In addition, I suggest, at the request of the President, this bill includes a provision to resolve a dispute between the District of Columbia courts and the Public Defenders Office. We included that provision in the bill because this has to be enacted before the end of the current year. If that does not happen, then the public defenders—the entire office, which defends those in the District who cannot afford their own lawyers, will not be able to meet its payroll.

The leadership of the House and Senate Appropriations Committee wanted Senator REID and me to address that problem, and we were able to do that with the help of Chairman MCDADE and his ranking member, Representative FAZIO from the State of California.

I hope Senator HARKIN will reconsider this objection and will let us adopt this conference report. All I can say is, in all honesty, Senator HARKIN and those who feel like he does, holding this bill up is not going to help one bit resolve the problem that centers around how much money should Labor, Health, and Human Services have to spend this year on its annual appropriations. It is just not going to help.

There is nobody suggesting the money ought to come out of this bill. There is nobody suggesting that the solution to the problem, which is raised by the Senator from Iowa, can be solved by this bill or by this Senator.

It has to be resolved, if a problem exists, through the leadership here and the chairmen of both of the Appropriations Committees, and I assume maybe even the White House. Since all of that would be required to resolve the problem, I once again ask, What good does it do to hold this bill up? And I hope that will not be a long-lasting event.

I thank the Senate for considering this.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to mention another anti-environment rider in the Interior appropriations bill. I have already discussed two of them. One is Glacier Bay and the other is Izembek. This will be the third.

Mr. President, this amendment deletes the rider that limits the Forest Service's ability to close roads on National Forests that threaten public safety or the environment.

Let me explain. The Forest Service has constructed over 370,000 miles of roads on National Forests across America—370,000 miles of roads. These roads, the ones that Forest Service has constructed, are called authorized roads; another name given to them is systems roads. Most of these are single-lane roads. They are relatively low quality, often built to harvest timber. They are just basic roads built to meet basic needs.

Many of these roads, though, have outlived their intended purpose. They are no longer needed. That is, they are built essentially to harvest timber, a lot of them, or built for a specific purpose and that purpose is no longer in use. So the roads therefore are no longer needed.

About 40 percent of the 370,000 miles of authorized roads are maintained to public safety and environmental standards. The remaining 60 percent are in poor condition and in many cases are a threat—a real threat—to the public safety or a threat to water quality or often a threat to wildlife habitat.

In addition to these authorized roads, the Forest Service estimates that there are at least 60,000 miles of additional roads. These unauthorized roads are sometimes referred to as ghost roads.

This is a photograph, Mr. President, of typical ghost roads. These are created when somebody decides that he or she wants to drive a pickup, a car, or a four-wheeler to a stream, or whatnot. After a while, a few people drive back and forth and we end up with an unauthorized road or a ghost road.

Another example is here. Here is a young fellow on a bicycle. It is close, perhaps, to a stream. It is hard to tell from this photograph, but basically after a bit more use it becomes kind of a road—a ghost road. There are about 60,000 miles of these kinds of ghost roads that the Forest Service thinks exist out in the National Forests—roads caused by people, not roads that the Forest Service has planned or built.

Again, Mr. President, just to recapitulate, there are about 370,000 miles of roads the Forest Service has planned on building. Most of these are deteriorating. Many of these roads were intended to be used as logging roads to harvest timber, and the timber harvest is gone; that is, the timber has been harvested so they are no longer in use.

Then there are 60,000 miles of ghost roads not planned by the Forest Service and which are created by people who drive around in pickups or other off-road vehicles.

Mr. President, the Forest Service cannot safely manage all of the authorized and the unauthorized, so-called ghost roads that cover our National Forests. It just cannot do it. There are too many roads. Too many miles of roads. As a result, many of these roads are safety hazards, and some cause significant environmental problems.

Mr. President, let me show you these two photographs. These are photographs of authorized roads, of system roads, of roads the Forest Service planned—not the ghost roads. In this top photograph of this road, you can tell the road is washed out. It is just washed out.

