

Veteran's Day 1983

The tragic deaths of young Americans in recent weeks should be keenly in our minds as we mark the observance of Veterans' Day on Friday. Recent events should remind us of the sacrifices our servicemen have made, and are continuing to make, in serving their country.

A decorated war hero and an avid spokesman for veterans, State Assemblyman John Behan, puts this moment of history in perspective with the following words:

"If ever there was a time since the end of the Vietnam War for us to honor our armed forces, it is now. The startling and traumatic events of the past few weeks in Lebanon and Grenada serve as a stark reminder to everyone that our world is not truly at peace and that danger to our fighting men and women is very real indeed.

"Thus when we observe Veterans' Day in New York State on Friday, Nov. 11, there will be more than ample reasons for us to pause and remember all those who serve and have served their country with pride and dignity today, yesterday, and in years gone by.

"It is perhaps difficult to think of a young man or woman — often still in their teens — as being a "veteran." However, when these courageous young adults decide to serve their country in the highest calling — the armed forces — they have earned that

privilege. All of them, like the millions who came before over the years, deserve our respect and admiration.

"Anyone who thinks that patriotism in this country is a thing of the past has only to look at what happened immediately following the recent tragic events in Lebanon. Despite the dangers, the uncertainties, and the almost impossible tasks of countering the guerrilla type warfare being waged by our enemies, armed forces recruiting offices were overflowing with young men and women willing to serve their country in the name of peace and freedom throughout the world.

"In truth, this was history repeating itself, because Americans have always risen to the call in times of trouble and peril to the nation they love. It is the reason we have been free since the time of our Founding Fathers and it is perhaps our biggest source of comfort in dangerous and troubled days such as these.

"Thus, on Veterans' Day, 1983, we as Americans not only should pay our respects and honor to the 2.4 million veterans in New York State and over 30 million veterans throughout our nation, but we should also reflect on the events of recent weeks and say a special prayer for those courageous, heroic Americans who died and were injured in the defense of freedom."

Wars Are Not Theaters

When news first reached us about the United State's invasion of Grenada, we noted with interest the cries of anguish from the television commentators that they had not been invited along for the battle. They were indignant! They complained they had not been given advanced knowledge of this attack so they would have their T.V. crews on location to record every bloody incident.

War correspondents have been present in almost every war. They see, they feel, they write and they report. During World War II, moviegoers were treated to filmed clips from the battle fields. This was played out with the advent of television so that Americans received their daily dose of killing with their dinner. Friends who came back from

Vietnam often complained bitterly about how the fighting often was staged to accommodate the television journalists.

The Grenada mission had to be secret, swift and decisive if it was to succeed. We do not blame the administration; nor the Pentagon, for not giving the media advanced notice of this action. War is not a theater and it should not be conducted to accommodate the media.

As journalists we do not at all feel infringed upon or that our First Amendment rights were threatened because the press was not invited to go along for the ride.

A successful mission with the least possible number of casualties was, and should have been, the top priority.

And why not?

The Battle Is Beginning

We're heading for the courtroom! Suffolk Life's Power for the People suit, which seeks a fair share of low cost electricity from the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY), will be the subject of a hearing at Supreme Court in Mineola on November 17. At that time, PASNY Chairman John Dyson, who asked for that hearing date, will as was expected seek to have all causes of action dismissed.

The Power for the People action started soon after Dyson, at the request of Governor Mario Cuomo, negotiated with Grumman for the sale of a limited amount of PASNY power to Grumman in an effort to encourage the firm to expand here on Long Island, rather than consider a possible move and expansion to an area where cheaper power is available. Other businesses jumped on the bandwagon, and began insisting they, too receive, lower cost power. Dyson responded with a "Juice for Jobs" offer to firms that would move or expand here.

But nary a word was ever spoken on behalf of the public, which is currently facing electric rate increases of staggering proportions. LILCO, in order to pay for its Shoreham fiasco, first sought a 56.5 per cent rate hike. But that figure is now down the drain, and additional costs and problems at the ill-fated nuclear plant now require a rate increase not far away from 80 per cent. And experts predict that figure will go over the 100 per cent mark as costs continue to pile up at Shoreham, and new problems are found.

So, Suffolk Life initiated its Power

for the People suit on behalf of thousands upon thousands of readers who responded with contributions and letters of support.

