

sense, when applied would say that lots of transactions that we would think could catch us up, won't catch us up. The word immediate not only means now in time, it also means close to, be close to us, close to us in proximity and that means that the vote will result in some personal gain and private gain as opposed to public gain, as opposed to public gain, a private gain. And I guess the classic case really, and I will use a lawyer's example. The classic case is this. If I as a lawyer was to present a tort claim on behalf of a client to the State of Nebraska, and if that tort claim ultimately came before this Nebraska Legislature and I cast a vote on that tort claim in the Nebraska Legislature knowing that that claim when paid would result in a contingency fee to me, my gain is personal as private because I'm the only one that is going to get that. I'm the only one who is going to get that. Okay. Under the language that I have prepared because of a court decisions, if I cast that vote, I would be guilty of a criminal offense. Let me tell you, under current law...

SPEAKER NICHOL: Minute.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: ...as applied by the commission, if I cast that vote, I am guilty of a criminal offense and I'm trying to narrow the scope of exposure as opposed to broaden it.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Conway, then Senator Schmit. I don't see Senator Conway. Senator Schmit, do you want to go ahead, please. Then Senator Hannibal.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I recognize that Senator Johnson is trying to clarify the statute and I think that it is interesting that we find ourselves in this kind of a situation. I agree that there should be full disclosure. There should be a full disclosure of our interests, activities, business, personal, et cetera, and then once having made those disclosures, the public can decide whether or not we vote for personal gain or whether we vote for the general public. I think it's of interest of course, and I think that as I have said earlier, Senator Hoagland's very pointed question was specifically detailed, but it also, I'm sure we all recognize, was directed to determine if there was some possible manner in which I acted improperly voting on the video lottery bill. I would have to suggest that there was no bill in the history of the