

Open Letter To President Reagan

Dear President Reagan:

A few weeks back we wrote to you in reference to our concerns and those of our readers' over the opening of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. We have not heard back from you. We didn't expect we would. It could be said that Shoreham is a local issue, too case-specific for the President of the United States to comment on individually. This may be true, but Shoreham is symbolic of all nuclear power plants in the nation.

Our concern over Shoreham is not only with a utility that we have no faith in, but also with the N.R.C. which we and many others feel has failed the people of the United States. We are looking to the President of the United States for some words of assurance. We are looking for Ronald Reagan, the Ronald Reagan we have followed since his involvement with the ill-fated Goldwater campaign. The man who spoke of a love for this country, the government and for the people. Who implored the people to make this system work by taking part in it, by using their vote and their voice to raise the conscience of the elected officials to address the issues of their concern.

Those of us who have followed the actions of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have seen an agency that tragically has

a dual conflicting role as both promoter and regulator of the industry. Throw in the human element, the proliferation and protection of one's job and the regulatory aspect of the agency is weakened to a point that it becomes counterproductive.

We have watched the N.R.C. consistently change rules and regulations and sidestep laws to do what is convenient regardless of the safety ramifications for people. This seriously concerns us as we hope it will concern you, for the N.R.C. sits at your pleasure.

Mr. President, the residents of Long Island are asking for you to speak out with a firm, authoritative voice and assure us that if re-elected you personally will see that the N.R.C. is divorced from its role as promoter of nuclear energy, and it, or a new agency, will become a feverish promoter of public safety. We need this assurance from you.

We understand that you will be here on Long Island making a political appearance. Why not use this time and opportunity to address the single most important issue of concern to Long Islanders: the failure of the N.R.C.

And why not?
Sincerely,
David J. Willmott
Editor and Publisher

Agency, the biggest promoters of nuclear energy in the country.

We common folks looked to the N.R.C. to regulate. Stupid and naive we have been, for the N.R.C. admitted during the Shoreham hearings that it depends upon the ethics and the integrity of the utility for 99% compliance with its rules and regulations. Ask any Long Islander how much they trust the management of LILCO, you will find few takers.

During Governor Cuomo's Shoreham Commission hearings, Billy Carney never appeared personally as either a witness or a spectator. He didn't even have the common sense, or the interest, to send a staff member to monitor this fact-finding panel's attempt to separate truth from fiction.

Carney has steadfastly maintained a feverish belief in the N.R.C. and the management of LILCO. Now, lo and behold, at the eleventh hour, the sleeping politician has awakened and come to the realization that if 68% of the population firmly opposes the opening of Shoreham, which he has favored, he might be in political trouble. If he had common or good political sense he would have paid attention to the mail from his constituents, and realized that for the past several years they have been imploring him to use his office to insist that the N.R.C. do what it was created to do, be a firm regulator of the nuclear industry rather than a promoter. He would have been the first to call out, with a loud voice, in protest against the N.R.C.'s efforts to circumvent the laws, and proposals to change the laws to make the circumstances fit the N.R.C.'s changing criteria for safety which, in recent times, is designed to favor the utilities rather than protect the public.

It's interesting to see Carney's reversal, and now his new stand that he is in favor of a locally approved emergency evacuation zone. Could it be that Billy Carney has been informed by the N.R.C. that it is reducing the 10-mile radius to three miles so as to allow LILCO to qualify for an emergency evacuation plan? We think this is exactly the case, and we further think that if Billy Carney buys this unadulterated bull, he is even more phony than we thought he was.

The N.R.C. may say that it now has discovered that only people within three miles of the plant must evacuate. It doesn't mean that the people are going to believe it. You can bet your sweet bippy that when those sirens go off and the radio announcements report there has been an accident at Shoreham, most people with an ounce of common sense in central and eastern Suffolk are going to get out while the getting is good.

We are not about to wait for some N.R.C. bureaucrat or sleeping congressman to say to us, "Oh! We are sorry you got radiated 15 miles away from the plant. We made a little mistake in our calculations in our rush to give LILCO an operating license that forced you folks to pay for its mistakes."

Carney's big lie technique in trying to paint Hochbrueckner's position as pro-Shoreham is ludicrous. Hochbrueckner was personally in attendance at many of the Shoreham Commission meetings both as a spectator and a witness, when he was not there in a representative way. He proposed innovative ideas to cut the cost of electricity for Long Island ratepayers. During the years we have interviewed Hochbrueckner for his Assembly seat, we have asked questions of him in relation to Shoreham. Three or four years ago, he was lukewarm, as most people were in their opposition. During the past four years, Hochbrueckner has been strongly opposed to the opening of Shoreham, and the impact both from a health and financial viewpoint that would be imposed not only on his constituents, but all Long Islanders.

