

# Doesn't anyone care?

Several months ago members of Suffolk County legislative committees were made aware of problems at the Suffolk County Infirmary involving a rash of fractures suffered by some of the patients, and a charge of conflict of interest in the selection process of the Infirmary's director of nurses. Despite the essentially serious nature of these matters, these committees, and the county attorney's office which launched an investigation, have done precious little to shed light on these issues.

Recent reports indicate the nursing director has resigned, which is, we understand, giving some legislators cause to walk away from the conflict of interest issue without further investigation. This would be little more than a cop out. The issue involved charges that top level officials of the Suffolk County Health Department were involved in the selection process that resulted in the selection of the wife of a top level health department official. Was there a conflict of interest in this selection process? When one member of the selection committee voted against the final choice, he was dumped from that committee and replaced with someone else, who voted for her. Why? Doesn't anyone wonder? Doesn't anyone care?

Will it happen again during the selection

process for a new director of nurses? Who will make the final choice this time? Who will establish the selection criteria? Will it be someone well-connected? Or the best possible, best qualified person for the job?

When the matter of the rash of fractures came up, the problem was discussed by the legislature's Health Committee, chaired by Legislator John Foley. That discussion included presentations by the top officials of the health department. They explained the problem away as a medical problem associated with elderly patients, which makes them prone to hairline fractures. If that were truly the case, why would the number increase over the first quarter of this year? Why wouldn't the number remain fairly constant? One individual who has raised some serious questions about these fractures was given a brief opportunity to comment, but from the audience, not as an active participant in the discussion. Why wasn't a full investigation launched by this committee to explore the matter, to call in employees who may be able to provide pertinent information? To get at the truth? Doesn't anyone care?

The Legislative and Personnel Committee, chaired by Legislator Donald Blydenburgh, also met on the matter, but in executive session. Again, the top level officials of the health department appeared to present their version of the matter. The press

was excluded, so we cannot report on what transpired. Again, no effort was made to get information from employees who may have valuable information to present.

The Suffolk County Attorney's office is investigating the matter. That investigation continues. No report on the results of that investigation are expected until mid-August. That's about the same time the legislature is slated to convene again, following a six-week vacation.

Call it a recess, a vacation, or whatever, it is especially troubling to us that our gov-

ernmental officials would put something as sensitive as this on the back burner while they take six weeks off. If indeed there is a contributing factor that has caused this rash of fractures, shouldn't it be uncovered as quickly as possible to spare any unnecessary suffering? Doesn't anyone care?

Suffolk County government has many problems. It is in the throes of a fiscal crisis and a taxpayer revolution. But it doesn't cost money to be compassionate, to care, to get at the truth. Doesn't anyone care?

And why not?

## Whining and crying

In preparation for the 1990 budget, the Suffolk County Legislature and the county executive are conducting budget hearings. Department heads are parading before them whining, crying and sniffing. Instead of telling the lawmakers what they have accomplished, what they can accomplish with a set amount of money, they are acting like a bunch of spoiled rich kids who are being asked to give up their Jeep while they still have a Porsche and Mercedes in the garage.

The daily newspapers have been picking up on this childish whining by highlighting the people-sensitive items the department heads claim are the only items they would consider eliminating from the budget. A case in point: one department head has suggested charging fees to ambulance companies and fire departments for any services rendered by the county. That's not cutting costs! That's arrogance, nothing more than shifting the burden to another agency, which is supported by the very same taxpayers.

The county executive and legislature should send these crybabies back to their drawing boards with properly spanked behinds. This kind of nonsense is not productive, is not

good government and produces budgetary chaos that has resulted in Suffolk residents paying the highest taxes in the nation. It has resulted in long-time residents being forced to move out of the county and thousands more placing "For Sale" signs in front of their homes or businesses hoping they can sell before foreclosure takes place.

The county executive and the legislature would be wise to halt this charade. Establish for each department head a budget limit based on that department's allocation according to a budget that would live within the guidelines of the 1983 budget cap law.

