

Which Side Are You On?

County Executive Peter Cohalan, in his 1979 campaign, promised taxpayers he would be fiscally conservative. During the campaign, it was said by many candidates that the county budget had at least 10 percent fat and might have as much as 30 percent.

During Cohalan's first year in office, there was little change in how the government spent money. Cohalan and his staff were getting their feet wet, but were still able to bring in their first budget without increases. In presenting his first budget, Cohalan warned the county legislature that it appeared that the federal government, under the Reagan administration, would cut back federal aid.

The legislature should address itself to this probability before it became a reality.

By mid-spring, the federal government announced it was terminating the CETA program. The county would have to either terminate CETA employees or absorb them into the county's own budget.

Knowing Suffolk residents were unable to absorb additional taxes, which would be required to continue funding these positions, Cohalan ordered the elimination of most positions. The legislature balked and re-instated some positions it felt were either politically sensitive or those that individual legislators could use to buy votes and get political mileage. They overrode Cohalan's veto without regard as to where the funds were coming from for the continuation of these positions.

Last Wednesday, Cohalan vetoed over \$35 million dollars in expenditures passed by the county legislature. Cohalan said he did so because of the increase in county taxes the funding of these projects would cost. Again he warned the legislature that there is no more money left. We cannot afford to continue increasing our expenditures unless we are willing to increase the residents' tax burden.

Cohalan has heard the taxpayers' message loud and clear. The residents of Suffolk County want tax reductions, not tax increases. They have cut back their own personal

style of living, eliminating the frills that make their lives enjoyable in order simply to survive here in Suffolk County. Having had made this sacrifice themselves, personally, they demand no less of the government they've engaged to serve them.

The legislature has chosen not to hear these taxpayers. It is continuing to propose and vote for projects of limited value. The legislators seem oblivious to the fact there will have to be funding by taxpayers here in Suffolk County. The legislators refuse to recognize the residents' limits in their ability to fund new taxes.

Cohalan has promised that these initial vetoes are only the start. He feels he must veto any project that would add to your tax burden or cause an increase in taxation, unless it is of an absolute necessity. Cohalan has pointed out that the county's ability to develop a palatable budget, one the residents can afford, is precarious. The budget he will bring forth for 1981-82 may well necessitate severe cut-backs, even, possibly, the elimination of a substantial portion of the workforce.

Cohalan has indicated that there are a number of people in what might be called political positions whose jobs he will take a serious look at eliminating. He feels these positions should be the first to go, even though they will cause him the most flak both from within his own party and from those who are politically connected.

Cohalan takes his responsibility as chief executive seriously. To perform effectively, he must have the support of the taxpayers. The support must be visible and tangible. As a way of showing your support, we encourage you to clip the coupon printed below and send it to the county executive. If you disagree with Cohalan and feel the legislature is right in proposing new projects and new expenditures, clip the second coupon and send it to the presiding officer of the legislature, Mr. William Richards. Let's allow both branches of our government to know how we feel so that there is no question in anyone's mind on whether we will support tax increases or decreases in services.

And why not?

In an editorial which appeared in the June 17 issue of Suffolk Life, we noted our efforts to track down the Republican party chairman of Southampton Town, T. Riley McNeil, and also a second county employee, Michele Marzullo. That editorial contained the following error:

We said Marzullo's car was parked outside the office of a Quogue attorney at 4 p.m. on the day in question. The car in question turned out to be that of the attorney rather than that of Marzullo. Both the attorney's car and Marzullo's are sedan-type Cadillacs.

Marzullo claims he was at Town Hall at 4 p.m., not at the attorney's office. Marzullo said he had requested, at 8:30 a.m. that day, a personal leave day. At the time we tried to contact him at his Hauppauge office, we were told by the head of the department, Commissioner Kenneth Rosenblum, that Marzullo was "not authorized to be absent" from his job that day. Marzullo's personal leave request was signed by his immediate supervisor the following day, June 11.

McNeil had also requested several hours off under "personal leave time," but the head of his department, Director William Regan of the county's Department of Emergency Preparedness, was apparently not

aware of that fact. When questioned on June 10, Regan said McNeil was "out east checking bomb shelters." McNeill has been suspended, pending investigation of unauthorized use of his county vehicle, which was seen parked at Quogue attorney's office while he was on personal time rather than county duty.

Suffolk Life, in the June 17 editorial, raised questions, and poses them again, concerning the use of county vehicles, and the taking off of time for political matters.

What people do in their own time is strictly their concern. But county employees are in the public sector, paid by the taxpayers of this county, and the use of the vehicles they are assigned and the hours they work should be a matter of concern for all department heads, so as to insure that the public is getting maximum use for the dollars they spend.

