

# County's lease deal is aborted

At the 11th hour, just before an ad hoc committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was slated to vote for subpoena powers, an emergency meeting was called by Suffolk County Executive Robert Gaffney on the infamous Suffolk County car lease deal to discuss a compromise reached with Legislative Presiding Officer Donald Blydenburgh (R-Hauppauge) and the Republican caucus.

The essence of the deal was that the county would lease the 399 cars already contracted for, would purchase additional cars out of operating funds and more cars through bonding. The number of cars that were to be purchased dropped from 1,700 to 1,324. The Republicans kissed and made up, but the residents have been left wondering about this whole mess.

A number of troublesome questions have been raised for which answers have not been readily forthcoming. The original deal stunk and it still does. This was more than a tiff between the legislature and the county executive, and it shouldn't be buried under a rug.

We still question if the county has a complete inventory of all cars and vehicles owned by the county. We were assured early on, when the 1,700 figure was released, that an inventory was, indeed, available. Now it turns out, according to Gaffney's own omission, that the 1,700 figure was flawed. We don't need that many vehicles. The inventory, whatever it is that is available, is not computerized, as it should be, listing all the vital informa-

tion necessary to make decisions about the need for replacement. It's unbelievable administration officials were 376 cars off in their original contract figure.

The allegations that were made concerning the lease are still out there begging for answers. The whole process is questionable and in need of review.

Why has the county government gone to Request for Proposals when they should be using a pure and simple bidding process? It isn't only the leases and the procurement of cars that is in question. There are a number of areas in county government that have escaped the bidding process.

Although we spend millions and

millions of dollars per year in subsidizing mass transit through bus contracts, these contracts are not put out to bid. They are doled out via contracts without assurances the taxpayer is getting the most for each dollar spent. It has been demonstrated in the county's preschool program, which was put out to bid based on the recommendation of a management consultant, that competitive bidding can save millions. The county itself saved over \$3 million for the preschool busing.

The members of the legislative ad hoc panel, chaired by Legislator Herbert Davis (R-Shirley), that brought the lease deal to a head are to be congratulated. They have made government work. They saved the taxpayers millions of dollars through their determination and willingness to face political heat to right what they felt was wrong. They should not disband, but start digging into the other areas that are crying out for attention. They should change their focus to concentrate on the county's transportation system to determine why competitive bidding has not been put into place, using subpoena powers if needed. There are millions that can be saved, dollars that could be put back into the system to ensure it fully meets the needs of the county's taxpayers, without additional cost to the taxpayers.

Once that matter is explored and resolved, the ad hoc committee should focus on other areas of county government where "business as usual" continues in the doling out of taxpayer dollars to the favored few. This committee's success in forcing the reversal of a very questionable leasing deal should enhance their resolve to reap similar savings of taxpayer dollars. They proved it can be done. They should continue their task and, in so doing, earn the gratitude of taxpayers who deserve that kind of dedication from their elected officials.

And why not?

*For valuable voting information*

## Watch for questionnaires

In the next few weeks you will have an opportunity to really get to know the candidates who are seeking office.

Suffolk Life, as a public service to its readers, each year develops an extensive questionnaire, submits it to all major party candidates and publishes their answers.

The candidates for state races will have an opportunity to tell you how they would vote on approximately 125 different issues. The results of this questionnaire will be published next week, October 12. On October 19, candidates for federal offices will have the same opportunity.

We encourage you, the reader, to read the questionnaire, choose "yes"

or "no" for your own answer, than compare those answers to the candidates' answers. If their answers agree with yours, they are probably the candidates you may wish to vote for. If their answers are different from yours, you can probably count on them not voting in Albany the way you would want them to.

Candidates complain year after year that the questions are difficult to answer with a simple yes or no. Our response is simply this: When push comes to shove, and the vote is being taken, there are only three choices—yes, no, or abstain. Sure, politicians always try to explain their vote, but the final choice is still the same—yes, no, or abstain (blank, which can also mean "don't know").

Candidates who fail to answer the questionnaire are being less than forthright. In most cases it is not that they don't have a position, they don't want you to know it. Some choose not to answer the questionnaire out of arrogance and are as much as saying you do not have the right to know how I feel, trust me. That's hogwash.

