

# Willmotts and Why-Nots

David J. Willmott, Editor

## Mother's Day, 1984

The second Sunday in May is set aside to honor Mothers, the unsung heroes of modern civilization.

Years ago, Mother's role was clearly defined. She was her husband's wife, the keeper of the house, the rearer of children. She was loved, honored and obeyed by all. With our changing economic situation, standard of living and quality of life, Mom's role has been blurred. The only thing that has not changed is that she biologically is the only one who can have children.

Most Moms work right into late pregnancy. Many take only a short time off to have their baby before being forced to return to the work force. Few have the luxury of staying home and rearing the children through their childhood, pre-teens and adolescent years. Financial pressures of the day require the family to have two incomes to survive.

It's incredible to us that so many women have adapted and been able to successfully combine two careers. They continue in the work place, but remain loyal to their first obligation of

raising children properly and in the best tradition, and we guess that is what makes Mothers so very special. They always care and are always there no matter what the pressures of life may be.

Children of all ages should take the opportunity this Sunday to give Mom that extra hug, that extra love that is her reward for years of giving. Don't miss this opportunity for the day will come when you will no longer be able to say, "Mom I love you, thank you for all you have done. — Is there anything I can do for you?" No matter how many times you may say this, Moms love to hear it over and over again for they never put a limit on their love for you. Time, trials and tribulations never get in the way.

Make this Mother's Day a special one for your Mom. Go out of your way, put yourself out, dare to do the unusual to show her how deeply you care for the life she has sacrificed for you. She did, you know.

Happy Mother's Day.

And why not?

## True To Your Convictions

We have been a strong supporter of President Ronald Reagan. We endorsed him four years ago for president and have felt good about it ever since.

We are now deeply concerned about what appears to be a wavering in his convictions concerning state's rights. The president, from his early radio days, advocated a strong position on state's rights. A defined role for the federal government, a defined role for the state and other levels of government. Whether Reagan himself has wavered or not, there are those in his administration, namely his Commissioner of the Department of Energy, Donald Hodel, who is advocating the federal take over of powers reserved for the states in protecting their residents' health and welfare.

Hodel wants the constitutional laws bent or, to be kind, reinterpreted, to allow the Long Island Lighting Company, a profit-making monopoly, to assume the powers of the state, in

the form of police functions, to give credence to the corporation's plan for an emergency evacuation plan.

As we all know, Suffolk County government, charged by law with developing an evacuation plan, spent over \$1 million dollars of our taxes in an attempt to develop an emergency evacuation plan. They called in experts in emergency planning, crowd control, to name just a few special areas of knowledge, to develop the Suffolk County plan. As the plan was being formulated it became apparent to the county executive and the legislators that safe evacuation on Long Island, with its limited road system, could not be executed without potential loss of life or harm to the residents. The county officials took an oath of office to protect the health and welfare of their constituents when they accepted their responsibilities. They concluded that they would not be living up to this constitutional responsibility by developing a plan that accepted possible death to some residents and

potential injuries to others. Life is a precious commodity to these responsive and responsible elected officials.

The state, by using technicalities, could have superceded the county. Mario Cuomo, governor, explored all possibilities and came to the same conclusion that the county officials arrived at. He declared he would not force the state's will upon the county, or order an evacuation plan that could be responsible for loss of life or injury of any of Suffolk County's residents. The health and welfare of Suffolk County residents is a constitutional responsibility of the state and county governments. This role is clearly defined in the constitution as a state right, obligation and responsibility.

Far removed from the scene, the super politicians in Washington have argued that even if an evacuation plan could not be developed, one that would work satisfactorily, the corporation has spent over \$4 billion dollars to build a nuclear power plant and that investment must be protected.

These Washington politicians totally ignore the documented fact that Suffolk residents and Suffolk County government officials requested an evacuation plan be developed before the plant was constructed. There are reams of testimony in the pre-hearings expressing concerns about a nuclear power plant being built on a populated island with limited network of roads, and the probable problems with evacuation.

The N.R.C. and the company arrogantly believed that if they built the plant, they could force the licensing regardless of the safety problems or the health hazards to the residents. They believe that they were bigger than the constitution, more powerful than the elected officials,

which brings us to 1984.

The plant is almost complete, but the diesel generators needed for back up do not work. Contrary to the Lighting Company's earlier predictions of being short of power by the mid-80's, we are ten years off from needing the capacity of the plant. Yet, Washington is in a frenzy to license the plant. Why are these politicians willing to test the lengths of the constitution, bypassing logic and common sense, to allow the plant to be licensed at low power, contaminating the facility and probably squandering an additional \$200 million dollars? In doing so these bureaucrats are striving to violate the constitution and the protection it offers to the citizens.

On May 17, there will be a Congressional inquiry into the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's attempt to negate the law. Unfortunately, our congressman from this district, William Carney, will be useless, as he has allowed himself to be used as a pawn of the utility rather than as a representative of the people. Thank God there are other congressmen, namely Edward Markey from Massachusetts, who has had the courage to fight the N.R.C. and the administration to protect the people of Suffolk County.

