Willmotts and Why-Nots

Gioia Must Be Fired

The New York State Public Service Commission has time and again proven itself to be a utility-oriented regulatory body. Instead of living up to the basic reason for its creation--protection of the public against the monopolistic utilities-the PSC oes out of its way to insure the ancial stability of the utility, without concern for the financial ruination of the ratepayers.

Classic examples of this problem came this past week:

On October 29, an administrative law judge of the PSC recommended that the Commission authorize LILCO to increase its electric rates by \$68.7 million, the full amount LILCO had requested. The total increase, Judge Vincent P. Furlong concluded, was necessary "to ensure the utility's financial integrity." The entire increase, he added, should be in the form of an addition to the Financial Stability Adjustment, a mystical formula created by the PSC in the last LILCO rate increase request. An administratiave judge hearing that request also rec-ommended the full amount sought by LILCO, for exactly the same reasons.

And then, on October 31, PSC Chairman Paul Gioia argued before the State Energy Research and Development Authority, of which he is a member, that LILCO should be permitted to float \$582 million in tax exempt bonds. That amount would reportedly be earmarked to finance non-nuclear construction, which means nothing because LILCO could simply divert money from that area to continue its push to put Shoreham on line.

Gioia and LILCO, apparent partners in this effort to bail out a utility that has mismanaged and misspent millions of dollars collected from hard-pressed ratepayers, claimed the ability to float the tax-free bonds would represent a savings to taxpayers. State Consumer Protection Board Executive Richard Kessel disputed that myth. And so do we.

The problem is there is no control over what LILCO does with its dollars. LILCO donated more than \$600,000 to a group called Citizens to Open Shoreham, a group which had its formation in the Shoreham-Wading River School District by residents who were concerned only about the tax rates for their schools. COS used those funds to lobby for the opening of the plant, without regard to the fact that evacuation is not possible. And the PSC did nothing to stop that wasteful expen-

LILCO has spent enormous sums to pay for Washington public relations and lobbying efforts to put Shoreham on line. But the PSC has looked the other way. Giving LILCO a rate increase, as recommended by Furlong, and the right to float tax-free bonds, as urged by Gioia, would only enhance LILCO's efforts to buy its way into getting approval for a controversial, and unneeded, nuclear plant. At the ratepayers' expense.

The only way to solve this problem is to eliminate the cause: the PSC. But that's easier said than done. Despite repeated calls for a revamping of the PSC, little has been done through the legislative process. A major reason is that the utilities have a powerful lobby, one that works overtime to influence the decisions of most of the legislators. Another problem is that upstate ratepayers do not suffer from the skyrocketing rates Long Island residents face. They get cheaper hydropower at a fraction of the cost we pay. So upstate legislators do not feel the urgency of the problem.

There is little hope that the legislative process will ever act to correct the problem. Which means the only solution is a direct attack on the PSC itself. Only one person has the ability to do that: Governor Mario Cuomo.

Gioia is serving as the head of the PSC at the pleasure of Gov. Cuomo. The Governor could, immmediately,

fire Paul Gioia. He could name a new chairman, one capable of the kind of leadership that can bring about the change from within-a new breed of administrative judges, for example--with a new sense of direction that would target those who have become so cozy with the utilities, letting them know that the fun and games are over. That the top priority, and new emphasis, will be on the protection of the public. Those utilities that mismanage themselves into financial hardships will either have to correct their wasteful ways, or go bankrupt. That the PSC will no longer, as it has too many times in the past, dip deeper and deeper into the ratepayers' pockets to bail out utility mistakes and waste.

This solution has been offered before, and has been greeted by the Governor with the question: "Who? Who do I replace him with?" Well, we have a suggestion. We offer this suggestion with a bit of a reservation because Richard Kessel has been doing such a good job on behalf of the people in his current role. But we believe Kessel, as chairman of the PSC, could bring about the change that's needed if we are ever to end

the current fiasco that protects the utilities at the expense of the people.

Governor Cuomo has earned the respect of the people because of his strong stand against Shoreham, and against the mismanagement practices of LILCO. He has been articulate in his opposition to the wasteful practices that are threaten ing to bankrupt the public. But it's one thing to voice opposition, and quite another to take the kind of action that will bring necessary changes.

