

The Editor Speaks

The time has come to determine what is more important: the obese funding of the defense industry, which swallows massive amounts of capital with no visible product or additional funding for environmental preservation and protection, currently undefended and undersupported by those who stand in a position to lend their support.



Whi

le it is possible to ignore any political issue for an extended period of time, until it becomes a rallying cry for an unknown group, the environment must cease to be a political issue and become strictly a matter of common sense.

It is incomprehensible to imagine that anyone would not favor increased funding for a cause so benevolent as the environment, and while the Clean Water, Clean Air Bond Act recently proposed in New York State passed by a fair margin, it was still widely protested by groups of mostly middle and upper class citizens, who have children whom will reap the harvest of their parent's greed. The bond act means an

additional \$3.25 per tax payer, per year for the next 20 years. For the price of a cup of coffee and a donut the citizens of NYS could improve their environment on a grand scale.

As a member of the Nature Conservancy I heartily believe in increased funding of the environment. I find it hard to believe that a general apathy for the environment can be the universal feeling of the public majority. Unless the current level of funding is increased the environment is in most certain danger of destruction by industrial landfills, suburban sprawl and the American tendency toward disposable goods. We must act now or it will soon be too late.



ugh
ds
ch-
irst-
i-
s,
w-
ne
h
e

Dewey or Truman 1948, Environmental Bond Act Pass or not 1996

Albany - In 1948, Truman went to bed thinking he was the loser. In the morning he was the President. Forty eight years later, when New Yorkers looked at the election results one last time Tuesday night before going to bed, they thought the bond act was defeated. The reason was, with 73% of the polls reporting, the bond measure was losing by 9 points. The next morning many New Yorkers awoke to surprising news, the bond won with 56% of the vote.

How could this dramatic change happen? On Tuesday night most of the precinct reporting were from upstate New York. When the New York city precincts finally tallied their votes, the upstate landslide in defeat changed to a downstate landslide in approval.

It wasn't surprising that New York city voters

wanted this passed, while upstate New Yorkers wanted it defeated. It has been suggested that 1.3 billion, or 77 percent, of the money could conceivably go to New York City projects.

Actually, specific projects aren't detailed in the bond act legislation. Now that New York voters approved the borrowing, eligible projects will have to compete for funding, and they'll be reviewed by technical experts in state environmental and park agencies.

Editorial

It is about time that the voters got a chance to decide if they want to fund an environmental project or not. New York does need to spend more money on the environment. If not, the future of this state will be grim.

The Bond Act will provide funding for much needed clean water, clean air, land conservation and waste site cleanup activities. It will

improve drinking water facilities, solid wastes areas, and encourage environmentally sound technologies.

The money New Yorkers pay for this act will be used for the enjoyment and future of all. Most money that is paid in taxes aren't always paid back directly to the taxpayer, but this act is different. Every person will be paid back whenever they walk through a cleaner park, drink water, fish, swim, or breath.

The people who are complaining about this Bond act should think about how much they enjoy the environmental before they open their mouths.