Let Shoreham be a lesson to all of us. It is not enough to elect a man by his label. It is the quality of the individual, his abilities and, probably most important, the strength of his convictions on important philosophical questions that we should pay attention to.

Unless President Reagan wants to be known as soft on state's rights, he must make a positive statement on this issue concerning Shoreham.

And why not?

## Letters to the editor

Dear Dave:

The recent windstorm, with its resulting wave action, devastated the beaches and bluffs of Long Island's north shore. Many words have been written about the storm and its destruction of man-made and natural environment. The erosion stories were told but none offered serious solutions to the bluff and beach erosion problem.

The Incorporated Village of Shoreham was faced with a similar problem, the erosion of Village-owned bluff property. The Village considered many potential solutions to the erosion situation. The ultimate solution for the Village was rather simple and cost-free to the residents. The many landscapers, tree surgeons, and construction companies in our area were contacted with the idea in mind of providing these businesses with a deposit site for their leaves, grass, twigs, branches, stumps, boulders, and tree limbs. After dumping this clean fill over the lip of the bluff for less than one year the bluff became stabilized and remains so to this day, some twenty years and many violent storms, later.

Almost daily I see Town of Brookhaven trucks, some LILCO vehicles, some State trucks, and numerous private trucks loaded with clean and natural cuttings, sand, and broken-up concrete proceeding toward the Town of Brookhaven's landfill site. I believe the north shore communities could be better served by not dumping the fill in the Brookhaven Town landfill site but by dumping the fill over the bluffs. The fill would help stabilize the bluffs and allow natural ground cover an opportunity to take root. The landfill site will also remain less cluttered thus allowing space for 'real' garbage to be processed.

The bluffs could be stabilized if the private and public sectors and the citizenry cooperate for mutual benefit and allow placement of clean materials over the lip of the bluffs to achieve bluff permanence.

Very truly yours,  
John Bellport  
Shoreham

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter as a response to your article. Friends of Earth lash plans for campground. I refer to Mr. Jurgens' lawyer, Mr. Brown. He stated in the article "I can understand residents' concerns with the prospect of 1300 people coming in to the area to use the campsites." However, the Jurgens family and Swan Lake Corp. have a good track record.

If they have such a good "track record" why did they illegally fill wetlands at Swan Pond, no permit was given by Army Corps. of Engineers - which is necessary. It is also known that the Jurgens family violated 2 Corps. stop work orders. The U.S. Attorney fined Swan Lake Corp. \$2,000. The terms of compliance were that they must expand cranberry bogs south of River Road. (No proof of this work was ever given.) Also the property was not to be used for any purpose that would degrade groundwater.

We (the residents of Manorville) are unable to trust such an Corp. (with such a good record)! We have an awful lot to say about the proposed campsite.  
Jane Kreiger  
Manorville

## SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 23 NO. 37

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3908 Classified Ads 288-5000

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday

North Fork Patchogue Centerarch Rocky Point  
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson  
Hampton East Holbrook Hotsville  
Med Hampton Sayville Coram Three Village  
Westhampton Oakdale Mastic Shirley  
Moncks Ronkonkoma



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

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

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor  
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director  
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director  
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator  
Clare Swank - National Sales Director  
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager  
Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director  
Sherman Gordon - News Art Director

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

### General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

## What is the Value of Health?

We have been treated in recent days to an editorial series in which one of LILCO's strongest allies, Newsday, attempted to paint a very bleak picture of the future if the Shoreham nuclear power plant is scrapped. In Newsday's view, Long Island would be well-served if the plant is permitted to open — despite very serious questions about the quality of construction, safety and evacuation. Newsday believes everyone should stop fighting the utility in its quest to put the plant on line, and in the matter of a rate increase currently being heard, so that the troubled utility's fiscal health can be improved.

In short, if it's good for LILCO, Newsday is all for it. So what else is new?

There is another side to the Shoreham story that did not, unfortunately, make its way into Newsday's editorials. While Newsday worries about the health of the utility, little is said about the financial impact upon the ratepayers. Newsday talks about higher rates if Shoreham is scrapped, but nary a word about the tremendous rate increases — likely to more than double current rates — if the plant goes on line. The loss of taxes weighs heavily on Newsday's mind, but no mention is made of where these taxes come from in the first place — the ratepayers through their electric bills.

What's worse, however, is the fact that Newsday has apparently forgotten one very important consideration: the safety of the public. Governor Mario Cuomo becomes the target of some strong words which imply he is being guided "more by political considerations than by concern for Long Island's economic welfare." Newsday, very apparently, can't sense the real truth: Cuomo is concerned about the safety of the people, and the very real problems with evacuation should the plant suffer an accident.

