

She has left behind many warm memories, not just for her family but for a multitude of her friends and acquaintances. The mayor said he has childhood friends who, 40 years later, can still describe the smell and taste of a typical Helen Riley summer dinner.

She also leaves behind the legacy of a gracious lady who became a role model, not just for her family, but for her community, of a life well-lived.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, September 18, 1996 the Federal debt stood at \$5,193,856,710,104.18.

One year ago, September 18, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,963,469,000,000.

Five years ago, September 18, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,627,589,000,000.

Ten years ago, September 18, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,108,613,000,000.

Fifteen years ago, September 18, 1981, the Federal debt stood at \$976,715,000,000. This reflects an increase of more than \$4 trillion (\$4,17,141,710,104.18) during the 15 years from 1981 to 1996.

FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION: HERE'S WEEKLY U.S. BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending September 13, the U.S. imported 7,572,000 barrels of oil each day, 393,000 less than the 7,965,000 imported during the same week a year ago.

Nevertheless, Americans relied on foreign oil for 54 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf War, the United States obtained about 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970s, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the U.S.—now 7,572,000 barrels a day.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it appears to me that we find ourselves in a pleasant predicament when it comes to education appropriations for fiscal year 1997. On each side of the aisle we have leadership packages that would add some \$2.3 billion in additional funding to education.

In several areas, the Democratic package, of which I am a cosponsor, is larger than the Republican package. It would, for instance, add \$585 million to the Pell Grant program in order to fund a \$2,700 maximum grant for the coming year. It would also add funds to the Goals 2000 Program, to the Professional Development Program for

Teachers, to Education Technology, and to important higher education programs, such as TRIO and the SSIG Program.

In other areas, however, the Republican package is larger. In areas such as Title I, Adult Education, the SEOG Program, College Work Study, and Special Education, the Republican package contains more funding than the Democratic package.

Mr. President, there is a solution to the dilemma with which we are faced that is in the best interests of our nation. It is also an outcome that would get us out of a bipartisan battle, and bring the spirit of bipartisanship back to education policy making and appropriations. Very simply, I believe we should take the higher number from each package, put them together, and pass a package for which we can all take credit.

This would mean more money for education, and to my mind, that would be very good news, indeed. It would mean better funding in such critical areas as Pell Grants, Title I, Professional Development for Teachers, Special Education, and the campus-based student aid programs.

Instead of discussing which proposal is better in which area, we should resolve the dilemma and conclude an agreement that is in the best interests not of one political party or the other but of the American people.

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL RULES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pursuant to section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. sec. 1383(b)), a notice of adoption of amendments to procedural rules was submitted by the Office of Compliance, U.S. Congress. The notice publishes adopted amendments to the rules governing the procedures for the Office of Compliance under the Congressional Accountability Act.

Section 304(b) requires this notice and the amendments to the rules be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the notice and amendments be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE—THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995: AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL RULES

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURAL RULES

Summary: After considering comments to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published July 11, 1996 in the Congressional Record, the Executive Director has adopted and is publishing amendments to the rules governing the procedures for the Office of Compliance under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-1, 109 Stat. 3). The amendments to the procedural rules have been approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

For Further Information Contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200,

110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Telephone No. 202-724-9250.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA" or "Act") was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. In general, the CAA applies the rights and protections of eleven federal labor and employment law statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch. Section 303 of the CAA directs that the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance ("Office") shall, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors ("Board") of the Office, adopt rules governing the procedures for the Office, and may amend those rules in the same manner. The procedural rules currently in effect, approved by the Board and adopted by the Executive Director, were published December 22, 1995 in the Congressional Record (141 Cong. R. S 19239 (daily ed., Dec. 22, 1995)). The revisions and additions that follow amend certain of the existing procedures by which the Office provides for the consideration and resolution of alleged violations of the laws made applicable under Part A of title II of the CAA, and establish procedures for consideration of matters arising under Part D of title II of the CAA, which is generally effective October 1, 1996.

Pursuant to section 303(b) of the CAA, the Executive Director published for comment a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Congressional Record on July 11, 1996 (142 Cong. R. S7685-88, H7450-54 (daily ed., July 11, 1996)) inviting comments regarding the proposed amendments to the procedural rules. Three comments were received in response to the NPR: two from Congressional offices and one from a labor organization. After full consideration of the comments received, the Executive Director has, with the approval of the Board, adopted these amendments to the procedural rules.

II. Consideration of Comments and Conclusions

A. Definition of participant

One commenter suggested deleting the terms "labor organization" and "employing office" from the definition of "participant" found at section 1.07(c) of the proposed rules. The commenter noted that a "party" is included in the definition of participant and the term "party" is defined in section 1.02(i) of the rules as including a labor organization or employing office.

The final rule, as adopted and approved, incorporates the modification suggested by the commenter.

B. Contents or records of confidential proceedings

One commenter asked that section 1.07(d) of the rules be revised to reflect the commenter's understanding that "an employing office may acknowledge the existence of a complaint and the general allegations being made by an employee, and the employing office may deny the allegations." This commenter further requested that the phrase "information forming the basis for the allegation," found in the same section of the rules, be defined. According to the commenter, the phrase is ambiguous. The commenter did not, however, identify the asserted ambiguity.

The statute requires that the filing of a complaint and its subject matter be kept confidential. Thus, it is not permissible under the statute, as enacted—much less the procedural rules implementing the statute—for an employing office to disclose the information described. Moreover, no ambiguity has been identified or is apparent which would warrant modifying the proposed rule. Accordingly, the rule has been adopted and approved without modification.