

that have pretty much authority through a board or commission over the Director of Economic Development. One state has the Lieutenant Governor as Director and two that have an appointment made by a division head. Clearly 40 out of 50 states have the Governor making the appointment so that is a majority trend, but why we are in the situation we are now proposing a change is because we have had some negative experiences over the recent past, a department that has had some difficulty, and we are I guess being accountable, in a sense, suggesting a number of changes in the structure of the department, and among them is the changing the way the leadership of that department is selected. I have had grave reservation about changing that situation to take away that power from the Governor and give it to the board. As I said, the way it is done now, the board has applicants submitted to them. They review them and send over names to the Governor. The Governor then makes a selection. So that is one of three states that do it that way. What we are talking about under this bill is, a board or commission, I guess it is a commission is what we term it, would sit down and pick somebody, and then they send that name over to the Governor and the Legislature, and they could either accept it or reject it. If they reject it, I guess we are in a stalemate where the commission will have to go back and pick somebody else, but there is a veto power by the Governor or the Legislature in any appointment that would be made by the commission under this bill. Once an appointment is ultimately made under this proposal, then that person would serve at the pleasure of the commissioner, the commission, that is to say, after they are actually appointed, if the Governor signs off and the Legislature signs off, then they have no more input in terms of removal from office. It would be very similar to say Eugene Mahoney over at the Game and Parks Commission in that light that once appointed, unless the board that appoints them changes their mind, they are in for a certain period of time. The reason this is being proposed is to have a more long term view in terms of who serves in that capacity, not so much the changeover we have had. I think we have had on an average a two year term for most of these department directors in this area and we need people there for a longer period of time, not only for two up to four years in terms of a Governor's term, but beyond that, somebody there for a long period of time to build up the contacts and expertise, and it was thought that this approach would provide that. That is good but then you do lose the other side of it and