

Stoney's remarks and I can concur with his belief that we have, because of the very nature of our society, a school system that does not allow for the kind of religious indoctrination that some people feel is important. I recognize that and I think all of us must and do recognize that some people firmly believe there ought to be that daily religious indoctrination. I do not object to that. I think that is fine but I think that the state has an obligation, a responsibility to ensure that we have instruction of our children so that they can live in our society which requires a very educated populous. I have no opposition to religious schools. I have no opposition to those schools whatsoever and I believe that parents have a responsibility, yes, a responsibility to teach and to educate their children in their religious and moral convictions on an ongoing basis and I would oppose the state injecting itself into that function of the family but we are not talking about that. We are talking here about whether the state has a right or a responsibility to even require the education of children, and not only the education of children, but whether or not that will be done in a manner to ensure that they are properly educated. Certification, certification is the issue here, not religious belief. Senator Beutler talked about religions having private schools or parochial schools for years and years and they have done that and they have done that, complying with every law that the state requires. They have not asked for waivers. They have not asked for anything else. They basically have just complied with those laws and if the law was ever proposed to be reaching into those areas where it has no responsibility, those churches, those people of deep religious conviction said that is an area in which the state should not be involved and we oppose it and in every case the state basically recognized that and backed down. But now we are being asked to make exceptions to certification. We are being asked purely on economic reasons, not on religious basis, but on economic justification to exempt certain people from having certified teachers. It is really...the heart of this issue is whether the state has a responsibility to ensure that every child has an opportunity for an education. We mandate education and we do that and very few people argue the efficacy of that process and very few people have ever argued the efficacy of certification but now it has become an economic issue. It is, in fact, an economic issue. It is solely an economic issue. It is only an economic issue with which many people rise and say, the state has no responsibility because if, in Senator Dworak's words, if they are involved, the state has a right to speak in this regard...

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have thirty seconds.

SENATOR NEWELL: ...then, in fact, they can regulate many other areas. We are not asking to regulate churches. We are not