Hochbrueckner, on the other hand, has a record of action, not idle big lies at election time. Let the record be clear: Billy Carney has done nothing tangible as a congressman to protect the safety of Long Islanders from potential health and safety dangers of Shoreham. By his silence he has given support to the increases in rates LILCO has imposed upon you. And by his verbal expressions of support for Shoreham he must bear a major portion of the responsibility for the financial crisis that will be created if Shoreham goes on line and the ratepayers get stuck with the bill.

Voters in the First Congressional District will have an opportunity in the November elections to decide this most important question: Do they want a congressman who has turned his back on his constituents in favor of the utilities and nuclear industry, which rewards his favors with generous political contributions?

Or: Do they want a man, as is Hochbrueckner, who has in word, action and proposed legislation shown genuine concern for the safety and financial problems that threaten all of us in the future?

If Carney has his way, those evacuation sirens that dot our neighborhoods may yet sound an alarm to run for safety. If Hochbrueckner's view—that Shoreham should not open—prevails, they could be silenced forever.

We think the choice is clear.
And why not?

When The Truth Hurts, Lie!

Unfortunately, but true, this is the axiom of politicians in trouble. Adolph Hitler perfected it during the thirties. Tell a lie often enough and loud enough, and people will become confused.

In desperation, the "Big Lie" technique has been integrated into Congressman Billy Carney's re-election campaign. We hope the voters won't be confused by Carney's brazen attempt to now

picture himself as a Shoreham opponent, and George Hochbrueckner, his opponent, who is a genuine Shoreham opponent, as a supporter.

Carney now says that he, all along, has been in favor of a locally approved evacuation plan. That's about as far from the truth as you can get. What is the truth is that Carney has been a 100% supporter of the Nuclear Regulatory

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 24 NO. 7

NEWSPAPERS and Suffolk County Life

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

Suffolk Life is published in 18 market zone editions every Wednesday

North Fork
Riverhead
Hampton East
Mid-hampton
Westhampton
Moriches

Patchogue
Medford
Holbrook/Holtsville
Sayville
Oakdale
Ronkonkoma

Centerarch
Selden
Coram
Mastic/Shirley

Rocky Point
Port Jefferson
Three Village



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

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 Conaughy - Adv. Art Director
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$7.00 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.

Political Influence Loophole

There's a loophole in the law which mandates full disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures that permits political parties to solicit and collect contributions from individuals and special interest groups who have specific axes to grind. The loophole offers a safe sanctuary for

political contributions to go unreported, hidden from public view. If there is ever to be public confidence in the political system, this loophole must be closed. The chances are, however, it won't be for very obvious political reasons.

The loophole permits the crea-

Cont. on page 4

Political Influence . . .

Cont. from page 3

tion of a "Housekeeping Account" that is used to pay the expenses of political party operations. These funds cannot, under law, be used for political campaigns. That restriction, we suppose, is designed to prevent special interest groups of people seeking self vested interests—such as zone changes—from influencing the actions of elected officials. But what about political leaders? Aren't they influenced by big bucks? And don't they have some influence with the elected officials? And wouldn't they use it to encourage more donations? If your answer to those questions is "yes," you're correct!

Consider this: Political leaders in some towns, most especially those in western Suffolk, receive salaries for their leadership activities. Since those salaries come out of the headquarter's operational expenses—and thus the housekeeping funds—these leaders are directly benefitting from unrecorded donations. Those donations could come from

developers who just might want a favor in return. Or from special interest groups regulated by elected officials who are under the thumb of the political leader.

Consider the plight of the legislator who does not follow political orders when it comes time for re-nomination. Or when a needed project comes up in his district—remember the Sewer Legislators who followed political orders to punish those who did not support the sales tax hike for the Southwest Sewer District?

If a political leader wants a salary increase, all he need do is wheel and deal to up the ante for the housekeeping account. Who will know? Expect for the leader and the giver, and they are not likely to offer such information willingly.

In Brookhaven Town, during the trial of former councilman Steven Burke on bribery charges (Burke was acquitted of those charges), a stir was raised when Burke made mention of a "slush fund" where money can go unre-

ported. Town officials insisted they had no knowledge of any slush fund. Burke clarified that later to indicate he was making reference to the Housekeeping Account.

Recent reports concerning campaign contributions from those in the carting industry in Babylon Town revealed that carters were donating more than the election law limits stipulated, and those contributions went into the housekeeping account in Babylon to pay the operating expenses of the Babylon Town Republican Party headquarters. There are differing reports as to how much the carters donated. One official said about \$40,000, while another put the figure at the \$50,000 level.