Here is another photograph of another authorized road, the kind the Forest Service plans on. What happened here? The bridge went out. Some poor unlucky fellow did not realize the bridge had gone out until he caused it to go out. The bridge just collapsed. This guy's pickup went down on the collapsed bridge on the authorized road. Obviously, the bridge has rotted out.

In other cases, the authorized roads create environmental hazards. I might tell you what the top road is. This is a road on the Mount Baker/Snoqualmie National Forest that has washed out. These types of washouts often clog streams, as you might guess. They kill fish. That is pretty obvious. And in the middle of the night, they can be one heck of a pothole.

When roads such as these are unsafe, or cause environmental problems, we have two options. One is to fix the road; and the other is to decommission the road. Just a fancy way of saying closing it.

In deciding which roads to upgrade or close, the Forest Service sets priorities, obviously, based on public safety, based on environmental concerns, on a forest-by-forest basis.

Let's face it, road closures can be a big issue in some parts of the country. I know that is very much the case in my State of Montana; people have strongly held views as to which roads should be closed and which roads not.

These are not easy decisions for the Forest Service to make. But the Forest Service personnel by-and-large do the very best they can. And they do so after talking with the public. And they make their decisions based on what they think the public wants and based upon safety and based upon environmental needs.

Well, this is where the rider comes in. This rider prevents funds from being used to remove any authorized road until the regional forester certifies that all the ghost roads have been either upgraded to U.S. Forest Service standards or closed. That is, the Forest Service cannot look at any of the authorized roads in a region until it looks at all the ghost roads and either closes or upgrades each of them.

What does that mean? That means the Forest Service could not close any authorized road no matter how great a safety hazard it is until the Forest Service can certify that every single mile of the ghost roads, that is these kinds of roads—the little pathways—who-knows-where-they-are in the forest, have been either upgraded to either system standards or have been removed.

For starters, this is virtually impossible. The Forest Service does not even know where many of these ghost roads are. More important, this rider does not take into account whether these roads pose the greatest immediate threat to public safety or the environment.

In sum, this simplistic one-size-fits-all approach would wreak havoc on the ability of the Forest Service to sensibly manage roads in our National Forests.

As I mentioned early, the Forest Service now sets priorities for closing

roads on a forest-by-forest basis, based on what the public wants, based on public safety, based on environmental protection and restoration needs. A whole host of considerations go into it on a forest-by-forest basis or perhaps a district-by-district basis, not a one-size-fits-all national standard imposed on a Washington, DC, basis that you can't do anything with your system of roads until you either upgrade or close the ghost roads.

This rider would force the Forest Service to inventory thousands of miles of ghost roads and spend limited taxpayers' money upgrading or removing the roads, even if they are not causing safety or environmental problems.

Here is an example. Assume that the Deer Lodge National Forest in my State of Montana has an authorized road built to harvest timber, a very common occurrence. The timber has been harvested and the road is no longer needed, also very typical. Soon, the road is sliding down the mountain and it is unsafe for travel because of slippage and erosion and the road is clogging a stream, choking the fish in that stream, which often happens, too.

If this rider passed, the forest managers could not remove that road until it had inventoried the entire forest and found where each of the ghost roads were located and then either closed all those ghost roads or upgraded all to system standards. Let me repeat that. If this rider passed, the Forest Service could not remove the road I mentioned that is clogging up a stream until it has inventoried all ghost roads, and either upgraded the ghost roads—that is, the paths—to road standards, or closed them.

Plain and simple, this rider does not make sense. It does not meet the ''common sense'' test. It prevents the Forest Service from closing roads that now pose a very significant threat to public safety and the environment. It would prevent the Forest Service from doing its job. I believe the Forest Service should be able to close roads based on public needs, not on an arbitrary distinction of whether the road is authorized or unauthorized.