Department heads should be instructed to come back to the legislature and the county executive and tell them specifically what they are going to achieve for this money that they have been allocated. Specific goals, specific planned accomplishments. Generalities should be disregarded as rhetoric and inserted in File 13.

It's time for our county employees, particularly department heads, to start acting like grown up boys and girls who have serious responsibilities.

And why not?

## Where are all the young people?

"I can't afford to buy a house." ... "There is no affordable housing on Long Island." ... "I can't afford the taxes, they are too high for my earnings."

We hear these statements from young people on a regular basis. They complain about injustices done to them or conditions they have to live under. But complain is all they do.

Recently we were speaking with an office-seeker, who stated that in his town, in last year's primary, the youngest person to vote was 44 years of age.

We have attended Tax PAC meetings, the taxpayers' political action committee, throughout Suffolk. Although the meetings are well attended, there has been one chilling observation, with few exceptions: the young people are missing. When we say young we are speaking of those 40-years and under, not just the teenagers or those first becoming eligible to vote.

What is it with the young people that has created the lack of involvement? Did the youth of the sixties burn itself out over the Vietnam protest? The youth of that era, so conspicuously missing now, know first-hand that through citizen involvement, you can change government and make it responsive to your demands.

Where are the children of the seventies and eighties, the yuppies? Are they so content and caught up in their materialism that they are willing to let others carry the water forever? Don't they realize that if you don't speak up and protect your behind, someone else will eat your lunch? And their lunch is being eaten. Many are paying thousands of dollars more in real estate taxes than they would have to if Suffolk County, its towns and schools, operated even close to the nation's norm for spending and taxation.

All of you young people who are complacent with your plight in life, we encourage you to look beyond the materialism to the government that surrounds you. You can have an effect on it, but you must have input. Why not give up an evening of self pleasure for an evening of involvement? Why not budget some of your talents and your abilities and invest them in the political process, whether it be direct involvement in political parties or involvement in groups that are working on your behalf, such as Tax PAC?

This is your country. This is your government, and if you leave it to Jack to do it, he is going to do it to you. Is this what you want? Or do you want to have a hand in controlling your own destiny?

And why not?

## George has a plan

Energy Secretary James Watkins and President George Bush are reportedly collaborating on a plan of action to block the decommissioning of the Shoreham nuclear plant, under the guise of protecting this nation's "energy policy." If they really wanted to work for the benefit of this country, they would devote some time to finding out how the nation's nuclear weapons plant system has become the national tragedy that it has. And how to clean up the mess they created at the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Watkins has declared that Shoreham is brand new, high tech, well-run and safe. On what basis does Watkins come to this conclusion? Is it based on his expertise in how the nuclear weapons plants have become the environmental disaster of this century? One that is going to cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars because of the inept supervision by the Department of Energy. Or how the BNL has polluted

the environment to the extent it now qualifies for the Super Fund cleanup category, reserved for the most polluted sites?

The entire matter of the weapons plants, and the national laboratories, has been screaming for a Congressional and, perhaps, Justice Department, investigation. The manner in which these plants were permitted to deteriorate, and to pollute the air, ground water, rivers, streams, and impact on the lives of those who live near them, is criminal. If not in a legal sense, it surely is in every other way.

But an investigation is needed. The facts must be revealed. We call upon Long Island's Congressional delegation to formally insist on a Congressional investigation into the matter. Let the chips fall where they may, and let those responsible be held accountable.

And why not?

## How Much Better It Could Be

We are in a period of readjustment here on Long Island. Prices of homes are being deflated to compensate for the unrealistic rise in prices that took place between 1984 and 1987. Labor rates, particularly on the lower end, are stabilizing as a reflection of the general slowdown of the economy. Minimum wages, in reality, jumped from \$3.50 per hour to \$5.50 an hour for unskilled labor because there was no labor available to fill the jobs. Business has remained stable, but missing is the accelerated growth that was prevalent for several years and came to a screeching halt with the October crash of the stockmarket in 1987.

What has contributed most to our loss of steam is the number of businesses that are contracting their operations or moving off Long Island. During the boom times, some people unrealistically thought that the Long Island economy would never slow down or collapse.

