ARACLOR — RYAN

23 percent of total Job Corps openings in fiscal 1969." I commend Job Corps for seeking to raise the number of women enrollees in the program, inasmuch as the need for educational help, social adjustment, and skill training is certainly as great in the case of disadvantaged women as it is for their male counterparts. In fact, given the job discrimination levied against women throughout our society, I would venture that their need for job training to make them especially eligible for better jobs may even exceed that of the young men.

However, I believe Job Corps still to be doing too little. What is more, this 25-percent goal is difficult to reconcile with the language of the Economic Opportunity Act, which, as established by the amendments adopted in 1967, provides in section 117(b):

The Director shall take necessary action to assure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees receiving training at least 25 percentum shall be women. The Director shall immediately take steps to achieve an enrollment ratio in training in the Job Corps consistent with (1) efficiency and economy in the operation of the program, (2) sound administrative practice, and (3) the socio-economic, educational, and training needs of the population to be served.

I can appreciate that there might be some ambiguity in the phrase "enrollment ratio of 50 percentum women." This same language is used in the conference report—report No. 1012—to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, as well as the House report—report No. 866. And, in all instances, the phrase is susceptible to being interpreted, I suppose, as meaning there shall be one woman for every two men—that is, a 1:1, or 50 percentum ratio. However, I think the legislative intent clearly to have been that there be equality in the number of woman enrollees and men enrollees—that is, one woman for one man. Therefore, I have serious question whether the administration is comporting with the will of Congress—a will which was expressed over 2 years ago and which remains unchanged.

There is one more reference to the Manpower Report of the President I wish to make before addressing the disaster which has been inflicted upon the disadvantaged, desperate youth of, most particularly, our urban ghettos and the rural South, by the closure of 59 Job Corps centers. This point goes to the statistics presented by the report, which I confess leaves me extremely distressed.

The report describes "the Government's two main programs of work and training for disadvantaged youth—the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps." This is the description the administration itself ascribes to NYC and Job Corps—"the two main programs." Yet NYC has been restructured by the Labor Department to exclude youths 18 and older from its out-of-school component. This formal restructuring, which produced a reduction in enrollment and which was preceded by stopping all enrollments of youths 18 years and older in May of 1969, is reflected in the figures offered in the table presented on page 89 of the report: In January 1969, there were 45,700 youths enrolled in the New York City out-of-school program, whereas in January 1970, the number was down to 32,100.

Needless to say, the Job Corps enrollment figures presented by that table shows a similiar drastic decrease—from 32,000 in January 1969, down to 19,500 in January 1970. So, we have a combined total reduction for the two programs of 27,000 enrollees. Actually, the problem is even worse than this, since the figures for the first month of 1969 do not really reflect the total number of youths enrolled in these two programs at sometime during 1969. This figure, for Job Corps alone, is 53,000 youths who were enrolled at some point during the 12 months of 1969.

Yet, if these are the two main programs directed at disadvantaged youth, where then have those youths who presumably would have filled the no longer available slots in these two curtailed programs gone?

The answer to that question does not appear to me from the statistics. In fact, if anything, these statistics confirm the administration's repudiation of the Government's obligation to these youths—and to the rest of society—to aid them.

The figures for the programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act show that in January 1969, there were 91,800 enrollees. In January 1970, the number of MDTA trainees had dropped to 85,400, a decline of 6,200. The only programs showing any significate rise in enrollment are Job Opportunities in the Business Sector—JOBS—and the Work Incentive program—WIN. Yet, neither of these meets the needs of disadvantaged youths whose educational and skill levels require intensive upgrading. The report itself acknowledges what is well known—the serious problems of the WIN program. And the JOBS program aims at the hiring of workers by private companies, whose facilities, even if supportive services are available, are of small avail to teenagers.

Thus, there really is no place but the severely curtailed Job Corps for youths 16 to 22 in need of the counseling, skill training, and educational tutoring which that program provides. And particularly abysmal, as well as dismal, is the story of what has befallen Job Corps. Fifty-nine centers were closed. By now, only five supposedly new centers have been opened—the three mentioned in the Manpower report as having been opened in 1969, and two more which have opened since in Portland, Oreg., and Atlanta. This minuscule number of replacements for the closed centers is totally unacceptable.

In addition, these centers are restricted in terms of enrollment. The New Jersey center, for example, is open only to New Jersey youths. Thus, whereas its predecessor had in it approximately 300 young men from New York, the "new" center excludes these youths. They must be sent to Camp Atterbury in Indiana or Camp Breckenridge in Kentucky. I find this turn of events totally incompatible with the very words of the President's Manpower Report, at page 71:

Formal evaluation and the practical lessons of operating experience showed that, although some of the underlying premises of the Job Corps were sound, others were questionable. Extremely high dropout rates in the first 30 days following enrollment cast doubt on the wisdom of locating enrollees far from home and in isolated areas.