Dyson's response to our suit contains a number of legal contentions seeking to dismiss the action. Dyson, and PASNY, would rather that we go away quietly, permitting them to dispense the low cost power to the upstate communities and utilities as they have done in the past, and to the chosen few they wish to reward here on Long Island.

But we're not going to go away, for this is far more than a battle over power. It is, in the very real sense, a fight for survival. Neither Long Island as a region, nor its residents, can survive with electricity rates at such outlandish levels. And we do not intend to simply sit back and watch while the region, and its people collapse under the tremendous financial burden LILCO would heap upon our shoulders.

The judge who will ultimately sit in judgment of the Power for the People battle must make one of the most important decisions any judge has ever been called upon to make. That judge will be subject to the most intense scrutiny ever aimed toward any courtroom or judicial chamber, by Suffolk Life and the thousands of our Power for the People partners.

We seek justice for Long Island and its people, justice through a fair and equitable distribution of PASNY power that is vitally needed if we are all to survive. Hopefully, justice will be on our side.

And why not?

The Time For Talking Is Over

The time for talking is finally over! Election campaigns which seem to be getting longer each year have finally concluded, and the public has had the last say. Early deadlines here at Suffolk Life prevent us from reporting on the results of yesterday's balloting, but we will analyze the outcomes next week.

In the meantime, we offer those who won - and some who lost - this message: the political rhetoric of the campaigns should now be put behind us and the application of common sense applied to the myriad of problems we face should begin.

For those who promised "solutions" to our problems, now is the time to begin the process of putting those solutions to work. Determination and action must now be applied to weed out the empty promises which all too often are voiced in political campaigns, and the methods to realize constructive progress toward resolving our problems must be put into place.

Those who were successful in their quest for public office - whether it be for new terms or for the first time - must now work diligently to live up to the trust placed in them by the voters. Talk is cheap! Actions speak louder than words, and the time for action is now.

To the losers we offer this advice: analyze your campaign, determine the reason your candidacy did not capture the imagination of the voters. Don't moan about the "power" of the political party which helped defeat you. If you lost because you received little help from your own party, do something about it! Throughout the campaign we heard time and again the tired rhetoric about the need for a two party system. Such talk usually came from members of a town or county organization which is weak and without imagination.

Those who complain about the weakness of the political organization they represented in the elections have a couple of choices: they can sit back and lick their wounds, putting the blame on the lack of strength displayed by their town organization.

Or, and this would be the wiser choice, they can do something about it. They can work within the political structure to make their political organization stronger so that they, or other candidates in the future, have a stronger foundation upon which to launch a campaign.

It's not enough to complain that "we need a strong two party system." Talk is cheap, action is what is needed. And why not?

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 No. 12

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

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

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

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director

Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator

Clare Swanik - National Sales Director

Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager

Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director

Sharman 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 name 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 consideration of publication.

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

Cohalan's Mandate

The results of last week's election for county executive have many people scratching their heads wondering: "What does it all mean?" The margin of victory earned by Suffolk County Executive Peter F. Cohalan was far less than had been projected, certainly not anywhere near the 100% plurality he tallied in his first run for the office.

The county executive's race had been billed as a referendum on Shoreham, with two clear opposing positions from the opposing candidates. Cohalan ran on his record of opposing the opening of the plant, while his opponent, Assemblyman Patrick Halpin, insisted the county should stop battling LILCO because the plant would ultimately open.

Although the results of the balloting will be analyzed for months, there appears to be almost unanimous agreement on one fact: had it not been for the Shoreham issue, Cohalan would have been dumped at the polls on Election Day. It is clear that the voters gave Cohalan poor marks on much of his administration's track record except one: Shoreham.

Cohalan's efforts on behalf of the county's CSEA employees, which produced a giveaway contract that will have drastic financial implications in 1986, may well have earned him the support of CSEA, but cost him dearly in the minds of the voters. Many who turned away from Cohalan at the polls last week simply could not bring themselves to support a man who callously disregarded the plight of the hard-pressed taxpayer while negotiating contracts for the CSEA and the police.

Many of those who cast their votes for Cohalan did so very reluctantly. Their concerns over the questionable safety of the Shoreham nuclear facility, and the lack of a safe evacuation should a problem develop there, brought Cohalan many more votes than he would have had if Shoreham had not been an issue. The depth of the public's concern in that matter offset the loss of support

Cohalan enjoyed in the past from the ranks of business and industry, which supports, for the most part, the opening of Shoreham.

