

\$12 million shortfall. Now, I feel a frustration, as most of us do, by a law that was passed by the federal government. The 4-R Act, as far as I'm concerned, is the cause of this special session, and this situation should be taken care of by the Congress. Now, we're all aware that sometimes things don't work out for whatever reason, and the Congress has failed to enact legislation for us to deal with the problem fully. For that reason I feel a frustration, as most of us do. But in dealing with the problem as it exists and the assumption that the Congress will not make any major changes dealing with the 4-R Act, we have to try to find some way to deal with this shortfall. One proposal has been the corporate tax rate, increasing that particular rate. But there is one area of the discussion that really has not been brought out in today's debate, and that has been the level of payment that has been made by the corporations in the State of Nebraska. The proponents of this particular amendment have been quick to point out that the rate or the percentage of contribution to our overall state budget has remained the same or has been reduced since 1981. But, if you look at the figures that were also handed out, they include the amount of corporate tax that has been paid in that period. In that particular period it has doubled; from '81-82 fiscal year we've had a corporate tax rate payment of 42 million, to the current '88-89 session or fiscal year to \$80 million. That's close to doubling, it shows that there has been a substantial increase in the corporate level of payment to support state government. And just because the rate hasn't changed doesn't mean that there hasn't been an increase in the amount to support state government, there has been an increase. Now I think that maybe this is an issue that should be discussed next year. No one was all that concerned, last session, when we were discussing who should have to make that payment and we allowed that responsibility of the 4-R Act to fall on the political subdivisions, and all of a sudden, in a special Session, it becomes an important issue. It was important last year and no one said anything about it. We picked up the ball one year for this particular problem, but we decided not to pick it up the following year. If it was crucial then, it should have been picked up. But this is a special session, this is a session that we're supposed to solve all of the problems of personal property tax, and that perhaps is the fallacy of that particular approach. We have a 60-day session coming up, more than enough time to solve all the personal property tax issues that are going to be before us. We just got through with the 90-day session. There were a number of