fitting testament to the act's ability to move America's telecommunications policy forward—a true commitment and investment by Wall Street.

Mr. President, I firmly believe the act's goals of local competition and consumer choices will be fulfilled, and America will be better off. The best way to ensure that investment continues is to keep the law in full force.

When the act passed in 1996, Congress also knew that it would take a while to sort out the rules to produce local competition. More importantly, Congress knew that whatever rules the FCC adopted would be challenged in court. Congress was correct on both counts. This does not mean the law is flawed. To the contrary, this reflects the complexity of the issues and the intensity of the competition. Remember, it took a decade to write the law, and it will take time to implement it. I believe, though, that the majority of Members who worked on the act understand its success cannot be measured over a one or two year period. Courtroom battles did cloud the course toward local competition. This litigation did slow the pace for customer choice, but I am pleased to report that just 2 weeks ago the Supreme Court upheld most of the FCC's local telephone interconnection rules and affirmed that the local phone companies must open their markets in a meaningful way. It is my hope that opportunities for competition will now move forward swiftly and be afforded a proper chance to flourish in the marketplace.

Mr. President, Americans today are witnessing a convergence of technologies that was but a dream in 1996. Cable lines will provide American households with local telephone service and high speed Internet access. This is good. Traditional telephone companies will offer cable video service. This is good. More Americans are using wireless phones for personal and professional convenience. This is good. More Americans have personal computers with an ever-growing range of capabilities. This is good. The Internet is exploding as a means of commerce, research, or for just saying hello to a faraway friend. This is good. Television viewing will become an interactive experience with digital transmission, enabling consumers to personalize their own video programming or to go directly to a web site. This is good.

Mr. President, all of these significant and solid activities tells me something—Congress got it right 3 years ago. Patience will lead to other applications in the future that I, and some of my other colleagues, cannot even imagine right now. Mr. President, this is the kind of communications marketplace Americans deserve.

During this continued period of transition, it will be important for Congress to make sure that the Federal Communications Commission is properly structured. That it has the right tools to foster and further the ongoing evolution. Chairman Kennard's analogy—old regulatory models are a thing of the past, much like the old, black rotary phones—rings true. The FCC indeed must change, and Congress should start empowering the FCC rather than criticizing its individual decisions.

Mr. President, the Telecommunications Act is beginning to deliver the benefits of competition to the American consumer. The process of achieving the act's central goals is well on its way. I do not believe any of us want to turn back the clock to 1996 and take away all the new technologies, new companies, and new choices that have emerged and are now coming our way. Let's not put stumbling blocks on this path to progress. Let's keep America moving forward.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SANDRA K. STUART ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding work of the Honorable Sandra K. Stuart as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. After nearly five years in this position, Ms. Stuart is leaving government service to pursue other opportunities in the private sector. She definitely will be be missed by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I have enjoyed working with Ms. Stuart on a wide range of matters affecting the Department of Defense. I always found her to be extremely knowledgeable and very effective in representing the Department's views. Despite the sometimes contentious nature of national security matters, Ms. Stuart always maintained a friendly and constructive approach to her work which served our Nation very well.

Ms. Stuart had the difficult tasks of coordinating the Department of Defense's legislative agenda. She has deftly balanced a wide range of Defense-related issues, including Bosnia, missile defense, health care, readiness, acquisition reform, and modernization. Because Ms. Stuart earned the trust and confidence of those with whom she worked, she was able to promote the Department's views very effectively in Congress.

Ms. Stuart's experience with the Congress predated her current position as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. Before joining the Department of Defense in 1993, Ms. Stuart served as Chief of Staff to Representative Vic Fazio of California who recently retired from Congress. In addition to managing his Congressional staff, Ms. Stuart handled appropriations matters before the House Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. Stuart's legislative experience also includes work as an Associate Staff Member of the House Budget Committee and as the Chief Legislative Assistant to Representative BOB MATSUI of California.

Ms. Stuart is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and attended the Monterey College of Law. She is the mother of two sons, Jay Stuart, Jr. and Timothy Scott Stuart. She is married to D. Michael Murray.