There were those who thought we could impose unrealistic regulation, increase taxes and develop unrealistic high salary levels without impact, that business would continue to boom.

Long Island business was made up of many facets, and was not dependent on any single entity for its survival. Its diversification from resort to agriculture, research and development to assembly and manufacturing to office headquarters and a huge retail base, made for a fine mix. This finely-tuned mix has gone asunder because its very foundation, the small businesses that employ under 100 people, have quietly, but in growing numbers, been leaving the region.

Marie Zere Associates recently released a survey, completed on July 13, 1989, covering the last three years, which outlined the number of companies which have moved or contracted in size, and the number of jobs that have been lost. The four-page list, which is not the total picture, is frightening, for it represents over 150 companies and almost 23,000 that have left the area. During this period, only ten companies have come into the region.

The facts gathered in this report should forewarn all that Long Island is facing some very serious problems. The loss of its businesses and jobs have already taken the steam out of our economy, and stopped the prosperous growth of the past. We must address the problems that have caused this condition immediately. We must find answers and solutions.

Suffolk County has developed a nationwide image of being anti-business. We are paying the price. Between precedent-setting laws such as the VDT legislation and unprecedented environmental zeal that has resulted in cumbersome rules and regulations, we have told commerce and industry, "you can't do business here." Add to this the highest taxes in the nation, coupled with the second highest utility rates that are scheduled to increase by over 60 percent over the next ten years, and there are even fewer incentives for staying in or coming to Suffolk.

Think about it realistically, why should you set up a business in Suffolk County? What advantages do we have to offer that can't be found in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Vermont or New Jersey? Areas within these states are as close to the metropolitan area

in commuting time as Suffolk is. If you don't need the metropolitan area, there are even more reasons to locate further away from New York, such as North Carolina and Florida. Companies are locating in these areas in droves. They have the incentive programs and they mean it when they say, "We welcome you."

We must relax some of our regulations, change our attitude, slash the cost of doing business and find a formula to reduce utility rates. Our failure to find the right answers now can do more than take the steam out of the economy, it could collapse it. It's time for all of us to work together to identify the problems and find solutions.

And why not?

## Where's the Bottom Line?

In business, it's normal to have accountability and a responsibility for the bottom line.

Recently, we interviewed John Cavallaro, the head of the new Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse. He visited us to tell us on the importance of his department. Since we are currently in the throes of a tax rebellion, we inquired about his budget. He stated the department was budgeted for \$10.5 million, and then went on to try to placate us by saying that 75 percent of this money is funded by the

state. Our reply was, "We are not interested in what the state funds, as we are state taxpayers too, and the money for both county and state taxes is coming out of the same pocket."

We then got to the meat of the interview when we asked what we were going to get for our \$10.5 million. He seemed to be lost for words and spoke in generalities. We did not want generalities, we wanted specifics. We stated we are aware there is an alcohol and drug problem in Suffolk County. Did he have any figures which documented the seriousness of this problem, the

number of alcoholics or drug users per thousand population? Again, there was a blank. We then asked the real hard question, by investing \$10.5 million, how many less drug addicts and alcoholics will there be one year from now? Again, no answer.

It seems incomprehensible that we can establish a \$10.5 million government agency with a commissioner, a deputy commissioner, a secretary and 11 staff members and yet not establish a goal for the department or an expectation based upon real numbers, facts and statistics.

We do not think that this situation is unusual, it's commonplace in government and a great contributor to the high cost of Suffolk government and lack of productivity by the departments and employees. If there are no goals, no expectations, no accountability, you have a poor investment, with no hope of productivity. It's a lousy way to run a business and a lousier way to run government.

We can foresee poor morale within the department, poor organization and a waste of hard-pressed taxpayers' money. There must be more to government than politics and press releases. Just like in business, it's called productivity. Everyone must understand the need for their existence and what the goals of the organization are. The goals must be spelled out in simple, understandable terms that are realistic and can be met. Those meeting their goals should be rewarded, and those who are not, eliminated or terminated.

We can't afford to continue on with business as usual in government. It's time for reform.

