

It's Not Too Late To Question

Most of us have been frightened by the concept of drinking impure water. We have been frightened by politicians. They have painted an illusion that we are the enemy who are poisoning our environment, and unless we change our ways, spend billions of dollars in public works projects, our air will not be fit to breathe, our water in no condition to drink.

There is an element of truth to these fears, but we wonder if this element has not been played up and we are being rushed headlong into huge spending projects that may not be necessary, or even accomplish these goals.

There are a number of questions that we should have been asking, and should demand answers to now: How much water is available? How fast is it becoming polluted? If one area becomes polluted, will all areas become polluted? Are there any sources of water that might be free of pollution because of drainage conditions and, technically, will always remain free of pollutants? What is the scientific backup for the answers?

Where are priorities?

Over the last couple of years we have been rushing headlong into projects to buy open space. Is there a list of priorities for the most sensitive lands? Are there hydrological studies that indicate areas that must be preserved, should be preserved or don't necessarily need to be preserved? Are we buying lands for open space under the guise of saving our water? Does it make any sense to buy just a few acres in the middle of heavily developed lands under the guise of creating a watershed?

Scare rhetoric

Let's look at garbage. Governor Cuomo, two years ago, asked, "Do you want to drink water contaminated by your garbage?" He was being questioned on why the state was ordering our lined landfills to be closed by 1990. His answer was a cheap shot, scare rhetoric, for he did not offer any substantiation as to what the flip-side would be to continue to use lined landfills in the foreseeable future.

The mandates closing our landfills by 1990 will create a tremendous addi-

tional tax burden that we have predicted can rival our schools in cost. Estimates on plants to handle resource recovery, composting and burning range from as low as \$30 million to as high as \$300 million. There is no assurance from the state that once these plants have been built they, themselves, will not be a serious source of pollution and will have to be closed down because someone in the governor's office made a mistake.

The track record

We must remember it was the governor's D.E.C. that ordered municipalities to stop burning, to bury their garbage instead. It was the same D.E.C. that said, "We made a mistake, we forgot to tell you to put a liner on the bottom." The same D.E.C. that then said, "we made another mistake, rains are filtering through the garbage and causing leachates to build up in the pockets of the liner, and then into the groundwater." Another costly solution was offered: "Spend more to put liners on top of the garbage." Our towns spent millions more and did as ordered. The D.E.C. then said, "We didn't think this one out far enough. The liner on top and the liner on the bottom have caused a vacuum in which decomposed garbage is creating methane. To correct the state's mistake, you must now vent the gas."

In the latest round, they have called for the closing of the landfills in total. The D.E.C. has said to all our local towns: either come up with some way to recycle and dispose of your waste through some process by 1990, or we will require you to haul your garbage off Long Island and bury it in some state other than New York. In issuing this edict, the state did not provide approved methods or plans or the funding to accomplish the goals. Just an order from Albany that has the potential of doubling real estate taxes and raising the cost of disposing of garbage by as much as 300 percent.

Mounting costs

Towns which fail to come up with what the D.E.C. considers proper plans are already facing thousands of dollars in fines. Towns that fail to

have plants built by 1990 are facing the probability of having to cart their garbage off Long Island at a cost of between \$100 and \$300 per ton.

As we have listened to the discussions on this subject, we are brought back to many others we have had with people who are involved. Some have said the leachates are moving from the center of the dump at a rate of one foot every ten years. Others have said they are moving at a rate of 30-feet per year. Some have indicated that because of the soil conditions and the natural drainage, the leachates are filtered out in these particular areas and the dumps can remain forever more without causing pollution.

Orders, no funds

We don't pretend to know the answers. We have yet to come across anyone who has them. Everyone has bits and pieces of knowledge and rumor, but little of substance. Yet, the politicians, in their quest to please the voters who have concerns about the environment, and to please big business and unions who have a never-ending thirst for massive public works

projects, are quick to give orders, without providing the direction or the funding.