Cohalan's surprisingly low plurality may not be a mandate in the minds of some, but it is in our view. It is a mandate to Cohalan that he had better start concentrating on the financial problems of our taxpayers, eliminating his giveaway, country club type of thinking in negotiating contracts, and the grandiose schemes of some that would produce court complexes to satisfy the whims of some in the judicial and legal circles. He had better get back to the tight-fisted, good government promises which earned him the right to sit in the county executive's seat four years ago.

There is speculation that Cohalan's slim victory has hurt his chances to become a viable statewide candidate. That may or may not be. More important, however, is the way he performs in his second term. Statewide voters are unlikely to give much support to a man who can't be trusted to act on behalf of his constituents; whose "promises" litter a trail of political maneuvering; whose administrative record thus far is one of fiscal uncertainty.

Shoreham is an issue that will resolve itself one way or another by the time Cohalan goes before the voters again. He used that issue, and rightfully so because it is the most important issue we face at this point of time, in his most recent campaign. From now on, however, he will have to prove to the people of Suffolk County that he is a man of his word, and that his concerns are truly for the people he represents not only on Shoreham, but in fiscal affairs as well.

Otherwise Cohalan's future appears headed for the political obscurity of a judicial seat somewhere with the unanimous support of the public who will not be rewarding him, but anxious to get rid of him.

And why not?

It's LILCO, not LOLA!

It is becoming increasingly certain that in the minds of the Public Service Commission people the name of the utility which provides electricity to Long Island is "Lola" and not LILCO. Their theme song in regards to that utility is "Whatever Lola wants, Lola gets."

The most recent proof of that fact came last week when PSC Administrative Judge Frank Robinson indicated he will make a recommendation soon on the rate hike LILCO has requested, despite the fact LILCO has served notice on the PSC that they will revise their rate increase figures upward to reflect the ever changing financial problems of their Shoreham nuclear facility. What that means is Robinson will offer a recommendation without knowing

what the impact would be on the ratepayers. He has said before and is now proving those words that the only consideration is the financial need of the utility, not the plight of the public.

LILCO's original 56.5 rate hike proposal is now a thing of the past. While the new percentage of impact upon the public has not yet been made public, it is undoubtedly near or at the 76 per cent that even LILCO's own consultants said would spell financial disaster for Long Island. With the projected cost of Shoreham going higher and higher — LILCO recently revised the projected cost from 3.4 to 3.7 billion — the ultimate cost of electricity for Long Island will almost surely be double that which it is now. If the PSC continues to give "Lola" all it wants, as it has time and again in

the past, Long Island is in a lot of trouble.

Efforts to revise the Public Service Commission have proved fruitless in the past because of opposition from strong lobbying forces which have caught the ear of state legislators in areas where such outlandish rate increases are not being felt. But those efforts must be renewed with full vigor by our Long Island state

legislators not only toward the PSC, but also targeted at the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY), if the Long Island region is to be spared the fiscal disaster that is sure to come.

The time for action is now, or the time for change will surely be next year when elections are held for state seats.

And why not?

Are You A Winner?

Somewhere out there in Suffolk Life territory is someone who is going to get a very welcome gift during this coming holiday season. That gift will be in the form of \$3,500 in cash being offered in Suffolk Life's annual Christmas Shopping Spree, offered in cooperation with participating local retail merchants.

In addition to the top winner, there will be many other winners who will share in almost \$7,000 in gift certificates being offered by the participating merchants. In the 20 years Suffolk Life has conducted the exciting Shopping Spree, thousands of winners have been selected. And you can be included in this happy group.

It's simple to participate. Just fill out the coupon found in the full page

ad in this issue promoting the contest, take it to one of the stores listed and deposit it in the coupon container. You'll find additional coupons at the store, and it would be wise to fill one out to increase your chances of winning. You can't win if you don't participate.

The more you enter the Shopping Spree, the more chance you have of being named the winner of the \$3,500 top prize, or one of the other gift certificate winners that will be announced through the holiday shopping season. Join the Shopping Spree excitement at our participating stores and this could be a very happy holiday season for you.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Willmott:

As a new parent of a "white infant," I am upset about the amount of "want" ads for children in your paper. No wonder kidnapping is so prevalent in our country, and no wonder the reason for "child find" programs across the nation!

Anyone who is unemployed and in need of money simply can go out into the community and abduct a child, call any of the 10 numbers advertised in your paper, and one family is left devastated while a childless couple has illegally, perhaps unknowingly, obtained a child.