Sick time and personal leave time should be tightly controlled so that they are utilized for the sickness or unexpected personal business they are designed to cover, rather than being an excuse for nothing more than time off. The county needs to tighten its regulations and enforcement to eliminate abuses of employee benefits.

And why not?

Working At Night

It appears that at long last, the State Department of Transportation will be using common sense in making repairs on the heavily traveled Long Island Expressway, Southern and Northern State Parkways. The repairs will be done at night. This should bring joy to the hearts of every commuter or user of these highways.

We feel for the daily commuter, who loses hours of his life on a regular basis because of endless traffic jams caused by both minor and major construction that is done during the busy commuter hour. When we have been caught in these traffic jams ourselves, we have always wondered why someone in the great bureaucracy didn't use a little common sense and have this work performed during the night hours when traffic is at its minimum.

We have often witnessed reckless driving after cars emerged from the

traffic jams, as motorists increased their speed and took chances they normally wouldn't in an attempt to make up for lost time.

How many accidents can indirectly be contributed to these traffic jams? How many deaths were caused by construction work being done during the day instead of at night? Of course, there will have to be extraordinary safety precautions implemented to control traffic at night. More visible traffic controls will be needed, and these measures may be more expensive, but they will be minor compared to the savings that will result from the avoidance of needless blocking of traffic.

We congratulate the state officials for planning to schedule construction at night as well as those elected officials who have lobbied for this proposal.

And why not?

To Presiding Officer Richards:
I want increased government services and am willing to have my taxes increased to pay for them.

Signed _____
Town _____

Presiding Officer William Richards
Suffolk County Legislature
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, NY 11788

To County Executive Cohalan:
Please continue to oppose and veto all programs that will cause a rise in taxes. I want less government and lower taxes.

Signed _____
Town _____

County Executive Peter Cohalan
H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, NY 11788

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 20 NO. 48

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 17 market zone editions every Wednesday.



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 192,000 Circulation Weekly

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mud Hampton
Westhampton
Moriches

Mastic, Shirley
Patchogue
Medford
Sayville, Oakdale
Ronkonkoma
Centereach

Selden
Coram
Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District. Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Robert J. Andrews - Director of Sales
Claire Swanik - Co-op Coordinator

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Barbara Selvin - Copy Editor
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$5.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County: \$7.99 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume. NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submission and cannot be returned for any reason. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

WEDNESDAY JULY 1, 1981 SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS PAGE 3

Willmotts and Why-Not's

David J. Willmott, Editor

Losing Local Control

With little fanfare, two bills that could gravely affect our area passed the Assembly and the Senate recently. Both appear, in summary, to be good bills, but upon careful reading turn out to be a giveaway of our home rule powers, our ability to plan and control our own future. Both appear to be a backdoor attempt to bring new life to an estuarine sanctuary plan that was resoundingly opposed last year.

The first bill, entitled Waterfront Revitalization and the Coastal Resources (Assembly bill 1646-A, Senate bill 1244-A) is, allegedly, designed to take advantage of federal funding to revitalize and rebuild docks and other waterfront projects. The bill is not mandatory, and that is its saving grace.

Town boards can elect either to take advantage of its provisions or reject the concept. If they take advantage, they give up some home rule control to the Secretary of State. We are leery of the bill's provisions, but will accept the sponsor's statement that participation is voluntarily and will never be mandatory.

The second bill is 1645A, a companion bill to 1646A. This bill amends the Environmental Conservation Law in relationship to development of coastal erosion hazard areas. This bill is the Trojan Horse. It could take away from local municipalities their ability to plan or to zone their own development.

At first blush, you would think the bill only pertains to the major outererosion areas surrounding Long Island. But in careful reading, you find the language actually covers all waterfront properties whether they be on the shoreline or on a small tributary which eventually feeds into the bays, ocean or sound.

The bill takes away from the towns, and gives to the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Control zoning and planning powers on any land within 40 feet of anything that could be construed as wetlands. Under the bill, the municipalities are mandated to come up with a plan for erosion control. The plan must be to the liking, and meet the approval of the commissioner. If the commissioner rejects the plan, the town has six months to develop a plan of

which he will approve. If they again fail to please him, they are knocked out of the box and the county is delegated the responsibility for pleasing him and the power to implement and enforce a local plan.

If they fail to come up with a plan to his liking, the Commissioner then can come in and dictate exactly what he wants.

What is particularly alarming about both of these bills and the passage in both the Assembly and the Senate is the lack of information supplied by our state legislators to the town supervisors or the town boards on their contents, even though they could drastically affect municipalities.

When we spoke to Senator Kenneth LaValle from the first senatorial district last week, he claimed he had kept all supervisors informed. Yet in contacting the supervisors, they denied having any knowledge of these specific bills.