And why not?

## It's Our Money, give it back

The 1986 Tax Reform Act Congress passed reduced federal corporate income taxes from 46 percent to 34 percent. But New York State utilities collected taxes through utility rates at the higher rate. This 12 percent difference collected from us, the utility users, which was not paid to the federal government, is sitting in the utilities' bank accounts. In New York State alone, this amounts to over \$1,400,000,000 in over-collected taxes, or an average of \$90 per person.

The utilities were not entitled to this money. It is plainly an over-charge. Logic and common sense would indicate it should be immediately returned to the consumers it was taken from. Claiming a higher tax figure than is actually paid is nothing more than fraud on the part of the utilities.

The utilities, LILCO, New York

Telephone and others, twisted the arms of Congressmen and Senators and had a law passed that allows them over 30 years to return your money. In 30 years, even if invested at the simplest interest, this windfall they took needlessly from us would be worth three times its present value.

Representative Robert Matsui (D-California) and Byron Durgan (D-N.D.), both members of the House Ways and Means Committee, have introduced legislation HR2183 and HR1150 to allow the state Public Service Commission to decide how quickly this money must be refunded. Where is Tom Downey, who also sits on the House Ways and Means Committee? Why is he not also proposing or co-sponsoring legislation? What contributions has he received from utilities or their political action committees?

The utilities, if allowed to continue as they have, will have gotten away with highway robbery. This inequity must be corrected immediately. The utilities must be forced to return these over-collected taxes now, and not someday in the future. And when this bill is passed—as it should be—the Public Service Commission must take immediate steps to have the money returned to the public. It was wrongfully taken from us, and it must be returned to us immediately.

The Long Island Lighting Company owes its consumers \$162,097,577. The New York Telephone Company owes its consumers \$587,181,097. That's a lot of bucks that could be used as a shot in the arm to a dwindling economy. Contract your Washington representative. Demand an immediate return of your money.

And why not?

# We are In agreement

This past week the editor of this paper and representatives of Tax PAC met with Dr. Raymond DeFeo, superintendent of Boces I, Dr. Edward Milliken, superintendent of Boces II, Dr. Edward Murphy of BOCES III, and several school district superintendents.

Dr. DeFeo had suggested the meeting as a means of opening a dialogue between the various school officials and representatives of the taxpayers.

Dr. Edward Milliken of Boces II made an excellent presentation outlining the financial difficulties schools have faced over the last several years. Pam Bethel, a member of the board of education at Longwood, presented charts indicating that Suffolk students are a few percentage points ahead of the average student educated in New York State, including those educated in public schools in New York City.

Tax PAC discussed the reasons for the formation of the organization, the purpose of the organization and assured those in attendance that Tax PAC has been structured to be here for the long haul. They discussed the thousands of people who are being forced out of their homes by tax burdens they can no longer afford.

Tax PAC emphasized the organization and its members do not want to see children hurt or needed services taken away from the handicapped or the impaired. Tax PAC is concerned about the runaway bureaucracy and the waste of taxpayers' money that is prevalent in most districts.

Tax PAC questioned the need for public information offices, public relation personnel, multiple layers of supervisory positions filled by those who formerly were the best teachers within the schools. Tax PAC questioned the logic of having multiple small classes for general studies, when larger classes within the state-mandated sizes could be achieved. As an example, one East End school teaching third year social studies had four classes in which the enrollment was nine, 11, 12 and 13. The state allows up to 32 students in each class. Why not combine these and save the cost of two salaries, plus fringe benefits? This is where Tax PAC feels the fat is and economies could be made.

There are other areas in the general administration, as well as the management of the schools, that could be revised or eliminated, leading to substantial cuts in the cost of education which would result in a reduction of taxes.

During the discussion, which for the most part was positive give and take, two things became very apparent. Both the educational establishment and the taxpayers are suffering from dictates and mandates imposed by the state. They agreed the tax situation cannot continue. Homeowners, renters and businesses must have relief or the economy of Long Island will collapse.