Ms. Stuart earned the respect of every Member of Congress and their staffs through hard work and her straightforward nature. As she now departs to share her experience and expertise in the civilian sector, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize her outstanding and dedicated public service and wish her all the very best in her new challenges.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, now that we are back to doing the people's business, it may be of interest that despite the so-call budget surplus, the federal debt continues to increase by an average of $248 million a day. Some ''surplus''!

Congress and the Administration have been BUSILY creating new federal programs which in turn appear to absorb more taxpayer money than produce desired benefits for the American people. If we continue with this spend—spend—spend mentality, the American people's average portion of the federal debt will further escalate from its present sum of $20,650.78.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. President, I begin where I left off in the 105th Congress:

At the close of business yesterday, Monday, February 22, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,617,212,277,099.84 (Five trillion, six hundred seventeen billion, two hundred twelve million, two hundred seventy-seven thousand, ninety-nine dollars and eighty-four cents).

Five years ago, February 22, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,540,132,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred forty billion, one hundred thirty-two million).

Ten years ago, February 22, 1989, the federal debt stood at $2,722,208,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred twenty-two billion, two hundred eight million).

Fifteen years ago, February 22, 1984, the federal debt stood at $1,454,396,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred fifty-four billion, three hundred ninety-six million).

Twenty-five years ago, February 22, 1974, the federal debt stood at $467,489,000,000 (Four hundred sixty-seven billion, four hundred eighty-nine million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,149,723,277,099.84 (Five trillion, one hundred forty-nine billion, seven hundred twenty-three million, two hundred

seventy-seven thousand, ninety-nine dollars and eighty-four cents) during the past 25 years.

COUNTLESS FRIENDS MOURN VINEGAR BEND MIZELL

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, one doesn't lose a friend like Wilmer Mizell without experiencing a deep and penetrating sadness. And, by the way, Mr. President, my reference to ''Wilmer'' just now is one of the few times I have ever called him that. Sure, that's the name on his birth certificate; he was officially identified as Wilmer for the very good reason that Wilmer is the name given him by his parents.

At least 95 percent of his thousands of friends knew him as ''Vinegar Bend'', or sometimes as just ''Vinegar''. And everybody who knew him loved him. (He was born in Vinegar Bend, Alabama, 68 years ago.)

Vinegar Bend died this past Sunday while visiting his wife's family in Texas. He suffered a severe heart attack some weeks ago, but had bounced back and was apparently feeling well until the fatal attack on Sunday.

Vinegar Bend Mizell served three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1969 through 1974. His first wife, Nancy, was exceedingly popular among Members of the House and Senate until her death several years ago. He and his second wife, Ruth Cox Mizell, were a devoted couple.

Mr. President, I have at hand a newspaper account regarding Vinegar Bend's death. I ask unanimous consent that the article, published Monday in The Greensboro (N.C.) News and Record, headed ''Former Ballplayer; N.C. Congressman Mizell Dies at 68'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (NC) News and Record, Feb. 22, 1999]

FORMER BALLPLAYER, N.C. CONGRESSMAN MIZELL DIES AT 68

(From Staff and Wire Reports)

Wilmer ''Vinegar Bend'' Mizell spent 10 years in the majors and three terms in Congress.

HIGH POINT.—Former congressman and Major League Baseball pitcher Wilmer ''Vinegar Bend'' Mizell died Sunday while visiting his wife's family in Texas. He was 68.

Mizell, whose folksy, country-boy ways made him popular with voters in central North Carolina and with baseball fans in St. Louis and Pittsburgh, may have died from lingering effects of a heart attack suffered last October while attending a high school football game, said his son, David Mizell who is coach at High Point Andrews High School.

David Mizell's team was playing North Davidson in Welcome, near the Midway community where Mizell has lived since the early 1950s when he pitched for the minor league team in Winston-Salem.

Mizell, after a 10-year career in the Major Leagues, became a Davidson County commissioner and then served three terms in Congress from the 5th Congressional District which included Davidson and Forsyth counties. He was defeated in 1974 by Democrat Stephen Neal, a year in which Republican candidates nationwide suffered losses in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal.

