

F.B.I. investigates Southwest Sewer

It became public knowledge last week, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was investigating the whole Southwest Sewer mess for possible frauds perpetrated against the federal government, which is funding a large part of the project.

This is welcomed news. The Southwest Sewer District has been filled with irregularities, deceit and dishonesty from its conception.

Taxpayers of this special use district were blatantly lied to in the county's overzealous, unethical campaign to sell this district. Costs have skyrocketed from a promised top of \$250 million to well over \$1 billion.

From the outset, there have been rumors and innuendos, even a secretly circulated white sheet alleging corruption and thievery.

Over a year ago, we discussed with the D.A.'s office the possibility of a full-scale investigation into these and other alleged irregularities.

The D.A.'s office felt they neither had the manpower nor the funds to undertake such a massive investigation. The only hope was the federal government would undertake this project.

If the F.B.I. turns up fraud and proves the county government is part of it, the federal government can withdraw their promised participation in funding this project.

This is serious because it would bankrupt the entire project and lay an even more awesome responsibility on the shoulders of the taxpayers within this district.

Further it would affect all taxpayers of Suffolk County, because

John Klein and his buddies in the legislature, in an attempt to cover up their tracks, passed legislation last year placing the full faith and credit of Suffolk behind the sewer district bonds.

Because of that pledge, every taxpayer in the county could end up paying for this special district even though they would not receive an iota of benefit from it.

If the federal investigation turns up irregularities, indictments will follow. If these indictments hold up and result in convictions, we can only hope our justice system lives up to its name.

This type of crime actually is considered a white-collar crime. The history of white-collar crimes has been weak fines, often limited probation and at worst sentencing to one of the federal prisons which are run much like country clubs.

This is not justice, particularly when you consider the agony that has been caused residents of the Southwest and of Suffolk County over this totally irresponsible fiasco.

The pressure, placed by the enormous tax burden, has caused people to lose their homes in which they invested their life savings; it has broken up marriages because of the financial pressures and even thrown children into the streets.

Justice is long overdue on the Southwest Sewer District. It is not a question of if, but when the indictments are returned. Those who have been responsible for the sleazy fraud should be hanged in public instead of shipped off to a country club. And why not?

Bothered by ethics

We may be just naive enough, or better yet, idealistic enough to expect our public servants to be totally honest and ethical.

For this reason we are terribly upset by Perry Duryea, our Assemblyman from the first district, Eastern Long Island's first hope for a Governor in almost half a century. He has been dipping his fingers into the public till to finance his campaign for this race.

Perry's staff has been sending out newsletters and columns to all the weekly newspapers throughout the state. These newsletters and columns are paid for by you and I through our taxes.

Normally an Assemblyman would only send his columns to newspapers within his assembly district, so he can tell his constituents what he is doing in their behalf.

Using our tax dollars to finance his campaign may not be illegal, but it sure in hell is unethical, and it makes you wonder what other kind of marginal immorality is he involved in?

You must also consider the implications if he can't distinguish between right and wrong in this instance, his judgement might be impaired in making decisions that will effect us as the Governor. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'Civil service is not a family deli'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Talk about amazing!! In reference to your "TRY ADVERTISING" editorial, I'm amazed at your attitude concerning the civilian police clerks. You have always been on the mark in your editorials, but in this instance, I'm afraid you are off base on a few points.

First, let me inform you that the Police Headquarters building in Yaphank was originally built for Social Services. Because of its inaccessibility to welfare recipients, the idea was scrapped. That left Mr. Klein with a building in the works, but no department to fill it. The Police Dept. was chosen to be the new occupants. At the time of this decision, Commissioner Dilworth was not even a member of the Suffolk County Police Dept.; your editorial leads people to believe that he helped build it!!

You have also disregarded the fact that county clerical workers have to take a CIVIL SERVICE exam in order to be eligible for the jobs. TWO HUNDRED of those on the list were canvassed for the job. Out of them, FOUR women accepted out of sheer necessity. Why did 196 turn down the jobs??? Could it be the fact that these jobs require around the clock shifts? In other words, 8:00-4:00 for 5 days, off 2; then 4:00-12:00 for 5 days; then after 2 1/2 days off, 5 shifts of Midnight to 8:00 am; with rotating midnights off. This schedule also includes Sundays, Christmas, New Years, etc...

I have been working for the Police Dept. for three years, working the 9:00 am to 4:30 pm hours that most civilian employees work; and

believe me, \$7000 a year wouldn't induce me or my fellow employees to work around the clock shifts!!

In all fairness to both sides, working nights in Headquarters is no easy job. Four or five people on a squad have to be familiar with every aspect of each section within Central Records (the biggest office in the Police Dept.). These sections usually employ 20 to 30 girls during the day shift.

For the past 17 years, patrolmen have been working these positions, and no one has ever questioned the fact that they receive the same pay as the man in blue out on the street. You ask any member (civilian OR uniformed) of the Police Dept. what they think about women working around the clock for \$5400 a year, with next to nothing in raises for the next three years (due to the current farce of a CSEA contract), and see what they think! We're all for women getting a more fair wage under these circumstances.

When you say that people never consider the county because they still think you have to know somebody in order to get a job, please remember that we county employees had to take a CIVIL SERVICE test, and had to score high enough to even be interviewed for the jobs. CIVIL SERVICE IS NOT A FAMILY DELICATESSEN!! You have to make the grade to get in, and WHY NOT????? (L-12P) Very truly yours,
Suzanne A. Ring
Micrographics Operator
Central Records Bureau
Suffolk County Police Dept.
Yaphank

'It is an even more emotional issue for women'

Dear Editor:

In reference to your article in Suffolk Life about abortion becoming a local issue. From the contents of your article, it is obvious you are not only opposed to abortion, but to medicated funded abortions for poor women as well.

While I might wish to digress on the topic of abortion, the issue here is really that you oppose medicated funds for abortion. You make a feeble attempt to give the pro-choice side a representation, by enclosing the ballot with the pro and con statements. But your article really says it all.

It is unfair, discriminatory and quite illegal to provide medicated funds for rich women and deny these same resources to a poor woman. Your article not only shows discrimination toward poor women, but towards women in general.

Perhaps you should know that medicated funds are available to poor men who are in need of a prostate operation. Strange how men who are in need of financial aid for an operation that is strictly male are given funds and yet women are denied the same funds for an operation that is strictly female.

A further note of interest can be seen in the statistics on abortion versus welfare in the year 1977. 50,000 abortions were performed in New York state last year at the cost of 10 million dollars bringing the cost of one abortion to \$200.00. An estimated \$1,300 per

birth was spent on pregnancies taken to term for those women on welfare and after the birth of the child another \$258 per child for the first year. Aid to dependent children spent \$3,000 dollars (estimated) per child and infant day care spend an estimated \$5,000 dollars per child.

As you can see, the cost of welfare for poor women with a child to support far exceeds the cost of abortion.

It is interesting that the bill to ban federal aid for abortions to poor women has already been declared illegal, but is being voted on anyway.

Just as men have the right to federal aid to take care of their physical health, (prostate operations) so should women have the same. You stated that abortion is an emotional issue for legislators; it is an even more emotional issue for women when their rights are denied because of financial status. L-14A

Sincerely,
Barbara K. Hislip
East End N.O.W.
East Hampton

ED NOTE: I oppose abortions period. There are no medicated forms available for rich women. They don't qualify. You may be able to put a price tag on the value of life, I can't. I'm not god and I do not have the right to pick and choose who will live - rich or poor, black or white, male or female.

Suddenly there is light

We have really learned what winter is all about.

It has been years since we have had as much snow or it remained on the ground for this long. It's encouraging though, if you notice, there still is daylight until 5:00 p.m. and it is only dusk at 6:00 p.m.

The morning sun is arriving before

we are out of bed, which simply means spring is just around the corner.

We will all be happy to see the winter over with, even the kids are rapidly tiring of sled riding, snowman-making and ice skating. Let there be light. And why not?

SUFFOLK LIFE

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West
Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma
Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centereach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

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
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Dorothy Spatafora - Classified Mgr.

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

Changing hours to meet public's needs

Arthur Felice, county clerk, is petitioning the Commissioner of the State Motor Vehicle Department, James Melton, for permission to keep the Suffolk County Motor Vehicle offices opened until 8 pm on Friday evenings.

Felice stated Suffolk County is a commuter community and the present 9 to 5 hours of the Motor

Vehicle Department hinder residents in their renewal of licenses.