For morality's sake, and for the sake of those of us worried about child snatchers, I encourage you to discourage these couples from advertising for a child in this manner. It may just be another way to eliminate the all-too-prevalent lists of "missing children."

Name withheld by request

Southold

Ed. Note: When these ads first appeared we checked out their legitimacy. Most are seeking women who are pregnant, do not want an abortion but do not want the child either. Arrangements are usually made before birth in a very legal manner. The way we look at it, it's a viable alternative to abortion, which we oppose.

Dear Editor:

We are very pleased that the first annual Car Award and Cocktail Party for the benefit of the Dominican Sisters Family Health Service, which was held on Saturday, September 17, was such a great success. The proceeds from this event bring the total amount raised to date to \$37,000 toward the free service provided to the sick and needy in the Town of Southampton. It reduces considerably the projected deficit of \$125,000 for the current year.

In addition to the many active members of Charity in Action who worked so tirelessly to make this fundraising endeavor a social as well as financial success, we would like to take this opportunity to thank Club Burgundy for the use of their facility for the event and to Otis Ford for having a 1983 Ford Escort available for demonstration at various locations where tickets were sold. Without the help and cooperation of so many, such a successful event would not have been possible. We are most grateful for the support and encouragement of all.

Sincerely,
Mary Carnicelli
Health Service Coordinator
Dominican Sisters Family Health Service.

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 23 NO.

County Life

and 100

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ad and verified in excess of
Mailing address: Box 262 Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11958 Circulation Weekly

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 Hottelville Coram Three Village
Mid Hampton Sayville Mastic Shirley
Westhampton Oakdale
Ronkonkoma



David J. Willmott - Editor
John McKay - General Manager

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

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Manager
Claire Swartz - Suffolk County \$17.00 per year
Ted Coates - Suffolk County \$7.99 per year
Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County, \$4.99 per issue
25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life. In Suffolk County, \$7.99 per year. Newsstand single

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: We welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All letters must be accompanied by return address and cannot be returned for any reason. The space occupied by the error.

NEWS AND PHOTO

All news and photo

ERRORS - Rep

Willmotts and Why-Not's

David J. Willmott, Editor

Happy Thanksgiving

Thanksgiving Day was declared a holiday by our government to offer us an opportunity to say thanks for the bountiful gifts we share as citizens of the United States. Our country is rich in natural assets, a melting pot of people that encourages productivity, utilization of time, talent and efforts and offers the rewards to go with them.

We personally thank God for having chosen us to be born an American citizen and to enjoy and profit from all this country has to offer and give. We thank God for the favors He has given all American people, per-

mitting them to enjoy unprecedented well being, health and wealth. We are grateful, we are appreciative, and do not mind sharing our over-abundance with others.

This Thanksgiving, we look skyward with awe and appreciation and ask His blessing for the future. We hope that each of our readers shares in our optimism and our appreciation, and when they are gathered with their families and friends, that each of us will take a moment to reflect and thank God for His gifts.

And why not?

The Day After

We, like millions of others, watched the media-hyped motion picture, "The Day After." We also watched as ABC's Viewpoint, an analysis of the motion picture, outlined our current state of preparedness, or unpreparedness, for nuclear attack and defense.

The picture graphically depicted the horrors of nuclear war, a reality that could happen but, by the grace of God, won't. We doubt that there is a sane person in the world who would not trade some of our peaceful technological advances for the elimination of nuclear technology that is used for war. The painful, cold hard fact is this technology does exist, we have it, the Russians have it, and all too many smaller, more unstable nations either have it or are developing it.

As long as this technology is in the hands of more than one person, strength must be met with strength so as to avoid any one single country feeling they have the upper hand and could gain from using these awesome weapons. Reduction of weapons or elimination of weapon systems is a nice thought, but one that is not realistic as long as you have two diverse philosophies of government.

We, like many people in this country, have pulled down a lever supporting the concept of unilateral arms negotiations. We are sure that if the proposition had said that only the United States should reduce its arms, we would have voted "no" as would

have just about everyone else.

Idealistically if the Russians and other nuclear powers could be brought into verifiable accord on reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, the bells on every church in the country and in the world would ring out a message of peace. We believe our only hope for salvation is in technology and the development of an anti-nuclear system which we understand currently is on the verge of a breakthrough. This system, from what we have read, would be satellite-operated and, through technology, would reunite the atom thus neutralizing it and saving mankind from devastation from radioactive fall-out.

