NLRB 70th Anniversary

with John Higgins

Good Morning and Happy Anniversary,

We all know that 2005 is the 70th Anniversary of the Act and the Board. You've talked about it to your staff and some of you have had conferences marking the event.

My wife tells me that every anniversary is important and is forgotten at one's peril. But that doesn't mean every anniversary is the same. There is something different about those that end in zeros or fives.

And so it is that we mark the Board's 70th. But how to do it? What can we say after we congratulate ourselves for working at an Agency that is now well into its maturity? Around us we see major changes in the labor movement and we see the percentages of the unionized workforce dropping. We wonder then, as our staffs wonder, will there be an 80th, 90th or a Centennial for the Board?

I for one, have no doubt that there will. Indeed, if the Lord spares me, I'm already planning on what we should do when those anniversaries come. I want to talk a little about that future today as well as about our past. Anniversaries are great occasions for looking to what we hope will happen and looking back to see what did.

For me, I can't think of a greater honor than to be asked to talk to you about our Agency, where it is, where it has been and where, I think, it is going. And yet while it is an honor, it is a daunting task. Daunting because it involves the

achievements of the men and women who made this Agency what we inherited when you and I arrived 20, 30 or 40 years ago.

Doc Pennello, Henry Shore, Bill Little, Ivan McLeod Fannie Boyls, Beatrice Stern, Charles Fahy, and Arnold Ordman, Ida Klaus, Nort Come, Steve Gordon—. Just to name a few of the giants of our field who led this Agency through its early, adolescent, and young adult years. Those are people who had a real vision of what the world was like with, and what it had been without Section 7.

They are the kind of people of whom Longfellow was thinking when he wrote:

Lives of great ones all remind us,

We can make our lives sublime,

And departing leave behind us

Footprints in the sands of time.

These men and women, and hundreds like them left their mark on this Agency and the American workplace. And, in time, we will leave ours. What will our mark be? How will they remember us?

Certainly from our work – the commitment we show to our duties.

But, like it or not that isn't enough. As managers and executives our duty is to lead the staff and that means not just throwing our weight around or even doing good work. It means being sure that the staff knows what the mission of this organization is. Making sure that they know you are committed to the promise of Section 7 and it means encouraging them in that mission.

The stanza that follows Longfellow “sands of time” reference says it better than I can:

Footprints that perhaps another,

Sailing o’er life’s solemn main,

A forlorn and shipwrecked brother

Seeing shall take heart again.

But what I can tell you to tell them about our agency? Because we have shared so many of the same experiences much of what I would suggest would be old news to you. Nevertheless, even some old news needs to be repeated, not just for old times’ sake but to assure that our experiences are shared with younger staff members, employees who don’t know enough of our history or very much about those giants I just mentioned. It is important that our staffs hear about why there is an NLRB, what it has accomplished and the people who accomplished it. And the only way I know that they will hear it is if we tell them, if we leave our footprints in the sands by passing on the traditions that were passed on to us.

Today I want to share with you what I think are the memorable events of the Board’s history – the events that influenced where we are today and where we will be in the years to come. For me, these are events that exemplify our values as an Agency and that should be passed on to our staff.

I’ve picked 10 of them. I’ve been to enough agendas over the past 41 years to know that many of you will disagree with my choices.

And so, right off the bat, let me concede that my 10 are a very personal view of the Board's first 70 years. You may have others. What is important is that we use events like our 70th anniversary to cherish our history and to recount it to the younger staff.

I see each of my ten events as important in itself. But they made the top 10 list because each implicates a number of related policies that have successfully brought us to August 2005 and that I think will influence where we will be in August 2075.

Two more caveats. (1) I don't think I'm the David Letterman of the Board. And so, I am not going to rank these events or what they represent other than chronologically. (2) My focus is on our mission. Increasingly, we are being overtaken by budget, I.T. and Workforce Planning issues. But let's not ever let those important programs eclipse why we are really here. And that's what I want to talk about today.

(1) July 5, 1935 – Of course I have to mention this date. It is our birthday. But it is much more than that. The signing of the NLRA 70 years ago last month, represented the first time in history that a government passed a statute of general applicability saying that workers have a right to a say in their economic futures—in their worklives. Sometimes I think we forget just how momentous this event was.

