

## Where Was George?

During the Democratic Convention and the Democrats' evaluation of Vice-President George Bush's activities in the Reagan administration, the Democrats had a lot of fun shouting out, "Where was George?" In light of recent happenings, that question must be raised again.

Then The Suffolk County Republican Committee held their annual Suffolk County Reception last week in Melville, with a stand-in, United States Senator John McCrain of Arizona, speaking on behalf of Bush.

But where was George?

Is George hiding? Is he afraid to show his face here on Long Island because he is ashamed of his stand on Shoreham? Bush said recently that local levels of government, state or county, should not have veto powers over the siting of nuclear power plants. That means, of course, that the federal government, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, should have all the say, and the local representatives of the people should have none.

Where was George? Is he ashamed of facing the people of Long Island in the wake of the recent NRC decision which ousts the state, the county, and Southampton Town as intervenors in the battle over the legitimacy of the LILCO evacuation plan? The decision by an NRC licensing panel which ignored the safety of the public in giving LILCO's plan its official blessing, and authorizes a full power license for the plant?

Where was George when the NRC arrogantly changed the rules of the game to remove obstacles from the path of approval for the Shoreham license? When it declared it would "presume" local officials would participate in an evacuation emergency in the event of an accident at the plant? Why has George remained

silent when the NRC presumes an evacuation will work when intelligent people know it will not?

Where was George? And where was the courage and concern of Republican Party leaders who have allowed George to duck the issue rather than face the people? Are they ashamed of the man who heads their ticket? Are they so afraid that George will not have adequate answers about the administration's pro-Shoreham activities? Are the Republicans a party of the people? Or are they gutless politicians who share George's lack of concern for the welfare of the people?

Words are cheap, and we have been hearing a lot of them in this current campaign. Words about what George will do if he is elected president. Will George run and hide when the going gets tough on other issues? How can he talk about human rights in other countries when he has shown so little regard for the rights of Long Island residents?

Suffolk's Republicans who support Bush have said, "Sure, Shoreham is an important issue, but there are many other issues on which we agree with George Bush." Sure, there are other important issues. But how important will they be if Shoreham goes on line, there is an accident, and our people are forced to flee for their safety? Will George Bush's positions on Star Wars, health programs, deficits, taxes, or whatever, be of comfort to our people when they are stalled in a gridlock of traffic trying to evacuate?

Where was George? We don't know where he was on the night of the big Republican bash, but we know where he has been on the Shoreham issue: the wrong side. And we know that unless he has the courage to face the people whose safety he ignores, he doesn't have the

right to expect their support. The people have a right to expect a man who wants to be our president to have

the courage to face tough issues, rather than run and hide.

And why not?

## Halpin's Empty Promise

Patrick Halpin, in his quest to become county executive, repeatedly promised that he would cut county spending. He vowed he would not raise county taxes, in fact, he would cut them.

Halpin recently released his budget for 1988-1989. Although you can play games with numbers, and they are trying, there is one unescapable truth: the budget calls for a 100% increase in county property taxes. So much for campaign promises.

This should come as no surprise. Halpin had little or no administrative experience. He was an attractive candidate, but he didn't have substance, and his budget figures prove that point. It was plain to see right from the beginning that Halpin was in trouble. He brought people onto his staff without experience and without local knowledge. He offered salaries that were commensurate with years of experience to people who had been making far less in their former jobs. When he showed little desire to control his own budget for his own office, there was little hope that he could curtail spending throughout the rest of the county.

Despite his cries of fiscal crisis since he has assumed office, he has

not shown himself to be a man who is willing to eliminate wasteful spending, especially when he is the beneficiary of such spending. This is perfectly clear in his actions this summer, when he availed himself of a federally-owned home on Fire Island that, if offered on the open market, would bring \$200 to \$250 per day. Halpin, as county executive, paid \$35. To add insult to injury, Halpin kept a manned county police boat at his beck and call during his stay, ferrying him back and forth to the mainland, and to restaurants in other beach communities. This little indiscretion cost those of us who are Suffolk's taxpayers thousands of dollars in wasteful, needless costs.

Is this justice? Is this the kind of good government Halpin promised us? Lord knows what other little gems are hidden under the rocks that are contained in the pages of the county budget.