As far as any fear that was generated by the movie, "The Day After," we go back to a conversation we had with an old timer some 20 years ago when we were expressing our fears about living in a nuclear world. He said, "Son, what you fear is fear alone."

"Look at your desire to go back. Do you think that the early settlers of this country feared any less than you do today? Is it not true that you are just as dead from an Indian taking your scalp as an atomic bomb going off over your head?"

What we must do is to pray to God that a nuclear disaster such as was depicted in "The Day After" never happens, and we must develop, without hesitation, a defense that insures it will never become a reality.

The way we see it, the Russians, and we in this land, must realize we each have as much to lose as does the other in order to prevent the utilization of nuclear weaponry.

We pray to God that He gives us the

ability to develop the technology for a defense system that totally, unequivocally, neutralizes the dreadful power of nuclear weapons forever.

And why not?

The Shoreham Report

For the past five months, I have served as Suffolk County's representative on Governor Cuomo's Shoreham Commission. At the onset I agreed to put the confidentiality of the Commission in front of my responsibility as an editor to provide you with the news. It has been terribly disheartening to watch systematic leaks to the media by vested interests who felt planting of stories might help their cause or protect their backsides.

At the concluding meeting this past Saturday, Stu Diamond, a Newsday reporter who had been heavily involved in the nuclear Shoreham situation, made a formal request to be allowed to sit in and observe the panel complete their final recommendations. He stated he already knew the entire content of the draft.

He indicated it would just be

proforma for him to see the panel in operation in these final closing hours. His request was turned down.

To my chagrin I picked up Newsday Sunday morning and found that although he did not have the intimate details, he obviously had been privileged and made aware of some contents of our final report.

At the close of the meeting Saturday night, I reluctantly agreed again to withhold the full details until the final draft had been prepared and made available for the Governor to read. Since much has already been published as to the content, I will only say the report may well reflect, at long last, the people's needs, concerns and legitimate viewpoints.

Maybe the truth finally will prevail. And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Open Letter to Gov. Mario Cuomo:

Dear Sir:

You fail to remember it was our votes in Suffolk County that placed you in the Governor's chair.

I wrote to you and you promised me and later publicly that there would be no opening of Shoreham unless there was a safe evacuation plan which of course there isn't any. When big business and the pro-nuclear people got to you, you passed the buck to Washington, where there is very little, if any, concern for us.

I have always been a Democrat but always voted for the man regardless of party because straight ticket voting to me is stupid. On the other hand, County Executive Cohalan has fought for us, is still fighting for us, and has never wavered.

Unfortunately, re-election is a couple of years away. When it comes who do you think I am going to vote for? You? Forget it.

Very truly yours,
Thomas C. Kelly

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Apartments have been escalating to such horrendous proportions that apartment dwellers now face the alternative of giving up food or health needs in order to afford a roof over their heads.

Landlords have been constantly increasing rents that when a one year lease is terminated we have been raised as much as \$100 dollars per month. Besides this flagrancy, we dare not voice a complaint as our leases would not be renewed.

These indiscriminate and unwarranted rate increases smell of price rigging (anti-trust) which is constitutionally illegal and government should investigate this situation fully.

A bill, which is now in existence, mandated by the State of New York, called (E.T.P.A.) Emergency Tenant's Protection Act has been in effect successfully in New York City for several years.

This bill unfortunately must be implemented and passed by our township to become effective. A bill introducing this act was soundly defeated.

We have now reached the end of our patience and Brookhaven seniors, numbering in the thousands, are aggressively taking action, focusing attention to all concerned citizens. Our voting privileges and power will be a strong and forceful one, a means to awaken our leadership to our desperate plight.

If need be, we shall be instrumental in defeating those supercilious officials who have denied us our rightful privileges.

The interests of a concerned citizenry must supersede the powerful lobbying of the real estate combine.

Mr. Willmott, being a proven champion and voice for our town, I humbly request your competent assistance in making public our plight, working together with us as competently and earnestly as you have been diligently exploiting the Shoreham nuclear rejection.

Respectfully yours,
H.R.P.

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Judging by the reaction of our customers and friends, our 1983 Economic Review Breakfast was well received. In no small part, your coverage of our annual event helped to make that possible.