Of course we have all been subjected to the rhetoric that the odds of an accident happening are so small they don't deserve mention. But somehow things keep happening that shed some truth in that area as well: For example, diesel generators that are designed to provide power in the event of an accident. They don't work. Time and again they suffer serious

problems. LILCO takes them apart and rebuilds them, but they still don't work. The crankshafts split, the blocks crack.

LILCO then strings some outside lines to make up for the problems of the generators. And what happens? Another failure and the plant suffers a blackout. Some say for 15 minutes, others say 20, and some on-site sources indicate the down time was even as long as 45 minutes.

And just last week, something Newsday has failed to mention at this writing, a week after the occurrence, a new problem developed. An expansion joint in the hot loop of a radiation cooling line failed. Because there was no valve to shut off the water, thousands of gallons poured into the rad waste building, flooding that building with two inches of water, according to NRC officials, six inches according to on-site sources, which threatened a motor control center.

NRC officials insist there was no serious problem because the water which poured out was not radioactive. Had the plant been in operation it would have been. One NRC official said the tests are designed to find such flaws, and such leaks would not develop once the plant is in operation. Later, however, he said such leaks have occurred in operating plants and the water is simply pumped into a holding tank. The second comment contradicts the first, of course, but that is getting to be par for the course in trying to dig out the truths about what's going on at Shoreham. One must begin to wonder if the NRC is so anxious to put that plant on line that they are losing sight of what their real role is, regulation and protection of the public rather than preservation of the utility. Can we really trust them to reveal the true facts?

Will the NRC now take a good look at all the expansion joints involved in the rad waste system to insure others will not fail in the future? NRC officials we talked to didn't know late last week, but later reports indicate they may explore the matter now. But one NRC spokesman told us the NRC relies on the quality control procedures of the company for such action. From where we sit, that's putting the fox in charge of the hen house.

For all of Newsday's arguments

about why Shoreham should go on line and LILCO should be saved, its editorial writers appear to be suffering from tunnel vision. There's a lot more than financial problems ahead for Long Island if Shoreham is pushed into service simply to bolster LILCO's financial future, as Newsday and some federal officials would like. If LILCO is granted, post haste, a low-power license without consideration for the safety of our residents, the future cost of electricity may well turn out to be the least of our problems.

Whether Shoreham opens or not,

## Smoking Bill Defeated

With nothing better to do than write a bad law, the Suffolk County Legislature recently developed and passed an anti-smoking bill. Whether you approve or disapprove of the concept, the bill itself was a horrendous example of bad government.

While the law was not specific, it was certainly burdensome. It called for the segregation of smokers and non-smokers in public places and larger businesses with guidelines that were meaningless. It allowed each person to designate "his area" according to that person's smoking or non-smoking choice, but did not clearly define the parameters of "his area." It put penalties and fines on restaurateurs if patrons violated the provisions, but had no provisions for dealing with the violators themselves.

The attitude of some of the supporters was that at least it was a law, and they would worry about the technicalities some time in the future. Most acknowledged that little research

had been done about the problems the law would create. In a raw example of rushing to impose something, anything, good or bad, many voted first and thought about it later.

We were delighted that County Executive Peter Cohalan vetoed the measure and common sense prevailed in the legislature when the vote to override the veto was held. Now that the bad law has been killed, perhaps the legislators can spend the necessary time to do the research they failed to do, to analyze the problems and the best possible solutions. Now perhaps they will do what they should have done to begin with, study the matter fully before they act.

We would hope that in the future the members of the legislature do their homework and develop legislation that is both constitutional and workable. We do not need any more exercises in futility. We need good government that produces good laws.

And why not?

## A Billion & Abolishment

The cost of running Suffolk County government is coming close to a billion dollars a year. Every prudent taxpayer should be asking, "What am I getting for my billion dollar investment? Am I getting my money's worth? Could I be getting the same services for less money? Do I need all the services that my elected officials vote to provide for me and ask me to pay for?"

Connecticut, about 20 years ago, abolished county government because county government was a duplication of state and local governments, creating a costly bureaucratic maze that made little sense.

The same situation prevails here in Suffolk County. The county duplicates many of the services that are provided better by the towns. It also duplicates departments and services provided by state government.

The county government has grown at an enormous rate since the inception of the County Legislature, which is, by charter definition, a part-time board. It is made up of 18 people elected from similar size districts throughout the county. Unfortunately, the legislators have seen fit to pay themselves a full-time salary and, because of these salaries, many put in more hours and develop more laws and spending schemes than they should.

Prior to the creation of the County Legislature, the county was governed by a Board of Supervisors. These supervisors were elected to serve a dual role as chief executive of the town and a county board member. Being intimately familiar with their towns, and aware of the role of the county,

they limited county growth. They concerned themselves only with essential services that needed to be provided by the county according to the Constitution. The various county agencies headed by elected officials ran themselves.

Once county form of government was changed from a Board of Supervisors to a Legislature, the legislators created an abundance of new departments and services. These new departments became self-perpetuating, and have grown tremendously. Little thought was given as to whether they were duplicating the services of the towns and the state. There was no coordination.