High salaries for inexperienced cronies, patronage plums for politically-connected individuals, and wasteful use of county equipment and personnel are prime examples of a mindset that had better change in a big hurry if this county is to financially survive.

And why not?

## No Four Year Terms

Politicians and officials in many of Suffolk County's towns are gleefully wringing their hands in anticipation of the voters approving a change in the term of office they hold from two to four years.

These politicians, including supervisors and highway superintendents, hope they have pulled a fast one on the voters. Since this is a presidential election year, they are counting on the voters not spending too much time in the voting booth or paying much attention to the ballot.

The issue will not get the coverage it should, and because of this lack of exposure they will be able to sneak these changes into law.

A term of office is equivalent to an employment contract. The difference is, with an employment contract, when somebody does a bad or a corrupt job or is insubordinate, there are provisions for removal. New York State does not have a recall provision whereby voters, when they have had enough, can call for a new election through petition. Here in New York we are stuck with our decision for the specified term of the office. No matter how bad a politician may be, how insulting he is to the voters, we can't remove him from office until his term has expired.

two year term. Through the proposition politicians have placed on the ballot this November, they want to extend their terms to four years, thus doubling the time they can be insulated from the voters. They argue that two years does not give them enough time to complete projects. As we well know, many elected officials, the good ones, serve as long as they want. In the case of bad ones, two years is too long to have to endure their inept or arrogant performance, and it just plain doesn't make any sense to keep them in an additional two years.

The bad elected officials are the only ones that gain from four year terms. Good two year officials are reelected without much sweat. If they are doing what the public wants, they are responsive to their needs, the voters keep them in office. If they don't or won't respond to the voters, why should we be stuck with them for two more additional years?

This November we encourage the electorate to turn down, resoundingly, all propositions relating to the extension of two year terms to four years. There is nothing in it for the voters, the citizens. It is self-serving for the politicians who put it on the ballot and should be rejected.

And why not?