Felice feels keeping the offices opened until 8 pm will enable residents of Suffolk to avoid having to take time off from work in order to conduct their Motor Vehicle business. Our county clerk is right and we hope James Melton agrees and will authorize the late opening of these

offices.

When Felice ran for county clerk, he pledged to make his office more available and responsive to the public's needs.

We are happy to see he is following his pledge by asking the state to keep their offices open late.

Our only hope is that he will heed his own advice and open the clerk's

office late on Fridays.

We called the clerk's office last week and learned if you need to conduct county business, you must do it before 5 pm Friday.

It is a classic case of the pot calling the kettle black and we hope Felice will carry out his own suggestions. And why not?

Catching welfare cheats

The state Assembly this week passed legislation in an attempt to curb welfare cheats.

The Social Services Department will be required to match names and Social Security numbers of recipients against records of people who are working.

Some welfare cheats work regular jobs while at the same time collect lucrative welfare benefits. This plan

will cut down on some of the fraud.

But, the bill will impose a costly burden on employers who will be required four times a year to submit to the welfare department a list of all employees engaged during a quarter.

This list must be complete with their names and Social Security numbers. It is easy for legislators and bureaucrats to come up with programs, but we wonder if they ever

take into consideration the ramifications and the cost they are levying on businesses.

Businesses already must supply a list of employees to the tax bureau on a regular basis. We fail to see why the welfare department cannot obtain a copy of these lists from the tax department. This would save businesses from additional work and avoid costly duplication.

Of course, the difference between a private business compiling the list and the tax bureau is that private businesses will be picking up the cost for this governmental service.

We support any idea that will eliminate welfare fraud and cut down on welfare costs, but we can't see making the private businesses absorb the cost of government. And why not?

Give him a break

Alex Horton, superintendent of highways, was summoned to appear before last Tuesday's Riverhead Town Board meeting. In attendance at the board meeting were numerous town residents complaining about the quality of snow removal during the last storm.

The Riverhead Town Highway Department, during the first storm in January, were late in getting started, and as a result, the opening of roads and clean-up was not up to standard.

Horton and the department deserved to be rightly criticized for this poor judgement.

During the last storm, Horton had every available man and piece of equipment out and working as the snow started to fall. The major arteries and side streets in the community were opened as soon as humanly possible. Some of the men worked 36 hours straight without going to bed. The majority of the complaints the board heard last

Tuesday were from people who live on private roads where the highway department has no business plowing in the first place. Horton was also criticized by people for plowing in driveways people had just dug out.

You cannot effectively open roads and avoid plowing in people's driveways. If snow plows had to lift their plow every time they came to a driveway, roads would never be opened, and traffic would be paralyzed until spring.

We consider the board's parading of Horton in front of this meeting a cheap trick unworthy of the common sense normally shown by Riverhead Town elected officials. It may have been a good way to allow residents to blow off steam, but we do not feel it was fair or right.

We personally think Horton and his men did the best job they could during the second storm and they deserve thanks and appreciation, not condemnation. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'This remark was not called for'

Dear Sir:

I regard Denis Hurly very highly, but his statement in the Sunday, February 5th issue of Suffolk Life where he states that, the Wading River Chamber of Commerce has only 15 members, and that they only have an attendance of 4 people at their meetings. This remark was not called for and unnecessary.

I'm sure that Denis would not have dared make this remark before Nov. 8th of 1977. All organizations have attendance and other problems, we certainly don't say it in public print. As far as the Cross Sound Bridge is concerned everyone has the right to their own opinion. L-10P

Signed: Joe Hope!

'We have an unhappy guest'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

We have an unhappy guest in our midst. He is a medium-sized Shepherd cross - beige in color - found wearing a collar with a small Ess hook on it that had probably carried an identification tag.

A compassionate soul picked him up while driving somewhere between Quogue and Riverhead on February 6th, the day of the blizzard. She knew taking him out of the area wouldn't help his owners find him, but under storm conditions, she had no alternative. She drove to Montauk, kept him as long as she could, and then turned him over to us.

The dog is trained and well nourished. We

feel he was not abandoned. He is obviously accustomed to a loving home and family. He tells us constantly with cries and whimpers that he is longing for that home, and finds a kennel unbearable.

Perhaps through the magic of your circulation, his family will be able to re-claim him. A call to 516-725-4242 is all that's needed. (L-1P)

Sincerely,
Eleanor Healy
Corresp. Secretary
Animal Rescue Fund
Sag Harbor

'It really galls me'

Dear Editor:

I am in accord with "Disgruntled" and his (her) letter in the Readers' Opinion, in your January 29, 1978 issue.

It really galls me to think that the PSC allows LILCO to eventually have every raise they ask for, regardless of the hardship it puts on people. And the fact that we are all paying for their fuel bills (who pays ours?). It's surprising that more people are not up in arms. Why is the PSC called the PUBLIC Service Commission? Are they truly serving the public?

I believe that most people are dissatisfied with this arrangement, but feel trapped because of LILCO's monopoly and the reprisal they'd get if they fought these raises.

If only more people would get together and oppose LILCO's unfair rate increases, maybe something could be done to halt LILCO's greed. (L-13P)

Sincerely,
Doris
"Disgusted and Captive User
of LILCO'S Services"

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 17 NO. 102

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice 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
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West
Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma
Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Cantara
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

You are in the top 25%

Congratulations, fellow Long Islanders.

Your combined average family income of \$18,000 per year puts you in the top 25 percentile of income for the United States.

You're one of the super-rich, whether you know it or not. You're basking in the luxury of the filthy rich.

Of course being in the top 25 per cent you are expected to allow a larger portion of your income to be confiscated by the federal government, so that the wealth of your country can evenly be distributed.

Currently those of us who are in this top 25 per cent bracket pay 72 per cent of the total personal income taxes collected in the entire U.S.

Our esteemed leader, Jimmy Carter, doesn't feel we are paying our fair share. He wants us rich people to pay more.

By passing the recently imposed Social Security taxes, he has effectively reduced your annual spending power by three per cent. He is now calling for tax reform. Once you strip away the flowery image, tax reform simply means those of us who make \$15,000 or more annually as a combined family income will pay more when the federal bureaucrats enact this legislation.

Carter wants to reduce the personal exemptions we receive for dependents from \$750 to \$250. His reform calls for the elimination of the deductions for real estate taxes and interest we are paying on our mortgage.

These are only a few of the items Carter wants to reform.

We have all heard a lot about the three martini lunches he also wants to do away with.

Most of us are aghast at the thought

of somebody having three martinis for lunch to start with, who would be opposed to making a person whose drinking it pay for it. But in reality, the exemptions covered under a three martini lunch clique are just about everything we do to make our economy work.

When we editorialized against the election of Carter as President, we stressed our belief that Carter's conception of middle-class was based upon backwoods Southern standards and not the Northeast area.

The cost of living here on Long Island is darn near double that of the hills of Appalachia. Most of us sat back and never wrote to our Congressmen, Senators or the President protesting the increase in Social Security taxes.

As a result, we are now saddled with a potential of paying between our

own share and our employees' share over \$6,000 per year in Social Security taxes because of this legislation.

As burdensome as Social Security taxes are, they are a drop in the bucket compared to what Carter's so called tax reform will accomplish.

Carter has the potential with the various tax gouging schemes he and his administration have developed of being the worst socialistic president since F.D.R.

It's your paycheck, your standard of living and quality of life that is at stake. You better let Carter, your Senators, and your Congressmen know how you feel or in a very short period of time you are going to find the disposable income you are left with after taxes will reduce your standard of living below the poorest of our society. And why not?

Protection for the weakfish

A bill has been filed with the Senate and the Assembly Conservation Committee that if enacted, will ban the gill netting of spawning weakfish during May.

This is the peak spawning period for these fish. Weakfish, a distant relative of fresh water trout, are one of the gamest sport fish for its size found in our waters. It is also a delicious seafood that is considered a prize catch. Weakfish are cyclable.

Some years the bays are overloaded and other years these fish are all but missing. During the '20's, Eastern Long Island developed an entire in-

dustry around these fish. Special trains were run for vacationers and sportsmen to bring people here.

In the past few seasons, weakfish came back strong. During last year's weakfish run, we, as most fishermen, witnessed a proliferation of gill nets and fish traps throughout the bay that took an awesome toll on these fish.