Legislators, to make themselves feel important, created new laws, rules and regulations. Most are not needed but are required to be paid for by taxpayers. We would like to see serious thought and study given to the concept of total abolishment of county government. A return to local government, the government closest to the people.

Currently, Tax Action is petitioning the Legislature through the Suffolk County Initiative Referendum procedure for voters to be given an opportunity to choose whether they wish to continue to be governed by the County Legislature or a Board of Supervisors who would represent us under a weighted vote. Tax Action is only asking for the voters to be given an opportunity to choose what form of government the public deserves to have.

Cont. on page 4

## SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VCL 23 NC. 38

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3000 Classified Ads 288-3000  
Mailing address: Box 262 Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167 Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday  
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point  
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson  
Hampton East Holbrook, Hotsville Coram Three Village  
Mid Hampton Sayville Mastic, Shirley  
Westhampton Oakdale  
Moncks Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 210,000 Circulation Weekly  
Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk; Rocky Point School District; Patchogue-Medford School District; Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip; Town of Riverhead; Town of Brookhaven; Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor  
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director  
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director  
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator  
Clare Swank - National Sales Director  
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager  
Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director  
Sharnan Gordon - News Art Director

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

### General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS - Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon 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.

# Willmotts and Why-Nots

David J. Willmott, Editor

## A Billion and Abolishment

Cont. from page 3

The initiative petitions have been submitted and, we understand, as of Monday were approved by the County Attorney. They now go to the Board of Elections for certification and then back to the legislature for their approval or disapproval. The legislators can vote to accept the citizens' initiative and thus directly put the question on the ballot themselves. If they vote "no," the sponsors of this question will go forth in the ten towns with a huge petition drive to force the

issue and place the question on the ballot.

If a legislator believes in democracy and the right of citizens to choose their form of government, they will approve the initiative. If they consider themselves demigods, which we fear they do, they will oppose the motion, forcing it to go the petition route.

We would hope they permit the public an opportunity to settle the issue, once and for all, at the polls.

And why not?

## Editorial Special Town Election

Southold Town voters will go to the polls Tuesday to fill a vacant seat on the town board created when Supervisor Francis Murphy was elected as supervisor. Two candidates, John Bednoski Jr., running on the Democratic ticket, and Jean Cochran, a Republican, seek the position.

Both candidates currently serve as town trustees, share similar views on the major issues, and have shown in the past a desire to serve their fellow residents. Both have been involved in community activities, although in that area Cochran would seem to have an edge because of her long term, non-salaried involvement with the Girl Scout organization. On balance, both would, in our opinion, serve the tax payers well.

Another issue must be considered, however. Currently, with the one seat

vacant, the board is split 3 to 2 on the side of the Republicans. If Cochran wins, that margin will become 4 to 2. If Bednoski is the winner, the board will be evenly split, 3 to 3. While at first blush this may appear to be of value, with both political philosophies evenly represented, it, unfortunately, doesn't always work that way. History has shown time and again that evenly split boards, when each side holds firm to party line positions, accomplish little but fighting among themselves.

In our view, putting the political control issue in the hands of the voters, we favor, by a slight edge, election of Jean Cochran because of the dedication she has brought to her other endeavors. We think she would bring that same sense of determination and dedication to the town board.

## Letters to the editor

### "Industrial or residential?"

To the Editor:

The other night (April 17, 1984) there was a public hearing at the Riverhead Town Hall concerning a new light industry coming to town. The industry I speak of is the Mills Sallmaking and Awning Company. They are relocating from Greenport to Riverhead. Well, I think that is wonderful and good for the community and of course it will provide more jobs for the people here. Everyone at the hearing seemed to support the company coming here. However, I should have had the guts to stand up and say what I'm going to say in this letter. The location where they will build is on the eastern end of Elton Street. I live on Elton Street and would hate to see another factory come in. There are already two factories in the vicinity and this one would be placed where there is a beautiful stand of woods. Why does the fac-

tory have to go here? Why can't Riverhead have an organized plan of where to put factories? It seems they are here, there and everywhere in the town. Unfortunately, this section of Elton Street is zoned for industry. But I just can't see why they have to rip up a woodland, so close to residential areas. Again, I state that I am in support of the sailmakers coming here and think it's a boost for our local economy but please, isn't there someplace else they could put their building? I suppose that someday all the woods on Elton Street will be rezoned for industrial use and we'll have several more factories in our backyards. It seems that's the way Riverhead plans things.

Mary Laura Lamont  
Riverhead

P.S. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

### "P.S., we thank you!"

To the Editor:

My daughter, my granddaughter and I would like to publicly express our gratitude to the Police Department and the Eastport Firemen who responded to a severe flooding condition in our home recently during a rain storm, complicated by melting snow. The police were in touch

by phone and contacted the firemen who pumped out the surging water and dug run-off trenches during the downpour. At the time, our verbal thanks didn't seem quite enough to us.