We recommend you save these questionnaires. During the term of office, remind the candidates of the positions they took, the pledges they made and when they stray from the truth, nail them to the wall.

As a voter you have a right to know and to know the truth. Don't accept anything less.

And why not?

*In influencing public officials*

## Your letters can make a difference

It is said that the pen is mightier than the sword. These past few weeks we have been interviewing the candidates for various state offices. We noted that some of the incumbents had changed positions on certain issues. When we questioned them on why they changed their minds from the last time they ran, often they responded that they had heard from their constituents who made valid points. The constituents had pointed out things in their letters that the incumbents had not thought about themselves.

Of particular note, Assemblyman Paul Harenberg (D-Oakdale), an 18-year veteran of the Assembly, startled us when he said he no longer favored tenure for teachers without a periodic review. Harenberg taught in the Bay-

port system up until the time he became an assemblyman. In our early interviews, he was very protective of tenure for teachers. Based on correspondence from constituents, he said he is now questioning if tenure is not

protecting poor teachers more than protecting good teachers. He said that with the current compensation level for teachers, we are entitled to 100% excellence. He noted he could support legislation requiring teachers' perfor-

---

**"Legislators get their share of mail but often it is mostly from lobbyists and organized groups. Individual letters from constituents can carry a much more powerful message."**

---

mance be reviewed every four or five years, with tenure renewed based the teachers' performance.

This change in direction and thinking of some legislators was the result of average people putting their feelings on paper and directing them to the Assembly members. Legislators get their share of mail but often it is mostly from lobbyists and organized groups. Individual letters from constituents can carry a much more powerful message.

Most legislators want to do what is right, but must be encouraged by people taking part in their government. The next time you feel strongly on an issue, don't hesitate to write to your representative. They actually welcome letters from constituents voicing their opinions.

And why not?

Compromise is needed

# County government going too far

Suffolk County government once again has gone too far and is now trying to rectify its mistake.

This spring the Suffolk County Legislature banned smoking in all restaurants and other facilities. The only exemption was if restaurateurs built enclosed rooms and had dedicated ventilation systems. This requirement would cost most

restaurants \$60,000. Many restaurants were just holding on and were left with the choice of turning customers away because of the county ban on smoking, or driving themselves into bankruptcy because of the \$60,000 investment.

Restaurateurs were up in arms at last Tuesday's legislative meeting. Legislator Tom Finlay (R-Brentwood) had proposed a sensible com-

promise, one that required restaurants to maintain 60% of their seating for non-smokers and 40% for smokers. Most restaurants already have ventilation systems that direct and filter the air in smoking areas. This makes sense.

Restaurants on the west end of the Island know that their clientele will drive the few miles to cross the border into Nassau, where smoking is not as highly regulated.

Smokers are fed up with being regulated to the back of the bus. We know of a number of smokers who have protested with their feet. They have gotten up and walked out of restaurants where they feel they have been discriminated against. Some smokers we have discussed this issue with say they now try to avoid eating in regulated public places. They

avoid business lunches, eat at their desk or patronize restaurants that are not enforcing the rules.

We can understand people who are non-smokers not wanting to be subjected to secondhand smoke. We also understand smokers not wanting to be deprived of what they consider the pleasures of smoking. They are tired of others telling them what is good for them.

Segregated sections of the restaurants, with adequate ventilation systems, should be a compromise that both sides of the argument could support.

Banning--total elimination--puts all the rights on one side, stripping another of his or her rights. If there is a compromise that can protect everyone's rights, let's work toward it.

And why not?

Hire town manager

# Rare opportunity

The days are ticking down until the state gives its approval for Riverhead Supervisor Joseph Janoski to retire. After being elected to his ninth term in office, Janoski suffered a series of major heart attacks. His doctors have advised him that to return to work would be signing his own death sentence.

Councilman James Stark has assumed the duties and responsibilities of supervisor, however stating at the outset he would be willing to assume these responsibilities for a limited period of time only. With Janoski still officially in office, a special election can't be held, but the town board does have an opportunity to try an experiment that has worked successfully for many towns in Connecticut and some cities upstate.

