

S 1594

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 5, 1991

ed and the anticipated schedule for reducing the number of deficiencies in the State.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—**(1) WITHHOLDING OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—**

(A) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Attorney General finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any provision of this Act, the Attorney General shall, after notifying the State, withhold any payments or portions of payments to be made to the State under Federal law for administrative costs relating to the provision of services or amounts to be paid to elderly and disabled persons. Until the Attorney General is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply with the provisions of this Act, no further such payments or portions of payments may be made.

(B) NONWITHHOLDING OF DIRECT FUNDS.—Payments or portions of payments to States withheld under paragraph (1) may not include amounts to be paid to elderly and disabled persons or amounts for direct services provided to elderly and disabled persons.

(C) EFFECT OF WITHHOLDING.—Withholding of payments or portions of payments for administrative costs relating to the provision of services or amounts to be paid to elderly and disabled persons under paragraph (1) shall not effect the availability and delivery of such services or amounts.

(D) DEFICIENCIES AS FAILURE TO COMPLY.—Failure to reduce the number of deficiencies found under section 6(c)(3) within a reasonable time may be considered a failure to comply substantially with the provisions of this Act.

(E) APPEAL OF FINDING OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—The Attorney General shall establish by regulation a process for a State that has been found under subparagraph (A) to have failed to comply substantially with any provision of this Act to appeal the finding of noncompliance.

(2) FEDERAL COURT ENFORCEMENT.—If the Attorney General or United States Attorney for the appropriate judicial district finds a consistent pattern of noncompliance with the terms of this Act by a State, the Attorney General or United States Attorney may bring suit in an appropriate district court of the United States to require the State to comply with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. GRANTS TO STATES FOR COMPLIANCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM.—The Attorney General may make grants under this section to States for the purpose of enabling compliance by States with the provisions of this Act. Grants under this section may be used for the following:

(1) PROVIDING COUNSEL AND EVALUATION TEAMS.—To provide counsel and evaluation teams for alleged incapacitated individuals.

(2) TRAINING GUARDIANS.—To provide training for guardians of alleged incapacitated individuals as required by this Act.

(3) TRAINING COUNSEL AND JUDGES.—To provide training for counsel for alleged incapacitated individuals and judges in guardianship proceedings regarding this Act.

(4) MODEL GUARDIANSHIP MATERIALS.—To develop model materials for orientation and training of guardians.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—A State may not receive a grant under this section if the Attorney General finds a consistent pattern of noncompliance with the terms of this Act by the State.

(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

(1) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this section, a State shall submit an application to the Attorney General in accordance with the requirements established by the Attorney General.

(2) SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Attorney General shall establish

criteria for the selection of States to receive grants under this section.

(B) PREFERENCE FOR INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS.—In selecting States to receive grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to States that will use the grants for innovative programs designed to maximize the use of State and local resources to comply with the provisions of this Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) ALLEGED INCAPACITATED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "alleged incapacitated individual" means an individual who is subject to a guardianship action under State law.

(2) EVALUATION TEAM.—The term "evaluation team" means the independent professional guardianship evaluation team appointed under section 3(e).

(3) GUARDIAN.—The term "guardian" means a person who has been appointed by a court to have responsibility for the care and protection of the person or the management of the estate of the incapacitated individual, as specified in a guardianship order.

(4) GUARDIANSHIP ACTION.—The term "guardianship action" means an action to declare an individual incapacitated or to transfer the responsibility for the care and protection of the person or the management of the estate of an incapacitated individual to a guardian. The term does not include an action to transfer the exercise by a separate individual of the responsibility for the care and protection of the person or the management of the estate of a minor.

(5) GUARDIANSHIP ORDER.—The term "guardianship order" means any order by a court in a guardianship action to transfer the responsibility for the care and protection of the person or the management of the estate of an incapacitated individual to a guardian. The term does not include any order by a court in a proceeding related to the exercise by a separate individual of the responsibility for the care and protection of the person or the management of the estate of a minor.

(6) GUARDIANSHIP PETITION.—The term "guardianship petition" means the pleading that is necessary under the applicable State law to commence a guardianship action.