In 1215, King John signed the Magna Charta saying that someone—other than the King—had a say in the political life of a country. It was 720 years before a government thought to say that someone other than the boss should have a say in

something as important as people's work lives. And then in 1935 Senator Wagner wrote the Preamble and Section 7.

That is the real magic of July 5, 1935. All of a sudden workers had the right to organize, to say yes or no to collective bargaining and to do so freely. That was the dream of 1935 and in some respects, we have seen it come true. We have seen many, but regrettably not all employers and unions comply with the Act.

We haven't been completely successful in achieving the vision of Senator Wagner so we need to remember that we are still on a mission and just like those who have served before us, we need to pass the message of that mission on to our staffs.

It's easy to sit back and say these kids are not like we were – that they don't care the way we did. I don't think that is true but if it is, then it's our job as leaders to turn it around. Our job is to lead not sit back – smugly satisfied that because we don't think these kids have what we had, that gives us a good excuse to abdicate our responsibility to pass on the mission. It's a lousy excuse. That is why July 5, 1935 is more than just a date – it should be a wake up date for us – a true rallying point for a renewal of our mission.

(2) April 12, 1937 – The day that the Supreme Court decided *NLRB v. Jones and Laughlin Steel*. The Act was declared constitutional to the surprise of almost everyone. Bill Little, our deceased colleague and former Director in Indianapolis, once told me that between July 5, 1935 and April 12, 1937, young lawyers flocked to become NLRB employees. They saw it as a great and challenging cause but as Bill said, they also fully expected that when whatever case

got to the Supreme Court that presented the issue, they would be out of a job because the Act would be declared unconstitutional just like so much of the other New Deal legislation.

Were they surprised when the Supreme Court decided on a 5 to 4 basis, that the New Deal wasn't so bad after all. That fifth vote by Justice Roberts became known as the "switch in time that saved nine"—a reference to the fact that it mooted the need for the famous Roosevelt court packing plan.

For many years after 1937, Board agents celebrated Constitutionality Day with great festivity. Today we mark it with a lot less fanfare. And it deserves more. It deserves to be marked and marked well for our staffs because like its older sibling, July 5, April 12 marks the liberation of American workers from a voicelessness about their economic futures.

The issues before the Court and the court's decision were very controversial because employee free choice about collective bargaining was controversial then and it still is. People held and still hold strong, very strong views about labor management relations. The Act is probably more controversial today than it was in 1935. If you doubt that, consider whether the Act could get through Congress today.

This is why our law is still vitally important. Our staffs need to be reminded of this. An enthusiastic celebration of the day that validated our mission is an important way of doing it. The staff needs to see that Agency leadership is still awed by the wonder, the promise and the importance of Section 7.

Next April 12, make a footprint by letting your staffs know what this whole thing means to you. Don't hide your commitment under a bushel. Take it out and pass it on.

(3) June 23, 1947 – The day that the Congress overrode President Truman's veto of Taft-Hartley and thus put into place the Agency and the Act as we know them today. It was an extraordinarily controversial piece of legislation. Its most controversial aspect was, of course, the addition of Section 8(b).

Its opponents called it the "Slave Labor Act" and a number of career NLRB employees resigned rather than enforce it. The last Wagner Act General Counsel Gerhard P. Van Arkel resigned, noting that he agreed with President Truman's veto message and that he had "grave doubts concerning both the workability and fairness of the Act."

I'm going to talk a little later and in a somewhat different context about another controversial part of Taft-Hartley—Section 3(d). But even Section 3(d) aside, Taft-Hartley deserves the top 10 status because it represents so much of who we are today. It was the first step—and indeed a big step—toward a balanced labor policy—a policy of regulating both sides of labor management relations. Indeed, as we well know, it was Taft-Hartley that made the right to refrain, like the right to join, national labor policy.

But I think Taft-Hartley had effects on the Agency that go beyond those policies. For me it marked the end of a particular ideological period, – an ideology held by some within the Agency that their job was to aid unions not to protect employee free choice.

That view has been replaced with a balanced sense of mission and professionalism. We don't think we know what's best for workers. They do. Employee free choice about collective bargaining is truly a choice for employees—not for us.

I'm not sure I am articulating this very well but you know what I mean. You know the spirit of which I speak and you know how important it is that we as the leaders of this organization share it with those who will be sitting in our chairs during the next 70 years. It is critical that we do because we have a unique mission – a mission shaped by the Preamble, Section 7 and Taft-Hartley. It is a mission that will never go out of fashion. Pass it on.