They can hire a town manager, a capable executive who would run the day-to-day operations of the town. He would be a full-time business manager, working under the direction of the town board. Town managers normally work on a contract. They do the everyday jobs a chief executive is expected to perform. They bring to the board of directors, the elected officials, the policy or the political issues. They operate within a budget and assist in preparing that document for the following year.

They have the power to recommend hiring or firing. They work with labor and oversee the managers of the various departments.

In towns across the Sound, the elected mayor or supervisor performs ceremonial functions. They are the head of the town council. They conduct meetings but stay out of the day-to-day operations of the government. The system works well. The town enjoys the benefit of a highly trained business person who is free of day-to-day politics. This idea has been proposed for local governments here time and again. It has usually been rejected because the current supervisors did not want to give up their powers; their egos stood in the way.

Considering the problem of having a limited time frame to put a functioning, elected supervisor in place during the next year through an election, or a possible stalemate over filling the position through appointment, the current situation gives Riverhead a grand opportunity to experiment with this change in operation. The town board should discuss this position thoroughly and give it an opportunity to work.

And why not?

# Don't go home without one

What is the one thing you should never enter your home without? The answer is easy, a home fire alarm.

Home fire and smoke alarms can be as simple as a \$15 battery-operated device. The only thing you have to do is to change the battery every six months to be sure it is operative. These alarms are inexpensive, easy to install and can be bought in most local hardware or general merchandise stores. Better yet, have a hardwired, phone-connected fire security system installed that detects both smoke and heat. Yes, they are much more expensive. But what is a life worth?

Last year the majority of fires that killed people were in homes that were not equipped with fire alarms. Just last week two young girls died in a Copiague fire, and a man perished in a Hampton Bays mobile home fire. While we do not know if those premises were equipped with alarms, we do know stories are regularly re-

ported of families and individuals being saved because they did have a working fire alarm and were alerted to an emergency in time to escape.

For single persons, and particularly senior citizens, who live alone, a fire alarm is as important as your pay or Social Security check.

In addition to fire alarms, families should have an emergency plan for evacuation, a recommendation included in the highly-regarded Operation EDITH (Exit Drill in the Home). The Operation EDITH method advocates the family should sit down and discuss an escape plan for their home, develop escape routes and then periodically have home fire drills. The whole procedure need only take a few minutes, a smart investment that could well save your life.

And why not?

# What is the real difference?

When we graduated from college, we were not quite sure whether we were a Democrat or a Republican. We weren't even sure of the difference between the parties. In our quest to find an answer, we attended both Republican and Democratic club meetings.

At a Democratic club meeting, Suffolk County's first county executive, H. Lee Dennison, was speaking. When it came time to ask questions, I asked if he could explain the difference between the parties. The question startled him but, being quick on his feet, he responded. The Democrats start programs, the Republicans pay for them, he said.

During the last 40 years that the Democrats have controlled Washington, DC, they have started a lot of programs, many of them called entitlements. These programs have driven up federal taxes in every bracket. Most Americans today are paying, between federal and local taxes, almost half of what they earn. Our freedoms and our abilities have been stifled by regulations and socially correct programs.

Most voters will go to the polls this year having a clear-cut answer to what the differences are between Republicans and Democrats. Incumbent Republican congressmen and Republican challengers to Democratic offi-

ceholders signed a contract last week between themselves and the American public. They pledged that if they gain control of Congress, they will approve 10 items that would go a long way to capping spending and returning individuals rights to the citizens.

Sure this was an attempt by the Republicans to draw attention to their agenda. It is probable that even if they take full control of the House of Representatives and the Senate, they would not achieve all of their objectives. However, what they have done is draw the nation's attention to the differences and give Americans hope for reform and the direction Americans will take in the future.

The Democratic Party today is made up basically of special vested interests who have manipulated the government to support the agendas that they personally profit from. This is financed and funded by themselves and by the rest of Americans, who see no direct benefits.

This November 8, if you are registered to vote, you can cast a ballot. You can continue to send the entrenched incumbents back to office or you can send people committed to all Americans, not just the special interests.

And why not?

