

Grand daddy's car windows held many campaign signs belonging to various politicians, seeking a vote in the Black community. I suppose it never occurred to Grand daddy that his granddaughter would grow up to become a part of the Political Process. He did not know that he was molding me for a successful career with your Congressman Nick J. Rahall. Well, Grand daddy did not live to see the end results of the many rides we shared on Election Day, but I will always be grateful to him. For I did not meet the normal standards. Ladies and Gentlemen, you see, I never attended an Ivy League school. I was educated in a four room schoolhouse. My parents were not politically connected, nor did they contribute to a campaign committee. The one thing that they did, was to teach me how to seize an opportunity.

That same lesson is equally important today. Too many of us today let opportunity pass us by, because we look for it in a pretty package, delivered to our doors by Federal Express or priority Mail. Often times, when we do seize the opportunity, we take all of the credit and forget that the way was paved by someone else, who labored and toiled in the fields from sun up to sun down.

"Stony the road we trod, bitter the chattering rod". I've got mine and you get yours, never offering to lend a hand to help another. Well, I heard the songwriter say "The only time you should look down on a man, is when you are picking him up". Imagine Harriet Tubman, Conductor of the Underground Railroad, not reaching back, after seizing the opportunity to become a freed slave. Where would we be had it not been for Sojourner Truth, who traveled the country to proclaim to others the truth about slavery. Would we be able to sit in any seat on a bus today, had it not been for Rosa Parks, who refused to give up her seat in the front of the bus, when Coloreds were not allowed to ride in the front.

African American women; past, present, and future. What about Dr. Mae Jamison, first African American female Astronaut? What about Elizabeth Drewey, first African American Woman elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates? What about Carol Moseley Braun, the first female African American U.S. Senator, and my boss, Hazel R. O'Leary, the first African American and female African American to become Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy, one who has opened many doors to expose Minority Students to the world of Science. What about your mother and my mother, strong and courageous African American Women, who made tremendous sacrifices and stood firm, despite the obstacles they faced—despite society's denial; despite low paying jobs; despite prejudice and racism—women who because of their determination, paved the way for you and me.

"We have come over a way that with tears has been watered, we have come treading our path thru the blood of the slaughtered." But, I would ask you today, what profit a person to gain, if he or she does not reach back to help another? Now that we have arrived, what are we doing to ensure that we will have famous African American Women in the future?

There are young women in our own neighborhoods who need to know that there is a way off of Welfare and on to Faring Well. Each of you today has a Special Gift to give back, so that others can realize their dreams, their hopes, their goals. I challenge you to stir up your gifts, to lift up somebody, to respect each other, to love yourself and to never stop striving to reach for your goals, never give up—don't give in.

We are African American women, marching on till victory is won. Yet with a steady

beat, have not our weary feet, come to the place for which our fathers signed? African American women; past, present, and future.

Poet Maya Angelou sums it up by saying: "You may write me down in history, with your bitter twisted lies. You may trod me in the very dirt, but still, like dust, I'll rise". We will rise. African American women, past, present, and future.

#### TRIBUTE TO CAROL JENIFER

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1996

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, given that we are so frequently confronted with the troubles and the travails of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I would like to have the following uplifting article from the May 1995 issue of Management Review inserted into the RECORD. The article, by Anita Lienert, profiles Carol Jenifer, the first African-American woman to manage day-to-day operations in an INS district office. Ms. Jenifer is the District Director of the INS district office at the United States-Canada border located in my hometown of Detroit, MI. I hope and expect that the INS will continue to attract and promote individuals of Ms. Jenifer's caliber.

Carol Jenifer does not look like a huggable person. She wears her hair in a Marine Corps-style buzz cut and shuns makeup and jewelry. Although she's six feet tall, she seems even taller, carrying herself with a military bearing that reflects her years as a police officer in Washington, D.C. She carries a gold badge that says "District Director" and has just ordered a Glock handgun to keep in her desk. To get inside her office at the U.S.-Canada border in Detroit, you need to get by a metal detector and armed employees.