1990 is not that far away. Those whom we put on the town boards have to face this problem and come up with a solution during their term of office. Our state legislators, who passed this mandate, are the people who are responsible for the mess we are in. Collectively, our town boards, working with our state legislators and the governor, should document beyond a doubt that we have no other choice but to close our landfills. That there are no sound environmental sites that are suitable for sanitary landfills. Then, and only then, should they order the construction of refuse disposal and recycling plants, a location for the disposal of ash and a guarantee that it, in itself, will not be an environmental problem.

The state must provide the approved systems and the funding to build these. This burden is too big to be carried by the homeowners on top of all the other impossible taxes they are paying today.

And why not?

Interviewing For You

Your staff here at Suffolk Life has invited all candidates for legislative positions on the county and the town level to be interviewed.

The interviews take approximately one and a half hours each. We will be interviewing approximately 103 candidates. The process is long, grueling and tiresome. But we believe we have an obligation to seek out the best candidates to run our government.

We are not particularly interested in the candidates' politics. We are interested in their sincerity, their reasoning powers, their beliefs, their understanding of the problems and the solutions that they are ready to present.

We had to limit our interviewing process to only the two major parties because of time and human con-

straints. We are trying to make the interviewing process as fair as possible. We interview each candidate privately, during which they have an opportunity to present their qualifications and their positions in depth. We spend approximately one hour with both candidates discussing the issues that are pertinent to the campaign.

At the end of the interviewing process and other aspects of election coverage, the editorial board discusses the candidates and, by vote, decide who can best represent the people.

We wish there was a faster, less grueling way of doing this, but we know of no other way to seek out the truth and perform the public service that a newspaper should.

And why not?

A Point of View:

The Infirmary: a matter of shame

By Lou Grasso

"The Suffolk County Infirmary cares for the most frail, most vulnerable people in our population. That means the quality of that care must be extraordinary."

So said Suffolk County Executive Patrick Halpin recently in naming a Blue Ribbon Panel to study problems which have been cited in a State Health Department report on infirmary conditions. That report faulted the infirmary administrator, its medical director and director of nursing for activities not meeting standards of care. It also cited a number of deficiencies in housekeeping and maintenance conditions, and instances of nursing care that did not meet standards.

The administrator was faulted for not ensuring the director of nursing effectively implemented nursing care systems and adequate nursing assessment, planning, intervention and re-evaluation of residents.

The administrator was also cited for not ensuring the

medical director effectively fulfilled his responsibilities in reviewing accident and incident reports, identifying patterns and making recommendations to prevent such occurrences.

According to the state health department report, the medical director, who has held that position for years, long before the current administrator, failed in his responsibility to the facility by not reviewing 129 of 193 accident reports. "There was no evidence that he made any attempt to identify hazards to the health and safety of the residents," the report stated.

The efforts of the nursing director, the report notes, have not been sufficient to fulfill her function, and cites several instances of deficiencies in nursing service policies and procedures which "have not been implemented in an effective manner by nursing staff for safety precautions, prevention of accidents and injuries."

Problems at the infirmary began surfacing early this year when it was uncovered that a rash of fractures had occurred during the first three months. At the same time, a

controversy arose over the appointment of a new nursing director, chosen by a selection committee created by the county's health department, who is the wife of a top ranking official of that same health department. One member of the selection committee who voted against that appointment was dropped from the committee, a second committee convened, and the same selection was made. The infirmary administrator, it should be noted, voted twice—he was on both selection committees—against the appointment.

The matter of the rash of fractures was heard by the legislature's Health Committee, which heard testimony from the top ranking people at the health department. The explanation pointed to the fact that those who suffered from the fractures were elderly patients who suffer from osteoporosis, a condition of porous and fragile bones, and thus fractures of this type were not uncommon. Why, since the infirmary normally houses patients of this type, were the number of fractures early this year higher than normal? No explanation

SEE Page 8

Better Way to finance education

The costs of educating our children in elementary and secondary schools here on Long Island are approaching, and have exceeded, in some instances, \$10,000 per year per student. The costs are financed two ways, through state aid, which amounts to about 40 to 45 percent, and real estate taxes, which account for the balance. Real estate taxes make up 60 to 70 percent of the total bill. They have been mounting each year and have brought many homeowners to the point of being forced to abandon Long Island. The community is up in arms.

