

it does nothing more than what we thought we had done all along with regard to this area, and I believe that it's a good proposal as written. Again, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Witek, you're recognized to close.

**SENATOR WITEK:** Mr. Speaker, members of the body, if what you're sealing off then is just the compiling of the information in the auditor's office, that easily accessible form that you could go into the auditor's office and he would have already compiled all the working papers, then you are not sealing off any of the working papers for an audit, according to your interpretation of your language. And if every instance you've given me, every example you've given me has been to the Legislature, then why wouldn't you support this amendment that narrows this to the Legislature instead of assuming that this language calling working papers, say in the Department of Social Services, that you say that, yes, all those areas are still accessible to the public. If the auditor compiled the report of all those areas, and I don't know how long it took them to do that, but I imagine it was some period of time, of all those taxi cab rides and put it into an auditor's report, then what you are sealing off is the actual auditor's report. And yet the language of the bill says that final reports are still accessible, and you're telling me that working papers are still accessible, then what's the point of the bill? If you're telling us that we can see the final report, we can see all the working papers, we're not sealing anything off, then what is the necessity of bringing in a bill? And you're talking about changing form and responding to the Attorney General's Opinion, you're talking about one incident concerning senators' phone records. You already have the language in the bill, 579, that seals that off and makes that confidential. If you're concerned about just getting to the senators' phone records then use the language that you have in the bill that you've explained and narrow it to just the Legislature, and there would be no purpose, you've given me no purpose or no reason to include anybody else. You haven't explained any incidences where this has been necessary anywhere other than in the Legislature. You haven't given me any reason to believe that this would be any better than the language that we already have on...in statute on public records that those...all those other departments in state government would be subject to. So why change the language for the entire state