So when one of her clients leaps out of a seat in the waiting room at the Detroit branch of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and gives Jenifer a big hug, it seems somewhat out of place.

"Oh, Miss Jenifer," says Chadia Haidous, a Lebanese immigrant "I just got sworn in today! I'm an American citizen! And now I don't have to worry about my daughter."

Jenifer, 45, the first African-American woman to manage day-to-day operations at one of the 33 INS district offices in the United States, hugs her back and rejoices with the Haidous family.

Moments later, loping up the back steps to her office that overlooks the Detroit River, Jenifer explains that little Alica Haidous, 11, who was born in Senegal, could have faced deportation because her mother was not a U.S. citizen.

"The family was afraid the daughter would have to go back to Senegal unescorted," Jenifer explains. "I could have stuck to the book, but why? I made a heart decision and I made it in the name of family unity. I could have sent her back and had them petition for her, but I didn't. And now it won't happen because we don't treat our citizens like that."

Jenifer, who oversees a hectic operation with a \$14 million annual budget, considers herself one of the new breed of INS managers. While the southern border with Mexico draws most of the media attention, INS officials say the northern border has its share of illegal immigrants—they just don't talk about how many.

Therefore, it's her mission to walk a tight-rope to satisfy a number of different con-

stituents, from American taxpayers who are disturbed by the large number of illegal aliens entering the country, to immigrants who complain about long lines and insensitive treatment at INS offices.

One of Jenifer's first management decisions was to improve the atmosphere by installing brighter lights in the crowded waiting room. She is considering hiring a customer-service representative to handle complaints generated by the 48 million people who pass through INS checkpoints in her jurisdiction each year, including the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, the Ambassador Bridge and Detroit Metropolitan Airport. She is also determined to hire an inspector who is fluent in Arabic because her client base is 50 percent Middle Eastern and no one in the office is fluent in that language.

Jenifer has made it a point to get to know the names—and personal details—of the 254 employees and one drug-sniffing dog who work with her in patrolling eight ports of entry along 804 miles of water boundary between the United States and Canada.

So far, one of Jenifer's "employee" relations challenges has been communicating with the German shepherd: Gitta only responds to commands in German. Even so, Jenifer still knows how to work a room—whether it's full of customers or employees—in a charismatic style reminiscent of Ronald Reagan. She stops often to ask about sick wives or new husbands. But don't confuse her familiarity and warm-and-fuzzy approach with wimpiness. In reality, her management style is much closer to the tenets of Tough Love.

After all, her office deported 1,249 people in 1994. And shortly after the heartwarming scene with the Haidous family, Jenifer stands firm on a \$15,000 bond set by her deputy director earlier in the afternoon on a Jordanian immigrant whose wife had blurted out during his naturalization interview that she had been "paid to marry him." He also had prior felony convictions and there was an outstanding warrant for his arrest.

But to get a real feel for Jenifer, you need to see her in action at 7:30 a.m., as a single parent in Detroit getting her two daughters, Eboni and Kia, both 13, off to school. Jenifer skips breakfast and barks orders like "Kia, did you finish those dishes?" and "Eboni, give me that assignment notebook to sign."

While her girls scurry around, Jenifer straightens her simple black dress, snaps on a beeper and bundles up in a coat and scarf, stopping only to grab her ever-present black leather organizer.

Outside, it's 20 degrees and still dark, with a light snowfall. Sounding like a typical mother, Jenifer grumbles that she can't get the girls to wear their ski caps to school and that they keep pestering her to buy a dog.

"When I applied for the job a year ago, I told my supervisors that the girls were a huge part of my life," Jenifer says in the car on the way to work. "I told them I would have to limit travel because I attend games, go to parent conferences and pick them up after school. It didn't seem to hurt, because I think they wanted someone who could humanize the office."

At work, her office is decorated with striking paintings of "buffalo soldiers"—the all-black cavalry who fought and resettled the West. Jenifer explains that since taking the job last spring, she has been worried about every little detail, including whether or not she should have hung the artwork.