It's time for the Governor to act! To fire Gioia! To make it known once and for all that the Public Service Commission will no longer be owned by the utilities, but rather will serve the public. It's time to end the charade of rewarding utilities for wasteful practices by voting for rate increases to protect their "financial stability." The Governor can do it by replacing Gioia with Kessel, or anyone else who is a consumer, rather

than utility-oriented.

The Governor has the power to do it. We urge him to do it now, before the PSC imposes more of a hardship upon the public than it already has.

And why not?

Sorry Bill, There is a First Amendment

Those of us who are on the steering committee for the creation of a Long Island Public Power Authority are being sued by LILCO. LILCO chairman William Catacosinos and his board decided they couldn't take the heat in the kitchen, so they tried to shut the kitchen down with a law suit. The purpose of the suit is to gag us from speaking out on the proposal for a public takeover of the Long Island Lighting Company. Seems like Catacosinos doesn't like this idea, possibly because it makes common sense and it would lower rates for Long Islanders.

Catacosinos and his board also tried to link our campaign for public power with an action taken by the Democratic candidate for county executive in Nassau, John Matthews. Catacosinos, in the court papers, said we were in cahoots and contrived this diabolical plan, in violation of security laws, to change the management of LILCO.

The Long Island Public Power advocates are not interested in just changing the Board of Directors. Our aims and goals are very simple. We want to change the concept of the company from a cold-hearted greedy private profit-making corporation to a public utility, run by an authority, a responsive representative, and answerable to the people.

LILCO lobbyists have successfully gotten around a lot of Nuclear Regulatory Commission rules and regulations but they have not yet been successful in changing the Constitution of the United States to eliminate free speech. As long as we are protected by the First Amendment, we will continue to speak out, presenting new, vibrant ideas that may free the residents of Long Island from the clutches of the greedy, profit-making organization called LILCO, and there isn't much that Catacosinos or his board can do about it. We are confident the court will decide in our favor, for we know we are on the side of truth and truth shall prevail.

And why not?

Offices and Plant Located at 1461 Old Country Rd. (Rte. 58) Riverhead 369-0800 Classified Ads 369-0820 Mailing Address P.O. Box 167 Riverhead, N.Y. 11901-0102

318,000 Circulation Weekly

David J. Willmott-Editor and Publisher

Lou Grasso-Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann. -Regional Accts. Director
Claire Swanik-National Sales Director
Robert J. Andrews-Dir. of Marketing
Victor Prusinowski-Dir. of Cust. Relations
Subscription Rate In Suffolk County, 14, 99 per year Outside Suffolk County, 17, 00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales, 25° per issue.

Bill Johnson-Director of Printing
and Distribution
Duane Sundquist-Circulation Manager
Peter Parpan-Production Manager
Peter Parpan-Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Systems Manager
Sharman Gordon-Adv. Art Director
Joan Sullivan-News/ Art Director
Angela Gingo-Director of Sales
Mgt., Planning & Co-Op Advertising
Mgt., Planning & Co-Op Advertising
Suffolk County 14, 99 per year, Outside Sulfolk County 17, 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

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.

Is the Government

The court, which is the law, ruled that the Long Island Lighting Company could not implement an evacuation proceeding usurping the rights and responsibilities of government. In other words, there could be no Long Island Lighting Company evacuation plan without governmental participation.

An agency of the federal government, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, (F.E.M.A.) announced just prior to election that

they were not going to follow this court ruling. That they were considering a test, by drill, of LILCO's illegal evacuation plan.

The timing of this announcement was suspicious, as there were many of Peter Cohalan's, "the betrayer," friends running for election. These friends of the Fox had been doing his bidding in their campaigns by saying that they believed we ought to test a test so that we could say it worked,

Cont. on Page 4

Above the Law?

Willmotts and Why-Nots

"The Group's At It Again"

There is in existence a loosely formed organization of people called "The Group." People who are thankful for what they have and who try to help others who, because of no fault of their own, have fallen on hard times. As a result, they will enjoy no Christmas this year.

These are people who traditionally been hard workers, productive members of society who became involved in accidents or other dilemnas, are not eligible and in most cases are too proud to accept welfare or other social programs. They have kids who they are doing their darnest to raise; small children who, in most cases, don't understand why Santa Claus won't come this year.

What we have done over the past few years is pool our resources, and our time to provide Christmas for these families. We shop diligently, and with the help of many merchants are able to stretch the funds that we have a lot further than the dollars would normally go.

The kids receive some needed clothing, some special toys. The folks receive food, and, if we can manage it, a special gift too.