# Another stockholder bailout

Over the last six months, the price of LILCO (Long Island Lighting Company) stock has dropped close to 40%. During the Shoreham controversy, LILCO stock was, at one point, under \$3 per share. Then, because of the "gifts" in the form of favorable decisions granted by the New York State Public Service Commission (PSC) and the Federal Nuclear Regulatory Agency during the course of construction, the stock bounded back to almost \$8. Governor Mario Cuomo then negotiated the "sweetheart deal of the century," in the words of a Wall Street expert, and the stock rose to almost \$27 a share. Cuomo's deal allowed LILCO to recover three times its investment off the backs of the Long Island ratepayers.

Cuomo was the best friend LILCO ever had. The members of the LILCO board should have a bronze engraving of this great orator in their boardroom, one that they can bow to and pay homage before they commence any meetings.

Utility boardrooms across the country have been in a panic over the last six months. Two things have happened. The federal government has allowed the wholesale wheeling of electricity. Public service commissions in California and Michigan have started to take action in regards to the wheeling rates charged by utilities in their states. In fact, in a pub-

lished report early this week, it was claimed that LILCO officials, concerned because of the push for competitive purchase of power, made it known to state officials they would possibly consider a takeover offer. If true, Cuomo's proposal must be suspect as a LILCO bailout plan.

New York State's weak-kneed Public Service Commission has actually started to address the high cost of energy in New York State. They have ordered Niagara Power to reduce rates, which sent a shock wave over Wall Street. Utilities have been cash cows that Wall Street has been in love with.

The brokerage firms have even suggested that the bondholders have an explicit understanding with utilities that their bonds are sacred, will be honored, will pay interest, no matter what happens to the ratepayers.

Long Islanders have begun to seriously address the LILCO problem. They have been talking and launched studies, not only about taking over LILCO, but using the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) to condemn only the gas and electrical transmission lines of this corporation, or the comparable cost of installing competing transmission facilities and lines.

If LIPA, which has the power of emi-

nent domain as an authority and can do the deal, were to put competing transmission lines into place, they would render LILCO worthless. This is doable and it is a real threat. It would allow LIPA to buy the cheapest power on the market and distribute it on a cost-plus basis. This would reduce electrical rates below the nation's norm and could cut utility bills right in half.

Just as those of us who were advocating the takeover of LILCO when it was under \$10 a share began to realize the folly of our mistake, we see the governor pop his head up and make an offer to take over LILCO at \$21.50, at a time when LILCO's stock was at \$16.50. Some are saying this is an October surprise to bail the governor out in his reelection bid. They are wondering why now, after the damage has been done, he embraces an idea that had merit in the past but which he refused to embrace.

Is it the governor's desire to reduce rates on Long Island, or is it his obligation to bail LILCO and Wall Street out once again? If wholesale wheeling of power and reasonable transmission costs become a reality, LILCO will be worth a fraction of what the market says it is worth today. In fact, if it has no customer base, it will be bankrupt and the ratepayers of Long Island would be free at last.

Six of Suffolk's towns, Suffolk County government and LIPA are studying the issue. Supposedly, as part of Cuomo's backroom plotting to put together his takeover proposal, Prudential Bache has studied the financial feasibility, but that information has not been made public. Cuomo claims this will not be a hostile takeover, but rather will be a negotiated arrangement. So was his Shoreham deal, negotiated with the help of the PSC and Vincent Tese, state director of economic development. Remember the published reports about Tese negotiating with LILCO Chairman William Catacosinos in a plush New York City apartment over an expensive bottle of wine? Do we really want to go down that road again?

If the deal has merit, let's see the figures! We can't afford any more bailouts or sweetheart deals. An end to LILCO's arrogant rule over Long Island is certainly something we have all long prayed for. But we should have learned not to trust the actions of Cuomo and his allies when it comes to our energy costs. Fool us once, shame on them. Fool us twice, shame on us!

We must be ever vigilant and not let Cuomo snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

And why not?

## Part One;

# The failures of Mario Cuomo

When Governor Mario Cuomo looks in the mirror, he sees the reflection of a reasonably handsome, vibrant, intelligent, skilled orator. How sad it must be for him to realize that behind this facade is a man who has so badly failed.

Cuomo has had the opportunity of being governor of New York State for 12 years. When he took over the reins of power, this was still a good state, a pleasant place to live, economically rewarding to own a business and to work. In 12 years, he has brought this state to the bottom. He allowed politics and special interests to supersede common sense and decency.

