

Feuding About Freeway Sites Stirs Studies

By VINCENT THOMAS
Assemblyman, 68th District
 The feuding over freeway locations which has flared up here and there over the state during the past few years shows signs of coming legislative life again. The controversies which arose in Chico, Monterey, Sacramento, and San Francisco indicate very well the depth of feeling which can be developed by the decision as to the precise routing of a freeway.

In these disputes, frequently the state highway commission and the division of highways in the department of public works were primary targets. The responsibilities and powers reposed in them to formulate plans and make decisions as to routes were attacked, even though specific procedures for exchange of information with localities, and for full public hearings on route proposals were

worked out and followed. Suggestions were made that the legislature should be given more authority over policy as to highway matters.

Such suggestions were embodied in two bills at our 1961 session. One would have restored to the legislature full budgetary control over all highway expenditures. The second would have provided limited legislative control over highway administrative and maintenance expenditures alone. This matter passed the assembly, but both were referred to interim study. The assembly ways and means committee recently held a hearing on the matter.

THE COMMITTEE was told that under existing law, appropriations for highway purposes from the highway fund are continuing, not limited to fiscal years, because the cycle of highway construction takes

from five to seven years. The law also provides that a highway budget cannot be changed after it has been adopted by the highway commission except with the consent of the director of finance.

At the meeting, the author of the first board measure agreed to drop his bill, which he said would go too far in ending all continuing appropriations for highway purposes. Instead, he presented the second bill for consideration, saying it would provide a very necessary and sound fiscal procedure, and would produce closer cooperation with the legislature.

Our legislative analyst gave the committee a very penetrating review of the basic factors involved in separate fiscal review and control of highway financing, its advantages and disadvantages as compared to the usual annual budgeting, and the possibilities

of doing it in various ways.

HE DISCUSSED the history of the present laws, and reported on a 1955 outside study which recommended that continuing appropriations be retained, but under stricter supervision by the highway commission.

A basic question raised by the analyst was whether, because of the make-up and duties of the highway commission, it is deciding matters of broad public policy in terms of highway transportation needs only. He said the answer to this question involves a number of broad areas.

FIRST, is land acquisition, with its conflicts to highway versus beaches and parks, or versus farm land. Second are issues of freeway design and location. Third, mass transit

and other means of filling transportation needs.

Finally, the needs of long-range planning of all state economic interests may be beyond authority of the commission. He said there may be merit in the proposal for greater legislative control of the highway administrative budget.

He suggested that the legislature might exercise its responsibilities by direct studies of particular highway problem areas on a sample basis without interfering with the need for continuous highway development, and that a state planning board with broad representation might help with major state economic issues, including highways. He warned, however, that the commission must retain its final decision-making authority.

Every day in the U.S., according to the National Fire Protection Assn., fire levies this tragic toll of death and destruction: 31 lives, 1,525 homes, 11 churches, 11 schools, 4 hospitals, 105 factories, 22 office buildings, 149 stores, and 203 farm buildings.



COOL GAME . . . Nancy Clark and Cy, a star sea lion at Marineland of the Pacific, cool off during hot August and September days with a fast game of catch. This particular game ended in a tie, so Cy got a mouthful of chopped mackerel, and Nancy was left with the game ball.

Police Review Boards Remain Target of CDC

By CHARLES E. CHAPEL
Assemblyman 46th District
 Leaders of the Democratic Party have thanked me for my exposure of the platform, resolutions, and policy of the California Democratic Council, commonly referred to as the "CDC". Although my previous exposure of the CDC produced unsolicited expressions of thanks from patriotic Democrats, the recent wrangle in Sacramento at the meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee caused those Democrats who are loyal Americans to ask me to continue my exposure of the CDC.

At the meeting of the CDC in Fresno, in February 1960, the CDC said:

"Capital punishment should be abolished. The goal of penal administration should be the prevention of crime and rehabilitation of the criminal. We urge all California cities and counties to set up a police review board, separate and distinct from the law enforcement department, with the power to hear citizen complaints of mistreatment at the hands of law enforcement officials, . . . and if justified to recommend that disciplinary action be taken against the offending official."

one or more bills during the 1963 session of the California State Legislature to establish the so-called "Police Review Board" in each city and county of California.