The group is anonymous, as are the beneficiaries. In most cases these are people who have been brought to our attention by friends and neighbors who provide us with information about the needs and the

Just before Christmas, gaily gift wrapped boxes and bags appear out of nowhere. No questions asked, no special thanks solicited. Those of us who belong to "The Group" have enjoyed many Christmases knowing that because we cared, others would realize that God does work in strange

This year we already have the names of a number of families we intend to help. We have a little bit of room for one or two more very deserving families. If you know of someone who meets our criteria, please let us know about them. Each year we hear of many more families, particularly at the last moment, that we can't help because we have run out of funds.

If you would like to help by joining our group and making a contribution, you may send your funds to "The c/o Suffolk Life Newspapers, P.O. Box 167, Riverhead, New York 11901. The same address applies if you know of a family that may be in need. Our only requirement is that the family be a normal family who, because of circumstances beyond their control, cannot give their children a Christmas this

Thank you for your consideration. And why not?

doors open to the public, and disallow public matters to be discussed behind the closed doors of party caucuses.

We commend the electorate for its good sense in electing a legislature which stands strong in its opposition to Shoreham. And have no doubt, the legislators can read election results.

In the first meeting after Election Day, three legislators who had appeared ready to abandon the anti-Shoreham strategy reversed field and voted to continue the fight. Credit that more to the voters than the credibility of the legislators. The three did not win as convincingly as they had hoped, and a major factor was probably the uncertainty the electorate felt because of the Shoreham issue.

Voters weren't fooled by the strategy of Republican leaders to have legislative candidates support the test of a Shoreham evacuation plan while also saying they opposed full power operation of the plant.

Those candidates were talking out of both sides of their mouths. The test of any evacuation plan is probably all the federal government and Republican Peter F. Cohalan would need to jam an unsafe, uneconomical and unwanted plant down the throats of the residents of Suffolk County.

Now, Cohalan says that the voters killed the Shoreham plant, and he probably wishes we would all forget about what he did on May 30, when he betrayed the trust of those who elected him by dropping his opposition to a test.

The federal government is trying to find another way to hold a test, but the people of Suffolk County have proved that they do not take the issue lightly, and they will fight to the death of the Shoreham plant, lead by their legislators.

With all the good that may come out of the election, there remains a certain wariness toward our representatives, a hesitancy to believe they will carry out all their election pledges.

Of the six legislators who answered a question in Suffolk Life's pre-election questionnaire on whether the loopholes should be taken out of the county's budget cap legislation, four said 'yes,' while two said 'no'. In the first meeting after the election, five of the six voted differently than they said they would, and the sixth conveniently made himself absent.

The result is that the county executive will still be allowed to exceed the four per cent cap when putting his budget proposal together every year. Continued voting of that type would make the legislature shameful and the policy it sets useless.

Because of this type of activity, we take seriously our role as watchdog for the people. Between now and next year's election, we will continue to expose the wrongdoings in government, but hope our job is made easier by responsible officials in all levels of government.

And why not?

Post Election

Balanced and open goverment is the key to democracy, and we look hopefully to our newly-elected public officials to reward the electorate for its sensibility and awareness of the issues by providing good government in the upcoming years.

In the calm of another election passed, perhaps the most vivid example of the smarts of the electorate can be seen in voting for the Suffolk Legislature, where voters proved to political leaders that credibility, not mud-slinging, is what the voters want from their representatives.

We are assured, hopefully, of a balanced legislature. While the Republicans have 10 representatives to the 8 of the Democrats, we hope the edge is tempered by the willingness of most legislators to listen to the voice of the people when voting, not the voice of the political leaders.

We also hope to have an open government, and urge the legislators to re-affirm their pledge to keep the

Letters to the Editor

'LILCO Must have bulging pockets'

Dear Editor

How can LILCO get away with making the customers pay for the storm damage? They are suppose to have a storm fund for storms like this; if they don't they should have instead of soaking it into Shoreham. Some one in LILCO must have bulging pockets. I don't see why they don't have storm insurance like homeowners. LILCO is one big rip off to the people of L.I., and they are getting away with it. Are the politicians afraid of LILCO or have they all got their hands in LILCO's pocket?

I never talked to any of the out-of-staters

who worked on this mess, but I've talked to people who did and they were told that this was the worse mess of electrical wiring they had ever seen, the service was bad, the work bad, and their equipment was shoddy. They couldn't understand how they charged as high as they do and get away with it. Why aren't these lines underground like most of the housing developments?