There is a certain segment of the community which has proposed financing part of the school costs through an income tax. They argue that this is the fairest way to go. Those who are earning the highest incomes will pay the most, proponents say. Senior citizens living on fixed incomes will pay less, and people below the poverty level will pay nothing, as they do not now pay income taxes.

We have noted that those who support this concept have been careful to say the income tax portion will only supplement, not eliminate, real estate taxes for school funding.

A Suffolk County income tax would be a crushing blow to those who have earnings and want to settle here. It would probably be one of the biggest anti-business moves conceived, because businesses, unless forced to, will not operate where there is a triple layer of income taxes.

Marino addresses educ. Mandates

Reacting to the taxpayers' rebellion over school taxes, Senate Majority Leader Ralph Marino has written to state Education Commissioner Thomas Sobol, urging that the Education Commission undertake a review of what is actually mandated directly and indirectly by the state and the state Education Department.

Today, no one really seems to know what is actually mandated and what it costs. Marino stated in his letter that he wants a total itemization of all direct and indirect mandates, and a review of these mandates so that those that are not necessary or are too burdensome to be financed under local taxes can be eliminated, or the burden for funding shifted.

It is encouraging that this issue is finally being addressed on the state level. School boards, when addressing taxpayers and voters, have claimed that up to 90 percent of their budgets are mandated by the state. In this figure, they include both direct mandates and those that are of their own making.

Many senior citizens, contrary to the public misconception, pay income taxes. They may be living on fixed incomes, but when the Social Security, their pensions and their investments are totaled, they are above the poverty level and are subject to income taxes, just as they were when they were working.

For an income tax to be seriously considered, it would have to replace 100 percent of all real estate taxes. As a supplement, it would just give the school districts another source of income to spend, it would not create any incentive to reduce spending or increase productivity.

There is a better way, one that has been advocated by the business community, educational professionals and common sense thinking citizens. It's called the voucher system of funding education. Parents of students are given a voucher for a set amount of money. They can use this voucher for the education of their children, whether it be in public or private schools.

In New York City, there have been a number of private schools established that are thriving and offering education at far less than what we are paying here on Long Island. On Long Island also there are a number of private schools, mostly operated as religious schools, educating students at a fraction of the cost of public schools. Most of these schools are able to offer a superior education, particularly in the basics, where the concentration is on reading, writing and math.

In conversations we have had with superintendents, they have asked for the taxpayers' support to have these mandates looked at carefully, and analyzed for value. All have said both the educational establishment and the taxpayers need relief from those items that are not necessarily in the realm of education, but have been foisted upon the schools by the state as a means of addressing social problems.

The mandates that cover the basic education which offers all students the opportunity to receive a sufficient education, enabling them to receive a Regents diploma, are necessary. But the state Education Department and the state legislature have gone far afield in mandating that social measures be the responsibility of the school district taxpayers.

Marino, the governor and the Assembly minority leader are the three most powerful state governmental officials. Marino's attention to this problem should mean results and reform. We sure hope so.

And why not?

Parents who choose to send their children to these schools are not given any breaks for this basic education. In addition to the tuition and other support mechanisms which they contribute to, the parents pay their full share of taxes to fund public education costs.

If we truly want to improve the education of all students, while at the same time reduce the cost to the taxpayers, the only answer is competition. Allow private enterprise to be profitable and we will have the establishment of top-rated schools that will give our bureaucratic-heavy local schools a good run for their money.

Let there be competition between the private sector, whether profit-oriented or religious, and the public schools. Let them be competitive based upon both the excellence of the product, the student, and the cost of the education. If public schools were forced to compete for the availability of students and their tax vouchers, you would quickly find that a lot of fat would be cut, and excellence would surely be demanded of the student.