(4) September 29, 1950 – On this day the first Taft-Hartley General Counsel, Robert Denham, acquiesced in President Truman's request that he resign. In short, he was fired because he couldn't get along with the Board. The five Members actually went to the White House to tell the President that Denham needed to go. Interesting, but I bet you are wondering why I think this is one made the top 10.

Well, it did because I think that Denham's discharge set the tone for the cooperative spirit that has generally marked relationships between the Board and General Counsels for 58 years. The fight between Denham and the Board was a power struggle. Denham took the position that Section 3(d) gave him authority to go to court to challenge Board decisions. He thought his views on what national labor policy should be, were equal to those of the Board. They aren't and President Truman made that perfectly clear. Taft-Hartley was new. It was an experiment and

while Truman didn't like the experiment, he was committed to making it work. By asking for Denham's resignation, Truman was by no means denigrating the spirit and letter of Section 3(d). What he was saying was that Denham had pushed 3(d) too far and that he didn't understand how to strike the delicate balance between roles of the Board and the General Counsel in the statutory scheme.

Denham's discharge set the tone and since then, relationships between General Counsels and Boards have been generally good. In fact, Professor Davis comments on this incident in his leading text on Administrative Law. Discussing the question of Separation of Powers in administrative agencies, Professor Davis focused on the Board and on this early difficulty. Then he said and I quote:

> [S]uccessors to the original General Counsel have worked more harmoniously with the Board. The experience seems to show that complete separation may work tolerably well with congenial personnel but can cause serious trouble when the personnel are uncongenial.

There have of course been bumps in the road over the years but they have been more like rumble strips than barriers. Generally speaking congeniality has been the hallmark of Board–General Counsel relationships. They have worked hard to make the system function and function it has.

And so that is why Robert Denham's departure made the top 10. As Professor Davis suggests, the attempt at separation of power in Taft-Hartley was almost a disaster. But by working it out over the years since Denham, Board Members and General Counsels have avoided disaster and have made the system

work well. They did it because they believed in the importance of the Act and of a smooth running Agency. It has been a great achievement and is a story that needs to be passed on.

(5) December 10, 1959 – On this date, then Senator John F. Kennedy gave a speech to the Allegheny Bar Association in Pittsburgh in which he blasted the Board for casehandling delays. He likened an NLRB case to *Jarndyce v. Jarndyce*, the never ending case described by Dickens in Bleak House. "Justice delayed is justice denied" cried Senator Kennedy on that night in Pittsburgh and his cry was heard in Washington by the newly appointed General Counsel, Stuart Rothman. Although Rothman was a management genius, he was also a little bit of a tyrant and he knew how to get things moving.

In response to the JFK speech, he took a group of headquarters and field managers, put them in a room and told them not to come out until they came up with a system for solving the delay problem. A few days later they came to Rothman's office, pleased as punch with a plan that proposed a series of interim time targets, two of which were 60 days for unfair labor practice investigations and decisions and 90 days to implement those decisions. There had been relatively unsuccessful time target efforts before 1959 but this committee came up with some new ideas.

Rothman took the report, skimmed it, then threw it across the room saying it was accepted but directed that the 60 and 90 day targets be cut in half. And that is the source of those sacrosanct 30 and 45 days targets that all of us grew up under.

Perhaps nothing marks the Office of the General Counsel more than these dreaded "time targets." They have been the bane of the staff and of practitioners for

45 years. But at the same time they have been a polestar for General Counsels in their administration of the Act. No matter who the General Counsel is or was, and no matter what a General Counsel's attitude toward time targets was when first coming on board, all become "true believers." Why? Because they quickly find out the truth of Pete Nash's response to a question directed to him by a Regional Director at Pete's very first RD Conference.

Regional Director Henry Shore didn't like the time target system and he hoped that Pete would respond negatively when asked whether he supported time targets. Pete's response was brief but I remember it well. "Timeliness is next to Godliness," he quipped. Henry sat down. It was all over because Pete's response clearly evidenced that he recognized, as had his predecessors, that the employee without a job doesn't care about a perfectly written Final Investigative Report, Board decision or Appellate Court brief. The perfect is the enemy of the good if it unduly delays a reinstatement offer. Time targets are just the right balance between the dual needs for quality and expedition in casehandling.