I simply wanted to drop you this short line to thank you for your attendance and coverage of our Key Bank of Long Island session on September 29, 1983. The combination of Lee Koppelman on Long Island's economy, our economist, Peter Farrell, concerning general economic matters, and Victor J. Riley, our parent company's president and chief executive officer, on state banking matters, proved to be successful. We were all impressed with your speedy follow-up highlighting their comments and noting Long Island's positive outlook.

I hope you enjoyed the conference as much as we enjoyed sponsoring it. I anticipate that your schedule is hectic and your taking the time to attend is much appreciated.

Very truly yours,
T. R. Winnowski
President and Chief Executive Officer
Key Bank of Long Island

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Thank you from all the members of the Riverhead Country Fair Committee for the fine publicity we received in Suffolk Life. The follow-up stories have been great, too.

Everyone worked so hard to make the day, and the whole weekend, a success, and I think our efforts were well rewarded.

Now we'll have to wait 'til next year!

Sincerely,
Laurel Sisson
Riverhead

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 No. 14

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3000 Classified Ads 288-5000

Mailing 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 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.

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 Hottelville Coram Three Village
Mad Hampton Sayville
Westhampton Oakdale Massic Shirely
Moriches 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
Claire Swanik - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager
Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Sharman 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.

The Shoreham Commission

The public has been subjected to numerous leaks concerning the Shoreham Commission's report. Many of the conclusions reached by the Commission have been published. What has been published about the conclusions has been relatively accurate, but reports about the process the Commission followed were not.

The media would have you believe that the consensus was reached at the November 15th meeting when in fact, the consensus had been hammered out, at the conclusion of a three day session, on Saturday, October 1. The November 15 meeting was called to discuss the language of the consensus report.

The consensus was reached after hours of painful deliberation, and give and take discussion by the pro-Shoreham and the pro-safety representatives. Ironically, the one person with a poor record of attendance and participation, the pro-Shoreham Long Island Association-Nassau County representative, William Rowan, has been doing the most complaining. Rowan missed a substantial number of the meetings. When in attendance he asked few questions, made few comments. At both the October 1 meeting and the last meeting on November 15, when the consensus was being debated and discussed, he left early having more important things to do with his time apparently.

During the five months the Commission was in existence, those of us who cared, from both sides, sat attentively listening to voluminous amounts of testimony and technical presentations. The majority of the testimony came from pro-LILCO witnesses. Although most of us on the Commission had started with a preconceived conclusion or bias, both sides were enlightened and at different times had their minds changed to some degree. When all testimony had been given, facts disseminated, debates held, the truth was formed into a consensus on which few could disagree.

When I first went on the Shoreham Commission, there were eleven members. Marge Harrison, a Shoreham activist, and myself, were a distinct minority. After the first meeting, we met and concluded that the Commission was stacked 7 to 2 with possibly two who had no biases. Sub-

sequently, Leon Campo, a pro-safety proponent, and Herb Kouts, head of the nuclear department at Brookhaven National Laboratory and a staunch pro-nuclear advocate, were added to the commission.

As the testimony was given and the reports were read, we noted a distinct change in both questioning and in private conversations with other members of the Commission. As we became educated, learned the facts, truth rose above the rhetoric. The Shoreham Commission was given staff to work with, individuals who were officials of the Public Service Commission, the State Energy Agency and the Consumer Protection Board. All three of these agencies had played an integral part in the creation and the perpetuation of Shoreham. We often felt that these people were the foxes in the hen house. They were not the independent, outside staff who could be depended upon to help us reach a totally-balanced and independent conclusion.

As testimony continued, it became particularly apparent that the Public Service Commission may well have been led down a primrose path by LILCO and had been used, through both tradition and influence, to arrive at decisions sought by LILCO that may or may not have been necessarily good for the people.

In the early formation of the Commission, I attended a meeting in Albany called by ex-Public Service Commissioner Fred Kahn, now a consultant to utilities and also a member of the Shoreham Commission, to explore the economic ramifications of Shoreham. I sat quietly and listened for several hours to the plans that Kahn had for the State staff in exploring the economic ramifications. They dwelled at length on the ramifications of their findings as they related to LILCO the corporation, its owners, the stockholders, bondholders, financial houses, the effect opening or closing would have on local and State governments, the municipal bond markets. Not a word was said about the effect the opening or the closing scenarios would have on future rates, or their impact on the citizens and businesses on Long Island.