If we want productivity at a price we can afford, support competition rather than another tax.

And why not?

Surprise! Surprise!

A number of area school districts received a surprise recently, but it did not represent happy news. The surprise came in the form of a notification from town assessors listing the new assessment totals for the school districts. The news was bad.

A major reason for the decline in the assessment totals was the implementation in 1989 of legislation approved in Albany in 1987. That legislation launched a four-year phase-out, starting in January 1989, of taxation of telecommunication equipment at the central offices of telephone companies. This action was based on a report by the Temporary State Commission on the Real Property Tax, which concluded that the loss of revenue can be absorbed by the real property tax system in our state. Strangely, however, the report also noted: "However, given the fact that the revenue from these taxes is significant in some taxing units, the Commission further recommends that the taxes be maintained for this year and then phased out proportionately over the four succeeding years."

The Commission was right in the second instance, but dead wrong in the first. The phase out of this revenue will, indeed, have a major impact, one that can hardly be absorbed by the real property tax system in this state.

The impact in some districts will be substantial. The loss of revenues, in some, is a lot more than a drop in the bucket which can be absorbed. Patchogue-Medford, for example, lost about \$792,000. The result may well be much higher than anticipated tax rates in a county where residents are

already up in arms over tax increases.

School district officials are going to have to sharpen their pencils and go over their budgets once again. Any ounce of fat that was left in the budgets is going to have to be trimmed away at this time. Some of the "We'd like to have" programs and items which are not totally necessary are going to have to be sacrificed if the impact on the taxpayer is to be softened.

The most troublesome part of this matter is the attitude in Albany, of those who were members of this Commission, and those from the state education department who think nothing of adding mandate after mandate without the dollars to pay the bill. How many school district officials did the Commission members talk to before reaching their "can absorb" conclusion? How many hard-hit taxpayers did they ask about the burden they are asked to carry?

The answer to those questions is the same when other Albany officials and state legislators pass regulations or legislation that impacts on the local taxpayer, be it mandate or additional tax exemptions. None.

It's time they did. No action of this type should be enacted until a local public hearing is held so that the taxpayers have input, and the Albany folks get an earful. It's time the Albany folks face the music on the local level before, not after, they add the extra costs.

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

Dumping law vetoed, it's time to act

Listening to the cries of his constituents, Legislator Edward Romaine recently introduced legislation that banned the Social Service Department from placing welfare recipients in the William Floyd School district, Gordon Heights and North Bellport. The legislation passed, but Suffolk County Executive Patrick Halpin has vetoed it.

Some areas of Suffolk County have been the favorite target of the Social Service Department for placing welfare recipients. This action has created pockets where the residents are predominantly welfare recipients. The housing is often substandard, and rapidly deteriorates as more and more welfare recipients are packed into these neighborhoods.

This scattering of welfare pockets throughout Suffolk County is a disaster and a disgrace. For several years, we have advocated the development of a human resources center utilizing some of the lands and buildings cur-

rently owned by the county and the state. A prime spot would be the former Pilgrim State Hospital.

We have envisioned a complete human resources center where those in need of housing would receive good, safe and sanitary housing. A facility where all their needs would be provided in a campus-like setting. Think how much more beneficial it would be to have in one place not only housing, but medical clinics, vocational training, day care, elderly care, elementary and advanced schooling, health and nutritional programs.

Our current system spreads these needs out over the ten townships, generally locating these people in areas that are far from public transportation and away from the services they need and deserve. The argument against a central human resources center is that the recipient would be stigmatized. Who is kidding whom? When kids and adults say that they are living in certain buildings or in certain sections of

the towns that are known as welfare dumps, it is automatically assumed that they are welfare recipients. The stigma is there. What is not there is a cost effective or a humanistic way of providing them with the help that they need and deserve to both survive and to earn the tools to free themselves of the system.

