VETO MESSAGE:

VETO MESSAGE - No. 91

TO THE SENATE:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, the following bill: Senate Bill Number 1989, entitled:

"AN ACT to amend the civil service law, in relation to credits $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

allowed to children and siblings of uniformed $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

killed in the line of duty"

NOT APPROVED

workers.

Chapter 495 of the Laws of 2002 provides the children and siblings of firefighters and police officers killed in the line of duty with ten additional points on their civil service examinations. This bill would extend that benefit to the children and siblings of uniformed sanitation

The sponsors of the bill justify the bestowal of this benefit by

citing the "care and devotion" that sanitation workers "display for

every neighborhood," and ask that the "importance of their work" be

recognized through enactment of this legislation. I cannot disagree with

the sponsors' description of the importance of the work that sanitation

workers perform for New Yorkers' health and well-being, or of the

professionalism and dedication with which they carry out their job.

Nonetheless, I do not believe that the appropriate \mbox{way} to \mbox{honor} that

work is to give children and siblings of deceased workers a leg up over

their competitors in vying for state jobs.

The supporters of the bill submit no evidence to show that sanitation $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

workers are subject to a risk of violent death comparable to that faced

by firefighters or police officers, nor do they $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

their offspring and siblings should receive a competitive advantage over

other $\mbox{New Yorkers}$ - including those whose brother, sister or parent was

also killed while working at a job not included within the titles

covered by this bill. Whatever the merits of this approach to addressing

tragedies that arise from public employment - and my general view is

that any deviation from the merit-based process of selecting civil serv-

ants should be limited and rare — it makes little sense to $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

benefits $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +$

as to why they are included, and others are left out.

Finally, I note that this bill raises serious constitutional concerns.

Under Article V, Section 6 of the New York Constitution, appointments

and promotions in the civil service should be "according to merit and

fitness to be ascertained, as far as practicable, by examination which, $\$

as far as practicable, shall be competitive." The Section sets forth

certain exceptions for veterans, but does not offer $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

the workers covered by this bill.

The "merit and fitness" principle is at the bedrock of our system of

public employment. Yet the more the civil service system is $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

means to favor individuals for reasons unrelated to their fitness for $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

the jobs at issue, the more it will drift from its constitutional ${\tt moor-}$

ings. We should not permit that to occur.

The bill is disapproved.

(signed) ELIOT SPITZER