Most elective positions carry a

# SUFFOLK LIFE

## NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

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

<p>Suffolk Life is published in 27 market zone editions every Wednesday</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Huntington Str./Melville</td> <td>Coram/Middle Island</td> <td>Mid Hampton</td> <td>Lindenhurst</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brentwood/Central Islip</td> <td>Bay Shore/West Islip</td> <td>Huntington</td> <td>Amthville</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ronkonkoma/Holbrook</td> <td>Centereach/Selden</td> <td>Rocky Point</td> <td>East Islip</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hauppauge/Nesconset</td> <td>Mastic/Moriches</td> <td>North Fork</td> <td>Medford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Three Village/Port Jeff</td> <td>Sayville/Oakdale</td> <td>Patchogue</td> <td>Babylon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commack/Kings Park</td> <td>Hampton West</td> <td>Riverhead</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Smithtown/St. James</td> <td>Hampton East</td> <td>Northport</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Huntington Str./Melville	Coram/Middle Island	Mid Hampton	Lindenhurst	Brentwood/Central Islip	Bay Shore/West Islip	Huntington	Amthville	Ronkonkoma/Holbrook	Centereach/Selden	Rocky Point	East Islip	Hauppauge/Nesconset	Mastic/Moriches	North Fork	Medford	Three Village/Port Jeff	Sayville/Oakdale	Patchogue	Babylon	Commack/Kings Park	Hampton West	Riverhead		Smithtown/St. James	Hampton East	Northport		<p>Total Circulation audited and verified in excess of <b>495,336 Circulation Weekly</b></p> <p>Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of Town of Southampton, Brentwood School District, Town of Islip, Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point School District, Patchogue-Medford School District, North Babylon 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.</p> 	<p>David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;"> <p>Claire B. Swanik - Assistant to Publisher</p> <p>Ted Cook - General Manager</p> <p>Walter Hoefler - Director of Research</p> <p>Arlene Greene - Classified Manager</p> <p>Lou Grasso - Managing Editor</p> <p>Daniel H. Aug - News Editor</p> <p>Jonathan Willmott - Feature Editor</p> <p>Victor Prusinowski - Director of Sales</p> </td> <td style="width: 33%;"> <p>Sheryl Heather - Sales Manager</p> <p>Sharman Gordon - Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Lora Holdorf - Assistant Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Noble Laird - Advertising/Art Director</p> <p>Tom Gandolfo - Printing Manager</p> <p>Debra Rogers - Pre-Press Manager</p> </td> <td style="width: 33%;"> <p>Bill Johnson - Director of Printing and Distribution</p> <p>Barbara Lampasona - Data Processing Manager</p> <p>Hugh A. Battersby - Personnel Manager</p> <p>Frank Frolke - Comptroller</p> <p>William Lawton - Purchasing Director</p> <p>Duane Sundquist - Circulation Manager</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Claire B. Swanik - Assistant to Publisher</p> <p>Ted Cook - General Manager</p> <p>Walter Hoefler - Director of Research</p> <p>Arlene Greene - Classified Manager</p> <p>Lou Grasso - Managing Editor</p> <p>Daniel H. Aug - News Editor</p> <p>Jonathan Willmott - Feature Editor</p> <p>Victor Prusinowski - Director of Sales</p>	<p>Sheryl Heather - Sales Manager</p> <p>Sharman Gordon - Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Lora Holdorf - Assistant Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Noble Laird - Advertising/Art Director</p> <p>Tom Gandolfo - Printing Manager</p> <p>Debra Rogers - Pre-Press Manager</p>	<p>Bill Johnson - Director of Printing and Distribution</p> <p>Barbara Lampasona - Data Processing Manager</p> <p>Hugh A. Battersby - Personnel Manager</p> <p>Frank Frolke - Comptroller</p> <p>William Lawton - Purchasing Director</p> <p>Duane Sundquist - Circulation Manager</p>
Huntington Str./Melville	Coram/Middle Island	Mid Hampton	Lindenhurst																														
Brentwood/Central Islip	Bay Shore/West Islip	Huntington	Amthville																														
Ronkonkoma/Holbrook	Centereach/Selden	Rocky Point	East Islip																														
Hauppauge/Nesconset	Mastic/Moriches	North Fork	Medford																														
Three Village/Port Jeff	Sayville/Oakdale	Patchogue	Babylon																														
Commack/Kings Park	Hampton West	Riverhead																															
Smithtown/St. James	Hampton East	Northport																															
<p>Claire B. Swanik - Assistant to Publisher</p> <p>Ted Cook - General Manager</p> <p>Walter Hoefler - Director of Research</p> <p>Arlene Greene - Classified Manager</p> <p>Lou Grasso - Managing Editor</p> <p>Daniel H. Aug - News Editor</p> <p>Jonathan Willmott - Feature Editor</p> <p>Victor Prusinowski - Director of Sales</p>	<p>Sheryl Heather - Sales Manager</p> <p>Sharman Gordon - Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Lora Holdorf - Assistant Graphics/Production Manager</p> <p>Noble Laird - Advertising/Art Director</p> <p>Tom Gandolfo - Printing Manager</p> <p>Debra Rogers - Pre-Press Manager</p>	<p>Bill Johnson - Director of Printing and Distribution</p> <p>Barbara Lampasona - Data Processing Manager</p> <p>Hugh A. Battersby - Personnel Manager</p> <p>Frank Frolke - Comptroller</p> <p>William Lawton - Purchasing Director</p> <p>Duane Sundquist - Circulation Manager</p>																															

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. Please include daytime phone number for verification.

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



# Tale of two town supervisors

Last November, voters on the South Fork elected two new supervisors, Mardythe DiPirro in Southampton and Tony Bullock in East Hampton. Both towns have enjoyed rapid acceleration in their tax base. Both areas are favorites of second homeowners who build luxury homes which carry high assessments but require very little in support services.

Southampton had been run for ten years by Martin Lang. He was noted for being a tight-fisted manager. He was involved in every aspect of the town and knew where every penny was being spent. Although expenditures in the town had gone up substantially under his tenure, taxes hadn't.

East Hampton had been on somewhat of a roller coaster but, like Southampton, the supervisor had been a competent manager.

DiPirro came to the job without any real experience. She is a lovely woman who had been involved in altruistic organizations that had been funded through state grants and community contributions.

Bullock had been a town councilman, a member of the legislature. Although a Democrat like DiPirro, he had built a reputation for being frugal and prudent.