(7) GUARDIANSHIP PROCEEDING.—The term "guardianship proceeding" means any court proceeding in a guardianship action related to the determination of incapacitation of an alleged incapacitated individual or to the entering of a guardianship order. The term does not include a proceeding related to the exercise by a separate individual of the right to manage the person or estate of a minor.

(8) INCAPACITATED.—The term "incapacitated" means an inability of an individual to effectively manage the person or estate of the individual because the individual lacks the mental or physical capacity to do so due to illness, disability, or other incapacitation.

(9) INCAPACITATED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "incapacitated individual" means an alleged incapacitated individual who has been determined in a guardianship proceeding to be incapacitated.

(10) PROTECTED PERSON.—The term "protected person" means an incapacitated individual for whom a guardianship order has been entered.

(11) STATE.—The term "State" means the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands,

American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other possession of the United States.

(12) SUPERVISING COURT.—The term "supervising court" means a court that is supervising the guardianship order relating to a protected person and to which the guardian reports under section 6(c)(1).

(13) WORKING DAY.—The term "working day" means any day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal public holiday (as defined in section 6103(a) of title 5, United States Code).

SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION.

This Act may not be construed to grant to any court of the United States (as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code) any jurisdiction in any guardianship action that is not provided or allowed under Federal law on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. PERMISSIBILITY OF ADDITIONAL STATE LAW PROTECTIONS.

This Act may not be construed to preclude or supersede any Federal, State, or local law that imposes requirements of additional or more extensive protections for incapacitated or alleged incapacitated individuals that do not conflict with the requirements of this Act.

SEC. 12. TIME OF COMPLIANCE.

Each State shall comply with the provisions of this Act before the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself,
Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. REED,
Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. D'AMATO,
Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr.
GORE, and Mr. CHAFFETZ)

S. 353. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to conduct a study of the prevalence and issues related to contamination of workers' homes with hazardous chemicals and substances transported from their workplace and to issue or report on regulations to prevent or mitigate the future contamination of workers' homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

WORKERS' FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, in the 1980's, we passed or reauthorized legislation to cleanup our Nation's dump sites, waters, and air. We've focused considerable attention on radon, on asbestos, on lead, and on chemicals in our food such as alar. You would think we'd evaluated every environmental risk there is. Unfortunately, Mr. President, this is not the case.

We spend considerable amounts of money on remediating hazardous waste sites even when there is no known exposure. The EPA issues regulations to protect the public which will cost millions of dollars per health effect prevented. Meanwhile, we are neglecting the exposure of our children and spouses to toxic chemicals right in their own homes.

Right now, as I speak, workers in our Nation's industries are unknowingly bringing home toxic chemicals from their place of employment. Lead, mercury, pharmaceuticals, and even ra-

February 5, 1991

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1595

dionuclides have been carried home by workers on their clothing where exposure to their families occurs.

I am not talking about a hypothetical problem, but a real problem. In my home State of Vermont, both lead and mercury have been tracked home. In both Vermont incidents, elevated levels of toxics were found in the children of several of the workers. Similar incidents have occurred in the recent past in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee among other States. Right now, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry is investigating similar incidents in North Carolina and Michigan.

The bill I am introducing today with many of my colleagues is designed to prevent future such incidents from occurring. The first step in this process is to increase awareness of the problem. In the 1970's, workers homes were contaminated with lead from smelters. Regulations to prevent future such incidents were issued as a result.

Science and our understanding of toxicology has come a long way since the 1970's. Last year, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee held a hearing on the effects of chemicals such as lead or mercury. These compounds and others can cause permanent damage to the nervous system. Worse yet, as we learned in this hearing, many more chemicals than we know about may cause similar health effects. Therefore, it is vitally important that we protect the most sensitive of us, our children, from exposure to these chemicals.

Our country's workers deserve not only personal protection, but also protection of their families. We need to re-examine this problem again in light of our current state-of-the-art. We also need to examine the effects of home contamination on the families. Workers' families have reported feeling raped by the contamination. Their families have been ostracized because their friends are afraid they may catch the contamination. The parents suffer incredible anxiety worrying about whether or not their children have been permanently hurt. It's terrible that not only must our workers worry about whether they will have a job in the future, but also if their job will harm their families.