Mizell later held sub-cabinet posts in the Commerce and Agricultural departments under President Ford and Reagan. For Reagan, Mizell was the agricultural department's top lobbyist in the halls of Congress.

Mizell was known for his flat-top haircut. His nickname came from his hometown of Vinegar Bend, Ala. In the majors, Mizell pitched for the St. Louis Cardinals from 1952 until 1960 when he was traded to the Pittsburgh Pirates. He helped the Pirates win the National League pennant that year. Mizell pitched a losing game in the World Series that followed.

He finished his career with the New York Mets in 1962. His career record was 90 wins and 88 losses, with an earned run average of 3.85.

Mizell died in Kerrville, Texas, while he and his second wife, Ruth Cox Mizell, were visiting her family. Besides Midway, the couple also had a home in Alexandria, Va., David Mizell said.

Funeral services will be Thursday in Midway.

(Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of February 12, 1999, pertaining to the impeachment proceedings, the following statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chief Justice, my colleagues, in just a few moments, each of us will be called upon to do something that no one has done in American history. We will be voting on two articles of impeachment against an elected President of the United States.

Having listened carefully to nearly 50 of our colleagues who share my point of view, it is both difficult and unnecessary to attempt to reiterate the powerful logic and the extraordinary eloquence of many of their presentations.

I share the view expressed by so many that this body must be guided by two fundamental principles. I recognize that we are not all guided by these principles, but I and others have been guided, first, by this question: Has the prosecution provided evidence beyond a reasonable doubt; and, second, if so, do the President's offenses rise to the level of gravity laid out by our founders in the Constitution?

After listening to both sides of these arguments now for the past 5 weeks, I believe—I believe strongly—that the record shows that on both principles the answer is no—no, the case has not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, and, no, even if it had been it would not reach the impeachable level.

I also share the view expressed by many of my colleagues on the process which brought us here: an investigation by an independent counsel which exceeded the bounds of propriety; a decision by the Supreme Court subjecting sitting Presidents to civil suits—it is my prediction that every future President will be faced with legal trauma as a result—a deeply flawed proceeding in the House Judiciary Committee, which in an unprecedented fashion effectively relinquished its obligation to independently weigh the case for impeachment; the disappointing decision to deny Members of the Senate and the House the opportunity to vote on a censure resolution, even though I believe it would be supported by a majority in both Houses; and finally, the bitterly partisan nature of all the actions taken by the House of Representatives in handling this case.

But as deeply disappointed as I am with the process, it pales in comparison to the disappointment I feel toward this President. Maybe it is because I had such high expectations. Maybe it is because he holds so many dreams and aspirations that I hold about our country. Maybe it is because he is my friend. I have never been, nor ever expect to be, so bitterly disappointed again.

Abraham Lincoln may have been right when he said, ''I would rather have a full term in the Senate, a place in which I would feel more consciously able to discharge the duties required, and where there is more chance to make a reputation and less danger of losing it, than 4 years of the Presidency.''

Maybe it is because of my disappointment that I was all the more determined to help give the Senate its chance to make a reputation, as Lincoln put it, at this time in our Nation's history.

The Senate has served our country well these past 2 months. And I now have no doubt that history will so record. There are clear reasons why the Senate has succeeded in this historic challenge.

First is the manner in which the Chief Justice has presided over these hearings. We owe him a big, big debt of gratitude. He has presented his rulings with clarity and logic. He has tempered the long hours and temporary confusion with a fine wit. In an exemplary fashion, he has done his constitutional duty and has made it possible for us to do ours.

The second reason is our majority leader. Perhaps more than anyone in the Chamber, I can attest to his steadfast commitment to a trial conducted with dignity and in the national interest. He has demonstrated that differences—honest differences—on difficult issues need not be dissent, and in that end the Senate can transcend those differences and conclude a constitutional process that the country will respect, and I do.

Third is our extraordinary staff—the Chaplain, my staff in particular, Senator LOTT's staff, the floor staff, the Parliamentarians, the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate. They have served us proudly. Their professionalism and the quality that