Bullock immediately settled in and gained control of his town board. Based on his past experience, his desire to be personally involved, he has run the town smoothly and efficiently. This year he offered the town board his budget, which calls for a 1 percent tax decrease. It shows skill, organization and management.

Sorrowfully, the residents of Southampton do not have the same to look forward to. Before DiPirro was sworn into office, she had caused a furor amongst town board members, both Republican and Democrat. Bad blood between her and her Democratic counterpart, Pat Neumann, eliminated the ally she needed.

During the campaign, DiPirro showed her total lack of realism or expertise when she attacked the former supervisor for having a support staff. She said she did not need anyone else but a secretary to run the town. She charged that the supervisor's staff was a waste of taxpayers' money and was done solely for patronage purposes. When questioned further about normal things,

such as bathroom breaks and vacations for her secretary, DiPirro said she would cover for her and would need no replacement. This gave those of us who follow government closely an indication that this person would be in deep trouble from the beginning.

Our fears proved true. DiPirro's term in office can be described as a captain at sea without a ship or a crew. She has floundered alone, tossed from side to side by the whims of the day and the magnitude of the problems that face the chief executive of a major town with a multi-million dollar budget.

The lack of communication between her and her fellow board members has become so bad that the other four members of the town board have been forced to ignore her and try to run the town as a leaderless coalition.

DiPirro has submitted her first annual budget. It is an unholy disaster that shows a complete lack of comprehension of the budgeting process. DiPirro wants to raise real estate taxes at least 27 percent to bring her budget into balance. To bring her budget into balance, she includes income of \$1 million from a cabaret fee that she would like to see imposed upon restaurants and night-clubs throughout Southampton. How she can possibly include a million dollars of income from fees that have not been enacted into law, and probably never will be, is indicative of her tragic lack of experience.

A cabaret fee in the Hamptons probably never would be enacted. If it was, it would spell disaster and ruination to the economy. It would drive businesses away in droves and affect non-related businesses and even the prices of real estate and rentals. You must be competitive for the vacation dollar just as you must be competitive for every other dollar.

The budget is filled with other items both on the debit and the credit side that must be addressed. In good conscience, not one member of the town board can accept this document as a plan for the town's spending during 1989.

The former supervisor of Southampton lost to DiPirro because the town was going through a reassessment of its real estate values. Lang misjudged and accepted a plan

whereby one-third of the town would be reassessed each year. Doing the reassessment this way, Lang saved the taxpayers approximately \$4 million that otherwise would have been paid for through long-term bonded indebtedness. His plan was prudent, but not politically popular and as a result, voters rebelled against him and threw away his ten years of tight fiscal management in favor of a very lovely woman who lacks experience and depth.

We congratulate Tony Bullock for the outstanding job that he has performed. His budget is one of the best and one of the most understandable we have seen.

We encourage Southampton Town Board members to do the work that the supervisor should have done. Go back to last year's budget, start anew and prepare a fiscal plan that avoids the need for tax increases, yet, still provides the essential services that are required by the residents.

To the voters we say, let us learn our lesson from this sad experience. Look deeper than the personality and outward appearance of a candidate. Look for the substance, the ability and the background that will allow the candidate to emerge as a leader and perform in a competent manner.

And why not?

## Make No Mistake

Citizens to Settle Shoreham, proponents of Governor Cuomo's Shoreham deal with LILCO, have been deliberately distorting the truth in their quest to beat back opposition to the settlement. They have been claiming that the legislators who opposed the horrendous deal are in favor of higher rates and opening Shoreham. Now they have issued press releases stating that opponents have come out recently in favor of the governor's deal, and listed Suffolk Life as an example. But they are wrong.

Make no mistake about it, Suffolk Life is dead set against the Shoreham settlement as it is now structured. We believe the ratepayers still can get a better deal, and you don't get a better deal by rolling over and simply accepting an agreement without fighting for a better break, as have the Citizens to Settle. While they have been hurling untrue blasts at the legislators who oppose Cuomo's mistake, those legislators should be applauded because it is their efforts, not the surrender tactics of the Citizens to Settle, which will result in some improvement, or at least hope for the future, in what is a very bad deal.