Personally and officially I am opposed to the enactment of any law or laws setting up the so-called "Police Boards," separate and distinct from the law enforcement department of any branch of government because already we have ample protection for citizens who allege that they are the victims of police brutality. Here is what you can do about the CDC attempt to handcut the policemen and sheriffs:

1. WRITE to all candidates for public office, particularly candidates for the assembly or the senate of the California State Legislature and ask them to answer the following questions in writing:
 - a. Do you belong to the CDC?
 - b. Are you endorsed by the CDC?
 - c. Do you accept and support the entire program of the CDC?
 - d. If you do not accept and support the entire CDC gram, what portion or portions do you repudiate and oppose?
 - e. If elected to the California State Legislature (or any other public office) will you support or vote for any bill or bills setting up the so-called "Police Review Boards" demanded by the CDC?
 - f. Do you or do you not know that the Communist party in California as shown by its newspaper, wants the "Police Review Boards" created by law?

OBVIOUSLY, the CDC does not like policemen, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officers if they are protecting the public. The heart of the CDC bleeds for the criminal but it is not interested in the families of those who have been murdered, mutilated, raped, or robbed.

At the meeting of the CDC in Santa Monica, March 1961, the CDC adopted what it called a "Crime Policy Statement," with no reference to legal weapons for law enforcement officers, but emphasizing what the CDC calls the "social sickness that produces crime."

The demand for "all California cities and counties to set up a police review board, separate and distinct from the law enforcement department" was not repealed or repudiated, but remained one of the goals of the CDC and its pet candidates. Nothing was said, either at the Fresno, 1960, or the Santa Monica, 1961, meeting, about the fact that victims of alleged police brutality already have the right to redress in court.

HAVING written to candidates for public office, particularly candidates for the California State Legislature, on the above subjects, you can ask any organization to which you belong to pass a resolution expressing its opinion of the so-called "Police Review Boards".

Your newspaper will be glad to hear from you on this vital subject.

Irene Ryan headlined as a female sad-sack in her night club engagements, continues to wear an unglamorous wardrobe in CBS-TV's "The Beverly Hillbillies," in which she costars with Buddy Ebsen.

Asked why she never switched to seductive minks and curly sweaters, Irene replied wryly: "That would be like trying to flag down the Super-Chief with a burned-out match!"

At the CDC meeting in Fresno, 1962, our informants could not obtain any written or printed expressions of CDC policy on the above subjects, and it can be assumed that in the absence of any CDC reversal of its stand against the police, the desire to handicap law enforcement officers continued.

Democrats who attended the recent Sacramento meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee tell me that the "left wing" element of the Democratic Party, who are not truly representative of most registered Democrats, continued to talk about introducing

"One benefit of inflation— youngsters can no longer get sick on a nickel's worth of candy."

Call Cumberford or Gilbert 3-4181 For Location of Store Nearest You

Savings AddUp

at VON'S and Shopping Bag

39¢
38¢
77¢

FREE SCHOOL BOOK COVERS!

Handsomely Illustrated California Designs. Available at All Von's & Shopping Bag Mkts.

OUR OWN MARGARINE VON'S & SHOPPING BAG 1-LB. CT. 1. 2 for 25¢	FRESH BREAD PERFECTION-SLICED WHITE or WHEAT STANDARD 15-OZ. LOAF 25¢	MIRACLE WHIP SALAD DRESSING KRAFT QUART JAR 49¢
Chunk Tuna STARKIST LIGHT MEAT 6 1/2-OZ. CAN 25¢	Peanut Butter Von's & Shopping Bag 16-oz. Jar 39¢	Jams & Jellies SUPERIOR BRANDY 20-oz. Jar GRAPE JELLY 3 1/2¢
Orange Juice TREESWEET FROZEN FLORIDA 6-oz. Can 6 1/2¢	Fresh Butter JERSEYMAID GRADE AA 1-LB. CTN. 67¢	

Chuck Roast
U.S.D.A. CHOICE STEER BEEF... ONLY!
Our Custom Trim Means Your Best Beef Value

BLADE CUTS 39¢/lb.