Long Island, once the most productive region, today is an economic disaster zone. Long Island's economy has been devastated by things under Cuomo's control. The cutbacks in defense have hurt, but they were not the one thing that killed the golden goose. On Long Island, it was and is the high cost of utilities, unaffordable real estate taxes, and state and local taxes that take more out of paychecks than any other state in the nation.

People can afford to buy homes on Long Island, but they can't afford to live in them. Corporations can start businesses but they can't remain profitable here on Long Island. This is not something new, it's been going on for years. Years that Cuomo turned a deaf ear to our cries for help. He has ignored and punished us.

## Lack of leadership

The high utility costs are the doings of Cuomo. The pain and blood of Long Island businesses and residents are

clearly on his hands. As governor, he appoints the chairman and the members of the Public Service Commission (PSC). He could have enormous power over these individuals. The PSC was supposed to protect the consumer by regulating rates while, at the same time, keeping the utilities that were managed well healthy.

During the early years of his administration, Cuomo left the holdover PSC Chairman Paul Gioia in place. Gioia was kept there even though he was clearly acting on behalf of the utility. Gioia threw out the "used and useful principle," which withheld payments for plants until they were used and useful. Had that been applied, this would have held down the cost of electrical rates and would have stopped Shoreham cold in its tracks. Instead, he kept feeding the near-bankrupt Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) with Construction Work in Progress funds which permitted the utility to continue its construction. This gave LILCO a blank check that drove the cost of Shoreham from \$250 million to \$5 billion.

## Cuomo's 'sweetheart deal'

When the county fought LILCO over the safety issues and had the company on the verge of collapse, the governor came to the rescue. During the Shoreham commission hearings, it became obvious that the state could buy the nuclear power plant for less than \$1.8 billion. Cuomo did not act, but instead went on to negotiate with LILCO for the public purchase of the plant for \$5 billion. It is now estimated that the total cost to the ratepayers will be close to \$10 billion.

The ratepayers ended up paying for the plant three times. The Wall Street Journal characterized the Cuomo deal as the "sweetheart deal of the century." They were right.

## Turned deaf ear

As predicted during the Shoreham hearings, we have watched the effects of the escalating LILCO rates take their toll on the economy, on jobs, on the values of businesses and homes. Everyone has cried out for relief, but the governor turned a deaf ear. He has never made any effort to revamp the PSC. This is a failure of leadership on his part to use the powers within his jurisdiction, and this has caused the problems. To compound this, he has refused to call out for the elections of public service commissioners which would put this agency in the hands of the people.

Back in the 80s, Long Island residents forced the creation of the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA). LIPA's purpose was to either take over LILCO or be used to control rate increases. LIPA was to be controlled by an elected board of directors, elected by the ratepayers. Instead of elections ever coming about, Cuomo has appointed his hand-picked members and has used LIPA as a toy and a tool for his own personal, political power.

Cuomo, singlehandedly answering to Wall Street, has kept LILCO not only affluent, but one which gained enormous profits out of the pockets of Long Island residents.

## Cuomo's high taxes

The second major problem with Long Island is the high cost of property

taxes, and paying the huge tax burden imposed upon all New York State residents. Long Island property taxes have been propelled into the highest in the nation by overwhelming educational costs. We spend more on education on Long Island than any other area in the lower 48 states. We spend the equivalent of a private college tuition. Again, Cuomo has failed to provide the leadership to address this problem. He not only has a bully pulpit, but he has the power to propose and have laws passed, and to use state aid to force local school boards to economize.

## Beats to drum

Cuomo could have stopped runaway educational costs anytime he wanted to. Instead, he has beat to the drum of the New York State teachers' unions and allowed killer taxes to force people out of their homes, which had once been affordable. He appoints the commissioner of education. This is a department that answers to him. Yet, he has not fostered through the department any of the programs that would have forced the local school boards to become real and operate, and provide a quality education that is within the state mandates.

On a state level, we have more state employees per capita than any other state in the nation. While the rest of America was downsizing, Cuomo was upsizing. He grew government to a point that drove businesses and residents permanently out of the state.

Unfortunately, Cuomo's list of failures is too long to detail in one editorial. The Cuomo failures, Part Two, will be offered next week.

And why not?