Sincerely,  
Patricia A. Bulter  
Speonk



**NEW LABOR RELATIONS DIRECTOR** — Following swearing-in ceremonies in County Executive Peter F. Cohalan's office, Labor Relations Director Daniel Bahr, of South Setauket, displays his certificate of appointment. Among those in attendance at the ceremonies were leaders of the labor movement, Bahr's family and members of the Cohalan administration. Posing with the new Labor Relations director are, left to right, Bahr's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Morton Bahr; Suffolk Labor Commissioner Ray Allmendinger; Suffolk County Executive Peter F. Cohalan; Bahr's family, daughters Shelly and Heather, and wife, Janet.

## Suffolk officials sketch a bleak financial picture

By BOB CHARTUK

Impending fiscal woes—worsened by the Long Island Lighting Company not paying \$26.2 million in taxes, Southwest Sewer District debts, and the downgrading of the county's bond rating—have moved some Suffolk officials toward corrective action.

The county's bleak financial picture was exemplified Friday by County Comptroller Joseph Caputo who reported that the county will have to borrow \$67 million to meet 1983 operating expenses.

Attempts to lessen budget deficits by Suffolk legislators and County Executive Peter F. Cohalan have not gone without criticism from other county officials.

Most recently, Legislator Sondra Bachety (D-Deer Park) proposed a staffing plan which would reduce Presiding Officer Louis Howard's (R-Amityville) staff from 12 to three. Bachety's proposal, however, was met with disdain by Howard's office.

According to Bachety, Howard spends \$467,000 per year in salary and benefits for his aides. "It seems to me," Bachety said, "that we cannot talk about reducing the county's expenditures while the presiding officer spends that kind of money. If we want to save the county money, we (the legislature) must first start tightening our own belts."

Howard's chief of staff, Vic Niemi, said, "The presiding officer's staff performs various functions which are necessary to run the legislature. Bachety's idea shows her lack of knowledge of the workings of the legislature. We

provide assistance to many of the legislators."

Bachety retorted, "A previous presiding officer, William Richards, had only three aides. Nobody has been able to tell me what Howard's 12 staff members do."

Deputy Presiding Officer John Rosso (R-Mastic Beach) commented, "I guess Howard needs more assistance than previous presiding officers." Rosso pointed out that an office for the deputy presiding officer in the county building in Hauppauge was eliminated by Howard to make room for his aides.

Some legislators were perturbed recently with Cohalan's failure to hire county employees which were budgeted for by the legislature. Cohalan is concerned with LILCO's non-payment of taxes and the possibility of the utility not paying another \$26.2 million in taxes due May 31, it was reported.

Cohalan's hesitance to fill vacant county positions came to light May 1 when the legislature's health committee learned that the executive did not fill five home health aide positions. In the legislature's Office of Budget Review there exists a computer printout listing about 1,000 vacancies not filled in the county.

Legislator John Foley (D-Blue Point), a member of the health committee, said, "This is an insult to the legislature. We had no correspondence. No one knew this was happening." Foley requested a meeting with Deputy County Executive for Finance William Brotherton to discuss Cohalan's hiring policies.

Legislator Wayne

Prospect (D-Dix Hills), a member of the legislature's Finance Committee, said, "If Cohalan's hiring freeze is to make up money lost from LILCO not paying its taxes, that's understandable. If it's to bail out the Southwest Sewer District, then Cohalan is being irresponsible."

Another legislator, Philip Nolan (D-Islip), proposed to reduce county spending by about \$7 million by reducing the number of consultants hired by the county. Earlier this year, Nolan said he would not vote for any capital projects that do not deal with public safety or emergencies, a proposed management employees' salary plan, and he said he will attempt to help reduce the county's operating budget by 10 per cent.

"The county is facing a severe financial crisis in the next year," Nolan said. "I hope my colleagues begin to recognize the seriousness of the county's fiscal situation, and begin to take an active role now in the process of reducing county expenditures, before there are no choices left."

"We have to anticipate the worst," Caputo said in announcing that \$67 million will have to be borrowed. According to Caputo, "things may get worse. If things continue as expected, the county may have to borrow up to \$215 million to make ends meet next year."

Caputo explained that in 1985, the county must pay \$15 million in Civil Service Employees Association raises, \$9 million in Patrolmen's Benevolent Association raises, and \$25

cont. on page 17

## Remember Why Memorial Day

Won't we ever have a Memorial Day when new names will not be added to the Honor Rolls of the departed who gave their lives in defense of the principles of our country?

Thankfully we had no major war this past year, but we still had the tragedy which took the lives of Marines in Lebanon. As they slept in their beds, a religious fanatic on a suicide mission drove a truck loaded with explosives into their quarters, killing them and himself.

The answer, of course, would be to lay down our arms, stop opposing aggression, surrender our principles, our way of life, our dignity and our spirit to those who choose to rule us. But the perfect answer would be a meeting of minds of all men of all nations that man is free and will not be ruled by another. Needless to say, outside of an act of God, this utopia will never exist. Therefore, we have no choice but to arm this country for both offense and defense. Our armaments must be the best, for any weakness provides an opportunity for a fanatic to decide that his reward is worth the chance.