How much farther must a New York City youth be sent to be considered "far from home"?

As I said in my statement on the floor of the House on January 20, I have serious question whether this practice of shipping New York City youths hundreds of miles away while there is a center virtually in their backyard comports with section 106(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act and with section 103(1) of that act.

But, my quarrel is not with legalities. My quarrel is with the administration's continued repudiation of our young men and women who have grown up with all the disadvantages that poverty, urban blight, poor education, and lack of hope can inflict on them. This repudiation is unjustified. It is unwise. This week we shall be debating the administration's family assistance plan, a key component of which is work training, and yet at the same time the administration continues to deny such training to youths who desperately need—and ask for no more than—a chance. Let us give them that chance.

PCB'S—AN ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, recent scientific research has shown that polychlorinated biphenyls—PCB's—pose a serious danger to the environment. Polychlorinated biphenyl—PCB's—are chemical compounds manufactured in the United States by the Monsanto Co. under the trade name Aroclor. PCB's, and their residues are extremely toxic to fish, birds, animals, and humans. Until recently, little was known about PCB's, even though their use is widespread. But it is now clear that they have within them the seeds of disaster.

As PCB's are not soluble in water, they are—like DDT—very persistent in the environment. This insolubility factor makes PCB's capable of being widely distributed over the earth via air currents. Upon being ingested by animals or humans, they are soluble in fat.

To the chemical industry, PCB's are a miracle ingredient used in thousands of products from hydraulic fluid to plastic wrappings to insecticides to printing inks. To scientists in several countries who have been carrying on independent research, PCB's are a menace that has been discovered in birds, fruits, fish, conifer needles, human fat, and human milk.

These scientists tell us that like their chemical cousin—DDT—PCB's cause birds to lay eggs with shells too thin to protect the embryos they enclose. Moreover, PCB's have a deleterious effect on the reproductive capacity of animals.

PCB's not only threaten wildlife. Human beings are likewise imperiled. If

MONS 030656

PCB's come into contact with the skin, they cause chloracne, a serious skin condition. If inhaled, the result is even more dramatic and frightening: among the symptoms are nausea, rapid breathing, loss of weight, and a lowered red blood cell count. More serious results are the deterioration of the kidneys, jaundice, and atrophy of the liver. In sufficient quantities PCB's can cause death.

While dangerous quantities of PCB's are sprayed into the environment as pesticides, this insidious chemical also infects the environment through more roundabout means. It appears that PCB's are getting into the environment in many ways—through the smokestacks of manufacturing plants, through the weathering or friction wear of PCB materials, and through the burning of plastics containing PCB's.

Dr. Robert Risebrough, associate specialist at the Institute of Marine Resources, Department of Nutritional Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, has done extensive research into the problem of PCB's. In an article entitled "More Letters in the Wind" in the January–February 1970 issue of Environment, Dr. Risebrough and Virginia Brodine state:

> A thorough investigation of the physiological effects of the agricultural and industrial chlorinated hydrocarbons, including their effects on the reproductive systems of both birds and mammals, is urgent.

I have called upon the administration to mobilize all available resources to detail the extent of the threat posed by PCB's, and to take steps to eliminate that threat.

I have urged Secretary of Agriculture Hardin to take immediate action to ban the use of PCB's in pesticides. And I have urged Secretary of the Interior Hickel similarly to take immediate action, in order to assure that our fish and wildlife are not further endangered by this environmentally dangerous chemical.

In my communications with Commissioner Charles C. Edwards of the Food and Drug Administration, I have called for establishment of food tolerance levels for PCB's, and urged that a study be undertaken to determine whether PCB's should be completely banned for all uses. Also, I have urged Commissioner Edwards to require that all products containing PCB's be labeled, in order that the public may be fully apprised of their presence in the products they purchase.

I have also asked Chairman Arnold B. Elkind of the National Commission on Product Safety to employ the Commission's investigatory powers to determine the nature and extent of the threat of PCB's to the environment.

Finally, I have called upon Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality to coordinate the efforts of all appropriate Government agencies, so that the public may know the sources and the seriousness of the PCB hazard, and in order that steps can be taken to eliminate this hazard as soon as possible.

Insofar as the Monsanto Co., the sole manufacturer of PCB's, is concerned, I have called for its complete cooperation in these Federal actions to determine the extent of the threat posed by PCB's. I have requested it to release all of its production and sales figures for its three plants manufacturing AROCLOR. Scientists tell me that only with these figures can they intelligently gage how much of the chemical is getting into the environment.