# Run scared, Long Islanders,

Picture yourself falling overboard. You need a life preserver and someone throws you an empty, quart soda bottle. It wouldn't be much help. Neither will the gamble on the takeover of the Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) that is only projected to cut your electrical rates by 10%.

This estimated 10% reduction would bring the average LILCO electric cost to about 15.5 cents per kilowatt hour. Our rates still will be 60% over the nation's norm. Our businesses and industries will not become competitive. Homeowners will still have to pay this huge premium to live on Long Island. If the takeover would reduce rates to the nation's average, it might make sense.

Florida Power and Light, one of the best run utilities in the nation, produces power, wheels, pays their overhead, and makes a huge profit, yet still is able to sell their power to everyday consumers for seven cents per kilowatt hour. This is the kind of competition Long Island is up against when it comes to keeping businesses, jobs and homeowners.

Suffolk Life has been a long-term advocate for the takeover of LILCO. We were instrumental in the creation of the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA). We were powerful proponents behind its creation and used all of our resources to get the bill through the legislature and onto the desk of the governor.

The Long Island Power Authority was to be a ratepayer-controlled public authority that would move forward to take over LILCO at a time when the utility was in perilous financial condition. If LIPA did not take over LILCO soon after being created, it would be poised to do so someday in the future if the rates got out of hand.

The initial legislation called for a publicly-elected board of directors within a three-year time span. Care was taken in crafting the original legislation to keep partisan politics out of this publicly-controlled power authority.

The governor extracted from the legislators, by threatening to oppose and veto the legislation, the authority to appoint the initial board. Although

many were against giving in to the governor, they felt that if this was the price you had to pay, since his dominance would only be for three years until the election was held, it was worth it to gain a Long Island-controlled power authority.

LIPA was created and the governor handpicked the majority of the board members, who became puppets doing his bidding. They were not the counterforce needed to protect the consumer. They became part and parcel of Cuomo's sweetheart deal that bailed out the LILCO stockholders and bondholders. Because they did not effectively perform the oversight they were charged with, the governor allowed the cost of Shoreham to be regularly increased three times and the ratepayers were made to eat it.

The cost of electricity went from about 11 cents to 17.5 cents a kilowatt hour, the highest rate for electricity in the nation. The stock went from a low of \$3 per share to over \$27 per share. Cuomo's handpicked board, which controls LIPA, never made any serious attempt to take over LILCO.

The three years came and past, still no elected board. The legislature and the governor conspired to deny the public the right to choose the directors. They postponed the elections. They had never drawn the maps of the districts.

Assemblyman Paul Harenberg (D-Oakdale) intends to introduce maps and legislation this January that, if supported, will mandate the election of LIPA trustees during 1995.

LILCO's stock during the past nine months has dropped almost 40% in value. Utility stocks across the country are beginning to become suspect. The reason has nothing to do with the incompetent management of the utilities. The federal government has allowed the wholesale wheeling of electricity. This change in the regulations has opened up competition where none had been.

LILCO stock currently is about \$14 a share, and fluctuating almost daily. The governor has offered to buy the company from the stockholders for \$21.50 a share, a 50% premium over what the market says the company is worth.

## Failures of Mario Cuomo, Part Two

Last week we began exploring the record of Governor Mario Cuomo during his 12 years in office. We listed the many problems which have caused our state to flounder, our Long Island to become a virtual economic disaster, and the failures of Cuomo to address these problems.

We detailed his lack of leadership in addressing the inactions of the Public Service Commission (PSC) which has catered to the needs of the utilities at the expense of the ratepayers; and his part in negotiating the "sweetheart deal of the century" with the Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) to close Shoreham, driving LILCO's rates to the highest in the nation.

We detailed his failure to deal with the escalating costs of education, his failure to effectively deal with the problems of financing education, of the declining quality of education our children receive, and of the ineffectiveness of the state's Department of Education to resolve these issues.

We noted, too, that we have more state employees per capita than any other state in the nation, and a tax structure that is driving businesses and jobs out of our state.

That's just for starters. Let's continue our look at the last 12 years under Cuomo and the conditions that exist because of his failures:

### Opposition to reforms

Following his liberal agenda, he has opened the floodgates to anyone who wants the opportunity to go on the dole without residency or qualifications. Even modest reforms, such as fingerprinting, have been opposed until the political winds blew so fierce that he could no longer ignore them. Even now, he blocks statewide fingerprinting, bowing to the New York City delegation that does not want welfare reform.