In many respects, Stuart Rothman may have left the biggest footprint of all. I don't know whether his commitment to Section 7 was equaled by his commitment to time targets. But there can be no doubt that his drive for efficient and timely case processing set the tone for casehandling policy since then.

We pass on this great tradition by our continuing efforts to meet the time targets and by letting the staff know that these targets help us to honor the promise of Section 7. They need to know that we don't have time targets for their own sake, we have them because those who depend on us to protect their rights, need them.

(6) April 1963 – This was the month in which the NLRBPA was certified. Certification of the NLRBU came later.

Interesting you say. But why do I rate these certifications in the top 10?

Well, they are there because they are in my view, watershed events in the history of personnel management at the Agency. There was, of course, a union at the Board as early as the late 30's but it fizzled in later years. The 1963 certifications had the force of law and they pushed management into implementing a more unified approach to personnel practices.

In the early days, indeed even into the 60's, Regional Directors and Washington Branch Chiefs had a great deal of delegated discretion to develop and implement their own personnel practices. Oh, we had a Personnel Manual but those of you who remember the 60's will remember how much discretion Regional Directors had. Or perhaps I should say just took. People sometimes characterize the Regional Offices of the 40's, 50's and early 60's as fiefdoms run by local warlords.

I'm not sure I agree with that terminology, but I do think that the certification of field and headquarters bargaining units encouraged us to centralize personnel policies.

Sure I'd like to have more flexibility but the fact is that a national labor agency should have the same general policies in Boston as it has in Memphis. There is room for local preference and we have agreed to local negotiations for just that

reason. But it is important that the same general policies govern practices in all our offices.

Collective bargaining has also encouraged us to be more creative managers. How often have we begun negotiations saying we can never agree to this or that demand only to find a way to compromise as bargaining progressed.

In other words, collective bargaining has helped us to think outside the box – to develop some policies that I seriously doubt would ever have been considered.

Sure, it can make management more difficult at times. Just a few weeks ago, I testified in the arbitration of the deferred benefits grievance filed by the NLRBU. They have given us something of a rough time on this issue but that is part of what managers must expect. I know we are right on this grievance and that we did our best in administering the budget in the year in question. At the same time, however, our obligations to the union encouraged us to be very careful in how we did it.

The important thing is that collective bargaining makes us better managers and it is after all why we are here. So that the why the certifications made the top 10.

Collective bargaining is an important value for us – a value we must pass on.

(7) January 12, 1979 – On this date, the then NLRB General Counsel John Irving refused to honor a subpoena issued by a U.S. District Court in Brooklyn for the authorization cards submitted as the showing of interest in a Region 22 “R” case. The case was a criminal matter and an article the next day in a New York

paper read: "NLRB Top Lawyer in Contempt in Rackets trial." The history of John Irving's contempt is chronicled in Volume 600 of Fed.2d.

Why is a criminal contempt citation of John Irving one of the top 10? In and of itself, it isn't. But what it stands for is. And what it stands for is the long standing commitment of the Agency to the confidentiality we promise to employees who use our process. It's not an absolute secret – sometimes, as at a trial – we have to tell. But most of the time we don't. We certainly don't tell when we run secret ballot elections and we didn't tell during the FOIA battles of the '70s when virtually every district court and court of appeals that considered the problem ordered us to turn over affidavits in advance of a trial. And we finally won that one in the Supreme Court when the court unanimously affirmed the Agency's position. *Robbins Tire* was not only a big FOIA case for us but the dicta of that decision lends strong support to the rational for the Agency's long standing position against discovery.

The Robbins Court recognized that there is something unique about labor cases. An NLRB proceeding is not a simple fender bender law suit in which strangers bump into each other and then after litigation never see each other again. The Court saw that there truly is an issue of economic dependence when employees testify against their boss or their union. And they saw that most NLRB cases settle so that employees in merit cases are much more likely than not to have to testify.

John Irving also saw the critical importance of confidentially when he packed his toothbrush to go to New York to say "no" to the subpoena. It was not of course his idea. He was simply carrying on a tradition – a value that this Agency has treasured since 1935 – the importance of employees knowing that the Board will go

the extra mile – indeed many extra miles to protect the secrecy of our process – in elections as well as in investigations. Ultimately we got a compromise that resolved the issue. Irving never went to jail and we gave a little on the cards. But Irving didn't know that on January 12, 1979 in that Brooklyn court room.