Most of us think logically and in a sane fashion. We do not really understand wars or why they are fought. Unfortunately, there are small groups and ambitious politicians who believe that their ideals, beliefs or desires for power give them the right to order others to take up arms. This sickness

has been prevalent since before Christ. Armies marched over the face of the earth, wantonly raping, pillaging, brutally disposing of human lives. It made no difference whether the people were armed or peace loving.

We have come so far on the planet earth. Our technology has increased our life span from under 35 years to almost 75 years. We have developed the wheel which gave us mobility, space crafts to take us to new planets, communication links that connect every country in the world within seconds, both by voice and by vision. Yet, we have failed to develop a language or form of communication to develop an understanding between men. Why can't we make known our respect for others and receive their respect back? Why do we fail to develop perimeters which no one would transgress?

This Memorial Day we not only remember those who have given their lives in defense of our country, our beliefs and our principles, but we pray to God that they have found peace and a reward for their sacrifice. We also pray that God gives us the wisdom, the strength and the understanding to avoid the temptation to transgress upon our neighbors, whether they be on the same street or on the same planet.

And why not?

the expedited schedule established by the NRC was set aside by judicial order.

Congressman Morris K. Udall, chairman of the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment, noted in an opening statement that "We are very much concerned with the integrity of the regulatory process. In this case, it appears that the procedures adopted to resolve substantive safety issues did not provide adequate protection of the rights of the parties."

Just prior to the hearings, the NRC voted to throw out the expedited hearing schedule requested by LILCO and approved by a licensing board created after a previous board refused to consider the LILCO request. The most recent NRC ruling permits added time to hear the contentions from all sides into the matter of emergency power at the plant in the event of an accident, a very important subject in light of the troubled on-site generators, and the recent power outage when auxiliary lines brought into the plant to counter the diesel problems also failed.

In our view the hearing produced clear cut evidence of that which has been feared for a long time: the NRC, the federal agency with the responsibility to protect the safety of the public from nuclear accidents, is an agency with many inherent problems. With the exception of two NRC commissioners — Victor Gilinsky and James K. Asselstine, who have vigorously fought the questionable tactics of the past few months — the other members of the NRC are more concerned with the utility's problems and finances than they are about the public's safety. Unfortunately, Gilinsky will soon leave as commissioner, the price he will pay for being dedicated to his responsibility of representing the public's welfare. He will not be reappointed to that position, which is the way the administration can weed out those who do not follow the administration's "push the nuclear plants through without delay" philosophy.

Note at the outset we said the hearing was requested by Congressmen Downey and Mrazek. Another name should have been mentioned as well, but wasn't because Congressman William Carney, who represents the congressional district

most affected, has failed miserably in speaking out on behalf of the public. His line of questioning during the hearing gave firm evidence that Carney is a "yes" man for the nuclear industry. Suffolk legislators present to support the presentation of County Executive Peter F. Cohalan walked away from the hearing shaking their heads in amazement at Carney's actions. At a moment in time when he could have insisted that the NRC take every action necessary to insure the safety of the public, Carney could only muster weak questions that appeared to seek a way to excuse the actions of the NRC in giving in to LILCO's request for expedited hearings and waivers from current regulations despite the problems of public safety.

Following the hearing, Carney showed a bit more of his support for Shoreham by voicing support for the holding of a drill to test evacuation possibilities. Such drills are nothing more than paper exercises which prove little. They move people around theoretically, without coming to grips with traffic jams, panic, and the host of other ingredients that accompany a real nuclear accident. It's a farce, and Carney is a part of the farce.

If the hearing proved nothing else, it showed clearly that the NRC, with the exception of Gilinsky and Asselstine, and officials like Carney, are more concerned with the financial plight of LILCO than they are with the safety of the public.

The hearing proved also, by the presence of the Suffolk County legislators on hand, that the Shoreham issue is far more than one man, Cohalan, opposing the opening of the plant. It is the near-unanimous (with only Presiding Officer of the Legislature Louis Howard siding with LILCO) decision of county government, and that of Governor Mario Cuomo as well, that Shoreham poses a very real threat to the public.

The hearing may not change a thing in the final scene, but at least we know who is sitting on whose side of the fence, and why. The LILCO supporters are the people who will have to ultimately answer for the problems that will surely come if Shoreham is put on line. They are the people who will bear the full brunt of responsibility for shunting aside the safety of the public in favor of the financial benefits of the utility.

And why not?

## Weeding Out The Truth

A Congressional Committee hearing into the regulatory happenings in regard to the Shoreham nuclear power plant focused on the recent actions of Nunzio J. Palladino, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to expedite hearings on LILCO's request for a low power license. While the hearing produced no official finding, the testimony presented and the responses during cross examination of witnesses shed

lots of light on the manner in which the NRC operates, and the attitudes of some of its members and some of our federal officials.