Joseph Janoski, supervisor of Riverhead, said that he received a packet from LaValle too late to discuss it with other supervisors. In fact, both the Assembly and the Senate had already voted. Martin Lang, supervisor of Southampton, said he had continually requested that both the Assembly and the Senate, prior to considering any measure affecting the town, develop and circulate an impact statement about the effect the bill would have. Lang stated "Of course, we did not receive an impact statement or any other notification. We are being notified by your office after the fact."

LaValle was at a loss to explain why he had not bothered to notify the media about these bills so that they could inform the public. This seems particularly odd, considering the amount of concern showed by the media over the estuary bill last year. LaValle, as do the other senators and assemblymen, regularly sends out reams of information on bills under consideration for dissemination to the public.

Both these bills have been passed and now are awaiting the signature of the Governor. Carey should act prudently, and withhold signing these bills into law until his office has conferred with the executives of the

municipalities. The supervisors of Long Island should have had an opportunity to give their input. Carey's failure to seek local input will be a clearcut indication of his lack of

sensitivity toward the needs of the municipalities and the people they serve.

And why not?

Should We Pay Their Way?

As you have probably read, mass transit is in trouble. The system is on the verge of bankruptcy. Fares on subways, buses and railways have not been increased to reflect costs. Management of the metropolitan transportation authority has not been successful in gaining productivity from the workers. Powerful labor unions have been effective in keeping featherbedding rules in force that cause and encourage waste of manpower and an over-all increase in operating cost.

Governor Carey has proposed a bail-out of the MTA based on the assumption that those of us who use cars and live in the suburbs can afford additional taxes more than the users of mass transportation can afford a realistic increase in fares. Carey has proposed an increase in New York City and suburban sales taxes by one quarter of 1 percent. A tax on oil companies would be passed through to consumers, causing an increase in the price of fuel by 1 cent per gallon.

In addition, he has proposed a host of other taxes on communication and transportation and business.

During the last several years, those of us who must use our own automobiles for transportation to work as well as for just getting around have seen the price of fuel increased four to six times what we paid less than a decade ago. The sales tax on gasoline has gone from under 2 cents a gallon to over 10 cents per gallon. Yet, Governor Carey and the Legislature never recognized our

plight or advocated any kind of tax relief.

Fares for public transportation have been increased during this period but not in comparison with the cost of private commutation. It is politically unpopular for the Governor to allow realistic fare increases that would require users of mass transportation to pay their own way.

Public transportation should not be used as a means of redistributing income. Yet, when you tax non-users for the benefit of those who use mass transportation, this is exactly what you are doing.

Carey's proposal is anti-suburbia. Why take money from the suburbs to bail out the city? To take money from those of us who only have our automobiles as a method of transportation and giving it to those who have mass transportation at their disposal is blatantly unfair. If fares need to be raised to bail out mass transit, then those increases should be funded by those who are direct beneficiaries from its existence.

Every Long Islander should understand that the proposal that Carey has come up with is an anti-suburban proposal and must be stopped.

If the bill has not been enacted by the time you are reading this editorial, we encourage you to call your Assemblyman or Senator and ask them to vote "no" on any proposal that will increase your sales taxes or your cost of gasoline. Why should you be penalized so someone else can have a free ride? And why not?

Let There Be Daylight

There may be more light in your future. A Senate panel is holding hearings on whether to increase daylight saving time from March through October, including Halloween.

The new daylight saving time is proposed to be from the first Sunday in March through the first Sunday in November. Currently, daylight saving runs six months from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October.

Increasing daylight saving time by two months will considerably improve the amount of time we have available to spend outside. It also will hasten, at least psychologically, the end of winter and extend the daylight saving hours through Halloween, which in itself is important because of the number of children out trick-or-

treating in the late afternoon and early evening. It should also result in a small reduction in the cost of utilities for homeowners.

A few years back, during the first energy crunch, daylight saving time was extended year-round. It was repealed because many people found themselves going to work in the dark. It presented hazards for children who had to leave for school by 7 a.m. This was true from mid-November through mid-January, when the skies are dark for the longest period of time, but it won't be a problem under the new proposal.

If you support the extension of daylight saving time, why not send a note indicating so to the two senators from New York, Al D'Amato and Pat Moynihan?

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mrs. Worthington Hoare:

"Applause" was a huge success and now that it has ended, the NorthFork Community Theater would like to thank you for the excellent coverage and publicity afforded us by

your paper.

Sincerely yours,
Priscilla Sprague
Mattituck

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000

Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 17 market zone editions every Wednesday.