While law stipulates that these funds cannot be used for campaign purposes, they indirectly are. Political parties must rely on donations to exist—that's how they get the funds to stay involved in politics, to keep their political machines alive. Not all donations are specifically earmarked to a particular candidate, some go to the party for general use. If there were no funds secreted away in a housekeeping account, the party would have to use some of its general donations to maintain its operations. Since the housekeeping fund donors provide the bucks for this purpose, the party is free to use the general donations to bolster the campaigns in need of the most help.

The campaign financing laws

were put into place to eliminate the possibility of someone peddling political influence for personal gain. If, for example, utilities pump huge sums of money into a candidate's campaign, that knowledge is a signal to watch how that candidate—if elected—deals with issues involving utilities. But if you don't know how much the political leaders are secreting away in the housekeeping accounts, and where it is coming from, as is currently the case, we haven't really shut the door on political wheeling and dealing.

We should. But we're not optimistic. Do we have any elected officials on the state level who would dare to invoke the wrath of political leaders by proposing an amendment to the law that would close this loophole, and prevent our political leaders from hiding those questionable donations that are too touchy to stand the scrutiny of public exposure?

And while they're at it, they might also consider proposing a state law that would hold political leaders accountable for influence peddling, and liable to criminal charges when they are caught wheeling and dealing?

It's time, we think, to put some insurance of integrity back into the world of politics by taking away the loopholes, and stop allowing our political leaders to escape—as some have—punishment for exchanging political favors for financial reward.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

"They are birds of a feather"

Dear Sir:

Re: Fooling the Voters (Sept. 19, 1984).

Your last sentence covers Mr. Carney's sins beautifully, especially for us senior citizens.

Some time ago you wrote an open note to President Reagan. Did he answer?

President Reagan said he was happy to have Mr. Carney on his side.

As far as we Suffolk senior citizens are concerned, they are birds of a feather.

As I watched Jim Jensen on Channel 2

last night, I was very pleased to see that the Nassau senior citizens are doing something about their unfair treatment by the Republicans.

I think we Suffolk senior citizens should do likewise.

Please print any suggestions. Thanking you in advance,

Yours truly,
Sidney Schwartz
Riverhead

"America is a great country"

Dear Sir:

Yesterday at the East Hampton station I picked up "Suffolk Summer Life" before boarding train number nine (9:58 a.m.) for New York City.

The third car, "No Smoking," was air conditioned to Siberian cold. The second car, "Smoking," was tolerably warm. Both were ancient, dilapidated cars.

Car number one was one of the former parlor cars. Access to it was barred by a chain.

As soon as the conductor came I requested access to this clean, warm, comfortable car. This access was denied to me.

I asked the conductor for his name, which he refused to give to me, other than identifying himself as conductor of train number nine. And as such, he told me, he had the prerogative (that was the word he used) to bar the public from any car he desired.

My car filled with smoke and became colder and colder.

Each time he came by I complained. He suggested I use the Jitney.

Finally he also addressed himself to my accent and asked where I came from.

"Germany," I said.

"We rebuilt your country," he told me.

"Only after first, at much greater cost, destroying it," I countered.

And that was where we remained.

On the platform in Jamaica other passengers told me that Germany had good railroads because the government ran them.

I countered that Amtrak, as far as I know, is government sponsored. Still, they said, it was a corporation. (Does that mean corporations don't know how to manage?)

While incensed on the train, I read the excellent article by Michael Agostino, "Filling the World's Abyss."

My husband and I spent an entire summer without a car, giving me ample opportunity to test "public transportation" and to get angrier and angrier.

I am a woman, age 52. I have a driver's license, very little driving experience, slow reflexes, and I approach at this point the L.I.E. with fear and trepidation.

(Tomorrow I am attending the funeral of a close friend, a man, age 46, killed in a collision with a truck.)

I feel strongly we must fight for better and faster trains, for buses, and for bicycle paths.

Long Island's flat—ideally suited to bicycling.

Yet, on my road (Springs Banks), all the Porsches and Ferraris and what-not that were restrained on the L.I.E. by police, at last can "enjoy" their "power" on this narrow and winding road, where I bicycle!

Well folks, I am not sorry I came to America back in 1951. America is a great

country. And thank God, I still hope and pray, immune to dictatorship.

Still I agree we must do a lot of fighting to make it better.

M.L. Goldscheider
East Hampton

P.S. I also enjoyed Sharmon Gordon and Kevin Alter and others. You have a great team.

