

capital of the United States and should be the concern of every citizen of the United States. At the rate we are going, we don't set a very fine example for the rest of the country.

The affairs of the District of Columbia are managed and supervised by the Congress of the United States and fortunately we the residents of Maryland elect some of the Congressmen. It therefore behooves us to elect those who will fight for our rights as citizens and small business owners, and we must have some assurance now that we will be protected in the future with a strong police force, and with protection insurance, should this ever occur again. Some insurance companies have cancelled policies of those stores that have reopened.

When we read that the Negro people would want all businesses in the District to be run by their people, we wonder why we are fighting so hard for integration—do they want it?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDITH BOOKOFF.

HYATTSVILLE, Md., May 8, 1968,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON D.C. AFFAIRS.

DEAR SIR: I think the following should be brought to your attention.

My husband was working a laundry route in S.E. and he said he does not like the way the negroes on the street are looking at him. He was born and raised in Washington and has worked routes for over 20 years; so he should be able to judge. One of the other men who was working 14th St. N.W. had the same feeling.

My son (22 years old and 6'8" tall) also made a delivery in S.E. yesterday, and said he had the same feeling, and he was not going back.

At that my son who is in Northwestern High School, Prince Georges County, said the negroes there are saying "You ain't seen nothing yet."

I am concerned for their safety as well as my own, since I work in the District.

Very truly yours,

KITTY W. WILLS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTHOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1968.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, House District of Columbia,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the members of the March Grand Jury One for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, have concluded from our experience of the past two months that there is a significant need for legislative action concerning crime in the District of Columbia. We respectfully offer the following comments and suggestions.

First, we are dismayed by the prevalence of crimes of violence in our community. In case after case presented to us, the defendant has shown little restraint in resorting to violence in the execution of his crime. According to the *Report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia*, there was an arrest for crimes of violence in forty-five percent of all arrests and sixty-one percent in arrests for assault. In 1965, only fifty-four percent of those defendants convicted for aggravated assaults were imprisoned. Based on the apparent lack of penal deterrents to the use of violence, we would recommend that a minimum sentence of imprisonment be mandatory when a defendant is convicted a second time for a crime of violence.

Second, we were astonished by the number of defendants who were already on bail under the Bail Reform Act of 1966 for one or more other crimes brought before us for indictment in another crime. The Commission's report mentions, "Other felon charges were pending against more than eleven percent of all arrested offenders." We are aware of the fact that the original intention of bail was to guarantee the presence of the accused at trial, but it appears there is also an equal need for the protection of the community when it becomes apparent that the defendant flaunts the privilege of bail by committing further crimes, or even, jumping bail. In either of the aforesaid instances, a judge under the Bail Reform Act of 1966 is powerless to deny bail except in capital cases. We feel that in such situations and others where warranted by the circumstances of the crime the judge should be allowed to exercise his prerogative to deny bail.