papers of...documents that are already exempted under the public document issue, the public document law, why do we have to put this provision in there when we're dealing with those that are referred to in 84-712 and 84...through 05, why do we have to add additional language? And if this was a concern, where do we see the problem arising? I guess the burden should be on the introducer to explain the need for the additional language. If the auditor had no problem with it...

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yeah, okay.

SENATOR HALL: ...and we adopted his changed...

SENATOR PIRSCH: I guess...

SENATOR HALL: ...I don't see where the problem arises.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Hall. I guess I see a lot of new language talking about who shall have access to records and in what form and...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...when it would be nonpublic. And there are other statutes, I assume, that do hold different records and files as a nonpublic. So I guess I am questioning whether...why that is so bad to make sure that the public does have that information unless sections of laws that have already been established say that they shall not be made public. So I guess I will listen to the debate but...and will give the rest of my time, if I have any left, to Senator Witek to see what she would respond.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: There's only about ten seconds left. So the time having expired, Senator Witek, you're recognized at this point.

SENATOR WITEK: Mr. Chairman, members of the body, thank you, Senator Pirsch. That's my point, Senator Hall. I don't see why there is an objection to this amendment from you because it's doing exactly what you wanted or what you said you wanted this