"I almost took the pictures down," she says. "I didn't want to overwhelm people who couldn't relate to something like that. But after I thought about it, I realized I needed those men (in the pictures) to watch my back. Management has some pitfalls."

In private, Jenifer admits that "being a tall, black female has had its problems."

Testifying before a congressional committee last fall on equal employment opportunity protection and employment practices at the INS, she described the low points of her career, beginning with her job interview 12 years ago for an INS analyst position.

"The interviewer seemed more surprised that I was articulate and a product of the D.C. public school system than in other qualifying factors," Jenifer told the committee. "It was quite obvious that I did not fit whatever image this manager had regarding African-Americans. He later remarked that one day I would be his 'boss' . . . There remains a perception that my advancement was due to connections and not based on merit."

She says she had to struggle for every promotion at the federal agency, at one point hiring an attorney to present her concerns about lack of advancement to INS personnel officials.

Despite those early challenges, Jenifer says the transition to her new \$88,000-a-year position has been relatively smooth, due in part to her long INS experience that ranges from working as an officer in the detention-and-deportation branch to holding the post of second-in-command in Detroit before she got the director's job. Her boss, Carol Chasse, INS eastern region director, describes Jenifer as "a shining star."

"She's got it," Chasse says. "She's a practitioner of good human relations. Leadership in the '90s is about people skills and that's critical here because we deal with huge volumes of people."

Although Jenifer grew up in Washington, D.C., she never dreamed of working for the INS. The daughter of a bookbinder at the Federal Bureau of Engraving wanted to be a firefighter. "But back in those days, women didn't get to be firefighters," she says. "I had to settle for police work." Her time on the D.C. force included a stint undercover on the prostitution detail.

Jenifer later earned two master's degrees, one in counseling from the University of the District of Columbia and one in public administration for Southeastern University. She said the degrees helped her develop the discipline to manage efficiently.

The first order of almost every day is meeting with her top managers. Six out of seven of Jenifer's managers are women, which is notable considering there are no female border patrol chiefs in the United States and there are only two female district directors. On the day of the interview, Jenifer seems to be running later for her daily briefing, until she explains that she sets her office clock 15 minutes fast on purpose. She grabs a piece of hard candy from the jar on her desk and heads out right on time.

The meeting is fast-paced and informal, and covers topics ranging from the need for air fresheners in the office bathrooms to a video for employees about avoiding sexual harassment. Jenifer insists that her managers keep their remarks to a minimum, and they give their daily reports in a sort of verbal shorthand that takes a total of 21 minutes.

"E-mail is negative," begins administrative officer Judy McCormack.

"No arrests yesterday," pipes up James Wellman, acting assistant district director for investigations.

The issue of bathroom air fresheners prompts some discussion. "I don't care what you get, as long as we get them in there," she says to her staff, slightly annoyed after being questioned about what type should be ordered.

Jenifer is anxious to end the meeting and get down into the public waiting room for her daily "walkaround" with people who are here to take citizenships tests, file paper-

work contesting deportations or apply for green cards. Although she speaks English only, she communicates well, sometimes with gestures or hand-holding or by repeating phrases over and over.

Today, about 75 people are assembled by 9:30 a.m., under disconcerting signs that say things like Fingerprinting—Now Serving #823. Jenifer later explains that the signs record the number of people from January 1 to the present. Still, the signs just seem to magnify the "Waiting for Godot" atmosphere in the room. The Detroit office serves about 350 people a day and conducts about 1,300 naturalization interviews a month.

Jenifer doesn't identify herself, but plunges into the crowd, smiling and joking.

"Where are you from?" she asks one man. "Nigeria," he replies tersely.

"What part?" Jenifer continues.

"Africa," he says.

"I know it's Africa, silly," she chides him, laughing. "I've been there. What part?"

By this time, the man and his companions are smiling. Everyone in the room is staring.

