VETO MESSAGE:

VETO MESSAGE - No. 49

TO THE SENATE:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, the following bills: Senate Bill Number 177-A, entitled:

"AN ACT to amend the labor law, in relation to requiring represen- $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left$

tatives from veterans' organizations on the New York $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

force investment board"

and Senate Bill Number 948-C, entitled:

"AN ACT to amend the labor law, in relation to the membership of

New York state workforce investment board"

NOT APPROVED

Each of these bills pursues a worthy goal - to insure that the voices

of certain important groups within the State are heard on the State

Workforce Investment Board ("SWIB"), the entity that allocates federal $\ensuremath{\text{G}}$

job-training funds received by New York under the Workforce Investment

Act of 1998 ("WIA"). Unfortunately, the bills conflict with each other, $% \left(1998\right) =1000$

and with federal law.

SWIB was created pursuant to the federal WIA, which $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

majority of SWIB's members must be business representatives, chosen in

accordance with certain very specific conditions set forth in $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

At present, New York meets those requirements, with business represen-

tatives comprising 21 of the 41 members of the board (51%).

The first bill (S.177-A) would increase the total number of SWIB $\,$

members to 44, by adding two individuals recommended by the AFL-CIO with

experience in "mature worker issues," and adding the Director of the

Office for the Aging to the board. The second bill (S.984-C) would

increase the total number of SWIB members to 43, by adding two veterans nominated by the AFL-CIO.

Needless to say, it is not possible to sign both bills, because they

are mutually contradictory, creating boards of different sizes with

different compositions. Moreover, signing either bill would place $\mathop{\mathrm{New}}$

York out of compliance with federal law, because a minority of the ${\tt SWIB}$

members would be business representatives. New York receives a signif-

icant amount of federal aid under WIA, which could be put into jeopardy $\$

if these proposals were enacted. For that reason, the Department of $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1$

Labor, the Division of the Budget and the Governor's Office of $\operatorname{\sc Employee}$

Relations all oppose these bills.

I fully support increasing representation by the elderly and veterans $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

on ${\tt SWIB}$, provided this is done in a manner that complies with federal

law. WIA currently is up for reauthorization in Congress, and $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$ staff

will monitor any changes in that law that might affect the composition $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

of SWIB. In addition, my staff will work with the Legislature to find $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

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

the interim, however, because federal law does not allow for the changes

these bills would effectuate, I cannot allow them to be enacted.

The bills are disapproved.

(signed) ELIOT SPITZER