"Has gone too far to be ignored"

To the Editor:

This is in regard to the letter concerning the stringent penalties of drunk driving:

After reading the [letter] entitled "Is this America" (September 12 edition), it has come to our attention of the neglect and misinformation which this "reader" has on the problem of driving drunk in our society. While driving under the influence, not only are you endangering yourself, but also the lives of innocent people who happen to cross your path. Approximately 25,000 people die on our roads due to alcohol each year, while 50 per cent of all accidents are alcohol related. This problem has gone too far to be ignored. Logically, the only way to control this problem is to inconvenience the

offender.

Although this crime had no injuries, does this classify it as a "good crime"? No! The state has granted each one of us the privilege to drive and in turn we must show our responsibility on the road. Endangering other people's LIVES is enough cause to "rehabilitate" even the most sane driver. Which would you prefer—a 14-week course and the parting of 200-plus dollars or the brutal murders of countless innocent people? We leave it for you to decide.

Sincerely,
James A. Christy
President
SADD, Mattituck High School
Catherine M. Christy

"Truly a 'moving experience'"

Dear Dave:

I write to thank you for your continued generous coverage of the activities of the Family Counseling Service of the Hampton Council of Churches, Inc. In particular, you and your staff were most helpful to the success of "A Moving Experience," our auction and party at the home of Miss Elisabeth Remsen. Your feature story and follow-up articles and pictures were deeply appreciated.

We are also indebted to Miss Elisabeth Remsen who was our Honorary Chairperson and who offered her lovely estate for the event, to Hugh O'Brian who was the first recipient of our "Family of Man" award, to Bill Beutel who was the auctioneer, to John Blaney for donating the Reynolds House, and to Lou Aeur and Tina Santi Flaherty for their superb inspiration and leadership as

co-chairpersons.

We want to thank all of our special benefactors who supported us as "Big Movers," "Movers," and "Patrons," our many corporate sponsors who provided the wonderful items that were auctioned and that filled our over-flowing tote bags, the Follet Funeral Home for supplying a tent, and Chief Teller for his assistance.

As executive director of the Family Counseling Service, I wish to express my gratitude to all of the committee for donating precious summer vacation time and to all in the community who supported what was truly a "moving experience."

Sincerely yours,
George W. Busler
Executive Director
The Family Counseling Service
Westhampton Beach

A Meaningless "Commitment"

Congressman William Carney held a press conference last week to announce he had obtained from President Reagan a commitment that the federal government would not impose an evacuation for Shoreham over the objections of state and county governments. According to Carney and several political cohorts who appeared at his side, this commitment will prevent the licensing of Shoreham without a locally approved evacuation plan in place. In our view, Carney's claims and the President's "commitment" are meaningless, nothing more than a political ploy to bail Carney out of what could well be a losing race for re-election.

This is what the President said: "... this Administration does not favor the imposition of Federal Government authority over the objections of state and local governments in matters regarding the adequacy of an emergency evacuation plan for a nuclear power plant such as Shoreham."

This is what he didn't say: Reagan did not say he would take any action to halt hearings being conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the LILCO evacuation plan (LERO), the only utility created evacuation plan which would use utility employees to direct an evacuation which has ever been considered.

According to an NRC spokesman, Joseph Fouchard, director of the NRC's public affairs bureau in Washington, "the commission proceedings on the Shoreham case are continuing. The NRC is an independent agency. The commissioners are the judges in this case. The adequacy of the LERO plan is the subject of their deliberations." If the NRC approves the LILCO plan, the Reagan administration would not have to "impose" a plan, the NRC would do the job for him.

Nor did Reagan say he would guarantee that the NRC would not

approve a low power license for Shoreham. In fact, an NRC meeting on low power authorization is set for November 1, although that may well be delayed until after the election to prevent the creation of an unhappy mood in the minds of voters here in Suffolk until after the ballots are cast. The same NRC memo which sets the November 1 authorization meeting also notes a date of December 1, 1984 for "initial criticality" (fuel loading) at the Shoreham plant. Will Reagan's "commitment" stop that from happening?

Without these two assurances, the president has promised nothing, and Carney is blatantly attempting to mislead the people. And his political cohorts who have declared the president's "commitment" has shut the door on Shoreham have either been hoodwinked or are also misleading the public.

Just last Friday, a news story on the final actions of Congress meeting in special session to deal with appropriations included a little blurb that reported that the House and the Senate had passed a measure that continues the NRC's authority to license a nuclear power plant without an evacuation plan in place. Billy Carney joined his fellow congressmen and senators in passing this measure by a voice vote. If he is indeed opposed to opening Shoreham, he could have opposed that measure. He didn't. Mr. Carney, actions speak louder than words.

