

do not understand that philosophy and I do not understand why people are so hesitant because they are concerned that some school districts have been pioneers in the area. And it is not just...I don't see it as an argument between rich districts and poor districts. As I have pointed out, I think it's more a matter of who had staff and personnel ready to go ahead and push forward and because some school districts did, they were ahead of the curve and had Internet on-line for those students. But I don't think that students should ever be penalized. I don't care if it's rich district, poor district, trained staff, whatever the reasons, we're talking plain and simple about equal opportunity and providing that possibility to all students. That's how I see the argument, Senator Beutler, and that's why I strongly have supported this bill and worked with Senator Robinson on it, and I do not think we're breaking new ground. I think we've done it in the past and I would hope that we will continue to do it in the future when we recognize that a certain need for children across the state. I will never frame my decision on if I need to pay back other schools who have already expended money to provide those opportunities. Philosophically I just simply do not understand that and I oppose the Beutler amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bohlke, I thank you for responding. There's nothing worse than a debate where in the debate where people either, one, don't respond or, two, don't respond to the point but try to get the argument off onto some side issue or some nonissue and I really do appreciate your responding. Let me say this, the example you give is weatherization and I appreciate that, however, weatherization had two key differences. One was that weatherization wasn't denied to anybody who applied. And, two, which is different from this case, because we are actually denying it to those that have already expended money. Secondly, weatherization was a loan program so that the money continued is essentially a loan program. And so that money continually turns over and the money is continually there and the problem with weatherization, if there is a problem with weatherization, is that the use for it has almost expired. It will have expired in four or five years. I think there's still a good use for it for four or five years, but the point is all of the school districts have maximized their use of it. They all had access to it and that's the way it was. That's the way it is. So I don't think that there is a