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 192,000 Circulation Weekly

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mid Hampton
Westhampton
Worthington

Mastic, Shirley
Patchogue
Medford
Sayville, Oakdale
Ronkonkoma
Centereach

Selden
Coram
Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District. Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday. It is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Robert J. Andrews - Director of Sales
Claire Swanik - Co-op Coordinator

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Barbara Selvin - Copy Editor
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$5.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales; 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales; 25¢ per issue.

General Information:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume. NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Home Rule on Erosion

Nassau-Suffolk Planning Commissioner Lee Koppelman met with East End supervisors and village officials early Monday morning and echoed Suffolk Life's editorial concern about giving the commissioner of the state Department of Environmental Conservation control over Long Island's shoreline. He agreed that the erosion control bill recently approved in Albany has the potential to erode the towns' and municipalities' home rule control over erosion matters.

Koppelman questions, as we do, the DEC's ability to comprehend and effectively handle a project of this magnitude, based upon its horrendous track record on other matters.

Koppelman suggested, and the supervisors agreed, that the counties of Nassau and Suffolk should be excluded from the bill, giving the DEC commissioner power of final approval over erosion control plans. Instead, he said, a group within these counties,

working in cooperation with local governments, should be the lead agency, rather than the state's DEC, to develop, coordinate and integrate an island-wide program through the joint efforts of the communities involved.

We would support such a proposal if the alternative group, a Long Island Erosion Control Commission, was made up of representatives of each town, and if the towns had veto power over any rule or regulation that could interfere with the current planning and zoning regulations of that town or the communities within it. Each town could thus have input into the overall plan and still be able to maintain control over its destiny.

Until such a plan is realized by way of an amendment to the current bill, we join with Koppelman and the towns in eastern Suffolk in voicing opposition to the erosion hazard control bill as it currently stands.

And why not?

Carey's Had It

Uncle Hughie may love New York City but he definitely dislikes New York State's suburbs.

Carey just signed into law his transportation tax package to save the New York City 75 cent subway fare. For starters, it is going to cost us in the suburbs an additional three cents per gallon of gasoline due to the pass-through tax.

Mobil Oil Company has already raised its wholesale price on gasoline. Dealers are expected to raise retail price by three cents a gallon to compensate for Carey's save-the-subway tax.

Carey must think we are all a bunch of damn fools here in the suburbs. Why else would he have chosen a tax we can't escape from, one that affects us so drastically, so that our poor, maligned brethren in the city can have their transportation costs subsidized? We hope every suburbanite will remember it was Governor Carey who did it to Long Islanders.

In addition to paying three cents more a gallon of gasoline, we Long Islanders are going to have to pay a

quarter of a percent more in sales tax. In addition, there will be increases in our utility costs, both for telephones and electricity.

What is right or what is fair has nothing to do with Carey's anti-suburban taxes. His decision to sock it to the suburbs so that he can subsidize the city is a decision made on pure politics. Carey obviously believes he does not need the suburbs to win reelection in 1982, but he must have the city vote. He is counting on suburbanite voters forgetting the increases they will be paying in taxes on gasoline, fuel, utilities as well as sales. His pollsters obviously must have convinced him that straphangers have better memories and would have held it against him if he had the courage and the audacity to require that they pay their own fair cost of transportation.

Just look around. What has Carey ever done for Long Island? Don't spend too much time thinking. The answer is, virtually nothing. The state, under Carey, has increased suburban taxes, cut back on suburban services, taken suburban land off the

tax roles without compensation to the local real estate taxpayers. This has been done not for the suburbs but for the sake of the city. Between Carey in the Governor's chair, and the Democratically controlled Assembly, the suburbs have taken a shellacking.

We fear, as do many others, that Carey's latest rape of the suburbs will force even more businesses out of Long Island, reduce employment opportunities and force an ever-increasing number of productive taxpayers to flee from Carey's plundering of the suburbs. Thinking

taxpayers should be looking for a gubernatorial alternative in 1982. The Republicans must consider fielding someone who is a proven executive, a fiscal conservative and who believes there is something else to New York State besides New York City. A candidate who realizes that New York State's strength and fertility lie in the suburbs should be a winner.

This state will never again be the Empire State as long as it has a governor who acts like a mayor who can't see beyond Manhattan. And why not?

D-Day for Social Security

Last week's news from the White House indicating that the Social Security system will be broke by mid-1982 had to send chills down the spines of our senior citizens, as well as the working taxpayers who fund this program.

All too many of our senior citizens look to Social Security as their primary or, in some cases, sole means of survival. Without Social Security, a program they themselves paid into all their lives, they cannot survive.

The working taxpayers who today are paying for this program find — between their own contributions and the contributions of their employer — that over 13 percent of the money they earn, up to \$30,000 per year, has been taken from them to pay for Social Security's current benefits.