School taxes account for 60 to 70 percent of real estate taxes. During the last five years these taxes have doubled in most districts. The cost of

educating a student here on Long Island is over 130 percent higher than the rest of the nation.

Milliken states the cost of schools can be broken into three categories: First, the basic education which once was the sole purpose of the educational establishment. These are mostly mandates ordered by the state so that any student throughout the state has an equal opportunity to receive a Regents Diploma.

The second part of school costs are electives and enhancements chosen by the local school boards to meet the requests of special interest groups who have lobbied the school boards over the years.

Although Milliken specified this area as a cost factor, he failed to mention that these electives and enhancements are costly add-ons to the budget. It is here that the school board has total discretion. As special interest groups request programs, the school boards have responded by adding them. These programs, in too many cases, have very limited enrollment, with some classes having a teacher to student ratio of under six. School boards that are desirous of cutting back the tax burden should examine these programs with a fine tooth comb. Eliminate those that do not serve the majority, or have such limited enrollment that students are virtually receiving specialized tutoring.

The third area is a phenomenon of the seventies and eighties. The State Education Department, at the directive of the governor and with the consent of the legislature, has imposed social programs on the school districts. These programs are costly, and it's questionable whether the funding should be borne by real estate taxes.

The programs deal with the gifted and the handicapped, as well as health and pre-kindergarten, just to name a few of the areas. With these special social needs have come requirements that go far beyond the normal personnel requirements of a school district. Such support personnel as psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, speech and hearing handicapped teachers, teachers of the visually impaired, etc., are specialists who are not only certified teachers, but also have degrees, including doctorates, in their chosen fields.

Often, because of the nature of the disabilities, classes are reduced from a mean of 25 to as little as one on one. Few would disagree that those who are

handicapped should not receive the benefits of an education. There are also few who would disagree that the cost of these expensive services are not necessarily educational expenses and should be funded 100 percent by the state that mandates the school districts to include these services in their curriculum. The cost of providing services to the handicapped averages over \$22,000 per student compared to \$8,000 for a regular education.

In these cases, it was not necessarily the school board that either chose to give the programs or set up the standards under which they are given, regulations which have made them so costly. They are the dictates, the mandates of our New York State assemblymen, senators and the governor. They have mandated that our local districts offer programs, and spend the money for them, but have refused to accept the responsibility for their actions by providing the funding. The result of this cowardly action by our state officials is that they have forced all districts into expensive programs they can't afford, which has resulted in real estate taxes being so high that good, decent people must sell their homes to survive. That's not just, nor right, for the taxpayers or the children. New York State government must accept the responsibility for the overwhelming financial burden it has brought upon the people of Long Island.

In addition, the state is responsible for the inequities in revenue sharing through school aid. Because of faults in the formulas, we have low income districts spending less on students, but taxing more. As an example, Rocky Point spends \$8,238 per student on education, and they tax the residents \$3.60 per hundred. Shoreham/Wading River spends \$15,624 per student and yet only taxes their residents \$1.02 per hundred.

All on the state level have acknowledged this problem for years, but have steadfastly refused to correct the inequities. Both Tax PAC officials and the superintendents of education walked away from this meeting with an understanding of the frustrations and problems of the other. There was a resolve to jointly work for changes on the state level, and to tighten the reins on spending to reduce the cost of education borne by the taxpayer locally. Not a giant step in the tax revolution, but the toes are in the water and are going in the right direction. Let's hope the journey continues.

And why not?

## Taxation without representation

During the balloting for school board elections and votes on budgets, it became very apparent that these elections are not democratic and can be fraught with fraud.

In the United States, we operate under the principle of taxation with representation. Not so in school elections. Owners of property which is taxed to fund the operation of schools are denied their right to vote. In order to qualify to vote in a school election, many school boards have insisted you must be a resident of that district.

It does not make any difference whether you have kids in school or not, whether you own property or not, whether you pay rent or not, you are eligible to vote. But, if you do not have a residence in the school district, although you may be a large land owner and will pay a large portion of the taxes, you are denied your right to exercise your vote.