There are a number of people here in Suffolk County who are making, and will continue to make, millions of dollars a year by keeping the system as it is. As long as they have the ear of the politicians and those in health and

social planning, they will keep the system the way it is, forcing the recipients to live in intolerable conditions bleeding the taxpayers through oppressive taxation and not meeting our obligations as citizens. A central system of human resources would serve all communities well. It would serve the people who need the help the most. It's time that our public officials stop playing games with the lives of people and start working toward developing a meaningful system to give them a brighter future.

And why not?

Curfew controversy

The Suffolk County Legislature recently approved curfew legislation requiring all young people under 18-years-of-age to be off the streets by 8 p.m. on Halloween.

We don't like curfews, as they smack of a police state. We also don't like, however, the fact that Halloween has been turned from being a fun-filled experience for young kids into an excuse by young punks to create dangerous situations, vandalism and destruction.

We believe that it is the parents' responsibility to take care of their own kids. No children should be allowed to go trick or treating on their own, they

should be accompanied by an adult. Just for the heck of it, parents of kids beyond the trick or treat age should require them to stay at home that night to help curtail the destruction that goes on in the name of fun.

If parents have control over their kids there won't be the shameful display that we have had in the past. As kids have rights, parents have responsibilities. It is time we lived up to them instead of inviting the government to impose a military state on our children.

And why not?

Change batteries

The National Association of Fire Chiefs reminds us that on Sunday, October 29, we go from daylight savings time to standard time by changing our clocks back an hour. The association recommends that while we are changing our clocks, we also change the batteries in the fire alarms most of us have in our homes.

In most cases, the fire alarms are rarely noticed. They become part of the scenery of our homes. The only time they function is if we remember to test the alarm, or if there is a fire. If we haven't tested the batteries or remembered to periodically change the batteries, the alarms could well be useless when we need them the most to warn us that a fire has erupted in our homes, giving us an opportunity to flee.

The chiefs estimate that as many as 50 percent of the alarms in the

United States are non-functioning. Non-working smoke detectors contributed to over six thousand deaths last year and 130,000 injuries.

None of us know when fire will strike. Our homes contain many hazards such as deteriorated wiring that can short out at any time and cause a fire. Fire can break out at any time. Tragedies happen too often at night when the residents are asleep. The fire alarms, when working, give us warning and can save our lives.

The fire chiefs hope that everyone will use the reminder of changing their clocks to change the batteries on all their alarms. We think it is a great idea. Most batteries do not function properly after a year. Change them as you change your clock back this year. The life you save may be your own.

And why not?

Point of View

'A state bailout for area hospitals? No!'

By Ray J. Mincone

We have always viewed hospitals as noble institutions dedicated to the care and recovery of people who are ill. And so they are. But after reading a September 21, 1989 Newsday article by David Zinman entitled "Hospitals Demand State Bailout," we were infuriated. According to this article, David Sisto, president of the Hospital Association of New York is supporting a call for a state bailout of \$275 million to \$300 million to help offset a \$1 billion operating loss suffered by hospitals in New York State this past year alone.

Even more upsetting was a remark made by an officer of Long Beach Memorial Hospital who said his center faces a \$1.3 billion operating loss this year compared to \$700,000 in 1988, and that hospitals in Nassau and Suffolk will show an operating loss of \$26 million in 1989. Considering that Long Beach told us they were profitable earlier in the year and refused to accept an offer of assistance that could have saved the hospital more than \$4 million annually is a mystery which leads us to believe these statements are simply not true! Surely, these officials must be referring to upstate hospitals and not hospitals here on Long Island; they are too efficient to allow this to happen. We know, they told us!

But let's take our story from the beginning: Earlier this year we read another article in Newsday which reported that hospitals on Long Island were having a very difficult time to compete and could not cope with today's spiraling cost of

medical care. Since our company is one of the few management consulting firms in the metropolitan area that specialize in the design and implementation of proprietary cost reduction programs, we decided to embark on a promotional program that would help hospitals save money by improving their efficiency and reduce nonproductive costs.