This bill requires the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to sponsor research into the causes and effects of past incidents of home contamination. The resulting studies will help us determine the extent of the problem. Once we determine the extent of the problem, this bill would require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue regulations to prevent future such incidents. Then, hopefully, our families will be safe. ●

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I join my colleague, Senator JEFFORDS, in the introduction of the Workers' Family Protection Act of 1990. The insidious link between hazardous chemicals and

substances present in the workplace, resulting in contamination of workers' homes, translates into a real health threat to significant numbers of American workers.

The Subcommittee on Toxic Substances, Environmental Oversight, Research and Development of the Environment and Public Works Committee held hearings on worker exposure to toxic chemicals in the aerospace industry. Workers were not only adversely affected by toxic substances while on the job, but were also transporting hazardous chemicals home on their clothing and their person. This may have humorous overtones when watching Homer Simpson coming home with his back pack glowing. When listening to a woman testify that she cannot remember the ages of her children, or in another instance, a woman who was driving with her windshield completely covered and did not realize it, the humor soon dissipates. The stark realization that there is a serious and imminent health hazard takes over.

And in the recent hearings I chaired in that same subcommittee on Wednesday, October 3, Dr. Peter Spenser, the Director for the Center for Research on Occupational and Environmental Toxicology, testified that prolonged exposure in the workplace constituted a significant threat to the health of the workers involved. Yet, the data compiled by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) strongly suggests that the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has conducted few studies on neurotoxic effects of the chemical substances in the workplace. In fact, OTA suggested that, "given the magnitude of the problem of exposure to neurotoxic substances in the workplace, the present level of effort will not ensure an adequate database to support the anticipated needs of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration."

Attempts are being made to address the problem of toxic substances in the home and workplace on a broad front. I have introduced legislation to reduce the threat of lead poisoning. Lead is an extremely troublesome neurotoxic substance. It is ubiquitous in the environment and poses a problem in the workplace. However, the lack of input on the part of NIOSH, as well as other Federal research programs involved in the study of neurotoxic chemicals and their link to neurodegenerative diseases, is inhibiting the overall effort to identify, define, and operationalize effective responses to the alarming problem of neurotoxicity.

This legislation will be an important step toward advancing the research being done on the relationship between toxic substances and the adverse effects they are known to have on Americans in the workplace.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S. 354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit mort-

gage revenue bond financing of mortgages for veterans of Operation Desert Storm; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit mortgage revenue bond financing of mortgages for veterans of Operation Desert Storm; to the Committee on Finance.

VETERANS OF OPERATION DESERT STORM
HOMEOWNERSHIP LEGISLATION

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would make sure that the brave men and women called to duty in the Persian Gulf receive the same State housing benefits that their predecessors from World War II, the Korean war and the Vietnam war enjoyed.

My legislation—the Veterans of Operation Desert Storm Homeownership Act of 1991—would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit mortgage revenue bond financing of home mortgage loans for veterans of Operation Desert Storm.

Two weeks ago, we enacted the Desert Storm Tax Relief Act—an important measure which gave our troops in the Persian Gulf some much deserved tax relief.

But it is important that we recognize that this move is only a first step. I think we ought to make sure that our young men and women of Operation Desert Storm also get the benefits they deserve when they eventually come home. In fact, my bill is designed to make it easier for them to own a home when they return.

Current law does not permit certain States to issue bonds to make home loans to veterans discharged after January 1, 1977—following the Vietnam era. This limitation on veterans mortgage bonds was enacted in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

Congress decided to limit tax-exempt bond funding for these veterans mortgages because it was concerned about the rising volume of bonds being used by a number of States—and therefore about the potential tax revenue loss for the U.S. Treasury.

The issuance of these bonds was cut back to amounts based upon previous volume levels and limited to only those veterans who had served on active duty prior to January 1, 1977. The 1984 act also limited the issuing of those bonds to the five States that were currently participating in this tax-exempt bond program: Wisconsin, California, Texas, Alaska, and Oregon.

Specifically, my legislation would include in the definition of qualified veterans all American service men and women serving in the theatre of hostilities as determined by the President since August 2, 1990.

One version of my legislation would amend the Tax Code to permit tax-exempt State bonding for mortgage loans to Operation Desert Storm veterans living in one of the five aforementioned States. These States were the only ones participating in the program prior to June 22, 1984.