The hearings were held at the request of Congressmen Thomas Downey and Robert Mrazek, county officials and Suffolk residents who have questioned the fairness of the commission's actions in the Shoreham proceedings. Indeed, those actions were also tested in a federal court and

## Inviting Tragedy

The bells ring, the lights flash and the gates come down, signaling that a train is approaching the crossing. Under normal circumstances, a train does approach. If you are near a railroad station, it stops and quickly departs.

It is illegal to cross between the gates. In fact, the penalty for such action has just been increased as the direct result of eight young people being killed by running a gate last year in Nassau County.

We have noted with alarm the longer than normal waits that occur at many crossings. These instances cause a number of motorists to chance an accident by running the gates. We have seen delays of more than 15 minutes in both Riverhead and Speonk during the past few months. While we understand some of these delays are

caused by equipment failure, too many others are caused by an almost arrogant attitude on the part of railroad employees. Their indifference to the long line of cars awaiting the move of the train away from the crossing causes motorists' indifference, and both are contributing factors which invite tragedy.

The management of the Long Island Rail Road must instruct its employees to avoid unnecessary tie-ups. It must firmly instruct that equipment must be promptly cleared from a crossing, or, if equipment failure is the cause of the delay, that traffic is directed carefully through the gates. An effort must be made to resolve this problem before more lives are lost.

And why not?

## SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 NO. 39

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 284-3800 Classified Ads 288-5000  
Mainq address: Box 262 Westhampton N.Y. 11977 or Box 167 Riverhead N.Y. 11901

Total circulation audited and verified in excess of  
210,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday

North Fork	Patchogue	Centerach	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hanston East	Holbrook	Holtville	Three Village
Mid Hampton	Sayville	Mastic	Shirley
Westhampton	Oakdale		
Moncks	Ronkonksa		



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

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

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor	Bill Johnson - Circulation Director	Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director	Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator	Linda Conaughly - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager	Clare Swanik - National Sales Director	Sharman Gordon - News Art Director
	Ted Conlon - Sales Manager	

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

### General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

## Why Are We Afraid of God?

The Supreme Court has ruled we cannot pay respect to God through prayer in schools. Last week, the United States Congress voted to forbid religious organizations from using school property, after school hours, for meetings.

Why is God feared? Our forefathers, when they developed our Constitution, rejected God. They did have concerns about one man's belief in God being imposed upon another, and made provisions to eliminate this threat. They did not fear God, however, and made no provisions for his elimination.

They did not reject the concept of a power stronger than themselves. In fact, they encouraged belief in religion by stating that no United States citizen could be restricted in his or her own personal beliefs or choice of religion.

Most of us here in America do believe in God, a power stronger than ourselves. To most of us it makes little

difference which God our fellow man believes in. That is his or her choice as it is our choice as to what we believe in. There are a number of people, a small minority, who choose not to believe in any God. That is their right, and most would defend it zealously.

We do resent their protesting our right to recognize a supreme being and denying our right to have and exercise these beliefs when we are on school property. For most of us our God is not only in a church or a temple, he is our constant companion and he guides our life whether at services, at work, at play, on government property or in a school. To be unable to recognize his presence is a restriction on our religious freedoms. How can a moment of voluntary silent prayer or a meeting by a religious group on school property, be construed as violating someone's religious rights is beyond our comprehension.

And why not?

## Pigs At The Trough

The best way to describe County Executive Cohalan's Executive Management Compensation Plan is pigs at the trough.

After the ill fated C.S.E.A. workers contract that granted income increases to county workers of up to 70 per cent, the exempts, those not covered by Civil Service, oinked that they wanted their's too.

Cohalan and his advisors, in all their political wisdom, appointed a commission of exempts from within the county to develop a compensation plan for themselves. They did some job, almost as good as had been done for the county workers. Not only did they give themselves 8 per cent increases in wages, they provided themselves with all kinds of extra goodies, as you might expect from pigs at the trough. For example, they decided to buy back accumulated sick days for management people. One department head claims that in his 20 years on the job, he has never been sick a single day and, therefore, under the provisions of this plan, which he personally took part in creating, he was entitled to \$23,865. This is hogwash.

Most department heads keep track of their personnel, who is in and who is out, who is late, who is on time and who is sick. From what we have experienced, however, no one keeps track of the manager but the manager himself.

We all should be so healthy as to never miss a single day under any circumstances from work. Even people who are confirmed workaholics occasionally succumb to illness, as hard as they might fight against it, and go to bed to recover.

There are all kinds of other perks this elite management commission decided that the political appointees were entitled to on top of nice raises for holding politically appointed jobs.

Cohalan was absolutely wrong in the first place in appointing people who are going to benefit from the recommendations themselves, personally. That is a blatant conflict of interest, and about as unethical as you can get.