Specifically, we offered to design, at no cost, a formal "Value Improvement Program (VIP)," for a deserving hospital which truly wanted to save money, with the understanding that when savings began to materialize, we could use their hospital as a model for other hospitals in the state to follow.

In February, our company contacted the administrators of 50 hospitals in the Brooklyn, Queens and Long Island area asking if they would be interested in receiving a Cost Reduction Program valued at more than \$240,000 that was capable of saving millions of dollars each and every year. Remember, as a promotional effort this program would have to be designed by our company and implemented for the hospital free of charge!

Conventional "cost reduction programs" and "employee suggestion systems" are nothing new, have been used for more than 50 years and save billions of dollars for both government and industry each year. Thousands of manufacturers and service oriented institutions have successfully reduced cost through similar programs; which are "universal" and designed to function effectively in any environment, including hospitals. So the question of whether the program could save the hospital money is not at issue.

The cost reduction system we were offering is much

more effective than conventional systems and is capable of reducing a hospital's operating budget between five percent to seven percent annually, without affecting the quality of services; which means it could save an average of \$6 million annually for a hospital having an operating budget of about \$100 million dollars; which is a high enough potential to keep most hospitals profitable. And so, with many hospitals on the brink of financial disaster, we believed every hospital would clamor for this grant. After all, who could refuse a \$240,000 grant that could help their hospital save millions of dollars? No one... or so we thought.

We began our campaign by sending letters to the administrators of each hospital requesting an appointment so we could explain the grant and how it could be used to save their hospital millions of dollars. Thirty-five hospitals (70 percent), in spite of a personal letter and several follow-up telephone calls, did not even have the courtesy to respond to our offer. This was a clear indication of just how receptive most hospitals were to the notion of "cost reduction." Fifteen hospitals (30 percent) however, appeared to have some interest in our offer and invited us in to meet with them.

At these meetings, we explained the purpose of our grant and discussed the structure of the program: what it was, how it worked, who we've done it for and gave them a preliminary estimate of the savings we thought could be generated. After learning that the grant was not to be taken as a lump sum cash payment, but rather was the market value of the program we were going to install for their institution, some

SEE Page 8

Throw the Bums Out

Last December, when county residents received their tax bills, they were astonished, stunned, frustrated and enraged. And they had good reason.

County Executive Halpin rode into office on a pledge to cut taxes over the next four years. The tax bill, the result of his first budget, raised taxes from 40 to 169 percent. Halpin wasn't alone, however, for schools have increased spending depending on the district from 5 to 20 percent, and seven out of the ten towns increased their portion of the tax bill from 7 to 19 percent. The tax rebellion began.

Voters from Babylon to Southold said loud and clear for all to hear, enough is enough, we will remember in November. We will throw the bums out.

Unfortunately, Halpin is not up for re-election, but the county legislature and the town boards are. As momentum built and the taxpayers became organized, it became apparent that being an incumbent was no longer an advantage as it had been in the past, it had become a big liability. The challengers had a rare opportunity of overcoming the benefits of incumbency. All the challengers had to do was present a reasonable platform, give an indication that they understood the taxpayers' wrath, offer a few constructive and positive solutions for cutting spending, meet the public, and they had a better than usual chance of being elected.

In all our years of watching and being part of the political process, we have never seen political parties acting so stupidly. In some races, the Republicans could have captured easily, they put up horrendous candidates and never gave them the benefit of any schooling. Democrats became arrogant and acted like this year's race was theirs by divine fault.

Brookhaven council candidates have failed to make a number of public meetings with some organizations, meet with our editorial board, or articulate the issues. The Democratic candidates in Riverhead and Southampton have deliberately ignored our interview process, without the courtesy of any explanation. It has become apparent that many of the Democratic candidates are being orchestrated by Pat Halpin's boys or political leaders. This is sad because if there ever was a need for independence, it was this year. If they are afraid, or unable, to articulate the issues, they would be a sorry lot of public officials.