February 7, 1991

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1853

The aim of the Subchapter S Revision Act of 1982 was to make the subchapter S pass-thru regime less complicated and more available to these ordinary taxpayers. With this goal in mind, every attempt was made to craft the legislation to avoid disqualification of subchapter S status.

It is my understanding that the proposed regulations are at great odds with both the spirit and the letter of the enabling legislation as well as with previous IRS rulings issued since the law's enactment over eight years ago. Moreover, based on these valid assumptions upon which taxpayers have functioned, many may suffer great hardships to the extent that the proposed regulations apply retroactively and carry oppressive penalties, including double taxation caused by revocation of subchapter S status. Such a result is unconscionable, and therefore, I request that you reconsider the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

DAVID PRYOR

HONORING THE MUNICIPAL CLERKS OF WISCONSIN

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, public service is one of the most important ways in which the citizens of a democracy can show devotion to their community.

The men and women who make the machinery of our local government run effectively—meeting our human needs and making our State a better place to live—deserve our gratitude and respect.

The week of May 5-11, 1991, Municipal Clerks Week, will provide all Americans an opportunity to say thank you to their neighbors in public service. I personally would like to extend a special thanks to the Wisconsin Municipal Clerks who will be meeting in Neenah, Wisconsin on May 9.

Thanks for making our lives easier—the citizens of Wisconsin appreciate the important work you do.

THE FAMILY PROTECTION ACT OF 1991, S. 353

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of S. 353, legislation that will reduce the incidence of home contamination from hazardous waste. This bill, the Workers' Family Protection Act, will help fight the risk of the inadvertent introduction of toxic chemicals into workers' homes.

Many workers in our Nation find themselves in jobs where they come in close contact with hazardous materials. Because of this contact, there have been instances where toxic chemicals have been brought into the home by way of a worker's clothing. This has occurred in several homes in my State of New York. Workers in a thermometer factory on the New York/Vermont border were found to have excessive levels of mercury in their homes. In some cases, children were found to have above normal mercury levels in their body fluids. It is probable that traces of mercury found their way into the workers' homes by way of their clothing.

By introducing this bill, Senator JERROLD and I hope that a solution to this problem will arise. The Workers' Family Protection Act will empower the government to study the prevalence of home contamination and give financial assistance to States to combat toxic hazards in the home. Of course, businesses are encouraged to seek more efficient ways to eliminate household contamination through providing work-place clothing and laundry facilities.

Mr. President, whenever obvious health hazards exist, we should do all that we can to correct them. This is one such instance. I believe that S. 353 will help lessen instances of home contamination in our Nation. I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to join me.

THE BUDGET AS IT RELATES TO AGRICULTURE

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I rise in further response to the administration's budget proposal as it relates to agriculture. This is a statement that I sincerely wish was not necessary, but due to the serious policy repercussions that this suggested budget would have, I feel it is incumbent upon me to take issue with the proposal and serve a reminder notice to the administration that agriculture was just asked to do more than its fair share in the budget same of this past year. It is way too early to present such flawed and misguided ideas to this chamber in hopes of quietly securing some short-term savings.

Last year we approved a farm bill that placed Federal expenditures at approximately \$54 billion over 5 years. But shortly thereafter, we passed a budget agreement that required us to go back and lower agriculture spending to \$40 billion. This amounted to a 25-percent cut. It was significant and it was dramatic. Our only consolation was that agriculture was told that the worst was over, that agriculture had done its duty toward balancing the Federal budget and that the budget agreement would be binding for the next 5 years. Now we find that the worst is far from over, and this is disappointing indeed. This latest budget proposes to cut up to almost \$400 million more from farm programs.

This latest budget proposal from the administration amounts to broken faith. If our farmers are expected to continue providing this country with a safe and stable food and fiber supply, then these cuts cannot continue.