The governor insists there can be no changes in the deal he made with LILCO. He has adopted a "take it or leave it" attitude, and has insisted the legislature must grant its approval. Although the governor won't change any of the financial gifts he has given LILCO in his deal, there is nothing to stop the legislature from tying into their approval a whole host of other items that would grant Long Island at least some hope of relief and protection into the future.

There is nothing which says that the only thing the legislature has to approve is what the governor desires. If the legislature approves the deal, they can add riders onto the

bill, calling for the revamping of the Public Service Commission so that it must take the needs and financial condition of consumers into consideration, just as the PSC now does with the utilities.

The Long Island Power Authority, L.I.P.A., could be funded and strengthened to become, not only a watchdog over LILCO in the future, but a watchdog with teeth capable of taking over the company in the future through condemnation of the remaining assets, should the LILCO arrogance of the past resurface.

The election of LIPA trustees must be held in the near future. The public must have an opportunity to elect the trustees, rather than allow the governor and his men to use LIPA as their own plaything. Although the governor has declared he supports LIPA, he has manipulated its progress in the past to suit his own desires.

The bill could be enlarged to give L.I.P.A. control over the future generation of electricity, leaving LILCO solely at the marketing end of this scenario.

There are many things which can be done and put into place without renegotiating the deal, and now is the time to insist upon these things being written into law. It's time for the legislature to play in the same league as the governor. If he wants to play hardball, then let it be hardball.

Let the legislature come up with a full-scale bill that includes approval of the governor's deal, but, once and for all, builds in the future protection for the ratepayers that we have been thus far denied. Let them give the governor the whole bill with the same proviso that he gave us: Take it or leave it, governor. If you don't, you will open Shoreham, not us, for we have complied with our end of the deal.

And why not?

IF FOR ANY REASON

**SUFFOLK LIFE**

NEWSPAPERS

IS NOT DELIVERED TO YOUR HOME OR P.O. BOX  
ON WEDNESDAY BY THE MAILMAN,

PLEASE CALL

**516-369-0800**



## Four times too many

Suffolk County Legislators, in a marathon session last week, passed resolutions amending the county charter, not to improve the charter, but to enhance their own power. These amendments will, if they are enacted into law, be disastrous for the taxpayers.

Resolution Number 1868-88 would strip the county executive of the ability to execute a line item veto of expenditures the legislators add to the county budget. It would limit the county executive to a veto of each budget amendment in its entirety, stripping him of the ability to eliminate wasteful spending on an item by item basis.

Even though the county executive can currently eliminate questionable budget additions through the line item veto, the legislators can override that veto with 14 votes. The legislators complain this allows the county executive to "convert 10 vote resolutions into 14 vote resolutions." In our view there's nothing wrong with that. If a budget addition can't withstand the test of passage by 14 votes it should not become an additional burden on the taxpayers.

The second amendment resolution will lead to a financial disaster for the taxpayers. Resolution 1867-88 would give the legislators four opportunities during the year to amend the operating budget, a privilege now given to the county executive. Currently the legislators have but one opportunity to add expenditures to the county budget.

The present system calls for the county executive to present a proposed budget. The legislators then amend that budget, usually adding monies for pet projects. On other occasions, the legislators bow to the pressures of special interest groups, adding funds for a host of special interest demands. The budget is then adopted, and the tax rate is de-

termined by the increased amount.

Under the proposed system, the legislators would have three more opportunities to be pressured into adding large sums to cater to special groups. The question arises, however, where are the funds for those additions coming from? Will they now add large surplus sums to cover the expenditures they will add later? Or will they move to transfer funds from other uses to pay for their later add ons?

Heed these words: giving the county legislators the ability to amend the operating budget four times a year is the same as giving the combination of the safe to a bank robber. History has shown us many times that many of our county legislators are weak, easy to pressure politicians who buy votes with taxpayers' money. Allowing them to act in such a fashion once a year is bad enough, but adding more opportunities is inviting financial disaster.

County Executive Patrick Halpin is expected to veto this resolution, and we hope he does. Since the resolution passed 11 to 6, the legislators would have to put together 14 votes to override that veto. If you, the taxpayers, want to protect yourself from future financial shenanigans with your hard earned money, you had better send a message to your legislator informing that legislator a vote to override will be very, very expensive to his or her political future.