Unrestricted commercial fishermen took so many of these fish that they dropped the wholesale price of over 80 cents per pound to under a nickel.

At a nickel a pound it doesn't pay to ship these fish as transportation and

ice costs more. There was a noticeable decline in weakfishing. Part of this can be traced to the natural cycle of the fish, but the abundance of gill nets and fish traps played an important part in this condition.

We have always believed in live and let live. Commercial fishermen have as much, if not more, right to the harvesting of fish as do those of us who fish for sport, recreation and food.

These commercial fishermen did not exhibit their normal restraint. We must look to the state to place

restrictions on the taking of these fish during the spawning period. Once this period is over and weakfish have had an opportunity to reproduce and insure a continuation of the species commercial harvesting should be allowed.

We encourage all those interested in the perpetuation of the weakfish species to write to the Conservation Committee of the Assembly and the Senate in support of the restrictions of the wholesale commercial taking of weakfish during spawning season. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'Peconic County effort must be started again'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I enjoyed reading your recent article about County Legislator Hurley's efforts to have the Suffolk County Legislature replaced with a Board of Supervisors. Aside from the difficulties he is obviously going to have, I think it important to note that from the standpoint of the East End, that happening if it occurred, would only be half of a victory. That is, a

Suffolk County Board of Supervisors, operating under a system of weighted votes, cannot reasonably be expected to decide fundamental suburban versus rural policy issues in favor of the East End interests.

It seems clear to me that the best hope that the people of the East End have for responsive and effective County government is to have their own county. Without un-

derestimating the difficulty of the task, the Peconic County effort must be started again. I say this because the next census is only two years away, and legislative reapportionment will follow it. We know that the population growth of the East End in the Seventies will make it very close to being an Assembly District in 1982, and the fact gives credence to the concept that it is large enough to be a

governmental jurisdiction.

There is much work to be done here, and much persuading to be done in Albany. If I run for and am elected to the State Assembly this year, I will consider the Peconic County effort the best and most important "good government" issue on my agenda. L-3K
Sincerely yours,
Patrick J. Russell

'Isn't standing in line also below her stature?'

Dear Editor:

I would like to shed some light on why unemployment is so bad in Suffolk County. My partner and I recently purchased an existing franchise store. We knew the original owner and his wife. At our closing, the owner stated we wouldn't have to hire anyone to replace his wife as she was no longer working in the store.

To our surprise, we received a notice she was collecting unemployment benefits at the rate of \$88 per week. We notified and explained to N.Y.S. Dept. of Labor for one month about the situation and new ownership. Needless to say, we were ignored and she continued to collect. As a final effort, our

accountant wrote directly to Albany.

The Patchogue office called us and again we explained the whole story. We also stated we have openings on all hours and a very good salary.

This morning we received notice that the wife is entitled to collect as the position and salary is beneath her stature. If this is true, isn't standing in an unemployment line also beneath her stature?

We also have people collecting benefits that have been offered jobs which were refused because they are students and cannot work any time but to their convenience. (L-2R)
Thank You,
Concerned citizen

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 18 NO. 1

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice 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. It is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West
Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma
Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centereach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

Sex education in the home

The county Health Department is pushing a sex education course be given in public schools.

The Health Department is upset about the rising number of teenage pregnancies and the fact that few school districts in Suffolk have a regular sex education program as part of their curriculum.

Sex education is a vital part of every young person's upbringing. The quality and quantity of this education is the first and foremost responsibility of the parent, who brought the child into this world.

We remember our own father's fear of explaining to us the "birds and the bees".

How we remember that Sunday afternoon we could sense something ^{of} ^{miss} and important was about to happen. After my father had sufficiently fortified himself and built up the courage to broach the subject, I was taken by the hand and led to my bedroom.

As my dad and I sat there on the side of the bed and waited through what seemed like hours, my father asked me, "Do you know all about sex?"

Although I knew some isolated facts, looking back now, most of them were jumbled up. But not wanting to appear dumb, I answered "Yes."

There was an audible sigh of relief and he said, "Thank God!" and that was the end of my formal sex ^{of} ^{on} education.

That instance took place some 30 years ago, and, we suppose, in some families, the scene is repeated today, but on the whole, we have found most young parents now face sex education of their children entirely differently.

No longer are their false values and false modesties. Sex is discussed openly and casually. Most children are indoctrinated into the real world of sexuality even before they go to school. They know the stork didn't bring them and have got at least a surface knowledge about how babies are made.

Parents, who fail to talk openly and candidly with their children about sex, are doing both their children and themselves a disservice.

But we question whether it's the right or the responsibility of the bureaucracy to assume this vital and real educational responsibility of the parents.

We do believe that nurses and counselors should be available in schools where students can go to seek additional adequate information about their bodies and their functions if necessary.

We see no reason why as part of a science or biology course reproduction of humans should not be covered.

We do seriously question the need

for an elaborate Masters and Johnson approach to this personal subject.

Sexology, morals and how you approach them is a personal thing. The type of sex education a parent chooses to give his child is his right and should not be infringed upon by the government.

Pregnancies are on the rise, not so much out of lack of knowledge, but out of attitude.

Because of our "new morality", abortion may be had on demand. Girls obviously pregnant are allowed to continue in school without scorn. Girls who choose to have and keep their babies are looked upon as almost as heroes.

Gone are the social reasons for not becoming pregnant. Add to this the open availability of instant welfare and being taken care of from cradle to grave, and there is no wonder there aren't more teenage pregnancies.

Today there is an abundance of information available to young people on every aspect of sex - how to, what to and why. Birth control and the various methods of contraception are explained in great detail.

A child has to be either ignorant or totally sheltered to avoid coming in contact with this information. The kids themselves discuss at great length sex and we find it hard to accept the teenagers, who get pregnant, got there because they did not know the result of their actions.

One of the other gems my father gave me in later years was the simple statement, "If you are going to play - pay, and if you can't afford to pay the price - Don't."

When we were children, we were taught that to be responsible for our own actions, we should know and accept the consequences of our behavior.

Let's face facts, we live in a permissive, socialistic society, where individual responsibility is not a popular concept.

Boys, who choose to engage in sex and fail to use contraception, do so because they don't care. They are willing to let the girl bear the responsibility. Girls who become pregnant and decide to keep the child fail to comprehend the responsibility that they are taking on. They know that society will take care of them.

The end result is a child who will face a very dubious fate being raised by a mother who is ill-prepared emotionally, psychologically and financially.

If parents fail to educate their children and their responsibility in dealing with sex, pregnancy and the real life problems, we don't see how a bunch of bureaucrats can do better. And why not?

Politicians lax concerning L.I.R.R.

Dear Sir:

Perhaps the following letter will initiate some activity on all those overpaid politicians to do something for the people who pay their salaries.

The L.I.R.R. has proven itself completely unreliable, deficient, uncooperative and definitely lacking in intelligent and practical supervision many times. They have a transportation monopoly on the island and have aborted many attempts of other companies to afford transportation to the residents of Long Island.

For about two years Setauket has not been a station stop; however, in the recent blizzard the idiots stopped there. The small parking lot was just an immense white mass and if anybody left the train they would have sunk in snow up to their waist.

Years ago it took less time to get to Port Jefferson than now. They spend more time standing still than moving. Their schedule for stations is as follows: Stop for at least five minutes before entering station - enter station

passengers either leave or enter - stand waiting for at least another five minutes before starting for the next station at approximately twenty miles an hour. The whole process is repeated again and again at each and every station.

At least 75 per cent of the Long Island working people go to New York for their livelihood. It is about time our overly paid politicians realize this as we are the ones paying their salaries. When they are running for office, they are very active getting votes with their false promises. Now is the time to leave their plush chairs and do something about the much needed alternate transportation in Suffolk and to pressure the L.I.R.R. for double tracks and major improvements in service.

The exodus of people leaving Long Island is growing, and from the comments of commuters it is going to grow much more.

F. Marchand
Rocky Point.

'How would L.I. evacuate?'

Dear Editor,

In reply to the letter sent to you by the director of the marine environmental council, I feel a few words should be mentioned in favor of the bridge.

About two years ago I wrote a letter raising the question, "What would Long Islanders do if we had to have an emergency evacuation?" Again I am raising this question. The L.I.E. is bad enough during the rush hours, can you imagine if everyone on Long Island was on it? How would the environmentalists get off the island? Ride a fish? I'm sure if the environmentalists worked with the builders (with an open mind), instead of against them, an amicable agreement could be met.