Just this past Congress, over two-thirds of my Senate colleagues joined together in rejecting the concept of a means test, an idea that has now been resurrected in the budget proposal. A means test is the most poorly devised policy idea to be debated in agriculture in recent years. I cannot fathom how such a program would even be implemented: would farmers be required to take their past year's tax records to

the local ASCS office in order to prove how much money they made last year? How would leaders view the stability and cash flow predictability of large farms if those farms were excluded from commodity program benefits? And exactly what will constitute off-farm income . . . income derived from one's interest in a cotton gin, the stock dividend in a rice mill, money made from trucks hauling other's grain to market? These are some of the immediate questions this policy brings to mind, but what about the implications for the future?

If the purpose of farm programs is to improve the stability in agriculture so long term adjustments and technology adoption can take place in order to continue providing a safe food supply, then how will the removal of many farmers from program participation effect these goals? That's one question I know the answer to, Mr. President. Adversely is the only way it could affect them. Further reduction of benefits will only serve to force more producers out of the program, thereby forcing those still in the program to have higher set asides in order to achieve some supply stability, and this will only drive the cost of the program up, and the farmer's income down. Think of the effect such a policy would have on rural business, banks, and the school districts that serve these areas. I have said it before, but clearly someone needs to be reminded . . . this would result in rural chaos. Such a policy would have terrible effects on agriculture, the environment, and the U.S. consumer.

This budget proposal also makes further cuts in the rural Electric Administration's lending capability. It also reduces the premium coverage for those choosing to use crop insurance. One would think, with all of these ideas sailing around and these fiscal changes being proposed that the administration would have taken the time to allocate funds for disaster assistance for 1990 crops, the only poor crop year that has thus far been neglected in recent years. Why?

This budget proposal says one thing to me. Apparently, this administration does not take last year's budget agreement seriously and it does not take farmers seriously. I think and hope that Congress can do better.

The long-term policy implications that this budget would inflict on agriculture would be severe. Our farmers and the consuming public they serve deserve better.

CENTENNIAL OF THE PORT OF PORTLAND

● Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an important event for the Port of Portland—the celebration of its 100th anniversary.

One hundred years ago there was a dream to make Portland a major west coast city. However, the treacherous

According to the Bureau of Reclamation, if the drought in California continues as forecast, Reclamation water deliveries to for California agricultural use will only be 25 percent of normal, and for municipal use, only 45 percent of normal. The California Department of Water Resources has curtailed all water deliveries for agricultural purposes from the State Water Project (SWP), and municipal water supplies from the SWP may also be reduced.

PERMANENT FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED

When drought conditions occurred throughout the west in 1977 and again in 1987 and 1988, Congress passed temporary emergency drought legislation—the Emergency Drought Act of 1988 (P.L. 95-107), and the Reclamation States Drought Assistance Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-387). The 1988 legislation directed the Bureau of Reclamation (BuRec) to help mitigate the effects of drought conditions through financial aid and resource management, in coordination with State governments. However, that temporary authority expired at the end of 1989. Although \$25 million was authorized to be appropriated, no funds were appropriated. Within available funding at the time, and under the temporary authority, the BuRec did accomplish a number of drought response and planning studies. Although efforts were made to pass new legislation, the Congress failed to pass new temporary drought assistance legislation in the 101st Congress.

Both earlier acts were not adequate to address the emergency nature of drought programs, primarily because of the temporary nature of the authority, time constraints, the time consuming nature of the necessary planning and implementation of federal drought response efforts, and lack of available funding. Permanent authority is needed.

Drought conditions in the west have become progressively more severe as we now enter the fifth year of sustained drought conditions in most of the 17 reclamation states. Most reclamation projects have carryover storage to provide adequate water during a few consecutive years of drought. However, demand from reclamation facilities has grown in the west as population and other water needs increase, and the drought conditions worsen. Water shortages influenced by drought will most likely occur more frequently in the future, requiring both water supply and demand to be managed more effectively and efficiently.

Most of the available water conservation efforts can be pursued by the Bureau of Reclamation under existing authority. However, legislation is needed to broaden existing law to apply to multipurpose water facilities rather than just irrigation facilities. Legislation is also needed to provide the Secretary with the permanent authority to work with State governments to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in short-term drought contingency planning and other drought emergency response measures.

The Reclamation Drought Response Act of 1991 would provide permanent authority for the Secretary of the Interior to:

Declare and terminate reclamation contingency plan activities.

Facilitate water transfers or institute a water market to serve users beyond the existing service area and authorized project functions.