To protect public safety and the environment, I believe this rider on the Interior appropriations bill should be deleted.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ed Cole, a congressional fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. One last rider I will mention. This rider is section 343 of the Interior appropriations bill which limits Federal and State actions to manage the Columbia/Snake River system.

I note that the chairman of the subcommittee is the present occupant of the Chair. In dealing with this subject, I have the utmost respect for what he is doing, particularly the great job he did in the Interior appropriations bill, which has many, many good features in it. He has worked very, very hard. It is a very complex bill, with NEA, the Forest Service, and Indian lands. I compliment the Chair.

With respect to this provision, we have a difference of opinion. I state that with all due respect.

The Columbia/Snake River basin covers about 259,000 square miles, including large parts of the State of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and British Columbia. It is home to several endangered fish species, including several stocks of salmon. The number of salmon has fallen dramatically from an estimated 10 million fish in the historical runs to about 1 million today.

For several years, we have been trying to bring salmon back, in part by improving the operations of the river system.

We have improved fish screens; we have improved fish ladders. We have barged salmon around dams. We have modified water flows to help juvenile salmon migrate downstream and adult salmon migrate upstream.

These modifications have been controversial because they sometimes restrict other uses of the river, such as power generation, irrigation, transportation, and recreation.

Like many others in the Northwest delegation, I have not been particularly happy with every decision that has been made. In fact, I supported a cap on the amount of fish-related expenses that is passed along to BPA ratepayers. We had to have that cap or else I believe the Federal agency would have gone too far. I also oppose some of the drawdowns at the Libby dam and Hungry Horse dams in northwest Montana because of the effects on recreation and the adverse effects on the bull trout.

I have maintained, however, that we should work within the framework of our environmental laws. There are a lot of competing considerations, and one is the framework of our environmental laws. The rider that I am referring to, section 343 of the Interior appropriations bill, would change that. It would override the Endangered Species Act, it would override the Clean Water Act, the Northwest Power Planning Act, and the Federal Power Act.

To put the issue in perspective, let me briefly explain how the Columbia/Snake River system is managed now. In 1995, under the Endangered Species Act, the National Marine Fisheries Service issued a biological opinion describing the actions that the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration must take, consistent with their other obligations, to save the wild salmon from extinction. The biological opinion includes both short and long-term measures.

In the short-term, it requires several changes. For example, it requires increased flows during fish migration seasons, better use of spills, improved methods of barging fish, limits on ocean fishing, and the use of more effective fish screens and fish ladders.

By 1999, it requires the Corps to assess the effect of a major drawdown of dams on the lower Snake River. This could include the breaching or removal of up to four dams. Those four dams are Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite. They can be seen on this map of the Columbia Reserve Basin.

What does this rider do? How would it affect current operations? It would have two main effects. The rider provides that the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Corps of Engineers and other agencies must receive specific congressional authorization before breaching or removing any federally operated or licensed dam on the Columbia/Snake system. In addition, the rider says that Federal and State agencies must get specific congressional authorization before taking any action that would ''diminish below present operational plans the Congressionally authorized uses of flood control, irrigation, navigation and * * * energy generating capacity of any such dam.''

Let me address these effects one at a time. The first issue is breaching or removing dams. As I said earlier, the Corps is studying the breach or removal of four dams on the lower Snake River—Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite.

I understand the argument that over time, over the long term, breaching or removing the dam is the best way to protect and recover salmon. After all, if you return a river to its natural condition, you don't have to manage water levels to mimic the river's natural condition when fish migrate up or down stream.

But we are not living in the abstract. In most cases, removing a dam is a big step with major consequences for power production, for irrigation, for transportation, and for recreation. For example, breaching or removing the lower Snake River dams would most likely eliminate Lewiston, ID, as a river port. Many farmers from Idaho, Montana and elsewhere ship grain by truck or rail to Lewiston and barge to Portland for export to Asia.

I believe an action of this kind should definitely require congressional approval. But that is already the case. In testimony earlier this year, the Commander of the Corps' Northwest Division said,

> It is our opinion that the Corps cannot use its existing legal authority to remove lower Snake projects . . . New statutory authority would be required to undertake these actions since the proposed actions would eliminate or significantly affect specific project purposes provided for in the authorizing legislation.