The NRC had a very busy week, by the way. It granted an operating license to the Bryant nuclear power plant, which had been the only plant ever denied a license by the NRC. That denial came because of serious concerns about the quality of construction at the plant.

Victor Gilinski, a former NRC commissioner, in a speech to Congress just before his retirement, outlined how he had found the staff of the NRC meeting to try to

find ways to re-open the hearings and circumvent the regulations that had led to the denial of this power plant's license. If you can't change the quality of the construction, or the danger to the safety of the people, change the rules and the regulations to eliminate the safety requirements. That's the way the NRC staff operates.

The NRC, also this past week, announced that in its wisdom it has decided that the people in the New York City area, 25 miles from Indian Point I, are in no danger of being radiated in case of an accident at this facility. Because some bureaucrats, whose jobs are at stake, make this decision does not mean that the facts they used were correct, or that their conclusions were proper. The facts that we have seen say otherwise: that in the case of a worse case accident, the people in the northern New York City area, with a northerly prevailing wind, are in grave danger. If there is a rain storm or a snow storm during this accident, with the right wind conditions, New York City would be a radiated hotbed.

In the Three Mile Island report, radiation attributable to the Three Mile accident was found in milk in cows as far away as Vermont. And there have been recent reports of a study which claims the area downwind of the plant during the accident has a cancer rate seven times higher than normal.

The NRC is the agency that Billy Carney places all his faith in. The NRC, and its staff, is the agency that Billy Carney has turned over your safety to.

In the questionnaire published by Suffolk Life last week, Bill Carney's position on the NRC and Shoreham is unequivocally presented. Of the four Congressional candidates in the two districts, Billy Carney is the only candidate who feels that the NRC has provided adequate safeguards for the Shoreham nuclear power plant. Obviously, Billy Carney never read or listened to one bit of testimony by the NRC, or by expert

witnesses or people who are involved in the construction of the facility.

The NRC admitted at the Cuomo Commission hearings that it was impossible for them to check or inspect more than one per cent of the plant. They relied 99 per cent upon the integrity of the Long Island Lighting Company's management for compliance with rules and regulations.

Billy Carney continues to show his ignorance and lack of thought by having faith in a "paper" evacuation drill that does not take into consideration actual reactions of people, and has predetermined results as an outcome.

Carney supports the NRC's expediting the regulatory process because of the utility's financial plight. What this means, folks, is that Carney puts the company's financial health ahead of the public's safety. Get the thing making money, and then we will see if it is safe for the people.

Readers, is that stupidity, arrogance, or just plain lack of concern for human life? We recommend that our readers study Carney's answers to all the energy and Shoreham questions. In his answers you will find contempt for his constituents, disregard for human life and pursuit of the almighty buck.

Shoreham has drawn out the real Billy Carney, but to those of us who have followed him as Congressman it comes as no surprise. He has consistently turned his back on the needs of his district, whether it be the dredging of our inlets to siding with the West Coast tuna industries and failing to get tuna included in the 200-mile limit off our shores. From ignoring our plight during the gas shortage to the needs of our senior citizens.

Carney has probably been the most dismal failure of any elected official and his arrogance on Shoreham makes him the most dangerous man to our health and government.

And why not?

Make It A Safe Halloween

Halloween is just a week away. As a kid, it was one of our favorite holidays. We got to stay out later than normal, use our imagination in developing costumes, received loads of candy and other goodies and, once in a while, even pulled a trick or two. It was an innocent fun night that we and our friends looked forward to with great joy.

Unfortunately, some sick minds have turned the past few Halloweens into nightmares. The November 1st paper will carry stories of kids poisoned and in-

jured by eating broken glass, pins and metal objects inserted by sickos into goodies they hand out to kids.

We ourselves this year will not give candy or fruit as we have done in past years. We will use coupons for hamburgers, soda and ice cream, or we will give change. To us it makes sense to give a gift to children that they will have no fear in using.

Let's put safety and fun back in Halloween.

And why not?

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 24 NO. 9

NEWSPAPERS and Suffolk County Life

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

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday

North Fork	Patchogue	Centereach	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hampton East	Holbrook/Holtsville	Coram	Three Village
Mid-Hampton	Sayville	Mastic/Shirley	
Westhampton	Oakdale		
Moriches	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

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: \$7.00 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.

Readers' Opinion

Dear Editor:

William Catacinos, poly-urethane puppeteer of frightening skill, has the whole island on his strings. Unless we cut them, we will be paying him enormous

sums of money for having written a script which we then dance to despite ourselves.

Yours truly,
Marcia Slatkin
Shoreham