The root of the Social Security problem goes back to the 1930s when the program was founded. Social Security was sold to the American people as an insurance program. It wasn't. It was simply another form of taxation. Two percent of their earnings would be invested each year on the first \$3,000 of income. It was to be put away by the government so they would have a retirement fund when they reached old age. The fund was intended to be an aid, not a sole source of income for those who retired. It was only planned to supplement their own pension plans and savings. Nobody would feel the bite. After all, it was only a maximum of \$60 per year: a \$30 contribution by the worker and \$30 by the employer. It would be taken out of the paycheck each week. Just pennies a week.

Instead of being an insurance plan, Social Security was a tax trap. After the money was taken from the public, it was not invested. It was passed through to the government and spent. The payments to beneficiaries were taken out of the payments taxpayers made into the plan. Instead of the plan surviving on profits from its investments as a normal insurance program does, benefits were paid directly out of premiums.

The initial Social Security plan was expanded to take in disability, premature death and family support. In the 1960s, Medicare, health in-

urance for seniors, was added.

Rates have been raised at an alarming rate, over 14 times in 30 years. Not only was the percent of tax raised from 2 percent to over 13 percent, the maximum amount of income that could be taxed was raised from \$3,000 to \$30,000.

We have long suspected the Social Security system would not be in existence when we reached our retirement age. This feeling was heightened when the government developed the Keogh and I.R.A. retirement plans for individuals and entrepreneurs who did not have private, independently funded pension plans of which to avail themselves. These plans allow a taxpayer to take a portion of his or her personal income and invest it as he or she sees fit in approved plans, using pre-taxed money. These plans were an admission, although it never was publicly stated, that the government could not do for individuals what individuals could do for themselves.

If the Social Security system will be broke under its present structure between 1982 and 1983, we must act now to avoid this catastrophe, at least for those currently receiving benefits or within a few years of retirement. These people have no time left for alternative planning, but at the same time, the American worker cannot afford to contribute more in Social Security taxes nor can the businesses, which contribute an equal amount. The funds for Social Security must come from further cutbacks in needless or marginal federal government programs, programs which most people would consider frills and luxuries.

Finding a solution to the Social Security dilemma should have been done years ago by a forward-thinking Congress and president. Past history is past history. Reagan and this Congress have no choice now but to find a solution. It is their biggest challenge.

We are sure it will mean sacrifice on everyone's part. But it is the type of sacrifice Americans have traditionally been willing to make, individually, for the good of the country. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I read your "Changes Worth Considering" article, relating to drinking habits, and I liked it very much. Do hope the legislature will see it your way and follow through. Kindest

regards to you and continue expressing your good thoughts again and again.

Sincerely,
Helene M. Block
Riverhead

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 20 NO. 50

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 17 market zone editions every Wednesday.



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 192,000 Circulation Weekly

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mid Hampton
Westhampton
Moriches

Mastic, Shirley
Patchogue
Medford
Sayville, Oakdale
Ronkonkoma
Centereach

Selden
Coram
Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District. Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher
John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Robert J. Andrews - Director of Sales
Claire Swanik - Co-op Coordinator

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Barbara Selvin - Copy Editor
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$5.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume. NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Why Should Session End?

Once upon a time, the position of state legislator was a part-time job. Legislators received part-time salaries. Many were farmers, some were businessmen, a few were lawyers. They convened on January 1 in Albany. In a few weeks, sometimes a little longer, they transacted all the state's business. The farmers had to be home by spring to till the fields and get the crops in. Sessions ended before the frost was out of the ground.

In the past decade, winter endings became a thing of the past. Sessions routinely went on into spring, and now go into the summer. It is already a fact that most legislators are involved year-round, but the sessions still have a formal ending. These endings are disastrous, abrupt and cause absolute pandemonium.

A whole host of bills are either passed or rejected without even being read or carefully studied by most legislators. They are passed as a package in a deal cut between the leaders of the Senate, the Assembly and the Governor's office.

Two bad examples of this last-minute pressure were the passage of the erosion control bill, which strips away home rule over local zoning and planning, and the transportation tax package, which appears to have been enacted without anyone really knowing or understanding its full ramifications on the region and the state. This kind of legislation is a mockery of the system. It makes those that we have sent to the Assembly and the Senate look like fools. Yet, the actions of these men can change the lives of the people, for these are laws they are passing, which affect not only the quality of life but the cost of living.

Today, the work of the Assembly and Senate goes on 365 days a year. Why not then continue to meet year-round? Set up a schedule of two weeks on and two weeks off, or whatever is necessary to meet the demands. Avoid having a formal end to the session when pandemonium rules and unrealistic legislation is passed. No one in the state is served effectively in this system. And why not?

Should LILCO Be Split?