The New York State Legislature must not only take a look at this inequity of the law, but at the entire way

school elections are held. Charges have been made that school administrators bribe students to vote by offering them credits. There have been instances in which people were bused to the polls at taxpayers' expense. In some districts, people had to be registered beforehand, and in others, they could register the night of the vote. There are instances where no documentation or substantiation that a voter was a resident was asked for. In some districts, anyone could walk in off the streets, scribble a name on a pad in writing that was not even legible, and cast a ballot affecting the education of the students, the election of the board and, ultimately, the taxes that would be raised and paid.

All of these conditions lend themselves to dishonesty and must be corrected. A comprehensive set of rules that are unified for all districts should be developed, that ensure honesty and fraud-free balloting in the future.

And why not?

IF FOR ANY REASON,  
**SUFFOLK LIFE**  
NEWSPAPERS  
IS NOT DELIVERED TO YOUR HOME OR P.O. BOX  
ON WEDNESDAY BY THE MAILMAN,  
PLEASE CALL  
**516-369-0800**

# LILCO's 'token' bonus rip-off

...re trying harder to serve you bet-  
... is a familiar statement in LILCO  
...vertising these days. What the ads  
...t say, however, is that some of the  
...LILCO officials are getting amply  
...led, in fact, exorbitantly so, for  
...efforts.

When Governor Mario Cuomo  
...his crew negotiated a settlement  
...h LILCO to end the controversy  
...r the Shoreham nuclear power  
...nt, ratepayers were told over and  
...r again that the deal made was the  
...t possible agreement that could be  
...ched. Those who complained about  
... financial disaster the deal would  
...se in the future were labeled as  
...ple who were simply trying to have  
...controversial plant opened. Rich-  
...Kessel, the governor's chief sales-  
...n who stumped Long Island  
...olling the virtues of the deal,  
...ued vehemently that the governor's  
...n, including Vincent Tese who  
...ved as the chief negotiator, had  
...ne the best possible job they could  
...utting together the agreement.

Well, we said it before and we'll  
...it again, we've been had. LILCO  
...de out like bandits, they got their  
...e and all the cookies. LILCO's  
...rd of directors were so tickled with  
...agreement, in fact, that they re-  
...ded LILCO officials who had been  
...olved in the deal with hefty bo-  
...es. William Catacosinos, LILCO's  
...official, was rewarded with  
...9,000. This is in addition to the  
...0,000 salary he draws. All told,  
...e \$250,000 went to LILCO offi-  
...s in reward for their efforts. In  
...ct, the very people who drove the  
...pany into near-bankruptcy with  
...ir arrogant insistence to push

Shoreham on line, got a reward for  
these efforts.

Interestingly, the bonuses did not  
come to light until LILCO filed a re-  
port with the Securities and Exchange  
Commission. Even more interestingly,  
the Long Island Power Authority is  
supposed to be represented on the  
LILCO board. A LIPA board member,  
Leon Campo, was selected by the  
LIPA majority to sit on the LILCO  
board. Where was Campo when the  
bonus payoff was approved? Why  
didn't he blow the whistle? Is he a re-  
presentative of the people-LIPA is a  
state agency designed to protect the  
people--or is he just another LILCO  
man?

A LILCO spokesperson was  
quoted as labeling the bonuses "token  
amounts" for a company with more  
than \$2 billion in revenues. Tell that  
to the people who are being hard-  
pressed to pay their electric bill. Tell  
that to the businesses who are being  
driven off Long Island because of the  
high energy rates. The same  
spokesperson said the bonuses would  
not come from the ratepayers but  
from the stockholders. We don't be-  
lieve that for one second. Unfortu-  
nately, the state Public Service  
Commission was part and parcel of  
the financial arrangements for the  
deal. We don't believe the PSC does  
an adequate job of auditing LILCO.  
We seriously question if the PSC  
would know if the bonus bucks are  
hidden somewhere in the operational  
costs of running LILCO, which are  
paid by ratepayers. Nor do we believe  
that the PSC does an adequate job of  
auditing the expense accounts of LIL-  
CO's top officials. How many of these

expenses are business justified, and  
how many for personal use?