Sometime when you are traveling around L.I. take notice of how many light poles are leaning, and look closer, you'll see that most of them are rotted off at the ground and should have been changed 10 years ago. It's no wonder so many came down and there are still more standing like that, take notice. Also notice how many bare wires with the cover gone from them. I'll give you an example, three years ago there were bare wires on my corner and everytime the wind blew, the sparks flew. Finally the people living closer kept riding

LILCO till they came and changed them, but it took a lot of phoning and 6 or 8 month's before they did. They don't do any work till it either burns, falls or blows then they have to.

Where is all the money going that is paid them? Let me guess. You know I had a good laugh the night of Grucci's Firework Display. I was in Farmingville and after it was over the traffic was in a deadlock; the police just threw up their hands at the mess. Nowhere to go, and that was only one little village, could you imagine what the island would be like if some-thing happened at Shoreham? Don't get me wrong, the police did a fine job with what they had to work with. But that was a good example of what could happen on Long Island; it's like the hurricane director said on T.V., it's no way you could evacuate the island in case of a real bad hurricane warning, so why does LILCO think it could be in case of a mishap?

They really had some nerve asking people to sign for Shoreham to go on line for the little dry ice they gave out. I'm glad I didn't go out there for dry ice because I would have told them where to put the dry ice and would let my meat rot before I sign anything; that just shows how sick LILCO is.

Seriously I think they should be investigated and their equipment checked and repair what they have wrong now, instead of blowing it all on Shoreham.

Thank you, Robert Stogdale

SUFFOLK LIFE



318,000 Circulation Weekly

David J. Willmott-Editor and Publisher

Lou Grasso-Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann.-Regional Accts. Director
Claire Swanik-National Sales Director
Robert J. Andrews-Dir. of Marketing
Victor Prusinowski-Dir. of Cust. Relations
Subscription Rate in Suffolk County. *4 99 per year Outside Suffolk County. *17 00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales, 25° per issue. General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regard Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will

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.

NEW LOCATION AND PHONE NUMBERS

1461 Old Country Rd. (Route 58) Riverhead, N.Y. 11901-2026

Main & General Office 369-0800

Office 369-0810

Classified Office 369-0820

The Fatal Flaw

A congressional subcommittee hearing in Washington last week focused on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decision to direct the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to conduct a partial test of LILCO's emergency evacuation plan for the Shoreham nuclear power plant. One of the strongest advances for the holding of this el ancise was Congressman William Carney, who insisted throughout the proceedings that the test could well unveil "the fatal flaw" that would prevent the plant from opening. The nature of the proposed test makes that highly unlikely. The real fatal flaw, actually, is the logic applied by Carney and the other pro-utility congressmen who sat in on the hearing. The NRC, in its haste to put the

Shoreham facility on line, has decided that even a partial test of a plan that a state Supreme Court judge has ruled cannot be legally implemented by LILCO, would yield information which would be "useful" to the NRC in its licensing proceeding for Shoreham. That decision came on a 3 to 2 vote, with NRC Chairman Nuncio Palladino and Commissioner James Asselstine opposed. Although FEMA agreed to conduct the exercise, Associate Director Samuel W. Speck noted in his remarks at the hearing that "an exercise without state and local participation will not have sufficient demonstration to allow FEMA to make a finding" as to workability of the LILCO plan.

Because county or state participation has been refused by both levels of government, FEMA indicates it will have people sitting in for key county officials such as the police commissioner and county executive. Only portions of the plan would be included in the exercise as a result of the court decision which stipulated LILCO does not have the legal authority to usurp police powers in directing traffic or other activities. FEMA signed a contract with Theodore, Barry and Associates of California on September 29 to

prepare the development of the exercise. That contract indicates that "LILCO will develop the basic exercise scenario."

Consider this: LILCO will help develop the scenario for the test which will evaluate them and their plan; the "test" will only focus on a limited aspect of the total evacuation proposal; local governments will not participate, with outsiders in their place; no people will be moved, instead computer models of traffic movement will be utilized. Carney will find no fatal flaw in all of this for one simple reason: The areas in which fatal flaws might be expected will not be tested.