The Suffolk County Legislature is considering the authorization of a study that could lead to a government takeover of the Long Island Lighting Co. Behind this idea are two propelling factors. Long Islanders pay LILCO one of the highest utility rates in the nation. These high rates have bred contempt for the monopoly, particularly when coupled with announcements of record profits by the corporation. The second reason is LILCO's decision to enter into nuclear generation with the erection of the Shoreham plant and the professed desire to build others.

One of the crucial arguments offered by those who favor the study is the fact that two small municipally owned electrical companies, in Greenport and Freeport, charge their customers substantially less for electricity than LILCO does. Both of these companies are here on Long Island, subject to the same economic pressures as LILCO, yet they are able to generate, market and distribute

electricity for less than it apparently costs LILCO to accomplish the same thing.

LILCO has organized an all-out campaign to stop the study from ever becoming a reality. What does it have to fear? Ironically, LILCO was involved, less than a year ago, in a campaign to persuade the Riverhead Town Board to authorize a study on the feasibility of establishing an oil refinery in that town. LILCO, Grumman and Northville, supporters of the refinery, argued it wouldn't hurt just to study the issue. We find it humorous if not hypocritical for the management of LILCO now to be opposing a county-sponsored study into the feasibility of a public takeover of this utility. After all, according to LILCO's reasoning on the refinery issue, what is a study going to do besides bring out the facts so an intelligent decision can be made?

If the study comes to pass, we would be very interested in seeing it split

into two aspects: first, dealing with a complete takeover, and second, splitting the marketing and distribution aspects from the electrical generation or the production of electricity.

Ira Freilicher, vice president of LILCO, maintains that the corporation does not profit in any way, shape or form from the generation of electricity. This aspect of its operation is done on a cost basis. The cost of fuel is passed on dollar for dollar without any profit to the company. We have often questioned what Freilicher says. His answers have double meanings. Facts are confused with more facts and, as a result, you are never quite sure whether the answer you got was yes, no, or maybe.

A study by independent, outside sources may reveal that consumers could benefit by stripping LILCO of its authority to manufacture electricity. A stripped-down LILCO, franchised only to distribute and market electricity, could be a healthier corporation, more profitable for stockholders and much more realistic in the rates it is

allowed to charge captive consumers.

The generation of electricity may have become too big a job for any individual utility to perform. Although this time it may seem unrealistic, a state or national generating authority could be part of the answer to our national energy problems. National ownership and responsibility for generation of power may lead to massive conversions to hydrothermal, wind and solar power if the profit incentive was taken out of such generation.

The answers to these questions can never be found unless the issue is studied. The County of Suffolk should lead the way in this project, in both the state and the nation. As LILCO said about the oil refinery, a study will produce nothing but facts on which to base an intelligent decision. It can't hurt to know the truth. LILCO wouldn't be opposed to truth, would it? After all, LILCO is Long Island's friend. It wants what is good for Long Island first, doesn't it?

Let's stop talking - authorize the study and let the facts speak for themselves. And why not?

What Price Murder?

Twenty years ago, Francis Henry Bloeth went on a rampage and murdered three people from Islip to Westhampton. He was named the "mad dog killer." We well remember the fear he caused, the anguish of the community. When Bloeth was apprehended and subsequently convicted and sentenced to die in the electric chair, the community breathed a sigh of relief.

In 1965, Governor Rockefeller commuted Bloeth's sentence to life in prison. Recently, 20 years after his bloody killing spree, Bloeth was paroled. Set free to live amongst society. Free to take up where he left off if his mind tells him to.

The reasons which led to his parole are sickening. Paul Young, a spokesman for the parole division, is quoted as saying, "Twenty years is a long time. The board felt in fairness he had served enough. Sentences today are nothing like they were. Today, most murder pleas are bargained down to manslaughter. People only do a few years."

That may be true, but it's garbage. It's sick for us to hold the premeditated taking of a life in the same context we do breaking into an unoccupied home or unarmed robbery. Murder is hardly a victimless crime. The victim of a cold-blooded murder will never walk again, talk

again, cry again or love. He will never be productive in society. He will never be able to give love, understanding, or cause answering emotions in another person. His life can never be brought back.

Bloeth, by his own admission, killed in cold blood. He is quoted as saying, "I didn't feel anything about killing them. If I had more bullets, I would have killed more people." Now he is paroled, free to walk the streets, acquire another gun and more bullets, and to continue where he left off. We hope, we pray, that he is a changed man, but who knows; who wants to take a chance that he now has reverence for life? We question whether a person like this ever changes. Do the appointed bureaucrats have a right to take the chance?

Bloeth's release is typical of just how weak our society has become, how unjust to society as a whole the alleged justice system is.