Use reclamation project facilities for temporary storage and to transport water for municipal and industrial and other uses outside the project service area—extension of the Warren Act Authority.

Provide short-term water from dead or inactive storage or ground water systems.

Allocate emergency funds and request additional funds as needed.

Provide emergency loans for minor structural and nonstructural activities with repayment obligations consistent with existing law and policy.

Establish water banks to exchange, sell, or lease water, consistent with all State water laws.

Provide technical assistance for conservation, contingency planning and research.

Establish a drought emergency fund with secretarial authority to disburse moneys from the fund.

Authorize the Commissioner of Reclamation to provide technical assistance to U.S. territories, States and other non-Federal water authorities east of the 100th meridian for conservation, contingency planning and research, with funding advanced to the Secretary. Also, to conduct a Precipitation Management Technology Transfer Program and field studies on a cost-shared basis with the States.

Make water available on a temporary basis for protecting fish and wildlife resources.

Implement all secretarial authority granted by the act and the implementing rules.

The legislation provides that all these new or extended authorities shall comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and all other applicable environmental laws.

I urge my colleagues, especially those from hard hit drought areas in the west, to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

WORKERS' FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1991

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Workers' Family Protection Act today. The purpose of the bill is to study the problem of worker home contamination. Recent history has shown that chemicals found on work clothes are frequently brought into the family home. This poses a health risk to workers' families, particularly their children. Additional study is needed to determine the extent of the problem and if Federal regulations are needed.

My interest in this issue stems from incidents of home contamination at a hazardous waste incinerator in my district. Caldwell Systems, Inc. (CSI) was closed in 1989 because of charges that it was not operated safely.

Because of their work at the plant, employees unknowingly came in contact with many hazardous chemicals. These employees have experienced a number of problems including illnesses affecting their nerves, brains, and breathing. Another unfortunate result has been that the families of these workers are also affected. A number of children developed breathing and other health-related problems because of chemicals brought home on their parents' clothing.

The CSI workers need protection, but so do their families. My bill is one small step in that

direction. Join me in helping to make families safe. Cosponsor the Workers' Family Protection Act.

Senator JAMES JEFFORDS introduced companion legislation in the Senate earlier this week. A summary of the bill is listed below.

SECTION BY SECTION SUMMARY OF THE WORKERS' FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This act is entitled the Workers' Family Protection Act of 1991.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

The purpose of the bill is to study the problem of worker home contamination. Recent history has shown that chemicals found on work clothes are frequently brought into the family home. This poses a health risk to the workers' families, particularly their children. Additional study is needed to determine the extent of the problem and if federal regulations are needed.

SECTION 3. STUDY OF EMPLOYEE TRANSPORTED CONTAMINANT RELEASES

Case studies make up the primary emphasis of this section. A total of \$1 million is authorized, allowing up to 10 case studies (\$100,000 each) of recent incidents. The case studies will review recent incidents to determine not only why they happened, but what, if any, long-term effects resulted.

In addition, both the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the Secretary of Labor are to conduct evaluations of home contamination of workplace chemicals. NIOSH is to: (1) identify industries prone to such contaminations based upon past incidents and enforcement actions; (2) evaluate current measures used to prevent home contamination; and (3) compile a review of relevant industrial hygiene research. The Secretary of Labor is to: (1) evaluate the effectiveness of current regulatory programs designed to prevent home contamination; (2) compile a review of indoor air quality issues as they relate to home contamination; and (3) determine the means families have to rectify contamination of their homes.

NIOSH is to issue a report within two years of enactment summarizing the results of these studies.

SECTION 4. REGULATIONS

Within three years of enactment, the Secretary of Labor must either issue regulations to minimize the risk of future incidents of home contamination or report to Congress that, based on the studies conducted under Section 3, additional regulation is unnecessary. In making this determination, the Secretary of Labor shall specifically look at industries that use lead, mercury, asbestos, pharmaceuticals, and pesticides. Recent incidents of home contamination have been documented or are believed likely with these chemicals.

SECTION 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

The cost of this legislation is not yet known. It is not the intent of this bill to create a costly program. Maximum expenditures on the order of \$3-5 million over the course of the Act are anticipated.