If the legislators feel so strongly that they should have such powers, let them vote to put it on the ballot and then make their case to convince voters it's the right thing to do. The county charter should not be a plaything so easily changed by the politicians to enhance their own powers.

Stop it now, or regret it later.  
And why not?

## Where is Mike?

A few weeks ago, we asked "Where is George?" We are forced to ask the question again, with an important change. Now we need to know, "Where is Mike?"

George Bush, the Republican candidate for president, has failed to make his personal stance on Shoreham known. Aides on one hand have been saying Bush would not force the opening of the plant. On the other hand, they are saying Shoreham is part of our national energy plan, and therefore should be opened safely.

Traditionally, Republican candidates come to Long Island to speak to the Republicans, who hold almost a 2:1 enrollment majority. Bush is not scheduled to appear in Suffolk or

Nassau, where he would have to face the Shoreham question head on. During a recent Republican bash he sent a stand-in to represent him, again ducking the issue here.

Michael Dukakis, the governor of Massachusetts and the Democratic candidate for president, has opposed the opening of the Seabrook plant nuclear plan, and has voiced some opposition to Shoreham as well. We have been led to believe his stance was more than showmanship, that he meant it. That he opposed the federal government efforts to license the plant despite the lack of a safe evacuation.

Michael Dukakis came to Long Island last week. Shoreham is the number one issue here. Dukakis

spoke about housing, but said nary a word about Shoreham. His silence was mystifying and has led to suspicion that his reported opposition to Shoreham is little more than rhetoric.

When the issue of nuclear power was raised during last Thursday's presidential debate, Michael Dukakis had his opportunity to make his stance known. He had the opportunity to tell the nation of his concerns and intentions on Seabrook and Shoreham. Not a word was uttered from this man's mouth. This leaves us with the uneasy feeling that

Michael Dukakis, the Democratic presidential aspirant, is hiding under the same Shoreham rock that George Bush is using to escape the issue.

Both candidates are asking Long Island residents for a commitment of support in the coming elections. Both should be told by the leaders of their political parties, and by the people, that if they expect our votes, we need to know their views on this most important issue. Now, before the election, we need to know, "Where is George?" and "Where is Mike?"

And why not?

## Behind the rhetoric

Most voters today feel there is little difference between candidates. Republicans and Democrats constantly espouse the same untruths. In this world of mass media and our electronic coverage, style and appearance are more important than issues and the true feelings of the candidates about them.

This is unfortunate for when we elect a person to the office, we are not only electing him or her but, in reality, a whole host of other people who will be staff members, who will guide the elected candidate and be instrumental in the making of decisions.

Politicians love to run away from labels. However, labels are often a convenient way for the voter to know the type of staff that will reflect the thinking of the candidate. When all is said and done, we do not have Republican or Democratic office holders. We have conservative and liberal philosophies.

The liberal philosophy is based around the concept that the government is better able to do for the individuals than the individuals can do for themselves. That individuals are better off taxing themselves heavily so they may pool their money to accomplish a medium for everyone.

Conservatives tend\* to think that the individuals are more capable, in most instances, to provide for themselves. That if asked and required, the individual will provide for himself the things that liberals ask the government to provide for them. For the conservative to have the funds to obtain these programs for themselves, they must be allowed to keep the maximum amount of money they earn, thus the conservative favors lower taxes.

On the economy, liberals feel that planned government intervention can stabilize economic growth. Conservatives believe that the market place, without governmental inter-

vention, regulation and freedom, will create a strong economy, producing jobs and economic opportunity for all.

The line becomes closer on social issues where both conservatives and liberals have a tendency to be moderate to extreme. Both agree that those in dire need must be taken care of. They tend to separate as they become more extreme in their beliefs.

Liberals would provide for everyone from cradle to grave. Conservatives believe they should provide for those in need, but then provide the opportunity for those who are capable to provide for their own needs and desires on their own.

On national defense, liberals believe that you can negotiate anything from a position of weakness. If you show the way by disarming, the world will follow you. Conservatives believe that the enemy only respects strength. Strength to defend and strength to retaliate when provoked.