If there is no compatible punishment for committing a serious crime, there is no deterrent. If there is no deterrent, there is no order; no order no law, no law no society. Have we come full-circle? Are we again living in a primitive world without morals, ethics or logic? It sure seems that way. And why not?

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

and Suffolk County Life

VOL. 20 NO. 51

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 17 market zone editions every Wednesday.

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mid Hampton
Westhampton
Moriches

Mastic, Shirley
Patchogue
Medford
Sayville, Oakdale
Ronkonkoma
Centereach

Selden
Coram
Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of
192,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District. Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Robert J. Andrews - Director of Sales
Claire Swanik - Co-op Coordinator

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Barbara Selvin - Copy Editor
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Subscription Rates: In Suffolk County: \$5.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume. NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Enclosed find my check for \$8.88 as a subscriber to your excellent publication, Suffolk Life.

I am subscribing for two reasons. The first is Barbara Selvin's accurate reporting of Islip Town Democratic Committee affairs in recent weeks. Her fair, even handed reporting of the facts, display the best qualities of the 4th Estate. She will go far.

The second reason is your superb column on Committeeship in the June 25th Edition of Suffolk Life.

As a Suffolk County Democratic Committee Member from Islip since 1961, I have never seen a better column on the importance, duties and obligations of being a Committee Member. Educationally, it was beyond compare. If I were not a Committee Member, it would have motivated me to look into becoming part of my party's committee! Bravo! and Thanks.

Sincerely,
Philip J. Nolan 6th AD
34th ED

Social Security Death Taxes

A few weeks ago we published an editorial discussing the shaky financial condition of the Social Security system. In response, we received a letter from Mrs. Diane Nagengast, alleging that some Social Security funds are used to foster abortion.

Our first reaction was that Mrs. Nagengast must be one of the "pro-lifers," who have been prone to exaggeration. Social Security taxes would never be used for abortions! But we checked with Congressman William Carney's office: she was right!

Under Section XX of the Social Security Act for 1979, the last fiscal year for which financial figures are available, \$2.9 billion in Social Security funds were spent on family planning services. These included abortion referrals and abortions, according to Carney's office.

We were dumbfounded. How the heck can our funds for old age paid in the form of Social Security be used to promote, or in some states, to pay for abortions? They are Social Security taxes, not general revenue taxes. Two-billion-nine-hundred-million dollars is an incredible amount of money.

What else are we paying for with Social Security funds which have absolutely nothing to do with Social Security?

The idea that Social Security funds can be used for abortions is absolutely ludicrous. The main reason Social Security is in trouble and will be in deeper trouble 20 years from now is there will be fewer and fewer working taxpayers around to pay for those who are coming up for retirement because of our declining birth rates. When the fund started, there were 16 workers for every recipient. Today there are fewer than four. By the year 2000, it is estimated there will be only two.

The Social Security Administration should be encouraging the development of new life, not its elimination before birth. We hope the Reagan administration, Congress and the Senate will take apart the Social Security Administration piece by piece and simply restore it to its original purpose of providing assistance for those who need it when they retire. Everyone, whether pro-life or for abortion, should join in protesting Social Security taxes being used for family planning and abortions. And why not?

A Belated Thank You

We congratulate the Brookhaven Town Board on doing what this country has failed to do. Last Sunday, it hosted a parade for Vietnam veterans to say thank you for having had the courage, determination and fortitude to defend our country when our men said no.

All Americans owe the Vietnam veterans a special thanks. These veterans heard the call and willingly sacrificed their time, and in some cases their lives, in one of the most unpopular wars ever fought. Whether our involvement in Vietnam was right or wrong, our government had called its people to arms. It was the responsibility of everyone to answer.

These men and women answered with pride but returned home without so much as a whisper of praise. Like any other war, they were expected to put their lives and their bodies on the line. But this was not an ordinary war. They were subjected not only to enemy fire, our own technology, but

worst, a constant barrage of anti-patriotic propaganda. We not only messed up their bodies but we messed up many of their heads.

The final insult was coming home not as heroes but as rejects. Instead of parades to commend their actions, they were met with open hostility; even worse, they were ignored.

Many veterans today are suffering from the consequences of this war. Psyches have been damaged, bodies broken, and in some cases, offspring born deformed. These veterans did not even have the quality of benefits our veterans of World War II and the Korean War received.

Our federal government is slowly coming around to giving these vets recognition. The Brookhaven Town Board's decision to honor those veterans is a tangible sign that the Vietnam vets today have the grassroots support which they so richly deserve. And why not?