In addition, Monsanto should immediately state, clearly and without equivocation, whether during the manufacturing process any PCB's are released into the environment, in any form; in what quantities they are released; and what control measures are in effect or are being developed. Monsanto should release to the public a complete list of the uses of PCB's so that consumers can be aware of their presence. Any manufacturer who uses PCB's should publish a list of the products containing these compounds, and such products should be labeled as containing PCB's.

The deterioration and degradation of our environment are accelerating with a frightening speed. Any delay in instituting controls for chemical contaminants only makes the potential consequences that much more ominous. We have used up just about all the luck available in unthinkingly and uncaringly despoiling our environment and endangering life by the use of dangerous manmade products. Thalidomide, DDT, oil slicks—these are only harbingers of more and greater disasters. Wisdom and caution must begin to prevail.

SOVIET SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Orbis, a quarterly journal of world affairs contains a thoughtful and provocative article on "Soviet Science and Technology: Some Implications for U.S. Policy." The article was authored by Prof. Foy D. Kohler and Dr. Mose L. Harvey. Mr. Kohler is professor in the Center for Advanced International Studies at the University of Miami and was formerly Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. as well as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. Dr. Harvey is director of the center at the University of Miami and former director of Intelligence and Research for the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe and senior member, Policy Planning Council, Department of State.

Because of the deep consideration being given at this point to the forthcoming SALT talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, I thought that this article would prove of particular interest and help to my colleagues. I am, therefore, including in the RECORD the text of the article and commend it to my colleagues' attention:

SOVIET SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

(By Foy D. Kohler and Mose L. Harvey)

Many factors have contributed to the downgrading of the Soviet threat that has marked Western appraisals of the international situation over the past several years. Certainly one of the most basic is a reluctance among opinion-makers of an old habit of discounting Soviet as against U.S. capabilities in the sphere of science and technology.

No one has gone so far as to return to the pre-Sputnik appraisal of the USSR as a technologically backward nation. Most observers appear now to agree that the Soviet Union is capable of great achievement in particular fields, especially when related to urgent military needs, through marshaling overwhelming human and material resources on a "cost-be-damned" basis. Most observers also recognize that from the standpoint of overall activity the USSR deserves ranking as a technological superpower. Nevertheless, recent comparative appraisals of the United States and the USSR differ vastly from those of a few years ago. Not only have the extreme alarms of the Sputnik era died out. The USSR is portrayed as lagging seriously behind the United States in most areas of scientific-technological endeavor. And projections show the odds more favorable to a widening than a closing of existing gaps.

American scientists and technologists who have had opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and to view at first hand—and in some cases to participate in—ongoing scientific activities in the areas of their specialties have played a leading role in the reassessment process. Since inauguration of the U.S.-Soviet exchange program in 1958, several thousand American scientists and technologists have journeyed to the USSR for periods ranging from a few days to a year or so, and have returned to relate their observations and experiences. Quite a few have made repeat trips, gaining appreciably in authoritativeness as a result.

Consistently, these American visitors have been impressed by the high qualifications and attainments of some of the individual Russian scientists with whom they have had contact. Many have also been impressed by one or another particular line of investigation they have observed. Nearly all have been strong in praise of accomplishments in certain disciplines—notably mathematics, astronomy, branches of theoretical physics, and, within narrow limits, oceanography; the Russians are acknowledged to be among the world leaders in these fields. But as a general matter, the Americans have seen the overall level of research, experimentation and application in the USSR as substantially under that of the United States, and in many instances under that of Western Europe and Japan. All branches of chemistry, experimental physics, earth sciences, meteorology, communication sciences and communication technology, all branches of the life sciences, electronics, cybernetics, reliability engineering, nuclear power, computer-controlled automation, metal alloys, metal substitutes, and numerous others have repeatedly been subjected to critical evaluation. It has not been unusual for observers to speak in terms of a Soviet lag of a number of years behind the United States, as for example "ten years" in the case of chemistry, "ten or more years" for different of the life sciences, and "many, many years" for cybernetics.

Americans have been particularly influenced by the contrast between U.S. and Soviet research facilities and support resources. Almost uniformly they have dwelt upon ill-designed and poorly-housed laboratories, limited equipment, overcrowding, the absence of research tools considered standard in the United States, the lack of trained research assistants and other support personnel, the paucity of research supplies, evident continued dependence on foreign sources for many basic items of equipment, the absence of sophisticated computers and other electronic devices. They have been impressed by the up-to-dateness of some "prestige" facilities and have shown awareness of

MONS 030657