A bridge could help so many people in so many ways. First raising the point of unemployment. Think of all the jobs this

bridge would offer. It would greatly reduce the unemployment on the island.

And I'm sure at the base of the bridge beautiful boat basins and recreation areas would dress up our town much more than some of these beaches where so much of this teenage mischief that we hear about goes on, besides it looking like the city dumps.

I'm sure the government or town can also take steps to stop the erosion problem?

What have the environmentalists done about this problem? These are just a few points in favor of the bridge. So if there are any people on Long Island in favor of this bridge speak out. You're not a lonely voice either!

Sincerely,
Sherrie Castellano

'PSC has callous disregard for public interest'

Dear Mr. Rivett:

The Public Service Commission has requested the public to comment on 12 proposed power plant sites in Suffolk County for its state-wide power plant siting program. The request has not been well publicized, the maps showing sites are available only at the Patchogue Library, and those maps are not easily decipherable by the general public.

Allowing less than a month for comment by setting a March 1 cut-off date for public input, indicates a callous disregard of the public's legitimate interest in these proposed sites.

Many civic groups, intervenors in the Jamesport power plant hearings, and Town Supervisors and Planning Boards in the

relevant Towns should be providing input to this power plant siting project, before public hearings are held for specific sites. Maps should be provided to the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board and to the Town Supervisors where these proposed sites are located.

On behalf of all interested parties in the County, the League of Women Voters of Suffolk County requests an extension of at least two months in which to comment on locations in the County which are recommended as potential power plant sites. To do less constitutes a hoax and a charade.

Sincerely,
Mallory Leoniak, President
League of Women Voters of Suffolk County

'God bless him'

Gentlemen:

My neighbors and I residing in Ramblewood Park, Wading River, wish to express our heartfelt thanks to Mr. Lewin, who, on Feb. 9th voluntarily donated his time and equipment to clear our roads and driveways of snow resulting from the recent blizzard.

We feel this man is truly concerned with the welfare of senior citizens, and is to be heartily commended for his labors.

God bless him. L-11P
Sincerely,
Arthur Smith
Wading River

VOL. 18 NO. 2

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday

Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork South Fork Riverhead Hampton West	Mastic/Moriches Patchogue Medford/Holbrook Sayville Ronkonkoma	Coram/Middle Island Selden/Centereach 3 Village/Port Jefferson Rocky Point	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 publishes 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	Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales	Rick Brand - News Editor
Maxine Holmes - Production Director	William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.	Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director		Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

Write your senator tonight

Pat Moynihan and Jacob Javits will probably vote "yes" for the passage of the Panama Canal treaty tomorrow. The vote on the treaty is scheduled to take place on Thursday, March 16th.

If this treaty passes, it will be a black day for America. Once again, we will have abdicated our responsibility and role as a leader in the world.

The Panama Canal zone is sovereign territory of the people of the United States of America. It is a vital link between our Eastern and Western Coast. We acquired the Panama Canal zone in perpetuity not as a temporary asset that can be given back and forth.

Our ownership and the operation of the canal has been a stabilizing force in Panama and all of Latin America. Our operation of the canal has produced jobs, income and revenues for the Panamanian people and the country.

Because of the existence of the canal and our operation of it, this country has enjoyed a far better economic climate than any of the other Central American countries.

The give-away of the canal is a horrendous action. It is totally irresponsible. This asset, worth several billion dollars in real money, is an asset of yours and mine as citizens of the United States. It is not only a tangible asset but an intangible one that has assisted in keeping the cost of goods and services which we use and consume down.

It is also a vital link in our defense system.

The day we give away the Panama Canal, we also give up the right for American ships to be the first ones through the canal in case of a war or armed aggression against this country.

The outcome of the Panama Canal vote may not seem important to you for it seems so removed from our everyday world here on Eastern Long Island. The outcome will have ramifications felt not only around the world, but right here.

One of the more frightening aspects of turning the canal over to the Panamanian government is the instability of this government. For almost the last decade, the country has been ruled by a military dictatorship.

Panama, like the other Central American countries, is subject to vital and swift changes in structure and form. Once we give up our ownership and control, we give up the right to defend this vital link. With our troops and bases removed, we will no longer be able to act swiftly to thwart sabotage.

President Carter, in a very misleading fireside chat, tried to sell the Panama Canal to the American people. One of the arguments he used was if we give away the Panama Canal, we will not have to have our boys fighting in the jungles of Panama to defend this property.

Ronald Reagan, who has led the fight to retain our control of the canal was given time by CBS TV network to rebut the President's position. Reagan, issue by issue, tore apart Carter's address.

If he wasn't so polite, he would have called Carter an outright liar. Instead, he used phrases like "not quite the truth," or "excerpts of facts."

We urge you to wire Moynihan and Javits tonight in opposing the passage of the treaty. You may do so inexpensively by sending a five word phoneogram to Washington for only \$1.

It could be the best dollar you ever spent on America. And why not?

Should the killings be called murder?

Chances are at least one person, probably more, will be killed in Moriches Inlet during the next six months.

This inlet, although officially closed to navigation by the Coast Guard, is regularly used by boatsmen seeking passage into the ocean.

The inlet is badly shoaled. This is a tremendously tragic and dangerous condition. The inlet is deceiving.

We have personally sat on the inside of the inlet and looked seaward. From all appearances a boat would have little trouble navigating into the ocean. The temptation is great. Many boats get through; some don't.

What happens is as a boat goes over the shoals, the waves drop out and the boater finds himself virtually sitting on a sand bar. The next wave that comes in catches the immobilized boat and capsizes it and drownings occur.

Rudy Kammerer, the commissioner of the Department of Public Works, has made application for emergency dredging work to clear the inlet in time for boating season. He must receive permission from the State Department of Environmental Conservation and the Corps of Army Engineers before he can start this work.

The Corps is dragging its heels in a typical bureaucratic fashion. At present because of the red tape and

the bureaucracy involved, the Corps of Army Engineers may not grant approval before July, well into the boating season.

Permission on an emergency basis can be granted almost immediately. A stroke of a pen is all that is needed. You may ask yourself if it is as simple as this, and a dangerous condition exists, why are they holding up the application?

The answer lies in the complicated maze of tin soldiers, who run the U.S. Government. Each is a god unto himself who will not be moved by man nor beast. Their inaction will result in people being killed here in Suffolk County.

They will call these deaths accidents, but in reality, are they not deliberate murders caused by the system we call government? Not if, but when, the next death does occur because the Corps of Army Engineers refused to recognize the danger and act expediently on Kammerer's application, the commanding officer of the Corps should be charged with murder. It would make a fascinating trial and the fact that an individual could be held responsible for the inaction of the bureaucracy underneath him might set a precedent to shake the apathy that permeates in our government. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'Not one mention of the suffering deer'

Dear Editor:

RE: Shelter Island Hunting, North Fork Edition, 1-25,78

Once again, we have an article about hunting where not even the slightest thought is expressed for the unfortunate animal. We read about the exhausted hunters, but not one mention of the suffering of the deer they had shot in the leg six hours before. This is not a "Bambi-like" mentality, as is propagandized, but a humane and proper concern for a fellow creature that experiences pain and fright the same as humans.

All the falsehoods of hunting: "It is a sport (In a sport both sides must have an equal chance of winning, and winning must be the same for both. Impossible. The animals have no guns.); "It benefits the animals" (Conditions caused by the violence of man, the gun, and the bulldozer must now be corrected in a non-violent manner. How much suffering is enough?) -- these and all the other fallacies must be expressed. If hunters are truly concerned, let them put down their guns and with all the latest

technology join with others in a truly caring manner to correct conditions brought about by violence. Violence is just another word for pain and suffering.

Most hunters are not aware of the enormous anger and sadness they cause in the rest of us, but this is not a problem to be solved by anger and raised voices. The appeal must be to the conscience of the hunters and future hunters to help them develop the understanding that all life is sacred. Yes, even the lives of the animals whose parts are bought daily in the supermarket and are conveniently called "meat." With the exception of self-defense, either personal or national, intelligent, compassionate, human-kind must by necessity choose non-violence. (L-8P)

Anthony M. Margraf
Medford

Ed. Note: If you care about animals suffering, go into the woods now with the snow on the ground. Find the deer stands. See the deer that are already dead from starvation, see the blood and guts of deer chased down by wild dog packs then ripped apart.