Cohalan should have had the good sense to go outside of government, appoint a non-partisan commission of business executives who are capable of evaluating the exempts' positions, to

develop salaries and benefit levels commensurate with private industry for comparable jobs and responsibilities, and then let the chips fall where they may.

Of course, this would not have been the politically expedient thing to do, even if it would have been the right thing to do for the taxpayers of Suffolk County.

Legislator John Rosso, deputy presiding officer of the county legislature, was as incensed as we were over many of the provisions in Cohalan's Management Compensation Plan. He and a group of fellow legislators have proposed a revised management plan that is more down to earth and affordable. It is a plan based on common sense, evaluating the positions and the responsibilities involved, and assigning a salary limit in keeping with the importance of the position, the budget and number of people supervised.

Increases above the salary limit for each position would have to be approved by the county executive on a merit basis, with many of the perks in the Cohalan panel's proposal eliminated. Sick days would have to be verified, and sick days, while there if

needed, would be lost if not used. The Rosso effort indicates an honest attempt to provide fair and adequate salaries and benefits without giving away the whole store. While we have not had time to thoroughly analyze Rosso's full proposal, it gives every indication of being much more realistic, and takes much of the "oink" out of the plan proposed by Cohalan's group.

If the county executive's office and the legislature find themselves at odds over these two proposals, which we suspect they will, we suggest that Cohalan would be wise to take the issue out of politics by turning the question over to an outside, independent non-partisan commission of business executives and allow them to make the final determination.

The county's taxpayers are already facing staggering problems stemming from the CSEA and PBA contracts, and this county certainly doesn't need another example of those fiscal disasters. It's time we give the taxpayers a break and include their ability to finance salary increases in the negotiating process.

And why not?

## Readers' Opinion

### "Same old insensitivity"

Dear Editor:

The Long Island ratepayer, suffering from one of the highest electric rates in the nation, might justifiably ask how a company can fire 1,000 people "without affecting the delivery of power" or more directly question why a company would hire 1,000 people more than it needed to produce and supply power to the Long Island community it was created to serve? A better question focuses on why LILCO has fired employees who have served the company and the people of the region for as many as 25 years while retaining the 250 Shoreham nuclear personnel who have not produced one kilowatt of power?

William Catacosinos has convinced some legislators in Washington to introduce legislation which dilutes the safety standards of nuclear evacuation; has rejected a public dialogue over its actions by placing a "cone of silence" on its employees; has managed to cut salaries by 10

per cent after which he is personally compensated at a \$2000,000 plus rate comparable to that of ex-Chairman Charles Pierce while at the same time creatively re-hiring Pierce as a consultant at an undisclosed salary; has contradicted his public statements that Shoreham might be abandoned by his actions which indicate otherwise.

Catacosinos' "new" LILCO demonstrates the same old insensitivity to the safety of the residents, the same old lack of concern as to the viewpoints of the citizens, the same old desire to increase its profits at expense of the ratepayer. It also demonstrates a misunderstanding of the will and resolve of the people to strive to ensure the safety and economic solvency of the citizens of Long Island.

Sincerely,  
Monica Dolan  
Great River

### "We will be back where we started"

Mr. Willmott:

LILCO is not interested in operating the plant. They want to run it at low power so they could call it used and useful. Then close it so they and the stockholders will be off the hook. The rate payers will be stuck

with the tab and the clean up. We will be back where we started, at the hands of mighty LILCO, paying whatever they ask for.  
Anonymous

### "The little people are hit again"

The following letter was written in response to an editorial entitled "Fire Sale"

Mr. Willmott:

Here Here! How true! Too bad enough people don't write more articles like this one.

Seems that the little people are hit again. It's amazing how the rich never seem to have a problem meeting their bills.

Wasn't it Mr. Catacosinos who said he didn't need this \$275,000 a year? How about cutting his salary even more by \$100,000 a

year!!

Then there was Mr. Pierce who was removed because of mismanagement, then all of a sudden he was removed because he is ill. How ill could he be if he has been retained for an undisclosed amount of money. I'm sure LILCO could rehire a few workers for the salary they are paying him!!

And why not?  
M.H.  
Hicksville

### "If your home is radioactive"

Dear People:

Just suppose a possible safe evacuation plan for Long Island is possible - what happens once you leave your home safely but can never return? What is the plan for the rest of your life if your home is

radioactive? Where will you live, work, where will your children go to school? What will you be able to do with your house? Sell it? To whom?  
Susan Leelike

## SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 NO. 40

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 284-3900 Classified Ads 284-5000  
Mailing address: Box 262 Westhampton N.Y. 11977 or Box 167 Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday.  
North Fork Patchogue Centerline Rocky Point  
Riverhead Medford Seaton Port Jefferson  
Hampton East Holbrook Hotsville Coram Three Village  
Mad Hampton Sayville Mastic Shrewsbury  
Westhampton Oakdale  
Ronkonkoma

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor  
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director  
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director  
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator  
Clare Swank - National Sales Director  
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager  
Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director  
Sherman Gordon - News Art Director

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

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.