That is the commander of the Corps' Northwest Division.

So there is not an issue here with respect to removing or breaching dams.

The rider is unnecessary in that respect. Congressional approval already is required.

This takes us to the second part of the rider. It requires congressional approval before an agency can take any action that will ''diminish below present operational plans'' the congressionally authorized uses of any dam on the Columbia/Snake system.

As I read the amendment, there would have to be specific congressional approval before a Federal or State agency makes any operational or management change that would reduce power production, irrigation, flood control or recreation. I believe that goes too far for three main reasons.

First, it is impractical. It would tie the management of the river system in knots. The management of the Columbia/Snake system is a very complex undertaking. It involves at least four Federal agencies: Bonneville Power, National Marine and Fisheries Service, Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. It also involves the Northwest Power Planning Council, the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, the government of Canada, many Indian tribes and scores of public and private utilities. There are hundreds of people involved.

To coordinate operations, the Federal agencies develop at least three operational plans each year: A flood control plan, a hydropower plan and a water management plan. During the spring and summer, a technical management team meets each week in Portland to review operations and make any necessary changes.

By locking everything in and providing that Congress must approve any action that diminishes other uses of the system below ''present operational plans,'' we would be micromanaging one of the largest and most complex river systems in the world.

The second problem is the congressional management may put several endangered species at risk of extinction. If changes are necessary to protect a newly listed species or further protect a species already listed to prevent it from being wiped out, the change would require congressional approval. Even minimal changes to provide specie protection may require Congress to act.

For example, new scientific evidence indicates that spills are more effective at protecting fish if they are conducted gradually over a 24-hour period rather than only at night. This approach slightly reduces power-generating capacity. So under the rider the agencies would need to get congressional approval before they can make a change.

The rider would not only threaten Federal efforts to protect the environment, but it would also threaten State efforts to protect the environment. Under section 401 of the Clean Water Act, when a Federal dam is being licensed or relicensed, States can impose conditions on the license in order to protect water quality. Many States do. For example, several States in the West have imposed conditions necessary to prevent dams from generating elevated levels of dissolved oxygen which can harm fish.

Utilities have questioned whether States have this authority, but the Supreme Court has held that they do.

The Gorton amendment would change all that. As I read it, a State agency could not impose any license condition that diminished power generation, unless it received the approval of the licensee or Congress.

That would, in effect, eliminate the section 401 authority that States have fought so hard to maintain.

The directors of the Western Governors' Association and the Western States Water Council share this view. In a joint letter, they say that, although their organizations do not take a position about breaching or making operational changes at any dam, the rider ''appears to clearly have the potential of diminishing State prerogatives under section 401, with regard to the rivers and streams identified in the amendment.''

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission also takes this view. In a letter, the FERC Chairman says that the rider ''would bar, absent specific congressional approval, State and Federal agencies from requiring or authorizing certain actions affecting the authorized uses of any Federal or federally-licensed dams on the Columbia or Snake rivers or their tributaries.''

I ask unanimous consent that both letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,
WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL,
September 18, 1998.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Committee on Environment and Public Works.
Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Committee on Environment and Public Works.

DEAR SENATORS: We have just learned that the Committee is considering the question of whether a proposed amendment would affect state Section 401 authority under the Clean Water Act. This relates to amendment No. 3555 offered on behalf of Senator Gorton. Given the time constraints, our organizations are not able to collectively express themselves with regard to this question. However, after consulting with our lead states on this issue, we are writing to express our view that the amendment appears to clearly have the potential of diminishing state prerogatives under Section 401, with regard to the rivers and streams identified in the proposed amendment. In so doing, we do not express an opinion as to the merits of any action to breach or remove any dam or to alter operational plans relative to any dam. Rather, the point of this letter is to advise the Committee of the position of the western states with regard to Section 401 authority, and to convey our concerns that the proposed amendment as written could diminish that authority.

