

humor. Let there be no doubt that Judge Stiftel's commitment to fairness is passionate and sure, but its expression has often been punctuated by a one-liner.

Vice Chancellor Balick told this story at the June 22 special session: "There was the time when Albert was presiding in a criminal trial, and the defendant was on the witness stand, exercising his right to lie in his own defense. Albert was fooling with the microphone, as he always does. He turned the volume up, which caused a loud screech. That startled the defendant, at which Albert said, 'Relax, it's just the lie detector.'"

Whether conveyed in wit or wisdom—and usually it is with both—Judge Stiftel's regard for his colleagues and for the court on which he served has been unwavering and inspiring. As Resident Judge Vincent Bifferato said, "He taught me to love this court as he does." And Judge William Quillen said of Judge Stiftel, "He has been a cheerleader, not only for the court but for each member of the court \* \* \* he has made each of us better than we otherwise would have been."

At the special court session, Judge Quillen presented a portrait of Judge Stiftel, which will hang in what was known as courtroom No. 1 when Albert was first appointed to the bench. The portrait was commissioned not by the court, not by the State, not by the Bar Association, but personally by the judges, past and present, of the superior court. This public tribute is all the more official coming as it does out of the sincere affection, respect, and gratitude of Judge Stiftel's colleagues.

That affection, respect, and gratitude are felt throughout and beyond Delaware's legal community, Mr. President, and it is my privilege to give voice to them today. We in Delaware honor Judge Albert Stiftel for the achievements and contributions of his public leadership and for his countless acts of personal kindness and courtesy. He leaves good will and good humor, as well as high standards, in his refreshing wake.

It is most appropriate that in the portrait that will now be a permanent physical presence, as its subject is a permanent spiritual presence, in Delaware's Superior Court, Albert Stiftel is doing what he has inspired so many others to do—he is smiling.●

#### MAUREEN WOODS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and pay tribute to Ms. Maureen Woods. In October of 1994, Ms. Woods became the first African-American woman to be appointed Assistant Air Traffic Division Manager of the Federal Aviation Administration. This important position is a most fitting recognition of Ms. Woods' distinguished career.

Maureen Woods began her service with the FAA in 1974. She rose steadily through the ranks, demonstrating her

exceptional ability at a variety of posts throughout the Midwest. She has earned several honors in her FAA tenure, including five commendations for performance and three awards for exceptional service.

As the Assistant Air Traffic Division Manager, Ms. Woods oversees 4,300 employees and manages the 4 Air Traffic Control Centers, 8 Automated Flight Service Stations, and 68 air traffic control towers in the 8-State Great Lakes Region. With both the Chicago and Cleveland Air Traffic Control Centers, the Great Lakes Region is the busiest in the world.

In addition to her service in the FAA, Ms. Woods has also been prominent in her community. She is the coordinator for the Young Women's Ministry of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, as well as a youth and motivational speaker for her local church. Ms. Woods serves as a positive role model for her community and her profession.

Mr. President, I want to add my voice to those of Ms. Woods' family and many friends in congratulations on this most recent accolade. Her effectiveness as a public servant and her selfless community involvement are qualities we all should seek to emulate.●

#### MEASURE DIVIDED AND PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 101

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 101 be divided and renumbered with texts I now send to the desk, that they be placed on the calendar and all other provisions of the existing consent agreement governing the consideration of S. 101 apply to these two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 131, Senate Joint Resolution 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the joint resolution be considered and passed, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 27

Whereas the Congress in consenting to the compact between Missouri and Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District provided that no power shall be exercised by the Bi-State Agency under the provisions of article III of such compact until such power has been conferred upon the Bi-State Agency by the legislatures of the States of the compact and approved by an Act of Congress; and

Whereas such States have now enacted certain legislation in order to confer certain additional powers on such Bi-State Development Agency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—*

(a) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to the additional powers conferred on the Bi-State Development Agency by Senate Bill 114, Laws of Missouri 1993 and Public Act 88-611 (Senate Bill 1670), Laws of Illinois 1994.

(b) The powers conferred by the Acts consented to in subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1995.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the Act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 568) shall apply to the additional powers approved under this joint resolution to the same extent as if such additional powers were conferred under the provisions of the compact consented to in such Act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is expressly reserved.

SEC. 4. The right is hereby reserved to the Congress to require the disclosure and furnishings of such information or data by the Bi-State Development Agency as is deemed appropriate by the Congress.

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 24, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. on Monday, July 24, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately begin consideration of S. 101, the gift ban/lobbying bill, under the terms of the consent order of June 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. I would just say for the information of all Senators, under the previous order the Senate will begin consideration of the gift ban/lobbying bill on Monday morning. We hope to be able to reach an agreement on both of these measures that will allow us to complete action on the resolution on Monday. Rollcall votes, if they are to occur, will not occur before 5 p.m. on Monday, so there will be no rollcall votes before 5 p.m.

I cannot say with certainty, but I would be fairly certain there will be rollcall votes after 5 p.m., either on final passage or on amendments.

#### BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 2 days ago, President Clinton called me to ask that

I delay the vote on the Dole-Lieberman legislation until after the London meeting, which ended just a short while ago.

I agreed to the President's request. Unfortunately, the London meeting was a disappointment—another dazzling display of ducking the problem. Instead of clarity and decisiveness, once again we have ambiguity and a lowest common denominator approach.

Instead of dumping the dual key it has been modified. Instead of responding to the fall of Zepa and Srebrenica, these two eastern enclaves have been written off. Most egregiously, the London meeting reaffirmed the current failed U.N. operation.