In next week's edition of Suffolk Life we will offer our specific endorsements of the candidates for the county races, the legislature, and the town boards. Over the past 25 years we have endorsed local candidates, we have based our choices purely on qualifications, not party labels. Our endorsements have been fairly balanced over the years between Republicans and Democrats. In instances where this has not happened it has been solely because of the quality of candidates. Incumbents are generally

more aware of the issues. Some challengers take time to learn them. But others simply say "When I get in office I will learn the facts and then act." That's asking the voters to sign a blank check, something no one wants to do.

All candidates from the major parties were invited to take part in both private and joint interviews with the editorial board of Suffolk Life. The interviews took approximately two hours each, which represents a very heavy commitment on our part of our time and resources.

The news and the editorial staff spent numerous hours preparing a questionnaire containing over 100 specific questions. These questions and the candidates' feelings on each one of the issues will be published in our election edition, November 1. In past years, the candidates have been required to answer all questions in a yes or no format. Some conveyed to us that this was difficult, and asked if we could modify our system to allow for a degree of support or opposition. We decided this year to give this a try

and the candidates were asked to express their support in four different degrees - strongly favor, favor, oppose, strongly oppose. Hopefully, the answers the candidates have given will give you, our readers, an opportunity to weigh the candidates' commitment and to better understand what the candidates are actually for.

We recommend that the readers answer the questions themselves, then check their answers against those that have been given by the candidates. Those that match your particular philosophy or political leanings should be the candidates you favor.

Unfortunately, the candidates who chose not to answer the questionnaires or attend interviews are insulting to you, the voter. You have every right to know where a candidate stands. Those who have failed to offer that information have done so out of arrogance or plain deceit. In our book, they are not genuinely worthy of consideration and should not have taken part in the political process.

During our interviews we have attempted to not only look at the re-

cord of the incumbent, measure the good against the bad, but we were particularly interested in how they perceived the taxpayers' revolt. The incumbents, particularly, have had a whole year to devise ways of cutting spending and reduce taxes. Some have heard the message and have reacted accordingly. Others, unfortunately, have failed to heed the warnings and can be counted on to continue down the path of spend, spend, spend, tax, tax, tax.

This is the year of survival for Long Island residents. We thoroughly expect they will vote their pocket-books, they will put aside party labels and vote for what is in their own best interest.

We hope there will be a record-breaking turnout this November. Next week, we will publish our choices. On November 7, you will make yours. You, the voters, have the ultimate say. We have worked hard to give you as much information as possible to help you in that choice. We urge you to be sure to vote. This is your turn to speak.

And why not?



Election Day, November 7, is your turn to speak out.

When All Pull Together

Out of despair, sometimes, we can be successful, particularly when all pull together.

Last year it appeared that the Shinnecock Inlet project was doomed. President Reagan, at the last moment, had pulled funds out of the budget which had been planned and promised for almost six years.

Shinnecock Inlet is vital to the commercial fishing industry, the recreational and sport fishing industries and to our vacation economy. The inlet has become badly shoaled over the years and has been responsible for the loss of several lives.

In early January, we convened a

meeting here at Suffolk Life. We invited all parties who are involved with the inlet and the government officials who would have to pull together if the project had any hope of being saved.

A few weeks ago, Bush signed an appropriations bill that will allow the project to start in either January or February of this coming year. How we got from that bleak night in January to victory can be summed up in two words, people persuasiveness. The commercial, recreational and sport fishermen put aside their differences and worked in unison as a team. The wives of the Shinnecock fishermen spearheaded the drive, enlisting the aid of the sport and

recreational clubs. Legislator Fred Thiele, Jr., (R-Sag Harbor) rounded up support on the county level. Congressman George Hochbrueckner (D-Coram) maneuvered the measure through congress, Senator Alphonse D'Amato (R-New York) spearheaded the drive in the senate. There were a lot of meetings, rallies, lobbying trips, letters and plain hard work. The impossible became reality.

We salute all those who gave generously of their time, their efforts and their money. Shinnecock Inlet has been saved. Lives that would have been lost, won't. Congratulations to all of you, you've won.

And why not?