The Western States Water Council has been working with the Western Governor's Association for some time to preserve state prerogatives relative to protecting water quality associated with proposed federally licensed projects. A resolution by the Western Governors' Association relative to this matter is enclosed for your reference. Since the Supreme Court upheld Washington's position in the so-called Tacoma case regarding the scope of state 401 authority, the hydropower industry has sought to persuade Congress to reverse or limit this decision. We have strongly opposed such efforts.

We hope that the Committee will consider these views as it considers the potential effects of the proposed amendment. If you have any questions regarding these matters, please let us know.

Best regards,

D. CRAIG BELL,
Executive Director, WSWC.
RICHARD BECHTEL,
Director, WGA–D.C.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, September 8, 1998.

Hon. DALE BUMPERS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUMPERS: In response to your staff's request, I am writing with respect to Section 343 of S. 2237 (the FY 1999 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior). That section, if enacted, could have a potentially significant effect on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's regulation of non-federal hydroelectric projects in the Columbia and Snake River Basins.

Section 343 of the bill would bar, absent specific Congressional approval, state and federal agencies from requiring or authorizing certain actions affecting the authorized uses of any federal or FERC-licensed dams on the Columbia or Snake Rivers or their tributaries. The proscribed actions would include reducing the generating capacity of any such dams; reducing their reservoirs below minimum operating pools (except as necessary for flood control, navigation, and safety); and requiring the release of stored water.

Section 343 would constrain the Commission's flexibility to act responsibly in its continuous oversight of licensed projects in these river basins. Moreover, as existing licenses expire, the provision would constrain the Commission's flexibility to balance the multiple public interest considerations involved, as required by the Federal Power Act, upon relicensing these projects.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. If you have further questions concerning the implications of Section 343 for the Commission's regulatory activities, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. HOECKER,
Chairman.

Mr. BAUCUS. Third, the amendment will have some unintended, and perhaps dangerous, effects.

Not all changes to the operation of the Columbia/Snake river system are made for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife. Often, there are other reasons.

Recently, there were concerns about sabotage of the Grand Coulee dam. The water levels were lowered, so that emergency repairs could be made. This reduced power generating capacity, probably worth a few million dollars. Under the rider, the reduction in water levels would have had to be approved by Congress.

Another example. In some situations, it may be appropriate to provide more

water for irrigation, at the expense of power production. Or vice versa.

Or to set more space aside for flood control. Each year, the planning process starts by measuring the snowpack and predicting the runoff.

In a particularly wet year, like 1997, operational changes may be needed to prevent downstream flooding, by setting aside more storage space in upstream reservoirs.

In a particularly dry year, operational changes may need to be made to allocate scare water among competing uses.

In many of these cases, under the rider, the agencies could only act if they received specific Congressional approval.

Mr. President, we all know how hard it is to get anything passed around here. Any change that is at all controversial can be at least delayed, and maybe stopped completely.

Do we really want decisions like this, that may need to be made quickly in response to constantly changing circumstances, to require specific Congressional approval?

To sum it all up, this is no way to run one of the world's largest and most complex river systems. That's why we have expert federal and state agencies, like the Northwest Power Planning Council and BPA.

Congress should set clear legal standards. When necessary, we must improve those standards. That's why I support S. 1180, a bill to improve the Endangered Species Act.

Congress also should conduct careful oversight.

But we should not require Congressional approval of the complex decisions that managers must make so that the river system functions smoothly.

By requiring Congressional approval of any changes that diminish the use of the system below ''present operational plans,'' the rider goes too far.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ON THE DEATH OF TOM BRADLEY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, for me, this is a sad day. Someone in politics whom I have very much respected passed away this morning, and that was Tom Bradley, former mayor of Los Angeles. Tom was one of America's finest mayors, a tireless advocate on behalf of the cities of America. I had an opportunity to work closely with him during the 1980s when we were both mayors.