"Lagos," he says. "Have you been there?" She has been accused of working the crowd, but "this is some of the most important work I do," she explains afterward. "I got a real feel for front-line work when I worked for the INS processing refugees in Kenya a couple of years ago. It sure gives you a different perspective on naturalization. It makes you realize that these are people's lives you're making decisions about."

Back in her office around 10:15 a.m., Jenifer sucks on another hard candy and meets with Harold Carter, an INS examiner who chairs a committee representing minorities in the Detroit district.

"Come on Harold, get comfortable," Jenifer coos as she scrabbles around on her desk looking for a pen. After Carter settles into a chair, she launches into her concerns: "There are no Hispanics in investigations . . . We don't have any representative [minority] groups at Sault Ste. Marie. We have to show we've tried to reach parity. Can we get people to work up there?"

Carter laughs, noting it's pretty cold at the Soo, which is an INS port-of-entry located in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. But they get serious again quickly. After all, there is a class-action suit in Los Angeles about lack of advancement among black INS officers.

After the meeting, she's off to the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, which runs underneath the Detroit River, but first stops to order Girl Scout cookies from a coworker. "I should have ordered more," she muses. "My kids know I hide them under my bed."

Jenifer needs to see how work is progressing at the tunnel and Detroit's Ambassador Bridge—the largest commercial-vehicle entry port in the United States—on the "Portpass" program. Portpass allows pre-qualified drivers to use express lanes, which will speed up the flow of traffic.

"Traffic can be my worst nightmare," Jenifer says. "We have a federal mandate to get people inspected here in less than 20 minutes—and we have to keep it moving or the complaints start backing up." The INS inspects people crossing the border, while U.S. Customs agents inspect things, but the two cross-train and work together. To the public, they are virtually indistinguishable.

Touring the new tunnel Portpass office, Jenifer is complimentary about the countertops that will separate staff and customers. "Good," she notes, "I like them wide so nobody can reach across and grab our people."

She's less sanguine, however, about the Portpass signs in the traffic lanes at the tunnel. "The signs are too little," she complains. "I don't know if people will be able to see them."

At the bridge at noon, Jenifer is still obsessed with signage. She tells Norman Byron, port director for the bridge, that she's worried that people won't be able to see the express lane signs at night. He assures her that they will be well-lit.

The two tour a trailer-type office set up at the foot of the bridge to accommodate the new program and staff. Jenifer checks out every closet and toilet and pushes back part of the wall paneling that has bowed out. She nearly slips coming down the steps in the snow and asks when skid strips will be put in.

"The skid strip for steps costs \$3,000 a roll," Byron says. "Some things we can't do until the weather gets warmer."

Back in Byron's office, Jenifer banters with several INS agents and asks for their recommendations on good places to eat nearby. They direct her to a restaurant in Detroit's nearby Mexican Village that looks like a dive, but turns out to have decent food.

Jenifer orders the quesadillas and chicken enchiladas and ends up taking home a doggie bag of most of the food for her kids. "I'm a horrendous cook, so I love leftovers," She admits.

By 1 p.m., she's on her way to Detroit's Metro airport to check on a request for more INS inspectors to accommodate a 60 percent increase in international passengers since 1993 due to airline mergers. It's a 45-minute drive to the airport, and on the way she talks about the mundane, yet important issues that face single parents, such as getting the laundry done and whether it's wise to hire a housekeeper.

Stuck in rush-hour traffic with Jenifer, you find yourself sharing the problems of raising teenagers and getting along with men. She seems more like an old friend by mid-afternoon than an interview subject. But then, her staff has warned you that Jenifer often "pulls an Oprah," or gets people to tell all unwittingly.

At the INS section of the airport, Michael Freeman, the supervisory immigration inspector at the airport, prints up a computer list of how passengers have increased on each airline since 1989. Jenifer studies the print-out and tells him she'll consider hiring 10 or 11 new inspectors to ease the crunch. Jenifer asks Freeman if he's lost weight. It's clear Freeman's busting to tell her something else and he finally does.

