

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 11, 2003 LB 355

Senator Landis, and I'll... particularly now that we've changed course and withdrawn the amendment. Because if you look at the operative language, we are including in the subset of compensation paid by a business, trade or profession shall constitute income derived from sources within this state if, and at (e) we're saying some of the service as a corporate director is performed in this state and the headquarters of the corporation is in this state, but does not include any fees directly attributable to attendance at board meetings outside this state. So I will either cover it on this five-minute segment or another one. The scenario I'm imagining is that oftentimes boards of directors of corporations headquartered in Nebraska, and we're privileged to have some wonderful corporations headquartered in Nebraska, structure their director fees as follows. There's an annual directors fee, and then there is a per-meeting fee in addition, sort of like a per diem that we talk about (laugh) only we're not paid like directors. My concern is that we are saying, and Senator Landis can and will correct me on anything I'm wrong about, but we are saying that we want to make sure we're able to tax the whole of what I'll call the base director fee, and then we want to tax every meeting fee where the meeting is held in Nebraska. Well, my mind immediately jumps to the conclusion that if I'm a corporation and if you're hassling me, I can do two things: one, I'll abolish the annual fee, base fee, so we don't have that problem; and then I'll hold all my board of director meetings outside the state of Nebraska. And since we aren't really into encouraging our corporations to perform in that manner, nor am I suggesting that any of them would, I'm sure that's advice that they would decline, but it illustrates my concern that we're going after a gnat with a bazooka. And I'm trying to figure out why we're doing this, how much money is involved. Has there simply been a hassle for the Department of Revenue or some bureaucrat located therein and, in their fit of pique they come back and they say, we'll show them; we're going to solve this? It gets a little more complicated than that because, while I'm not pretending, believe me, to be a tax lawyer, I know enough to be dangerous and I know that if you have a director, say from the state of Texas, who happens to be serving one of our Fortune 500 companies as a director that we're privileged to have located in Nebraska, then there may be some attempt to get