I saw firsthand how he would go about solving a problem. He was kind and gentle, but he was tenacious about promoting the city of Los Angeles that he so deeply loved.

He leaves a rich legacy for Los Angeles and for the entire State of California. No Californian—and particularly no Los Angeleno—will ever forget the pride of hosting the 1984 Olympics. Tom Bradley showed that an American city could host a profitable and spirited Olympic ceremony.

His other accomplishments are many: Bringing public rail transportation to his city; building an international airport—Tom Bradley Airport—and a port that generated hundreds of thousands of jobs for the region; opening the doors of city government so that city workers reflected the rich cultural diversity of Los Angeles.

One particular vision I have of Tom Bradley which I will never forget is when we met, of all places, on the Great Wall of China as mayors in June of 1979. I was there to secure a sister city relationship between San Francisco and the city of Shanghai. While San Francisco got that relationship, Tom Bradley went right out and secured a similar relationship between Los Angeles and Guangzhou.

Tom knew the importance that the Pacific Rim would play in his city's future and he would literally travel anywhere in the world to help promote the city. He was a forceful and successful advocate for the cities of America every time cities needed a strong voice. His presence was matched by a wonderful and soft gentleness that I, personally, will never forget.

My deepest sorrow goes to his family and to his many friends. Mr. President, I know we all will do our part to see that Tom Bradley's vision for Los Angeles lives on and on for generations to come.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will report the motion to proceed to S. 442.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 442, a bill to establish national policy against State and local government interference with interstate commerce on the Internet or interactive computer services, and to exercise Congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce by establishing a moratorium on the imposition of exaction that would interfere with the free flow of commerce via the Internet, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was under the impression that we had time to speak in the time allocated under the cloture motion; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Time allocated under cloture has begun. The Senator has one hour to speak.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I had voted in favor of moving ahead with the legislation itself because it is important. However, I daresay that I want to take a few moments of the Senate's time here to review the bidding about where we are on legislation and where we are not on legislation.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to address the Senate this afternoon because of my continued concern that we are not addressing one of the most important areas of concern for American families, and that is the legislation which is known as the Patients' Bill of Rights. I and a number of our colleagues have cosponsored Senator DASCHLE's legislation. I had hoped that we could debate and reach conclusion on this legislation. I believe the overwhelming majority of our colleagues on this side of the aisle are in support of this legislation and, if we had an opportunity to debate this issue, I think we would have support as well from Members on the other side.

Basically, it is a fundamental issue that I think all Americans can understand. This issue centers around whether doctors are going to make decisions with regard to the treatment of patients in our country, or whether we are going to have those decisions made by accountants—whose primary interest is enhancing the profits of the HMOs rather than the health of its patients. That is really at the heart of the Patients' Bill of Rights. There are other important protections, but that is at the heart of it.

This issue affects about 160 million American policy holders. Our legislation is supported by more than 180 leading health care organizations—virtually all of the major doctors' organizations, nursing organizations, and consumer organizations.

I have read the comments of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They distort the provisions of this legislation and talk about it as legislation which is unnecessary and legislation that will complicate the current practice of medicine. But, listen to the doctors. They say it will simplify the practice of medicine.

It does seem to me valuable to consider what the doctors say about this, what the nurses say about this, and what the overwhelming, virtually unanimous sense of the health professionals is about it, and they say that they strongly support our legislation. They are opposed to the Republican legislation. But all of them are asking when will the Republican leadership yield and permit us—permit us meaning the Senate—to take up this legislation and debate it and reach a resolution on these various issues. That is the matter I am addressing here this afternoon.

Over the period of the last 2 weeks in the Senate we have had votes on the salting legislation. I bet if we asked the Americans who are listening or watching this afternoon what the salting legislation is really all about and where it fits on their list of priorities, many of them would not know what it is all about. It is basically a technique which is used—and used effectively and legitimately according to the Supreme Court with its unanimous vote—to permit the organization of workers in