The Bar Owners' Plight

It is illegal to sell alcoholic beverages to anyone under 18 years of age. Sellers of alcoholic beverages throughout the state have lobbied for more than a decade for a state-run system mandating proof of age. Sellers of alcoholic beverages are subject to serious fines and the loss of license if they sell to anyone under 18. With easy to obtain false proof they are in constant danger. This is the reason why they've asked the state for some form of protection.

On several occasions a bill has passed both the Assembly and the Senate which would require sealed proof of age issued by the state to be presented for the purchase of alcoholic beverages. This bill carried substantial penalties if used improperly or if tampered with. This bill has been vetoed since Rockefeller's tenure by the governors of the State of New York, including Carey.

Why any governor would turn down such a measure is beyond our understanding. As an alternative to a statewide proof law, the Suffolk County bar owners have asked that such identification be issued by the

Sheriff's Department. They have requested that such proof contain a photograph of the bearer along with finger prints and pertinent data, sealed in unbreakable plastic. The issuance of such proof should be subject to a fee adequate to cover the cost of handing, so there would be no burden on the taxpayers.

Everyone agrees that this is a good idea, but it has never become a law. This measure could be made law and should be. There should be little debate or opposition to offering a system that proves unequivocally that a person is of legal age and has been duly registered with the Sheriff's Department and the County of Suffolk.

We encourage the County Executive to propose such legislation. We encourage the legislature to pass it quickly. We encourage the Sheriff's Department to cooperate fully. Let's stop under-age drinking. Positive proof of age, made by the county, that could not be tampered with, would go a long way toward stopping illegal under-age drinking. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

"A litany of self pity"

Open Letter

To Walked a Mile:

Your pitiful refrain, of your hardships touched me deeply. A litany of self pity, usually associated with losers. From the day you were born, you and others like you have placed all of your inadequacies, else where, but on your own shoulders.

My dear Mother had nine children, not even grammar schooling, but kept her brood alive. law-abiding, and free of hand-outs. How? By walking miles, to save a nickel carfare, washing floors, laundry, (and they had no washing machines in her time), and all of the jobs associated with house cleaning. Pay!, four dollars, for twelve hours of hard work.

Her children, were busy, with getting wood, and coal, shining shoes, selling shopping bags, delivering prescriptions. And every nickel was brought home, to help in providing what little food we did have. No drugs, crime, sex, beer drinking, vandalizing etc. No teenage pregnancies.

In spite of this abject poverty, none got an

education, none got involved with the law, and all matured into good citizens, who raised decent children.

Your heart rendering tale, of being both father and mother. Of your children needing supervision, of trying to heat a house on \$33 per month, not enough welfare monies, is typical of your generation.

Brought up on goodies, plenty to eat, much clothing, free of restraint, all sorts of permissiveness, have left you poorly equipped for life. And thus you, and some male idiot marry, proceed to have children, both with the mentality of twelve year olds.

Then again you shift the blame, every where but on yourselves. Stop belly-aching. Stop crying. You made the bed. Solve your problems. You whining parasites are destroying our society. Pay your own way. So Lady, your infantile husband left you with two children. Get out there and sweat. The way and the means are all there. Just seek. Mr. Peter D. Kuznir
Ridge, N.Y.

"Coholan is very right"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

The column you wrote about the government and taxes was very interesting. My opinion is that Coholan is very right, and I hope his mission will succeed on more government and less taxes.

Peter Coholan is a serious man, a man who is capable of starting and finishing. I surely

understand he is capable on giving more government and less taxes. A man who is not trying to steal your money, he's a man who is trying to save you money. But he cannot succeed without our help and support.

Yours truly,
April Leavy, Age 11
South Setauket

"Only this stands in the way"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

The central, over-riding reason for the county legislature's rejection of the CSEA contract is one key section. This section gives unprecedented control to the county director of labor relations over new or unused job classifications and grades. The effect here would be to create an administration czar in a policy-making area, an area previously reserved for the legislature. CSEA unit presidents, as well as the rank and file, object to this new feature.

Two available and simple solutions are open to the parties in question — the CSEA

and the county executive: 1) both sides agree to withdraw the disputed clause; 2) both sides agree to call an impasse. Then the legislature could determine, under law, the final contract.

The legislature made it clear for the record on the 7th of July that this key section is critical. I am confident only this stands in the way of a final agreement.

Sincerely yours,
John J. Foley
Suffolk County Legislature
3rd District
Patchogue

USPS 098-300

VOL. 20 NO. 52

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000

Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 17 market zone editions every Wednesday.



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 192,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District. Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mid Hampton
Westhampton
Moriches

Mastic, Shirley
Patchogue
Medford
Sayville, Oakdale
Ronkonkoma
Centersuch

Selden
Coram
Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Robert J. Andrews - Director of Sales
Claire Swanik - Co-op Coordinator

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Barbara Selvin - Copy Editor
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$5.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume. NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.