I use *In Re Irving*– that's the name of the case – in my law school class to emphasize the confidentiality of our processes. And I always look forward to that class because it makes me proud to have been part of the case itself and to be part of an agency that really goes the last mile in furtherance of its mission.

I am proud to talk about the secret ballot that so marks Board history. We've voted millions and millions of workers and today we vote many workers who because of their immigrant status may vote in a secret ballot only once in their lives – in one of our elections. What a record!

So John Irving made a footprint in time and *In Re Irving* made the top 10. If I had to rank the 10, the tradition of confidentiality and secret ballots that *In Re Irving* represents would be close to the top. The case should be part of every Region's in-house training. Everyone who works here should know its details and pass them on.

(8) July 27, 1979 – On this date, GC Memo 79-63 issued. Its subject – The Public Information Program. I selected this event because perhaps more than any single event I think, it has influenced our caseload. Nothing dominates discussions about labor law today more than the decline in union density in the private sector. Coincident with that decline, has been a drop in our case intake. I don't think there is any doubt that the one has had some affect on the other. But is that the full explanation for a reduced case intake? I don't think so. I think it is a lot

of factors, the most prominent of which may be the success of the IO Program announced on 26 years ago last month.

Commentators and Board critics have given many other reasons for the decline in case intake.

Unions are organizing less--unions are organizing more but are using card checks and neutrality agreements instead of the Board. A Board case takes too long. It is even suggested that unions are less necessary in a post industrial service oriented economy. Many explanations have been given. I think the answer is a little bit of all of the above plus the IO Program and the fact that there has been so much protective labor legislation in the last 40 years. When I joined the NLRB in 1964, an employee who had a job related race, religious or safety complaint had to seek redress through a union. Today that same employee has many Federal and State agencies that will handle the complaint. What might have been an incident that would spark a contact with a union in 1964, instead sparks a call to EEOC or OSHA today.

But employees, employers and unions are still coming to the Board for help. Often, that visit results, not as it did 25 or 30 years ago in the filing of an unfair labor practice charge, but rather it results in a referral to another government agency. And sometimes there is no charge because we discourage the filing of seemingly meritless charges a lot more today than we did in the 60's and 70's.

Those of you who were here before 1980, know that inquiries made of Regional Offices then were handled by an informal program that we called the OD –

the Officer of the Day. No attempt was made in those days to count the actual number of inquiries we received or even what happened to those inquiries. Then on July 27, 1979 we scrapped the OD program. The OD became the Information Officer.

This was not a mere name change. Memorandum 79-63 is 9 single spaced pages and it details an entirely new program for handling inquiries from the public. Most importantly it encouraged IOs to both discourage the filing of obvious non merit charges and to direct them to the right agency if that is where they belong. We also began to keep statistics on these inquiries and we measure those statistics against our experience during the last year under the old system.

During that last year (1980) we took charges in 9.7% of those inquiries. That number, that 9.7% is what we call our charge acceptance rate. Within three years under the IO program the charge acceptance rate had dropped to 6.7%. Since then, the number of inquiries we receive annually fluctuates, but on an average it runs about 200,000 a year. And that doesn't count the millions of website hits we receive each year.

Over the years, we have seen two interesting statistical changes in our caseload as a result. First, the charge acceptance rate has gradually dropped to the point where in the past 2 years it was 4.2% in 2003 and hit an all time low of 3.8% in 2004.

And second, because we are taking in less and less no-merit cases, our merit factor is up.

What does all this mean? Well it means that roughly 12,000 charges weren't filed in 2004 that would have been filed in 1980.

In my view, the drop in intake certainly doesn't mean that the Board isn't at the forefront of what the national labor policy should be. Indeed the caseload pending before the Board Members today reflects many of the issues facing today's workplace.

I suspect that we are one of the few government agencies that has been successful in reducing its workload while at the same time really improving its services to the public.

Will we see continued decline in our caseload? I don't know but I suspect not. The Board caseload and case profile has changed over the years and it will no doubt change again and again between now and 2075.

Our caseload peaked in FY 81 and then started down, a big part of the reason I think being the success of IO. Where will it be in 2075? I suspect it will be back up again – up again not because of inattention to IO but because the employees of 2075 will still want a say in what happens in their workplace.