There is probably a little bit of liberal and conservative in every voter. Most of us, when we were young, tended to look at the world through rose colored glasses and, as a result, were liberal in our philosophy. As we get older and life teaches us lessons, as we see how the world reacts to both conservative and liberal philosophies, we tend to become more conservative in our own personal philosophy.

When a candidate who is entrenched in a philosophy, either liberal or conservative, tells you he is a moderate, chances are he is not telling you the truth. He may be moderate on some very narrow issues, or issues that have universal acclaim, but his overall philosophy is the one that counts. If he isn't proud of it, he should not be seeking your vote. Look through the rhetoric and seek out the truth before you cast your ballot.

And why not?

IF FOR ANY REASON

**SUFFOLK LIFE**

NEWSPAPERS

IS NOT DELIVERED TO YOUR HOME OR P.O. BOX  
ON WEDNESDAY BY THE MAILMAN,

PLEASE CALL

**516-369-0800**



# You can say 'No' to taxes

As you go to the polls to vote a week from next Tuesday you will find propositions on the ballot asking you for permission for your government to increase your tax burden. These propositions must have voter approval to be enacted.

On the surface, the propositions

look too good to be turned down. They are motherhood issues dealing with transportation and the environment. When you get to the bottom of the skulduggery, however, you find the rhetoric that has been put out concerning them is filled with blatant untruths. And why not?

poration expenditures. They are relying on your lack of knowledge and your fear to force you into voting "yes" on Proposition 1.

Long Island has traditionally been shortchanged on transportation spending by New York State. As you travel upstate you see incredible road systems surrounding most metropolitan areas. There are massive four and six lane highways connecting towns a fraction of the size of most of our hamlets. The current bond proposal outlines 23 percent of the money is for Long Island, but this is only an outline and

there is no guarantee that if Long Island voters approve the measure they will get their fair share for Long Island roads. We haven't in the past. Let us learn from history.

Thinking legislators have said, "The only way New York State is going to have a dedicated highway fund is for the voters to turn down these expensive bond propositions." We agree with these legislators. We agree with the Automobile Association, the lobbyist group for drivers, and recommend strongly that every Suffolk County voter cast their ballot "NO" on Proposition 1. And why not?

## Road, bridge bond act

### Ballot Proposal Number 1: Road and Bridge Bond Act:

Currently, New York State motorists pay \$1.2 billion in special taxes, assessments and fees for the privilege of driving. The most common of these fees include gasoline and fuel taxes, licenses and registrations. Most of us thought that these special fees and taxes that are imposed upon us were put in a special fund to build new roads and to improve roadways in need of repair, as is done in 47 other states. Not in New York, the land of taxes. These special user fees and taxes go into the general fund rather than a dedicated fund.

According to the New York State Automobile Association, only \$400 million out of the \$1.2 billion will actually be used for the building and maintenance of roads. The balance of the money is left to the governor and the legislature to spend as they wish.

The governor and the legislature now come to you, the voter, and say, "We have roads that are deteriorating. We have bridges that are falling down. We want you to agree to borrow \$3 billion, plus interest, so that we can fix them." The interest will run between \$2.2 billion and \$3 billion, depending upon the bond rate in effect at the time of their sale. Our

Albany spendthrifts are saying, in effect, "In other words, we want to indebt you and your children for the next 30-years to pay for what you have been paying for all along through special taxes."

Department of Transportation officials admit that this is only the beginning, for within five years it is expected a new bond proposition will appear, asking voters to approve \$7 billion to \$9 billion additional funds, furthering our indebtedness.

Thinking legislators have said, enough is enough. We went to the voters just a few years ago and told them our roads and bridges were deteriorating then. We needed to borrow \$1 billion in emergency funds. This would take care of the critical problem. It hasn't. They declare what is needed is a true, dedicated highway fund where you pay as you go out of user fees. If the special user fees we currently are paying were dedicated to transportation, there would be available \$1.2 billion this year alone to address our road problems, more than enough money to take care of the needs today and the future, on a pay as you go basis.

Governor Cuomo and other masters of mirrors do not want to give up their discretionary powers to use transportation funds for non-trans-

## Extend county sales tax

### Ballot Proposal 2: Extension of the 1/4 Percent County Sales Tax or Water Protection Proposal:

On the last day of next year, the county sales tax will drop by 14 percent if voters say "no" to County Proposition 1, Ballot Proposition 2.