If the employees of LILCO, who  
are the ones who are really working  
harder to serve the public, were the  
people who were benefiting from a bo-  
nus giveaway, it might well be accep-  
table. But it is an insult to the people  
for LILCO's top officials to get big  
bucks for saving LILCO's neck from  
the financial crisis they forced the  
company into.

It's time for the New York State  
Legislature to call for a complete  
investigation, not only on the bonus  
payoffs, but on all the financial  
arrangements included in the Cuomo-  
LILCO deal. The bonus payoffs are  
nothing more than a rip-off of the  
public. Let's find out how many more  
ratepayers' dollars are being used to  
enrich LILCO's management at the  
expense of the public.

And why not?

## 'Vote for Joe Candidate'

# Political pollution

"Vote for Joe Candidate." They're  
here again, the unsightly political signs  
that crop up at busy intersections, are  
tacked on telephone poles and trees,  
and destroy the aesthetic quality of  
neighborhoods and high visibility  
areas.

Political signs are totally out of  
step with every effort to preserve the  
natural beauty of every community.  
They say nothing. The theory behind  
political signs is "name recognition."  
What that means, in reality, is the po-  
litical "experts" believe the voters are  
so dumb that they will cast their votes  
for names recognized on the ballot  
strips.

"Vote for Joe Candidate." Why?  
Who is he? Or she? What do these  
candidates stand for? Do they care  
about our communities? We think  
not! If they agree to the use of their

name for such unsightly signs, they  
must care very little about the aes-  
thetic blight they have caused. Take a  
good look around, you'll see signs of  
political pollution from past years still  
tacked to poles or trees, faded by time  
but still a blight upon the areas.

If the politicians are so anxious for  
name recognition, we think the voters  
should give it to them. Make a list of  
all the "Vote for Me" candidates  
whose signs have cluttered your neigh-  
borhood, and put them on the "Don't  
Vote for this Candidate" list.

What we need are candidates who  
will bring us good government, not  
sign-littered neighborhoods. Voters  
should sign-off on the "Vote for Joe  
Candidate" mentality and seek more  
worthy candidates.

And why not?

# ED Representatives Needed

Tax PAC is now organized and incorporated.  
It has had a major effect on school budgets  
by lowering the percentages boards had  
anticipated asking in new budgets. Tax PAC  
is having an effect on the county budget  
process, and on the town level as well. Our  
elected officials realize that there is an orga-  
nized, potent force ready to do battle to  
bring the cost of government in line with  
what we, the taxpayers, can afford.

Tax PAC is set up as a non-partisan,  
democratic organization whose strength is in  
its roots, the election district representatives.  
ED representatives have similar duties  
and responsibilities as a committee person  
in a political party. They are responsible for  
bringing as many people as possible within  
an election district, seeking out their opin-  
ions and soliciting the residents to work with  
Tax PAC for cuts in taxes.

It is intended that ED representatives be  
elected by the enrolled members of Tax PAC  
in each election district. The ED rep-  
resentatives, in turn, elect the officers of  
the hamlet chapters and their town chap-

ters. The town chairperson in turn becomes  
a member of the executive board of Tax  
PAC, Inc. They elect the officers of Tax  
PAC.

Many local chapters still have a number  
of election district seats open and need vol-  
unteers to fill them. If you are serious about  
cutting taxes, want to do your part, why not  
volunteer to be an election district repre-  
sentative for your area? You can and will play  
an important part in Tax PAC. You will be  
part of the official organization. This is an  
ideal way to meet people, to make friends  
and, most important, make a contribution  
toward cutting taxes.

If you are interested in being an ED rep-  
resentative and would like to learn more,  
clip the coupon printed below and send it to  
Tax PAC, c/o PO Box 167, Riverhead, NY  
11901. A representative from Tax PAC will  
contact you and you will be invited to a lo-  
cal, orientation meeting.

And why not?

**Yes, I am interested in learning more about being an  
ED representative in Tax PAC. Please give me a  
call.**

Name -----

Street -----

Town -----

Phone Number -----

Election District (if known) -----