What message is there for the staff in all this? What to tell them when they ask if there will be a Board pension in their futures? I tell them that no one can forecast the future, but that workers will always want a voice in their worklives and will always be looking to the Agency for help in doing so.

Whether they are working on a potential Supreme Court case or fielding an IO call, they are making a footprint in the life of that worker and that worker's family. If

they have any doubts about whether we are needed today or how we are perceived they shouldn't look to comments by labor lawyers about how his or her Board practice has declined. Instead they need to look at the 200,000 workers who come to them for help. Maybe they can't help them because they don't have an NLRA case. But telling them that so they can get on with the rest of their lives can actually resolve a labor dispute – is part of the statutory scheme.

Pass that one on.

(9) December 14, 1987 – The date of the Supreme Court's decision in *NLRB v. UFCW* (487 U.S. 112). As I indicated in discussing Event Number Three – Taft-Hartley – Section 3(d) of those amendments deserves special recognition in the top 10.

The precise issue before the Court in *UFCW* was the appealability of a decision of the General Counsel to settle a case, and the holding is that that decision prior to opening of hearing is an unappealable act of prosecutorial discretion. In short, the final authority language of Section 3(d) means just what it says.

In my view that language and this Supreme Court holding is critically important to the statutory goal of labor peace. Section 3(d) created a prosecutor for the National Labor Relations Act thus assuring that there would be reasonable cause for litigation and that a public official would be responsible for litigation.

Congress set a six month statute of limitation for filing charges and then placed the investigation and the decision on the merits of those charges in the hands of an high-ranking, neutral government official. The result provides aggrieved

persons with a channel for their dispute while at the same time assuring that the process moves quickly. It is a system designed to avoid, as much as possible, the festering of a labor dispute. People may not like the final decision they receive from the General Counsel or his representative, but they get it quickly. And, when it doesn't go their way, they have to accept it, put it behind them and get on with the rest of their lives.

Section 3(d) assures that non merit cases are identified, that the charging party gets an explanation as to why it is a non merit case and then, has the opportunity for de novo review of that decision. They may not like that final decision, but they can't complain that t hey weren't heard.

Wisely, General Counsels have set up mechanisms for assuring that the process works.

The Office of Appeals is a staff of truly committed attorneys who really take seriously the fact that they are the last best hope for an unhappy charging party. This office provides a de novo review of a dismissed charge and it is the same review whether the charging party has the best labor lawyer in the country or writes a note across the bottom of the dismissal letter saying simply "I appeal."

General Counsels have also mandated a Quality Review system which assures that cases that don't go to appeals or are not otherwise seen outside the Region are reviewed for accuracy and completeness of investigation.

Section 3(d) has been a smashing success and we need to talk about that success with our staffs and with the public.

And finally, number (10). For me it is **August 10, 1964,** the day I walked into Region 26 and was sworn in by Office Manager Marion McCaleb. For you, I hope your EOD made your top ten.

I'm very proud of my date and you should be proud of yours. For each of us. I think it's a date that should be acknowledged to our staffs every time comes around. Let them hear you say that today is my anniversary – and let them hear it said with pride. Not a whining remark that suggests you are happy to be one year closer to your pension. But a boastful statement of how proud you are to have served so long. It's a footprint that may encourage others to emulate your years of service. A footprint that perhaps another, sailing o'er life's solemn main, a forlorn and shipwrecked brother running shall take heart again.

Pass it on.

CONCLUSION

So there it is. Seventy years of service to the American workplace and certainly seventy more to go. I'm not sure I have been able to encapsulate those 70 years into my top 10 events. I had to leave out February 4, 1966, the date of the Board's decision in *Excelsior Underwear* and August 20, 1971, the date of the *Collyer Insulated Wire*. I suppose I could have decided to do the top dozen but then where would I put July 1, 1964, the date of the decision in *Hughes Tool*.

I could go on and so I'm sure could you. But my time is long since up. I thank the Conference Committee for this opportunity to stroll down memory lane. It is a lane built on accomplishments, ours and those who went before us.

We work in a bureaucracy but we have been successful in resisting the temptation of becoming bureaucrats. Continue to resist. Remember you are professionals on a mission and we need to make sure those who come after us will continue to advance the mission. In that way the dream of Senator Wagner and the promise of Section 7 goes on.

Happy Anniversary!!!