Former County Executive Michael LoGrande, last year, proposed to continue the extra 14 percent sales tax we currently are paying but which is scheduled to expire at the end of 1989. The revenues raised by this 14 percent were to be used, on a pay as you go basis, to acquire lands as a water shed. They were also slated for use by municipalities for local environmental projects. In addition, some of these funds would be applied to school districts and municipalities that would be affected by the taking of these lands to save them harmless from the impact of these lands being taken off the tax rolls. The proposition was overwhelmingly approved by the voters.

LoGrande's opponent, Patrick Halpin, didn't like the LoGrande proposal. When he was victorious he interpreted his victory as a mandate from the voters to change what they had voted for. Halpin has revised the formulas and the intent of the law. He wants to use part of the additional taxes for general tax purposes. In other words, throw it into the pot and spend it any way that he and the legislature see fit. He doesn't particularly want to share the revenues with the communities. He wants the town portion to be used to duplicate the funds coming from the state Environmental Bond Issue that was approved by voters. Most importantly, Halpin does not want to pay as you go. He wants to borrow the entire projected amount now and pay interest on it for years to come.

Since the voters approved of this issue last year, what has been ap-

parant is that as much as this may be a watershed bill, it is more a speculative builders enhancement.

At the writing of this editorial, there is no specific inventory of lands to be taken. Insiders seem to know which ones. Builders are already touting that they have plots of land available for future development that will border on county acquisitions. Because these lands would border undeveloped land, the value is substantially enhanced.

We wonder how well the watershed will be protected if you have a parcel of land that is designated as environmentally sensitive land but is surrounded by developments and condos. Yet, this appears to be all too often the case.

We all are for pure water. We question seriously whether this undertaking will guarantee it. We don't question the probability that some influential speculators and their political friends will get rich if you say "yes."

Proponents of the Halpin proposal declare the proposition is vital to save valuable lands. But even if the Halpin plan goes down to defeat, the 14 percent sales tax will still be extended, based on last year's approval of the LoGrande proposal. A major difference is, voters will be saving interest costs which could be turned back into the purchase of other lands.

Taxpayers should realize that spending money to buy lands is not the only way to preserve environmentally valuable lands. Sound planning and zoning principles, transfer of development rights, wisely used, can be applied to preserve lands as well. Spending taxpayers' hard earned money is not the only answer.

We urge you to vote your pocket-book. Vote "No." And why not?

## SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

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

Suffolk Life is published in 27 market zone editions every Wednesday

Huntington St./Meville	Coram/Middle Island	Mid Hampton	Lindenhurst
Brentwood/Central Islip	Bay Shore/West Islip	Huntington	Amthville
Romkonoma/Holbrook	Centereach/Selden	Rocky Point	East Islip
Hauppauge/Nesconset	Mastic/Moriches	North Fork	Medford
Three Village/Port Jeff	Sayville/Oakdale	Patchogue	Babylon
Commack/Kings Park	Hampton West	Riverhead	
Smithtown/St. James	Hampton East	Northport	

Total Circulation audited and verified in excess of  
**495,336 Circulation Weekly**

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of Town of Southampton, Brentwood School District, Town of Islip, Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point School District, Patchogue-Medford School District, North Babylon 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

Claire B. Swanik - Assistant to Publisher  
Ted Cook - General Manager  
Walter Hoefler - Director of Research  
Arlene Greene - Classified Manager  
Lou Grasso - Managing Editor  
Daniel H. Aug - News Editor  
Jonathan Willmott - Feature Editor  
Victor Pruslowski - Director of Sales

Sheryl Heather - Sales Manager  
Sharman Gordon - Graphics/Production Manager  
Lora Holdorf - Assistant Graphics/Production Manager  
Noble Laird - Advertising/Art Director  
Tom Gandolfo - Printing Manager  
Debra Rogers - Pre-Press Manager

Bill Johnson - Director of Printing and Distribution  
Barbara Lampasona - Data Processing Manager  
Hugh A. Battersby - Personnel Manager  
Frank Froike - Comptroller  
William Lawton - Purchasing Director  
Duane Sundquist - Circulation Manager

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

### GENERAL INFORMATION

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

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

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