For example, there will be no scared residents on the roadways fleeing a plume of radiation. There will be no young children, evacuated from school, sitting in an empty house while their neighbors scurry to safety. There will be no movement of elderly from nursing homes, or patients from hospitals. There will be no actual traffic jams, people rushing around trying to gather members of their families, cars out of gas, breakdowns, accidents other than make believe mishaps in a computer. The fatal flaw is the fact that the portion of the plan that simply can't work will not be tested. The fatal flaw is the fact that Carney simply won't recognize that fact.

Carney, becoming animated, his face reddening, and his voice rising, supported the test, exclaiming: "We should go forward, make that final determination so we can say we can or can't evacuate without local government. What are they afraid of? If so certain, why do they fear this test? What are they afraid of? We should find out." The fatal flaw is that Carney knows all too well that the NRC will take the partial results from a partial test and use them as an excuse to give the plant a full power license. If Carney doesn't know that, he has lost touch with reality. If he does, and doesn't care, he should resign and take a job with

LILCO, which seems to be his first priority.

Carney, at another point, insisted it would be illegal if the NRC and FEMA did not conduct the test. There was no basis of truth in those words. In fact, the court, an NRC licensing board and an NRC appeals board have ruled that LILCO does not have legal authority to assume the roles they project in their plan, which utilizes company employees in place of police. The fatal flaw is the fact that Carney misstated the truth. In our view deliberately.

Carney, Congressman Norman Lent of Nassau County, and congressmen from California, Florida and Utah argued that the test would produce "worthwhile results." They didn't say what. We think the fatal flaw is the fact the results will be worthwhile only for LILCO. The NRC will operate from the theory that local officials will participate if an accident happens. The NRC has no right to do that, and we're certain a court will rule that way in the future.

The fatal flaw is the fact that Lent expressed concern only that "Shoreham is being held hostage by the local yokels who won't partici-

pate" in the evacuation. He went so far as to declare that Shoreham is a matter of national security, because the perpetuation of nuclear energy is a matter of national energy policies. The fatal flaw is that this man mentioned not one concern about the safety of the people. Nor did Carney worry about that. They're playing games with people's lives. Make-believe evacuation games.

Last week's meeting was called by Congressman Edward Markey of Massachusetts, chairman of the subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power, at the request of Congressmen Thomas Downey and Mrazek, who opposed in forceful terms the holding of the test, declaring it to be an expensive sham. They took the side of the people, expressing concern for their welfare.

The representative of the First Congressional District, Carney, spoke on behalf of the utility and not of the people. The fact that the nuclear plant lies within his district makes his voice important to the people in Washington. He has failed his constituents. He has earned their scorn. The sooner we are rid of him the better.

And why not?

Government Reform Needed

We have just gone through our twentieth year of listening to can-didates, both incumbents and challengers, discuss government and why they were the best candidate. During these interviews a nagging thought kept coming to mind, our government is good, but needs to be made more responsive. This system needs rejuvenation.

We watched many public officials who had been in office too long try to justify the continuation of their existence. Many of them were tired, burned out and, most notably, unchallenged. They had become career politicians, milking the system for what they could get out of it rather than having the burning desire and zest to make the system work for the people they asked to support them.

In the legislature, whether it be county, state or federal, the system works to reward seniority. To obtain senority, it's a cardinal rule that you must go along to get along. Independent voices, new ideas, fresh approaches are forbidden from

freshmen legislators.

The leaders of both parties have cut a comfortable little deal: "You wash my hand, I'll wash yours." The minority gets a lesser amount of the patronage, the majority gets the max. Inside deals are cut on a regular basis, deals that have the blessing of both leaders. Legislators who truly want to speak out are regulated, by mutual agreement of both parties, to, literally, the back end of the aisle. They have the smallest offices, the smallest budgets to work with, and their staffs are miniscule compared to those who can be counted on to go along with the leadership.

Not every vote is equal in either the county, federal or state legislature. The leadership keeps the boys in line. Committees, where legislators can garner power, are an earned right of seniority and team play. Those that play the game the best end up with the best assign-

ments. Those who survive into their second term who are rebels, innovators, reformers, are regulated to the least important committees, where their voice is muffled and can't be heard. As time goes on these legislators lose their zest to fight. They become like the rest, content to pick the bones, smile pretty, kiss babies and concentrate on getting re-elected. The operation of our government is left to the few that are in leadership positions.

