

into a contract to provide where the state is directly involved, cannot enter into a contract where an individual had made such a contribution. It is the reverse, in a sense. They are not...I guess they aren't prohibited from making a contribution unless they want to become...bid on a contract to provide the services.

SENATOR HALL: But what if they have already acquired the service, the contract?

SENATOR WARNER: This is prospective only, it is not retroactive, so anything that is in existence now is unaffected. It would only be prospective, and anything they may have done in the past obviously would be inappropriate to attempt to...

SENATOR HALL: But I am talking about a contract that has already been signed, for example.

SENATOR WARNER: With the state?

SENATOR HALL: With the state, a contract that has already been signed prior to this law being passed.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR HALL: Would that individual or entity be prohibited from making contributions?

SENATOR WARNER: Oh, in the future?

SENATOR HALL: Yes, yes, in the future.

SENATOR WARNER: Not for the contract that was in existence but once it was a new contract, yes. This is not retroactive to affect the contract that is already in existence for the obvious reason that none of the parties could have known this statute might be proposed or enacted.

SENATOR HALL: Would the...so, in other words, an individual who would have the state contract today could contribute until the, and I don't know what the length of that contract is, I mean I am not sure myself. If it is five years or ten years or whatever it is, they would be able to continue to contribute, but since this bill has the emergency clause on it, once it became law, no other entity who wanted to bid would have the ability to make those contributions. So, in effect, we would be