'One of the most backward CATV systems'

Dear Dave:

I protest your recent news story about LI Cablevision, "CATV, growing entertainment industry". Long Island Cablevision is one of the most backward CATV systems in the country. Their rates are higher, and their picture is substantially poorer than other systems on Long Island. They offer no incentives like Suffolk and Brookhaven Cable companies do. These other systems offer Madison Square Garden events, included

with basic service. LI Cablevision does not. They offer local football games, town board meetings, stock reports. LI Cable does not. They also are very discriminating where they string new lines. People should remember this when the company comes along requesting another price hike. (L-4T)
Very truly yours,
Geoff Hawkes
Riverhead

SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 18 NO. 3

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West

Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma

Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centerach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

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.

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 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.

Crossing the sound

For years, men have envisioned a bridge crossing Long Island Sound which would open up Eastern Long Island's dead end.

Numerous studies and proposals have been made. These proposals have been knocked down as unwanted by Connecticut, too expensive to construct or too ecologically devastating and disruptive to the quality of life the people of the East End have chosen for themselves.

No one wants a bridge at their back door. Sites have been mentioned from Orient Point to Glen Cove. Currently, proponents of the bridge are attempting to push a Wading River location.

For a number of years, Suffolk Life was a supporter of a cross-sound bridge. The more we read and the more we investigated this proposition, the less thrilled we became with the idea.

In today's economy, a bridge would require millions of dollars to construct. Yes, it would produce jobs and it would make it a lot easier to get off this sandbar for vacations and business.

But in reality, Long Island, in itself, is a master market that thrives because of its self-containment.

There is limited ferry service from Orient Point year-round, and from Port Jefferson during the summer. There also is real plans in the works for an enlarged ferry service from the Village of Greenport to New London, Connecticut. This proposal is the brainchild of George Powers, of Mascony Transportation Company. Mascony has received the needed Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) permits. The ferries are ready to operate and they are readying the embargo site in Greenport.

When Mascony first proposed this idea, he received the blessings and the backing from the powers to be in Southold and in Greenport. As his proposal neared completion, and became more of a reality, a small group of self-serving individuals primarily from the Village of Greenport opposed this move on the basis the ferries would cause

congestion and traffic tie ups within the village.

There is some credence to their fears, but we believe it has totally been blown out of proportion. The village is using the taxpayers' money for an expensive legal battle to stop Mascony from operating.

Currently, they are busy passing ordinances they hope will impede Mascony's progress. Even laymen are saying this is a losing battle. The courts will strike down these new ordinances and potentially could open up the Village of Greenport and the individual lawmakers to multi-million dollar lawsuits.

With the advent of this much larger and probably more reliable ferry service, the dead end status of the East End would be eliminated.

The ships Mascony is proposing to use will carry three to five times the cars, freight and passengers that the current ferry services are capable of.

Because of the design and the construction, they will be able to operate in almost all weather conditions.

One would think if the leaders of Long Island and Connecticut were serious in opening up the dead end status of Long Island, they would back to the hilt the Mascony proposal.

If the Greenport site is not feasible, why aren't they aiding Mascony in finding an alternate location acceptable to the public?

A privately-owned, money-making, tax-paying ferry service that can move a large volume of traffic makes far more sense than spending billions of our tax dollars on a bridge that would not be completed for a decade or two.

We encourage Long Island residents, business and political leaders to get behind the Mascony proposition and aid in finding a compromise with the Village of Greenport or an alternate location as a terminal.

We need the kind of service Mascony can provide and we are depriving ourselves by not getting behind him. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'Show us your proof that abortion doesn't destroy'

Dear Mr. Willmott,

Thank you for your coverage of the abortion funding issue, and for your excellent editorial which reminded our Suffolk legislators that the lives of preborn babies are at stake.

Some of our legislators are either ignorant of this fact, or find it easier not to address the point. When we called Floyd Linton, who admits being pro-abortion, he steadfastly refused to discuss whether his vote against the funding ban would result in the destruction of human lives. Perhaps he believes it wouldn't, for he previously told us that he doesn't think a human being exists before birth. You'd have a hard time convincing a mother of that!

We've met very few people who can stomach the abortion of nearly full-term babies in the later stages of pregnancy; most

would call it cold-blooded murder. Since Mr. Linton's statements to us don't seem to rule out an endorsement of abortion the day before birth, perhaps this perspective will now persuade him to clarify his position with a time limit.

We issue Mr. Linton and other pro-abortion legislators a challenge: show us your proof that abortion doesn't destroy the life of an unborn human baby - or admit that what you advocate is killing. For our part, we stand ready to submit the documented scientific evidence that a human life begins when pregnancy starts, at the time when a sperm and ovum unite. L-4R

Chuck & Susan Garmhausen
Coordinators
Families for Life & Justice

'His hypocrisy condemns him'

Dear Editor:

It is Suffolk Life's editor's right to oppose abortion. It is not his right to force others to agree with him, nor is it right for him to force others to suffer the consequences of his personal preferences. If Mr. Willmott finds himself pregnant and if he's opposed to abortions on idiosyncratic - religious grounds, then this country won't force him to have termination of pregnancy. "Separation of church and state", as a working principle, affords him that protection.

What is good for the goose, though, is good for the gander. Mr. Willmott's interpretation of his god's wishes for the good of mankind must also be constrained by the principle of separation of church and state. Perhaps his god has revealed to him a set of standards that he is to endorse, accept, and preach - but, in this country, anyway, that's about as far as his religious freedom can go. If he is allowed to make his personal religion - associated and derived standards universal law, then church and state have lost their definition, and the freedom and prerogative of those who do not hold with his law will be violated.

Of course, Mr. Willmott is allowed to attempt to persuade others to believe as he does. He may display any fact, opinion or assumption that he wishes to offer as

evidence to support his position. And, of course, reasonable people have the right to reasonably examine his evidence, assess its reliability, its merits and its truthfulness, and judge according to their own standards. If they reject his argument, it does not mean he's wrong. It doesn't mean he's right. It does mean that they fully realize that, as he says, he's not God, and he does not have the right to pick and choose the laws that he would have others obey.

I assure the editor that I have yet to confuse him with any kind of god, though his name has been heard at times in proximity to words such as "that god - (expletive deleted) (expletive deleted)." He asserts that he does not have the "right to pick and choose who will live" - has he not read that the birth procedure is more dangerous to mothers than a competently-administered abortion? Has he not endorsed capital punishment? Has he not supported war actions of this country? His hypocrisy condemns him and his argument. May he restrain himself to writing of matters in which he has mastery - if there are any. It would be a pleasant surprise to find even one, but God only knows, miracles do happen.

Gordon Grant
East Patchogue

'No one seems to have an answer'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Today came the latest in a long line of ripoffs. Just when I thought I could catch up a little with the battle of the bills, our automobile insurance bill arrived in the mail.

It seems that there is a state mandate that there is a \$200.00 deductible under the revised No-fault law. So what comes along with that? A gigantic rise in the premiums that make up 100 per cent of what would have been saved. You have to raise your deductible in order to have your bills stay the same. It just goes to show you that you can't fight city hall.

What's with these insurance companies anyway? Can they be hurting that much? Is there no way a person is to make ends meet? What can you do when you've cut down on every conceivable thing possible and still have to juggle the bills to see which one you can pay this month? It's like playing "See how long you can hold your head up above the rising tide of bills." One bright thing is that they now have No Name Brands in some of the stores, so that it is possible to cut down on

the cost of canned goods.

I have a family of eight, and there doesn't seem to be any refuge from the daily hassle of trying to make ends meet.

Last night on "Sixty Seconds" on television, they had a segment about the theft of electricity. One company even told of their manufacturing a device to slow down or completely stop electric meters. Their contention is that the utility companies, especially electric companies, have been ripping the public off so much that this was the only way people could fight back. Of course, using these devices is illegal and there must be some other way, but no one seems to have an answer.

Well, it makes me feel a little better to be able to air my frustrations, but I hope there is a more lasting answer in the future. For now, all we can do is take one day at a time. (L-1T)

Sincerely,
Doris
Hanging in There

'Wonder how others do it?'

Dear Editor:

I read the article in Suffolk Life about school taxes being average. Every time I go by the school, you see the windows open - 10 - 35 degree weather - letting out heat - conserving Energy I'm sure. Even if government or state help pay for this, it is still my money besides the taxes I pay. My school tax alone is over \$900 and no children or grandchild attends schools.