Most workers in New York State

have private health insurance. As good as it may be, it does not compare with the Cadillac of plans Medicaid recipients enjoy. They have 32 options over and above those found in the plans that taxpayers have. A Medicaid recipient can get a vasectomy and a hair transplant at the same time, and we pick up the tab. Women on welfare who are having trouble getting pregnant are entitled to fertility treatments paid for by Cuomo's working stiff--us. She will receive additional benefits for this child. New York State pays a bonus everytime a welfare mother has another child. Those of us who pay taxes are expected to pay for additional children out of our taxed earnings without help from Mario and company. California serves the legitimate medical needs of 1.5 million more people than New York at half the cost.

### Death penalty vetos

Cuomo's liberalism is what has driven up our taxes. Cuomo has persistently, for the last 12 years, vetoed the death penalty that has been passed by the majority of the Senate and the Assembly. The death penalty is wanted by almost 80% of the New York State residents. Cuomo claims this is a matter of conscience and it may well be for him, but the residents are scared silly and want the deterrent the death penalty provides. They look at New York State's turnstile justice and cringe.

The governor sets the policy and the public is disgusted with our system of turnstile justice. They fear for their lives as they see criminals serving just a small part of their sentences. Murderers and rapists are back out on the street through work release programs and early parole. They are tired of seeing prisoners receive benefits they can't afford in their own homes--cable television, communal visits and a whole host of amenities that make a life of crime worthwhile. This liberalism toward the

criminal is part and parcel of the governor's mentality which refuses to accept the philosophy of an eye for an eye.

### Loss of jobs

During the 12 years that Mario Cuomo has been governor, 1.5 million jobs have left the state. During the last four years, over 500,000 productive, hard-working, taxpaying residents have left. They would be here today if the businesses they worked for could have been profitable, and they could have afforded to live here on the money they made.

We have made New York noncompetitive. The taxes have proved to be a disincentive to stay here. The wages that must be paid to afford a livable quality of life are out of step with the wages for the same job in other states. Grumman realized this early. They moved numerous operations off the Island. They could not afford to pay their staff the amount of money that was required to be a New York State resident. Grumman was a big one, and thousands of other smaller operations came to the same conclusion. They moved to Pennsylvania, the Carolinas, Florida and Texas.

As productive, taxpaying citizens left, Cuomo replaced them with more state workers and welfare recipients, further complicating the problem. The taxes on businesses alone have proven to be an enormous disincentive for staying here. Other states who control their spending have produced a better environment for profitability. It doesn't pay to make money or profits in New York State.

### Debt rating woes

New York, today, has one of the worst debt ratings in the nation. We are 47 out of 50 states, according to Forbes. This debt carries big interest payments that come right off the top of

taxes raised. Debt that we did not have any say in. According to the State Constitution, if the state wants to borrow money through bonds, they must go to the public for approval. In the last several years, voters have turned down bond propositions. Cuomo has found a way to sneak around these constitutional constraints. He has used state agencies such as the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) and the Thruway Authority to circumvent the law.

Cuomo sold Attica Prison to the UDC, and then rented it back from the UDC. He got a quick infusion of cash but has put the residents of New York State in debt for 30 years. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted in interest payments. This kind of fiscal insanity has led to us paying huge penalties in bond ratings and needless interest payments.

### Vote, it's critical!

Four years ago, Cuomo was re-elected by only 15% of the eligible voters. About 40% of us didn't bother to register to vote. Of the remaining 60%, only half went to the polls, and the vote was split. Cuomo got about 15% of the total number of voters who could have voted, and won. Don't think your vote doesn't count. It's critical! Cuomo's support comes from those who have their head in the trough. If you are tired of paying for it, get off your duff and take part in your government by voting on Tuesday, November 8.

Almost everything that Cuomo has touched has been tainted with politics his desire for re-election and the pleasing of the special interests that keep him in office. After 12 years of creating chaos he comes before us with a bag of empty promises; election year tricks God, how painful it must be for him to look in the mirror each morning.

He won't retire. We must retire him.

And why not?