

February 11, 1985

practice extends particularly to almost exclusive out of state activities. I chose to do that. Other lawyers here chose to work within the state. I chose to do it deliberately to avoid conflict problems. One of my main areas has been and will be the Caribbean Basin, Jamaica, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Virgin Islands, at least they were when I left, so on. I intend to continue my practice there. My practice primarily does not involve lottery, but, yes, I will continue to do that work. They have legalized lotteries in those places. My primary practice down there involves export and import. It involves doing certain work for agencies of the federal government which I am not going into now but which is completely separate and independent work, legal work based on some of my skills. It involves, as I say, a variety of those things. I have no ownership, investment, whatever, in IGT of Nebraska, never have, and with my finances probably never will. However, if I did, even if I did, or if I owned a lottery company myself, the issue of a conflict is a little premature. There isn't even a bill here. There are no legal lotteries in this state. If one is passed, it may or may not be a state operated lottery. More important, if a lottery is passed where individuals can participate, then potentially every man, woman and child in this body, plus one and a half million Nebraskans can get in the business, same as I could or anybody else could. The point I am making is, I am willing to have the standards applied to me as long as they are applied to everybody else. I think I can hold up under any conflict of standard...interest standard you want. I think that when you read the articles as they develop on the issue, simply do this, apply the same standards to yourself, see where you are. Old John will feel satisfied he is okay. As I say, my business is out of the state, has been and I intend to continue. Thirty more seconds and I will quit. But I want to give you an exact parallel, an exact parallel, and think about this. Initiative 300 bars corporate ownership of farmland. I am working with other people to put together farm groups or corporations for ownership of land in other states, some people from Nebraska. I am also in here diligently working for a repeal of Initiative 300 because I think it is bad for the state. Are you going to tell me my work in trying to put farmers or investors together to own farmland in other states where it is legal is somehow a conflict of interest because I am working to repeal Initiative 300 here? Precisely the same situation. I appreciate the time and I just thought I would clear this