Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in honoring the Mare Island Original 21ers for their efforts to end racial discrimination at Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

On November 17, 1962, twenty-one African American workers at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, CA, took a historic step by filing a racial discrimination complaint with President Kennedy's newly created Committee on Equal Job Opportunities. The complaint quickly helped lead to sweeping changes locally at the shipyard and nationally at military installations, including early Affirmative Action-type programs. All the men wanted was a wage comparable to their white co-workers and to be treated like what they considered standard men. The group's surviving members still talk about the movement, but the full story was buried in the 1960s and only recently came to light as a result of a series of newspaper articles by Vallejo Times Herald reporter Matthias Gafni. The story is one of the time. Vallejo was a Navy town, and a separated one. With its naval shipyard, Vallejo has always had a population reflecting a wide range of ethnic backgrounds; but it was not always harmonious. In the late 1950s minorities were mostly working in unskilled positions at Mare Island as sandblasters, laborers and cleaners, with efforts to keep them out of certain positions. The discrimination was not restricted to withholding promotions and unfair hiring practices, according to one of the workers. At each phase of every work day they faced discrimination.

By 1960 the Civil Rights Movement was in its infancy and the African American workers were losing patience. In March 1961, President Kennedy issued an executive order establishing a sweeping, government-wide Equal Employment Opportunity Policy. Twenty-one workers began organizing under the leadership of Willie Long, meeting in complete secrecy to protect their safety and their jobs. A complaint was drafted and twenty-five workers ultimately signed it. The complaint covered deplorable conditions for black workers, involving promotions, the apprenticeship program, and general unfair treatment. The shipyard commander found no pattern of discrimination, but President Kennedy's committee was inundated with similar complaints from around the country and changes were finally made after several years. Almost everyone who signed the original complaint was promoted to supervisor and fortunately escaped any of the serious reprisals they feared.


Madam Speaker, in tribute to these men and their fight for equal rights, it is proper for us, and it is indeed my hope, to formally recognize the Mare Island Original 21ers, and thank them for their heroic actions.

The introduction of the Udall-Eisenhower Arctic Wilderness Act

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY
Massachusetts

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the Udall-Eisenhower Arctic Wilderness Act honors two great American visionaries by designating the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness in their names and giving permanent protection to this great unspoiled wild place. Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower began the bipartisan legacy of fighting to protect this majestic area for future generations of Americans when he set aside the coastal plain in 1960. Twenty years later, in 1980, Democratic Representative Morris Udall succeeded in doubling the size of the Refuge, protecting even more of this untrammeled wilderness from oil drilling.

President Eisenhower and Morris Udall had the vision to protect a remote but very special piece of pristine wilderness. I am proud to introduce legislation today along with Representative Jim Ramstad of Minnesota that would complete the job they began by giving permanent protection to the coastal plain of the Refuge.

I am also proud to introduce this legislation under the bill number H.R. 39, a bill number with important historical significance in the effort to preserve the land within the Arctic Refuge. H.R. 39 was the bill number given to Mo Udall's Alaska Natural Interests Conservation Act that became law in 1980, expanding the area President Eisenhower had set aside and renaming it as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Representative Udall later began introducing his legislation to designate the coastal plain of the Refuge as wilderness under that same bill number. This bill number offers an important reminder of the legacy of fighting to protect this majestic area.

Two-thirds of the oil we consume everyday in the U.S. goes into the gas tanks of our cars, trucks and SUVs. From an energy standpoint, drilling in the Refuge is completely unnecessary. If our cars, trucks and SUVs traveled just 3 miles more per gallon today, we would save more oil than drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would produce at its peak levels of production. But more than that, if we increased fuel economy standards to 40 miles per gallon over 10 years, we would save more oil within 15 years than we would be able to get out of the Arctic Refuge over its entire 40-50 year production life.

The oil fields on the North Slope already annually produce more air pollution and greenhouse gases than the municipality of Washington, D.C. and the Arctic is showing the strains of global warming. Two weeks ago, the Bush Interior Department proposed listing the Polar Bear as an “endangered species” because global warming appears to be so drastically affecting its habitat—particularly the summer ice floes needed to hunt—that the bears are drowning in their own blood when the floating ice melts. Last week scientists confirmed that a giant ice shelf—the Ayles Ice Shelf—snapped off of its land anchor just 500 miles south of the North Pole in the Canadian Arctic. This is a feature of the Arctic landscape that is thousands of years old. The remaining ice shelves are 90 percent smaller than when they were first discovered in 1906.

Our addiction to oil is real and enduring and still largely untreated. Drilling in the refuge would amount to a declaration that we remain in denial about this addiction, its impact on our planet and our obligation to future generations. If Congress were to ever turn the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge into an industrial footprint by allowing oil drilling, the impact on