"I just found out my wife is having a baby," he says. They chat about children and health concerns. If Jenifer ever tires of the INS, she could probably have her own talk show.

She makes it a point to shake hands with or speak to all 12 of the INS inspectors on duty that afternoon before heading back to her office. The new hires, whose desks are piled with books like *The Art of Cross-Examination*, stiffen when Jenifer walks in the room. But within minutes they are relaxed.

Back at the office, Jenifer goes through the paperwork that has sprouted on her desk over the last few hours. Her secretary puts the most urgent notes on her chair. There are employee identification cards to sign, a quarterly meeting with immigration lawyers to arrange and an application for a bowling tournament with the heads of other federal agencies in Detroit, from the Secret Service to the FBI.

"Oh," Jenifer groans, "I need a coach to help me bowl better. I bowled an 80 last time and have yet to live down the shame."

By 4:45 p.m., Jenifer is walking out the door to pick up the girls. They are waiting for her in the school library, complaining about their eight-grade class pictures.

Jenifer studies the photos as closely as she's looked at any paperwork today. "Yes,

I'm keeping these for blackmail purposes," she says. The three of them burst out laughing.

By 5:15 p.m., the INS manager who insists that "fair management and families" are the cornerstones of her personal and professional life, is walking in the side door of her house holding the leftover chicken enchiladas in her free hand.

# UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today, the introduction of the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act will, for the first time in nearly a century of U.S. administration, provide a congressionally recognized framework for the inhabitants of Puerto Rico to freely express their wishes regarding the options for full self-government. I want to acknowledge the insightful leadership of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH in working with the committee to formulate a process to advance the United States-Puerto Rico relationship toward a conclusive one of full self-government. A number of Members have been supportive and instrumental in the development of the legislation, including ELTON GALLEGLY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Resources, BEN GILMAN, chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and DAN BURTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere who cochaired with Mr. GALLEGLY the October 17, 1995, joint hearing on the 1993 Puerto Rico status plebiscite. There also has been substantial input from Members on the other side of the aisle.

This matter of tremendous importance to the United States and the nearly 4 million United States citizens in Puerto Rico can only be resolved by adhering to constitutionally and internationally based principles and standards for full self-government. While many may misconstrue this legislation to be designed to benefit one local Puerto Rico political party over another, it is, in fact, a serious bipartisan effort to enact into law a pragmatic process with the long-term objective of resolving the Puerto Rico status dilemma. The legislation divides the process into three manageable stages which follow historical precedent set by the Congress in providing for final political statuses of territories and trust territories during this century.

The first step in the process is the initial decision stage in which voters are asked which fundamental relationship they prefer with the United States—one of separate sovereignty leading to independence or free association or under United States sovereignty leading to statehood.

The second and final steps are the transition and implementation stages which follow the historical patterns of enabling and admission acts for territories becoming States and similar measures for insular areas becoming separate sovereigns.

If this self-determination process does not result in voter approval of one of the recognized options for full self-government, then by democratic choice of the voters—instead of by Fed-

eral mandate—the status quo will continue and Puerto Rico will remain a locally self-governing unincorporated territory under congressional administration.

Under the U.S. Constitution and applicable principles of international law, the three recognized options for full self-government are independence, separate sovereignty in free association with the United States, and full integration into the United States leading to statehood. In order for Congress to determine how to respond to the aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico regarding a permanent, future political status in a manner which promotes and preserves the U.S. long-term national interest, we need to address the status question based on clearly defined principles and standards. This is precisely what the bill does.

Locally conducted plebiscites have been inconclusive, and were unduly influenced by vested interests exploiting the status quo. It is time for the U.S. Congress to meet its responsibility under the Constitution to provide for a self-determination procedure in which the U.S. national interest in resolving the status issue is taken into account, rather than allowing the issue to be dominated by local political rivalries and interference from those who thrive opportunistically on the present territorial status. The United States also has a right of self-determination and this process requires action by both the United States and Puerto Rico in order to advance toward a full self-government relationship.