I moved here about a year ago with the low-income housing supposedly that life should be better -- joke -- my taxes are about \$1500 a year, my car no longer could take the commuting so I had to get part-time work here, C.

Moriches has no jobs, limited transportation, no entertainment, no adult courses for betterment of oneself, limited stores that you are actually forced to go out of town for shopping and bargains.

Then I'm told my taxes are average, seems to me something is wrong somewhere. Guess the best I can hope for is welfare cause my belt is as tight as I can get it and I'm still going backwards fast.

Wonder how others do it, because I like it here but sure would like to know how to make it. (L-5T)

MC Raynor
C. Moriches

SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 18 NO. 4

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales; 25¢ per issue

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.



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice 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

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

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.

We want parity too!

Parity is the battle cry of the police when they are in negotiations. They argue we should be getting paid at least as much as police officers in the surrounding or adjacent districts. The cry of parity started in New York City.

For years, police were the highest paid of the uniformed work groups, the firemen followed and then the sanitation men. During the "give it a trial" Lindsay days, the firemen and the sanitation men cried parity and were given a salary and benefit scale equal to the police department.

During this period, the Nassau County cops demanded parity with their New York City brethren and Suffolk officers followed suit.

The cry of parity weak-kneed the politicians, and, of late, compulsory

arbitration has driven our cost of police protection to the highest in the nation.

After five years of service, Suffolk County Police receive a gross salary of \$21,000 per year as a result of last year's arbitration. This year, Nassau cops got their wages raised to \$22,000. On top of this salary, taxpayers are footing the bill for another \$20,000 worth of fringe benefits per man. When all costs are figured, the average cop is making over \$40,000 per year while working a limited number of hours.

East End police, not to be outdone by their West End counterparts, are demanding parity in this year's negotiations.

They want what they consider is their just right without consideration

for the taxpayers.

It's time the taxpayers demanded parity, too. The funding for our police forces comes from real estate taxes. Real estate taxes on similarly valued pieces of property are twice as high in Suffolk County as they are in New York City.

Real estate taxes in Suffolk County are eight to 20 times as high as they are in upstate New York, where their residents are exposed to a far less amount of crime and have less fear of leaving their homes or walking in the streets.

Suffolk residents should be demanding parity with their upstate counterparts. Is it not the job and the responsibility of our law enforcement agency to control and eliminate crime? Does it make sense for us to

be paying 50 to 100 per cent more than our upstate counterparts for police protection and not be able to have the sense of security that these people enjoy from their investment in law enforcement?

When our town boards enter into negotiations with the police unions, they should enter into these negotiations with a demand for parity with all other districts in the state of New York, not only from the standpoint of service provided but from dollars invested.

Negotiations are a two-way street. The public must be able to receive a sense of security and safety for the dollars they are investing.

If we don't have this, then the investment we are making in police protection is wasted. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'Recast N.Y.S. Tax Structure'

Dear Dave:

I would like to respond to your recent editorial in which you asked how taxes can be reduced without cutting back on services.

Tax reduction can be accomplished by allowing growth in New York State's existing revenue structure while simultaneously controlling the cost of government.

My five-year proposal, as detailed in October 18 and October 23, 1977 statements, calls for a \$2,230,000,000 (B) tax reduction coupled with a projected growth in revenues of \$4,769,000,000 (B).

The objective of my program is two fold: to provide long over-due tax relief for our low-income and middle-income families and to stimulate job-creating economic activity by industry and business. When fully implemented, my plan would reduce personal, property, business, and sales taxes by over \$2,000,000,000 (B) annually.

It is essential that New York State take positive action to recast our tax structure and ease the burdens of the second highest taxed people in our nation. And we must do it now. Otherwise, a continued loss of business and jobs could cause New York to become a permanently-depressed welfare state.

Revenue growth projections for the next five years, computed by the Governor's Division of the Budget, anticipates a growth in all revenues based on present tax structure of \$4,769,000,000 (B). Elimination of fraud and abuse, welfare reform, and a "minimal" increase in federal assistance or grants should provide another \$1,500,000,000 (B).

If the revenue projections are borne out, my proposed across-the-board tax cuts

represent what I consider to be a conservative total, less than half of the estimated growth. The difference between the additional revenues and the tax reduction plan should prevent New York from becoming an economic wasteland while stimulating the creation of thousands of new jobs. Any tax reduction that generates jobs should be viewed as a straightforward investment rather than a loss of state revenue.

My record on taxes has been one which strongly supports tax cuts. Until 1971, governments responded to demands for expanded services by increasing taxes. However, in 1971, I was one of the first in the nation to recognize the trend of expenditures spiraling above revenues. As Speaker of the New York State Assembly, I led a successful fight to cut Governor Rockefeller's 1971-72 budget by \$756,000,000 (M) and have supported tax decreased and cost cutbacks since that time.

To reverse the flight of businesses and jobs, I vigorously opposed Governor Carey's successful tax increase of \$600,000,000 (M) in 1975 and proposed with Senator Anderson a \$300,000,000 (M) tax cut which Governor Carey scuttled. And the governor has pledged no tax increase in his 1974 campaign.

Governor Carey's miniscule tax cut, accomplished as he increased other taxes, was not a cut in the permanent tax rate, but was in effect, a tax credit. Mr. Carey claims he eliminated the 2 1/2 per cent tax surcharge that was due to expire anyway. His other tax reduction - a one-year credit which takes effect this year - gives a maximum \$50 credit to a few families.

Carey's program is to a large extent a one-year, one-shot tax cut while my proposal is a permanent tax reduction program phased in over five years, or sooner. My program is designed to grant across-the-board tax relief and to make New York economically competitive with other states.

I believe my proposal to be economically

sound, one which combines tax reduction with growth in New York State's existing revenue structure. By taking this conservative approach, while controlling government costs, essential services will not be impaired. (L-5R)

Sincerely,

Perry B. Duryea, Jr.

'... but are you anti-education?'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

After reading your editorial entitled "Sex Education in the Home," I felt the necessity to reply.

The county Health Department recognizes the alarming birth rate among teenagers in the county and have attempted to offer their assistance to any school district without an existing program in their field of Sex Education or Family Living. By merely offering their assistance, does not as you imply, mean they are pushing sex education!

You state "sex education is a vital part of every young person's upbringing and the quality and quantity of this education is the first and foremost responsibility of the parents." Granted...that is a correct statement, however, are parents today being responsible in this area of sex education? Probably not!! You then recap your own parents' approach to the subject. That approach is probably more like the situation most of today's teenagers and pre-teens encounter with their parents. You also go on to state "that you find most parents today face the subject of sex openly with their children." Have you taken a poll on the subject or is this revelation merely a personal statement based on imput from a few close friends?

I feel that a child should not have to seek

out a school nurse or counselor to obtain vital information about sex education. I do feel that such a course should be part of the full education a child receives. I also seriously question your implication that a Masters and Johnson approach will be given. You are doing a great disservice to your readers by assuming that the Health Department curriculum will be the curriculum of any school district which may entertain implementing a Family Living course.

I feel that by educating the child in sex education, as well as the 3 R's, the finished product would result in a child better able to cope with life on an everyday basis.

You are obviously anti-Health Department but are you anti-Education? Let's face facts...if sex education is part of a school curriculum, it will be taught by professional educators and not bureaucrats as you so state.

Rather than use your statement, "If you are going to Play - Pay and if you can't afford to pay the price, don't"...let's hope we can educate the total child and then hope the choice he makes will be the correct one. "And why not?" (L-1V)

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Fox Centereach

'We're 100% for the bill . . .'

Dear Mr. Willmott,

We read with interest your editorial re weakfish netting in the March 8 issue. We're 100 per cent for the bill banning the netting of spawning weaks.

You say commercial fishermen have as much right to the harvesting of fish as do sportsmen. No one can argue with that. However, you added the phrase "if not more." You can't really believe commercial fishermen have more "right" to harvest a natural resource than sportsmen do. If you do, you must be a commercial fisherman yourself!

A license gives a fisherman the right to use a net, and therefore, to catch fish in large quantities. He has a legal right to a method which the sportsman does not have. The sportsman can enjoy their same right however, (if he wants to turn pro) by simply paying the fee.