The answer to this dilemma is quite simple, although it will probably never be enacted without a constitutional amendment, limit the terms of office of all elected officials. On a local level, two four-year-terms should be enough for supervisor. Three for supervisor. Three two-year-terms for councilmen. State Assembly should not serve any more than three two-year-terms. State Senator, two four-year terms, or one six year with the possibility of recall. The same goes for Congress, a maximum of three terms for Congressmen. One six year term, with recall provisions for, or two four-year-terms for United States Senate. If a candidate felt a calling to remain in public service, he could always move on and upward, leaving the town and moving to county, state or federal positions. New faces and new ideas would bring the fresh blood desperately needed in govern-

There once was a concept of public service in this country that a man would take a few years out of his life to serve. He would go into office, give a few years of service and get out. Salaries were such that you could not make a decent living. Once you made your contribution to the society that had nutured you, you returned to whatever field or endeavor you had come from.

The salaries we pay our elected officials today are too attractive. Most legislative postions, by law, are

SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS and Suffolk County Life



318,000 Circulation Weekly

David J. Willmott-Editor and Publisher

Linda Conaughty - Systems Manager
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director
Claire Swanik-National Sales Director
Robert J. Andrews-Dir. of Marketing
Victor Prusinowski-Dir. of Cust. Relations
Subscription Rate In Suffolk County. 14.99 per year Outside Suffolk County. 17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales, 25 per issue.

Suffolk County Lite, In Suffolk County 19.9 per year. Outside Suffolk County 19.9 per year. Outside Suffolk County 19.9 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

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.

Cont. on page 4

David J. Willmott, Editor

A Boy Scout is Trustworthy

Last Sunday we had the pleasure of attending an Eagle Scout Court of Honor in which a friend's son was inducted as an Eagle Scout. It was a provement for the young man, for exparents, his brothers and his grandmother, as it was for all of us who were in attendance. Becoming an Eagle Scout is the result of years of dedication, commitment, de-termination and adherence to the Scout oath, laws, rules and regulations.

One of the keynotes of scouting from Tenderfoot to Eagle is that a scout is trustworthy. One of the dignitaries who spoke at this occasion was Congressman William Carney. After his spectacle of disloyalty to his constituents at the recent F.E.M.A. hearing, we could not but think how hypocritical it was for him to take part in this ceremony. Honesty, loyalty, trustworthiness, the basis of scouting all thrown out the window by William Carney.

Carney lied when he told the

F.E.M.A. officials that the people of Long Island want a test. How far from the truth can you get? Carney lied and showed his disloyalty to the

people when he said that holding this test imposed by a federal agency is not going against the will and the intent of the president's letter which he used in his bid for reelection.

Trust is what his constituents had in him, trust that he would represent their viewpoint, protect them from the bureaucracy in Washington. Yet, here just a few days before this Court of Honor, he displayed the most blatant misuse of trust that any congressman from the First Congressional District has ever perpetrated on his constituents.

Bill Carney has been promised a job or a position for selling out his constituents, this only goes to prove that every man has his price. There is not much that anybody can do to change Bill Carney at this point. It's too much to ask that he resign, because he still has the Long Island Lighting Company's bidding to do. But, Bill Carney, please refrain from holding yourself out to impressionable young men who truly believe in trustworthiness, honor and honesty.

And why not?

Another State Fiasco

As if we don't have enough problems trying to prevent the bureaucracy of the federal level pushing an unsafe nuclear plant down our throats, now we have the bureaucracy of the state level telling us that some of our fragile lands would make ideal sites for an ashfill dumping site, one that would handle the remains of garbage from all of Long

It wouldn't be so bad if all we were dealing with were the bureaucratic appointees who fiddle away the time in state agencies, trying to justify their salaries. The ashfill problem, however, comes our way as the result of legislation sponsored and supported by public officials elected by the very people who are now being dumped upon.

If this problem wasn't so serious, it could be downright funny. The local town governments, who have the responsibility of doing something with the garbage produced by their residents, are constantly told by the state level what they can and can't do. The state government never provides the dollars to do what they say must be done, just the edicts which they constantly change.

In 1983, the state legislators--including those we sent up to Albany-decided the towns must phase out their landfills, facilities that the state said many years before were the answer to our garbage problems. These legislators didn't say what the towns should do with their garbage, of course, nor did they provide the bucks to do something, anything. They just legislated: close the landfills!

the state legislators--including those we sent up to Albany--are telling us that one ashfill to take all of Long Island's incinerated garbage will solve all our problems. And they have managed very nicely to manipulate things so that this ashfill won't go in Nassau County, or in western Suffolk. Their plan is to stuff it down the throats of those in eastern Long Island, where fewer people live. Fewer people make less political noise, you see.