After 400 years of colonial rule by Spain ended in 1898, it should not have taken another 100 years of American administration for the U.S. Congress to define the options for full and permanent self-government. The United States-Puerto Rico Status Act permits full self-government to be realized in Puerto Rico in definitive steps, with a smooth transition to whatever form of full self-government the people choose: independence, separate sovereignty in free association with the United States, or statehood.

There is an important event which took place recently which is relevant to the introduction of this legislation. On February 29, 1996, I joined three other House committee and subcommittee chairmen from the Committees on Resources and International Relations in responding to Concurrent Resolution 62 of the Puerto Rico Legislature.

In the Concurrent Resolution the legislature asks the 104th Congress to respond to the results of the November 14, 1993, status plebiscite in Puerto Rico, wherein the Commonwealth ballot proposition received a plurality of 48.6 percent votes cast, and to indicate the next steps in resolving Puerto Rico's political status. After extensive research, oversight, and a joint hearing, a substantial record was developed enabling a concise response to Concurrent Resolution 62.

Following is the text of the response to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of the Puerto Rico Legislature:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, February 29, 1996.

Hon. ROBERTO REXACH-BENITEZ,

President of the Senate.

Hon. ZAIDA HERNANDEZ-TORRES,

Speaker of the House of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

DEAR MR. REXACH-BENITEZ AND MS. HERNANDEZ-TORRES: The Committee on Resources and the Committee on International

Relations are working cooperatively to establish an official record which we believe will enable to House to address the subject-matter of Concurrent Resolution 62, adopted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico on December 14, 1994. While the specific measures addressing Puerto Rico's status which the 104th Congress will consider are still being developed, we believe the history of the self-determination process in Puerto Rico, as well as the record of the Joint Hearing conducted on October 17, 1995 by the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, lead to the following conclusions with respect to the plebiscite conducted in Puerto Rico on November 14, 1993:

1. The plebiscite was conducted under local law by local authorities, and the voting process appears to have been orderly and consistent with recognized standards for lawful and democratic elections. This locally organized self-determination process was undertaken within the authority of the constitutional government of Puerto Rico, and is consistent with the right of the people of Puerto Rico freely to express their wishes regarding their political status and the form of government under which they live. The United States recognizes the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination, including the right to approve any permanent political status which will be established upon termination of the current unincorporated territory status. Congress will take cognizance of the 1993 plebiscite results in determining future Federal policy toward Puerto Rico.

2. The content of each of the three status options on the ballot was determined by the three major political parties in Puerto Rico identified with those options, respectively. The U.S. Congress did not adopt a formal position as to the feasibility of any of the options prior to presentation to the voters. Consequently, the results of the vote necessarily must be viewed as an expression of the preferences of those who voted as between the proposals and advocacy of the three major political parties for the status option espoused by each such party.

3. None of the status options presented on the ballot received a majority of the votes cast. While the commonwealth option on the ballot received a plurality of votes, this result is difficult to interpret because that option contained proposals to profoundly change rather than continue the current Commonwealth of Puerto Rico government structure. Certain elements of the commonwealth option, including permanent union with the United States and guaranteed U.S. citizenship, can only be achieved through full integration into the U.S. leading to statehood. Other elements of the commonwealth option on the ballot, including a government-to-government bilateral pact which cannot be altered, either are not possible or could only be partially accomplished through treaty arrangements based on separate sovereignty. While the statehood and independence options are more clearly defined, neither of these options can be fully understood on the merits, unless viewed in the context of clear Congressional policy regarding the terms under which either option could be implemented if approved in a future plebiscite recognized by the federal government. Thus, there is a need for Congress to define the real options for change and the true legal and political nature of the status quo, so that the people can know what the actual choices will be in the future.

4. Although there is a history of confusion and ambiguity on the part of some in the U.S. and Puerto Rico regarding the legal and political nature of the current "commonwealth" local government structure and territorial status, it is incontrovertible that