I'd like to know your reasons for saying "if not more". Also please give me some names & proper addresses so I can write to Albany as you suggest. L-2V

Yours truly

J. Robert Hensler Amagansett

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 18 NO. 5

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West
Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma
Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centereach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

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
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

Mickey Mouse, Donald Duck and school boards

Having allowed the cost of educating Long Island students to rise to the highest in the nation, some of Suffolk's school board members rewarded themselves for this dubious achievement by voting themselves a trip to Disneyland in California.

These junkets are being paid for with your real estate tax dollars.

Some members of school boards, who are attending the convention, claim they are going there solely to increase their effectiveness as school board members. That is not even funny.

They are going there on a taxpayer-paid vacation. Sure they will discuss the administration of schools, but the real motivation is to enjoy a free vacation. You can be sure if the convention were held in Hoboken, you wouldn't get five school board members from Sachem attending the convention.

This is not the first time Suffolk Life has brought junketing by school board members to the public's attention. For the last three years, we have done stories about this wasteful practice, particularly during a time of

austerity in education.

School boards that have taken part in this pleasure, should return home to a host of incensed taxpayers demanding their scalps.

You have to question the judgement, the morals and the ethics of school board members who take these kind of expensive trips as a reward for their "no pay" jobs.

When a person becomes a member of the school board, they accept a tremendous amount of responsibility. They run for office knowing full well the job is a thankless one for which there is no financial remuneration.

To create a bypass system of rewards is just plain unethical and a betrayal of the trust of the people who have voted for them in the first place.

It is one of those nice little legal ways of stealing. You can't go to jail for it, but it sure the hell doesn't stop your neighbor from realizing what you have taken from him.

We encourage the voters of school districts, whose board members are on the take, to kick them out and replace them with people of integrity. And why not?

He is getting religion

Last year Floyd Linton was a legislator from the fourth district. He also was the majority leader of the legislature.

When Parr Meadows was attempting to open, Linton stood on the side lines while various county agencies put up roadblock after roadblock to thwart the opening of this huge employer.

We editorialized about his deplorable behavior. Armed with this knowledge, voters gave him a message at the polls. Instead of a several thousand vote plurality, he barely squeaked back into the legislature by 900 votes.

Gone was his huge plurality and many of his aspirations for a higher elected office. Last week, Linton

called a meeting of town, county and state officials to aid in the reopening of Parr Meadows. A complete turnabout.

Has Linton gotten religion, or is it Linton's desire to run for Congress that is making him act as a concerned legislator? We hope he is more than a "Congressional" convert. Politicians have a way of turning on the responsiveness to their constituents as their need for support rises.

Even if it is only Linton's desire to be a serious Congressional contender that is the motivation behind his new face, we are happy that he is at long last making an attempt to be a responsive representative. And why not?

Sewer moratorium - now

On Tuesday the Suffolk County Legislature will vote on a temporary 60 day moratorium on the Southwest Sewer District. The moratorium will halt construction in areas four and seven.

It will give the committee and the legislature time to determine whether it is in the best interest of the residents of the Southwest Sewer District and the entire county to confine further construction of the sewer district to the areas already sewered, mainly in the Town of Babylon.

The passage of this moratorium will not affect federal funding on the project, nor will it interfere with the overall completion of the present system.

Legislator Robert Mrazek who has proposed this moratorium, feels he has uncovered a legal method to confine the sewer district, while at the same time, obtaining full federal funding for the overall project.

If this can be done, the burden on the residents of the Southwest Sewer District can be cut and there will be no need to dip into the sales taxes paid

by all county residents to subsidize the district.

Unfortunately, this proposal is already turning into a partisan, political battle with many Republicans lining up against many Democrats.

We implore the county legislature to put aside partisan politics and their struggle for power to vote in the best interest of their constituents.

The passage of this moratorium is a must now. For if it isn't passed, bids will be let and pipes will start to be laid and construction will begin in East Islip and the north western portion of the district.

Supervisor Peter Cohalan of Islip, whose town is directly involved, endorses the moratorium. We hope all legislators, regardless of their political affiliation will vote for this temporary halt so that reason, sanity and common sense will have a chance to prevail.

Do your part whether you are in the district or not, contact your legislator now and demand that he vote for this temporary moratorium. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

'It is our new morality . . .'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Your editorial in the Sunday, March 5th issue of Suffolk Life expresses my views on sex education exactly. It is our 'new morality' and not the lack of knowledge that

is causing the problems in today's society.

(L-4V)
Thank You,
Dorothy Laager
Port Jefferson Station

'Let their stockholders finance them'

Dear Sir:

The Long Island Ratepayers Association is a group of people who are "opposed to LILCO's unfair rate increases" and an organization determined to "halt LILCO's greed," as per "Disgusted and Captive User of LILCO's Services," March 1, 1978 issue.

This person and the "Disgruntled" of January 29, 1978 issue and many other angry persons out there may be interested in joining us in our fight against the outrageous concept of the consumer having to pay for the construction of LILCO generating plants. The decision of the PSC allowing LILCO to bill the consumer for Construction Work in Progress (CWIP) is believed contrary to the letter and intent of the Public Service Law.

Experts assert, and LILCO now admits, there is no local need for increased electric power. Therefore, it is likely that the L.I. ratepayer will be in the position of paying for expensive plants which will maximize profits for LILCO stockholders and executives while providing no benefit to the ratepayer.

The increase in an average bill resulting from the planned Jamesport plants have been estimated by economists as high as sixty four dollars per month. This does not include

normal fuel adjustment. Nor does it include the cost of Shoreham which already has a cost overrun of one billion dollars. The magnitude of these costs will have an incredible impact not only on the individual ratepayer, but also on every local business and service industry on the Island.

If LILCO truly believes these plants to be a sound economic investment, let their stockholders finance them. The Long Island Ratepayers Association is in favor of the production of necessary energy, but it wants to ensure that it is produced as economically as possible.

LIRA's immediate objectives are:

- 1) To have LILCO set up economic incentives for reduced usage of electric power;
- 2) To join suit with Suffolk County in support of the fight against the ratepayers being billed for CWIP;
- 3) To petition to have public hearings held to examine the billion dollar cost overrun at Shoreham and to evaluate the competency of LILCO performance under so-called PSC regulations. L-6V

LIRA
Box 1977
SAG HARBOR, N.Y. 11963

'The finger is going to turn around'

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Regarding your article by Kevin McCoy on the crumbling concrete at the H. Lee Denison building, County legislator John Foley stated that the construction had to be faulty. County attorney Howard Pachman is investigating the possibility that the contractor used sub-standard materials. No matter who says what, the finger is going to turn around and point at the County.

On all public works projects the pouring of concrete is strictly controlled by the County. The weight and strength is specified by the County engineer. The loading and mixing is inspected at the concrete plant. Inspected again after mixing on the job and inspected while pouring. No concrete is allowed to be poured unless approved by the County in-

spector. Four cylinders are taken of each pour and sent to a testing laboratory. They are broken at various times and reports of their strength are recorded and sent to the County. A contractor or supplier would have to be out of his mind to try to cheat with all this control. Since something did go wrong the County should be able to say what.

The taxpayers paid for good concrete and paid to have it inspected. The taxpayers have a right to know what went wrong and the people they paid to inspect the job should answer. You, as a crusading newspaper publisher, ought to follow up this specific line of inquiry. Where are the records? L-7V
Truly yours,
Richard K. Wade

SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 18 NO. 6

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year
in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of
195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West

Mastic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma

Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centereach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.

'Who is Mr. Lang's advisor?'

REFERENCE: "Southampton Debates Cop Protection" Article Published in the March 5, 1978 edition of Suffolk Life Newspaper

In the past three months the Southampton Town Police Department has been the target of many misleading and inaccurate statements made by Supervisor Lang. The Southampton Town PBA would like the opportunity to respond to Mr. Lang's comments with the following:

Recently in a local publication the headlines read "Southampton Debates Cop Protection." In a complaint registered by a Noyac resident in which this resident stated that he never calls the town police. This resident continued with the following statement "I've given that up because every time I call the operator tells me its going to take some time to get over here." This resident states every time, but neglects to give a specific incident. This Noyac resident further stated that "I call the State Police and they're here within minutes." Our response is simply to advise the people in the Noyac area that these are not accurate statements.

Mr. Lang stated, "We could put five more men on the road. We pay \$2 million for police protection a year and we're not getting our money's worth."

At first glance these statements seem adequate. When you look at these statements in depth you find that Mr. Lang's knowledge of the police department is very limited.

It is true that he could put five men back on patrol duty as such. According to Mr. Lang this would be three detectives, a police officer (that Mr. Lang refers to as a tow truck operator) and a K-9 officer.

