

doing considerable research over the weekend and reading more about child abuse, it seems that it goes in a cycle and at some time, some place you have to break the cycle or it will continue from now until eternity. Children who are abused grow up, marry, and then begin to abuse their own children because this is the way they were reared. So somewhere along the line if we break the cycle, there will come a time, hopefully, that there will be no child abuse or little child abuse. I was not in favor of this in the beginning because I was afraid it would start just another duplicative program. But I found out that we do not actually have a child abuse program at this time. For that reason I am going to vote to advance LB 333, although I don't think I did on General File. But I can think of no better way to spend \$10 billion than to start a program that would at least be a beginning to stop child abuse. Remember, when you create child abuse and it goes on from generation to generation those children also grow up to become the greatest amount of those who commit other crimes, not just child abuse. Remember, there are many, many forms of child abuse. There is sexual child abuse, there is mental child abuse, there is physical child abuse. If the generations below us grow up under those conditions, what kind of a society will we have in just the next short five to ten years? So \$250,000 at first blush to me looked like a lot of money. But when I compare it to what we spend on football in this state, when I compare it to what we spend on so many other projects I think it is a pittance. Therefore I'm going to support LB 333 and would urge the rest of the body to support it. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Mr. Clerk, we have an amendment to the amendment?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler would move to amend Senator Warner's amendment. (See Beutler amendment found on page 2099 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, my amendment would essentially do two things. It would reduce the appropriation from \$250,000 to \$200,000, and it would strike the provision relating to the establishment of the trust fund. I am doing this to give you the opportunity to reject what is essentially, I think, a novel suggestion