

giving a special designation to that entity that currently holds the contract. Is that not right? At least until the end of that contract.

SENATOR WARNER: That is correct. It does apply, if there is a renewal...I do not know the dates of any existing contracts.

SENATOR HALL: And I do not either. I am not asking that because I can't answer it either, and I don't know, I just look at that and see that as potentially a very large loophole that would allow individuals who currently hold a contract to make contributions and be exempted under this law, even though they might, at the same time, be bidding on an additional contract that could come down the road. They could argue the contribution was made under the auspices of the company that held the state contract prior to the existence of this prohibition. Thank you, Senator Warner. I appreciate the response.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: The other part of the proposal that just strikes me the wrong way is, what the difference between these contractors, I guess, than the contractors, for example, on state highway projects? Those are statewide operations. They have had problems in the past. There has been bid rigging kinds of proposals. We don't prohibit those folks from making contributions to campaigns. And I've picked those out because they are, frankly, the only statewide contract that I could think of that has had problems in the past. I do agree with some of the language in the bill that says the people do want to have a lottery operation as clean as possible. They want to show that there is integrity involved and that there can't be any appearance of wrongdoing, but when we start to single out individual entities, or individual types of operations, I think that it is very difficult to draw the line at gambling, for instance.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Hall. The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.