

point and he or she would be prohibited from voting. Is that an accurate interpretation?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Well, I would not want that to be the interpretation, Senator Carsten, and again, applying court decisions to the language that I'm offering, your conclusion would not be the correct conclusion. Court decisions would say that the concept of immediate financial gain means that that member must effect that gain by reason of that vote on a personal basis and on a private basis as distinguished from a larger public, as distinguished from a larger public. All right? Now, you may have a personal situation as you've just discussed that you might benefit in a sense from that piece of legislation, but so long as there are others who are benefitting as well, then under the expression "immediate financial gain", the fact that others are benefitting as well allows you to vote. Now...without criminal sanction, without criminal sanction, and the reason, why has this even become an issue? It has become an issue because the Political Accountability and Disclosure Commission has taken sections of our law that the drafters never thought applied to voting, that they never though applied to voting and I know that because I have visited with the drafters and said, these sections can apply to voting.

SENATOR CARSTEN: And then, Senator Johnson, Mr. President, if I may ask one more.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Sure.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Then the same application would be at the moment against you in the legal profession could be applied. Is that my understanding?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes, yes. It could be...

SENATOR CARSTEN: Because you are not only individually, but collectively...

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: That's right.

SENATOR CARSTEN: ...in the legal profession. Is that correct?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: That is correct. So as a collective