In the wake of the fall of Zepa, it is hard for me to imagine that anyone still believes that the U.N. mission is viable in Bosnia—that what we are witnessing is anything but a colossal, collective catastrophe.

Yesterday, the Bosnian Presidency building was shelled while the European envoy, Carl Bildt, was meeting with the Bosnian President. If attacks on Sarajevo continue, what will be the West's response? Another meeting. According to Secretary Christopher, the focus of U.N. efforts will be to open access to the city for humanitarian aid. Yes; the Bosnian people need food. They also need protection.

The London meeting reportedly produced a decision to defend Gorazde through a substantial response—after a serious warning is given to the Serbs. Gorazde is already under attack. How much further do the Bosnian Serbs have to go before the warning is triggered?

The Serbs are becoming more aggressive and more defiant by the hour. The London meeting made it clear there would be no immediate or decisive response except more meetings.

In effect, what the Clinton administration and European leaders are doing is trying to manage the conflict—to limit the war's consequences without providing a solution. Or, as the Bosnian Prime Minister said, without dealing with the real problem—which is Belgrade-sponsored aggression.

Western leaders in London also called for a cease-fire and more negotiations. It has been 1 year since the Bosnian Government signed the so-called contact group's plan. Why should the Serbs sign now after yet another display of fecklessness?

It is crystal clear that the London meeting did not produce a solution. It did not result in a policy.

I believe that the Senate will not be fooled by administration spin doctors who will no doubt announce great results from the London meeting.

I believe that there is a substantial majority in favor of the Dole-Lieberman legislation and that the disappointing outcome of the London meeting will only serve to strengthen that support.

Once again, I want to emphasize that the Dole-Lieberman legislation lifts

the U.S. arms embargo after UNPROFOR withdraws. It seems to me that this point is being deliberately ignored and intentionally obfuscated by those allied and administration officials who claim that the Dole-Lieberman legislation if passed will be responsible for a U.N. pull-out. This does not take effect until they are out, so we will not be responsible for a pull-out.

No doubt this is a political tactic designed to find excuses for what is the inevitable end of the U.N. mission in Bosnia. It may not be today, may not be tomorrow, but this will end as a consequence of its own failed policy. If only administration and allied officials would spend as much time designing a new policy as they do designing new excuses for their inability to develop an effective and principled policy. The bottom line is that passage of the Dole-Lieberman bill may be an excuse for U.N. withdrawal, but it will not be a cause.

The dire administration predictions of humanitarian disaster have come true—but not because of lifting the arms embargo, but because of a lack of American leadership and a willingness to go along with failure in the name of consensus. Despite the paternalistic assertions made by administration officials that they have the best interests of the Bosnians at heart, the present approach is not humanitarian, it is inhumane. First, the Bosnians were corralled into giant refugee camps, then disarmed, and then left unprotected.

With respect to the assertion that this legislation would give the Bosnian President the right to send 25,000 U.S. troops to Bosnia I would make three points: First, the commitment to send 25,000 U.S. troops to Bosnia for either a withdrawal or to police a settlement is a commitment that was made by President Clinton—and not pursuant to any request by the Bosnian Government or the result of any congressional action. Second, the days of colonialism are over. The Bosnian Government is a sovereign government and has the right to tell the British, French, Dutch, and other forces if and when it wants them to leave. Third, President Clinton has yet to make his case to the Congress that 25,000 troops are needed for such a withdrawal. Let us not forget that the Dutch troops in Srebrenica negotiated their departure with the Serbs—they were not rescued by U.S. marines.

Let me also indicate, as I was told by the foreign minister just a few days ago, he said there were about only 30 U.N. personnel in Serbian-held territory. Somebody said that figure is much higher, maybe 500, maybe 600; but, again, it would not take 25,000 American troops to rescue 30 or 500 or 1,000 U.N. personnel.

We have been assured by the Moslems that they would in no way interfere with the withdrawal.

Finally, I would like to say that a belated NATO response to the brutal Serb

onslaught in the Eastern enclaves is not a substitute for a policy. The U.N. operation is a failure. That is a fact. And no amount of reshuffling will change that fact.

Neither Band-aids, nor reconstructive surgery will save the U.N. operation in Bosnia. Lifting the arms embargo and letting the Bosnians defend themselves is the only policy option which has any hope of saving them—and saving United States credibility.

I might point out, the New York Times—which has been struggling with this issue editorially, as many have on the floor, today, and maybe that will be referred to by my colleague from Connecticut—said rather flatly, it is time to lift the embargo. It is time to lift the arms embargo. If we do not want to Americanize what is happening there, and we want to give this independent nation a right to defend itself, then the course is clear. Lift the arms embargo after withdrawing the U.N. forces, and then we believe we can supply the Muslims with weapons. They can be trained in safe places with no hazard, by anybody in the United States or any United States force who might be involved in any weapons or training or whatever.

We believe this is not the best solution. There are not any good solutions. It gives an independent nation a right to defend itself and gives the people in that nation a right to defend themselves. In my view, sooner or later, it will happen.

Maybe not this week. Maybe not next week. Maybe not next month. But winter is coming very soon in that part of the world, and I believe before that happens, U.N. forces will be withdrawn or on the way out. Then, perhaps, the Bosnians will have an opportunity to do what they wanted to do for some time.

I do not mean to dismiss the humanitarian aid that has been provided. It has been helpful in some cases, but unintentionally, the U.N. protection forces have become a barrier, which unintentionally has been a help to the Serb aggressors, and not to the poor people who are trapped in the enclaves.

So far, one has fallen. Another is about to fall. Clearly, everyone is in danger.

---

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I just say, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.