Center Cut Chuck 47¢
Boneless Chuck 89¢

Chuck Steaks 47¢
Family Steaks 89¢
Ground Chuck 59¢
Ground Round 69¢
Stewing Beef 79¢

RIB STEAK OR ROAST 89¢/lb.

Round Steaks
FULL CUT 79¢
Tender N' Juicy Choice Beef
BONELESS ROUND STEAK 89¢

RUMP ROASTS 79¢/lb.
U.S.D.A. CHOICE
BONELESS RUMP ROAST 89¢

SLICED BACON 59¢/lb.
Eversweet Lean

Seafood Sea-lections
FANCY SHRIMP 1.19¢
Fillet of Sole 79¢
4-Fishermen, Frozen

FISH STICKS 59¢
SCALLOPS 45¢
FISH STEAKS 39¢

OH BOY FROZEN PIZZAS
CHEESE 39¢
Sausage 49¢
Pepperoni 79¢

Lanolin Plus Sale!
Your Choice of:
Hair Spray . . .
Creme Rinse . . .
Egg or Castile Shampoo

16-oz. Bottle **63¢**

Raisin Bread 29¢
Chock Full of Raisins. Youngsters Favorite with Peanut Butter

SNACK DONUTS 27¢
Another Lunchbox Favorite
Powdered or Crumb. 16 in Pkg.

SANDWICH BAGS 7¢
ZEE-WAXED
30-COUNT PACKAGE

LUNCH BOXES \$1.79
BY THERMOS
WITH 10-OZ. THERMOS 8TL.

BOOK BINDER 66¢
3-RING
Choice of Styles
BIG VALUE

FILLER PAPER 39¢
3-HOLE
200 CT. PKG.

RUSSET Potatoes 8 1/2¢/lb.
U.S. NO. 1 IDAHO'S FINEST
BEST FOR BAKING

BLACK GRAPES 10¢/lb.
LARGE SIZE

AVOCADOS 2:25
Fancy—Best for Salads
SEEDLESS • LUNCH BOX FAVORITES

RAISINS 10:29
Fancy
1 1/2-Oz. Pkg.

TV DINNERS 49¢
SWANSON
8 VARIETIES
FROZEN 10-OZ. PKG.

FROZEN MEAT PIES 5 8-oz. \$1
VON'S & SHOPPING BAG
50% More Meat Than Ordinary Pies
• Two Crusts •

Delicatessen Specials
SLICED CHEESE 3 8-Oz. \$1.00
Each Slice Individually Wrapped For Easy Separation

Cottage Cheese 49¢
SWISS CHEESE 25¢
Yon's & Shopping Bag Wisconsin Natural

Jerseymaid • First Day Fresh
Cottage Cheese 49¢
SWISS CHEESE 25¢
Yon's & Shopping Bag Wisconsin Natural

Vodka or Gin \$2.99
For Cool, Summer Drinks • 80-Proof
FIFTH

STRAIGHT BOURBON \$3.99
MILLBROOK • 80-PROOF
MILLBROOK BOTTLED IN BOND
STRAIGHT BOURBON \$3.99

Calo Dog Food 2 1/2 49¢ 26 OZ. CAN	White Rock Lo-Cal 2:29¢ Bell's Chopped Olives 10¢ Nabisco Fig Newtons 25¢ M.J.B. Long Grain Rice 21¢	BEECHNUT BABY FOOD 3 29¢ The Most Babied Foods in the World 4 OZ. CAN	Northern Toilet Tissue 4 37¢ Charcoal Briquets 10 89¢ Foodcraft Dill Pickles 29¢ Sunshine Krispy Crackers 33¢	Beef or Veal Cutlets 4 69¢ FROZEN 3 OZ. EA.
--	--	--	---	---