I respectfully requested that the "people effect" be given priority over

the effect on the corporation, the investors and government. They seemed a bit taken aback that someone would care about the people. They indicated that they could not factually determine the effect that huge rate increases would have on the residents of Long Island. They did not have a computer model that looked into the hardships and the reaction of people. This only confirmed my long-held suspicion that the Public Service Commission was not interested in the public, only the utility, the financial markets and government.

Marge Harrison, Leon Campo and myself, insisted that if the staff was to prepare computer runs, that they develop runs that showed the various scenarios both favorable to the public and to the utility. We argued long and loud that we wanted the "used and useful" principle to be factored into the financial runs as it was not only a possibility, but a very real probability of being implemented if not voluntarily, by court order.

We had difficulty in getting anyone from the state to even acknowledge that such a law existed until the last day and virtually the last witness at the hearing, Jerrold Oppenheim, assistant state attorney general in charge of energy and utilities who not only acknowledged in great detail the existence of the law, but indicated that the Attorney General's office had full

intention of applying the law to the Shoreham situation.

We have been asked on many occasions if the process followed by the Commission was a sensible approach. I believe it was, for the Commission was composed of both pro-safety and pro-Shoreham facets. The facts, although at times slanted, were presented and truths did emerge.

We are disturbed by some reports, allegedly by Commission members, complaining about the process. Possibly if LILCO had a better representative their side would have been better told. But we doubt it when you consider that Chairman John Marburger told the Commission that he was a scientist first and, as a result, pro-nuclear. He admitted he had controlled the agenda and the flow of information.

As I had felt in the beginning, the deck had been stacked initially against the people, in favor of the company. Yet, enough members took their duties and responsibility seriously and, as a result, will present to the Governor a comprehensive analysis on which he can make logical decisions.

Those decisions, if he has the courage to carry them out, will save the people and possibly propel him to new heights in many eyes.

And why not?

Finding a Home for the Gruccis

The tragic accident at the Grucci fireworks plant Saturday has left Long Island saddened and shaken. But, by the grace of God, no residents living in the surrounding areas were killed.

No one in their wildest dreams would have expected such an explosive force coming from this facility. A minor explosion, perhaps, but not likely as the Grucci family and their employees, who mostly were blood relatives, worked as a team ever-mindful, ever-vigilant of the dangers that surrounded them.

The factory located in Bellport had initially been built in the middle of the woods, the homes that sprung up after the factory had been in operation were probably the result of a lack of foresight by the builders, the owners and our government who allowed residential construction so close to an explosive situation.

The Grucci family had been good neighbors not only in Bellport, but to most of Long Island. Just this past October, they put on a spectacular show in Riverhead to commemorate Suffolk County's 300th Birthday. The price they charged the town was a fraction of what they normally would charge for such a display. Felix Grucci, the elder of the family, said he wanted the display to be his contribution to the people of the great County of Suffolk. The county had treated his family well and he ap-

preciated it, he said.

The Grucci facility now lies in rubble. One of his sons is dead, as is a cousin. Although the family has not announced their intention to continue, it should be expected they will. It would be a shame if they were not allowed to continue here on Long Island in a safe location.

Two locations come to mind, both in Westhampton. The atomic bomb bunker site at the Suffolk County Airbase, removed by thousands of acres from any substantial development. Also the old Bomark Missile site presently partially utilized by the Suffolk County Police Department as a training ground. Both sites have, in existence, containment areas built to withstand and contain atomic bombs and missiles. The Suffolk County Airbase site, in particular, is well removed from population and could be the future home for the Grucci operation. The Grucci family has been the pride of Long Island, bringing world-wide attention to our region. Now that they are down, but we hope not out, it would be fitting for our government to return the many favors they have heaped upon the community in helping them find a suitable site for relocation that would be safe and beneficial for the perpetuation of the family's artistry, and the community.

And why not?

Letter to the editor

Dear Mr. Willmott:

The Friends of Mattituck Free Library want to thank you for your continued support. The news item about our folk concert was excellent and we are most appreciative. The concert was a huge suc-

cess - due in no small measure to your help.

Many, many thanks.
Sincerely,
Hilda H. Celeste
Press Secretary

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 NO. 15

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Maining 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 Seiden Port Jefferson
Harrison East Holbrook Mottsville Coram Three Village
Mad Hampton Sayville
Westhampton Oakdale Mastic Shrewsbury
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; Suffolk County 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
Claire Swank - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - 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.