Somewhere along the line our state legislators seem to have forgotten that they represent the same people the towns do. They have adopted the attitude that because they are state legislators they know all the answers. The truth is they hardly know what the problems are, and certainly do not know the problems of the towns because they rarely, if ever, sit down with town officials in an attempt to evaluate the problems and possible solutions.

They simply legislate from on high. Some, and Assemblyman Bill Bianchi is a prime example, seem to constantly use their state position to hurl political barbs back at the local officials, especially if those local officials are of the opposite political party. In the heat of an angry civic gathering in Yaphank last week, Bianchi sent his aide to declare Bianchi is opposed to the selection of a Yaphank site for a regional landfill. To hear Bianchi's logic, the whole landfill problem is the fault of Brookhaven Town because they have taken no action to solve the problem of where garbage is to go when the mandated closing of the landfills takes place. Our guess is he was trying to take the heat off himself for being a prime sponsor of the faulted ashfill legislation by trying to blame the town. From the reaction of the crowd, it didn't work.

From the anger we have been hearing about the effort to dump all of the waste from Long Island's incinerated garbage on prime lands in eastern Suffolk, it is clear that our state officials who supported this legislation are in big trouble. Their "stick it to the towns" track record is going to come back to haunt them. The politicians to the west outfoxed our local legislators by manipulating the site selection process to keep ashfill sites out of their own territory, earmarking these sites, instead, to eastern Suffolk.

A county plan has emerged that recommends the creation of a number of sites rather than one. That would make Nassau responsible for its own ash, and western Suffolk responsible for its own. This is the most logical solution. Our advice to politicians in Nassau and western Suffolk is to "keep your ash in your own territory.'

And why not?

Happy Thanksgiving

We are a world of complainers. We love to look at a glass and complain that it is only half full, when we should be looking at it and say gratefully it is only half empty.

Thanksgiving gives us this op-portunity to look around us, to take stock, to be appreciative of the bounties that we take for granted but enjoy on a daily basis. Our friends and our family whose love and respect we enjoy but never think of their incredible value. All the wonderful things we do have we should thank God profusely for. No matter how smart we are or how hard we are able to work to acquire the things we want, it is only through his grace.

As we gather with our families, our friends and celebrate our Thanksgiving meal, let each of us start this festive occasion by joining hands and thanking God for his bless-

And why not?

SUFFOLK

NEWSPAPERS and Sulfolk County Life



318,000 Circulation Weekly

David J. Willmott-Editor and Publisher

Linda Conaughty - Systems Manag Sharman Gordon-Adv. Art Director Joan Sullivan-News/Art Director Angela Gingo-Director of Sales Mgt., Planning & Co-Op Advertising

Bill Johnson-Director of Printing and Distribution Duane Sundquist-Circulation Manager Sharman Gordon-Adv. Art Director obert J. Andrews-Dir. of Marketing ober J. O

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.

Letters to the Editor

Disapproval of ashfill site

Dear Mr. Hartman:

In further reviewing the Generic Impact Statement on the Long Island Regional Ashfill, my concern and disapproval over a potential site in Jamesport, New York has magnified considerably.

The impact statement clearly points out that the rail transportation of wastes to the ashfill will be introduced in an effort to limit the demand on Long Island's roads of additional haul trucks. The report also outlines planning needs for such a rail transportation system which include increased maintenance of existing tracks, back-up storage facilities if tracks are temporarily unavailable, the potential for leakages of wastes, increased noise pollution from diesel engines and finally, community opposition to increased freight service.

After my initial review of the impact state-

ment I expressed concern over the burdensome traffic load to the local road network. I now would add that railroading waste, expecially in the Riverhead/Jamesport area, further enhances a traffic dilemma. Our railroad system is not suspended on trestles, but is instead, networked on ground level. As a result, during operation all railroad crossings will interfere with local vehicular traffic as well as the increased traffic of some sixty (60) trucks hauling waste to the site daily. It would seem much more sensible to consider areas with established overhead trestle crossings as the site selection process continues.

Your continued time and consideration regarding this matter is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours, Gregory J. Blass

Legislator

מושע של נמחוווק מ נטטה מנ עול