The detective division was established in 1973. The clearance rate for burglaries the year prior to town detectives was 12 per cent. This was accomplished by an agency that investigated felony crimes for the town police at that time. At the end of 1973 the burglary clearance rate by town detectives exceeded 40 per cent. In 1974, 1975 and 1976 this burglary clearance rate remained around 40 per cent. In 1977 it was 25 per cent which is still well above the national average. There are many reasons for this success. Total commitment to their jobs, they reside in the town, know the people of the town, a constant flow of information to and from the patrol force, readily available anytime of day or night and quick response time when needed. This is a great deal for the taxpayer to give up because of Mr. Lang's lack of knowledge.

As for the police officer that operates the tow truck, Mr. Lang leaves the impression that this is all he does. The main reason the tow truck became a part of the police department was public demand at the time. Not too many years ago the Town of Southampton was cluttered with abandoned, unregistered vehicles that private enterprise would have nothing to do with. This situation was corrected and now is controlled through the efforts of this officer. When these vehicles are impounded they must be disposed of in accordance to law. This involves a great deal of time and correspondence with various state agencies. There is a considerable amount of money taken in by the town through the towing of vehicles. According to the Southampton Town Police Department's annual report this officer towed disabled police units on 51 occasions at an estimated savings of \$1,500. The duties of this officer also include checking junk yards and enforcing this particular town ordinance.

He also schedules the maintenance on the police units and sees that the maintenance is accomplished. An example of the effectiveness of this type of care of town police vehicles, the town has bought back police vehicles they traded in for use by fire prevention department. If this type of maintenance is not continued the expense for repairs is much greater. Someone has to be specifically responsible to see that the maintenance is done when it should be.

Mr. Lang's contention has been that he

'I can use some supportive measures'

Dear Editor:

I wish to congratulate the Middle Country School District and the county in their push for sex education.

As you can see from the enclosed, I have been for it. My daughter is almost eleven now and I can use some supportive measures.

could put the towing out to bid cheaper than the salary of the officer. This is undoubtedly true, but what Mr. Lang does not state is that these vehicles still have to be checked by the police department for owners and whatever correspondence the law requires, as this is a police function, not a function of private enterprise. This would still require an officer to check out the vehicles, but not with the added expense of a private bidder.

Mr. Lang mentioned putting the communications officers and the K-9 officer back on the road.

As for the K-9 officer we would like to inform Mr. Lang that this officer is on patrol. He supplements the regular patrol. This man works strictly nights, and is on twenty-four hour call. In addition to his patrol duties this officer and his dog have apprehended many perpetrators of crime, located a great deal of evidence in criminal cases, and located missing persons. Again we feel Mr. Lang's lack of knowledge of our police department is evident.

Mr. Lang also stated in reference to the police department that "We're not getting our money's worth." This is a ludicrous statement to make. The national average is 2.5 officers per 1000 population. Every police department in the East End is in excess of two officers per 1000 population except Southampton Town Police Department which has 1.3 officers per 1000 population. Southampton Town is the most populated town on the East End. Using the town population of 33,691 (LILCO's estimate as of January 1977) and 2.5 officers per 1000 population, you will find the town should have eighty-three (83) officers. We do the job with forty-three (43) officers. How can anyone make this kind of statement and not substantiate it. In 1975 this department had 51 officers, in 1976 - 47 officers, in 1977 - 43 officers. We feel that the public should be apprised of this unnatural phenomenon and inquire from your elected officials as to why in 1975 would the personnel of the police department go from 51 officers down to 43 officers in 1977 and 78. Especially in light of the fact that the population and crime rate have gone up.

We presently (We because the members of the Southampton Town PBA are also taxpayers in the Town of Southampton) employ as the administrator of Southampton Town Police, Chief Conrad W. Teller. Chief Teller was employed by the State Police, Suffolk County's District Attorney's Office and as a Lieutenant with the Suffolk County Police Department. He is a graduate of the FBI Academy and respected throughout Law Enforcement circles.

Mr. Lang has had numerous years of experience in the cesspool business and a total of three months experience as Supervisor, and apparently feels he is better qualified to run the police department than the Chief of Police who has more than twenty years in Law Enforcement. Obviously Mr. Lang is not qualified in light of his recommendation to put the communications officers on patrol. Apparently Mr. Lang's knowledge of the town police is so limited that he is not aware that our communications officers are civilian personnel and not police officers.

Who is Mr. Lang's advisor (s)? We most confidently suggest that it could not be anyone with knowledge of the Southampton Town Police Department and definitely no one with any experience in the administration of a law enforcement agency.

We respectfully request and suggest that Mr. Lang consult with the Chief of Police on matters concerning the police department. We feel this would assist Mr. Lang greatly in making well informed accurate statements to the press and the public in matters concerning the police department. **Respectfully Submitted By The Membership of the Southampton Town PBA, Chester Walker, President**

A return to representation

A resolution was submitted by Legislator Martin Feldman to allow the public to propose laws and for them to be put on the ballot for approval in a general election. This resolution sets up a procedure known as initiative and referendum.

It circumvents having to go to elected officials and allows the public to petitioning to have these proposals put on the ballot.

This is one of the most important resolutions ever proposed for Suffolk residents. Under the present system, if a resident or group of residents wants a particular proposal or proposition, law or amendment to be enacted, they must gain the support of at least two legislators to have the idea voted upon by the entire legislature.

The legislature, being composed of politicians, is more often self-serving than being interested in the public. They have refused, at times, to even allow issues to be debated even though they are of grave importance to the citizenry.

Public initiative would ultimately give the voters the power to control the size, the involvement and the cost of their government. A similar proposal is being made on the state level and makes equally good sense.

Under the procedure as outlined, a person or a group would have to

collect 250 signatures to have their proposal considered.

Once this criteria is met, they would have to collect additional support representing at least 10 per cent of the votes cast in the last gubernatorial election, for the issue to be placed on the ballot.

If 10 per cent of the voters show that they are interested in deciding the course of the government the proposition would appear on the ballot for all voters to either accept or reject.

This resolution is a necessary and a long over-due step in making government more responsive to the needs of the public. Outlandish giveaway programs, salary settlements, and capital construction that indebts our children would be stopped. We hope Feldman is successful in the passage of this procedure.

We are sure that the legislators from the area covered by Suffolk Life will support this measure as most of them have pledged themselves towards making Suffolk government as responsive to the public as possible. Nothing could be more responsive than setting a procedure whereby the public could make their own laws if a consented majority agreed when the elected officials fail to respond. And why not?

Don't give up now

For more than a year, school officials in the crowded Middle Island district have been studying the possibility of developing a year-round education program. The idea is to utilize building space that goes begging over the summer months.

We watched and applauded the efforts because the buildings were constructed with hard-earned taxpayer money and they should be used to the fullest, especially when you consider that the ultimate enrollment in the district is expected to be as much as 30,000 students.

Unfortunately, it now looks like the idea is dying. After a year-long study and even a visit to a school district in Maryland that has year-round classes, a committee set up to iron out problems connected with im-

plementing such a program has cried uncle.

That group, made up largely of teachers and administrators, feels the problems are insurmountable.

We think their efforts, up to now, have been half-hearted. After all, if you were a teacher, earning a full year's salary for 181 days of work, would you be all that anxious to change the set up?

Adopting a full year school program would save the school district and the taxpayers millions of dollars in the long run.

The school board should take a little leadership and tell their staff a year-round program is what they want, and they had better find the solutions to the problems or they'll need new jobs. And why not?

SUFFOLK LIFE

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900, 924-4466
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Published twice a week except last week of year in 13 market zone editions on Wednesday and Sunday



Total circulation audited and verified or sworn to be in excess of 195,000 Circulation Twice Weekly

North Fork
South Fork
Riverhead
Hampton West

Mattic/Moriches
Patchogue
Medford/Holbrook
Sayville
Ronkonkoma

Coram/Middle Island
Selden/Centereach
3 Village/Port Jefferson
Rocky Point

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

Norman Hirsch - Director of Sales
William J. Gallagher Jr. - Retail Adv. Mgr.

John McKay - General Manager
Maxine Holmes - Production Director
Darlene Albin - Advertising Art Director

Rick Brand - News Editor
Lorraine Peczowski - Office Mgr.
Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County; \$15.00 per year. Outside Suffolk County; \$17.00 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.