

PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

**The Honorable Samuel E. Hayes, Jr. (R)**

81<sup>st</sup> District

Blair, Centre and Huntingdon Counties

1971 – 1992

INTERVIEWED CONDUCTED BY: Heidi Mays, Archivist  
March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2005

Transcript: Heather Deppen Hillard

**Heidi Mays (HM):** Hi.

**The Honorable Samuel E. Hayes Jr. (SHJ):** Hi.

**HM:** My name is Heidi Mays. I am the Archivist for the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. I am here today with former State Representative, Samuel E. Hayes, Jr., who represented the 81<sup>st</sup> District for the years 1969 [1971] to 1992. As a Republican Member, he rose to the positions of Majority and Minority Whip, as well as Majority Leader. Good afternoon.

**SHJ:** Good being with you, Heidi.

**HM:** Thank you. Could you describe your childhood upbringing on a farm in Huntingdon County and what specific values did you learn from that experience?

**SHJ:** Well, I'd refer to Pearl Buck, when she wrote the book, The Good Earth<sup>1</sup>; it's a good upbringing, being that close to the soil and being that close to people. The pastoral landscape, it gave a young boy a chance to grow up safe and sound and to reflect upon the values of our Pennsylvania and our America. It was a good foundation for my later service in the House of Representatives. And Pennsylvania, historically, has been an agricultural State. [It] continues to be it today. And so, that's a good upbringing. Certainly, it's not the only upbringing, but that was a good one.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1932 Pulitzer Prize winning novel.

**HM:** What did you want to be when you grew up?

**SHJ:** Well, interesting that you ask that question. A lot of young boys as they're growing up they talk about being a fire chief or a police chief; I would sit around, even as a young boy reading, as best I could, stories about George Washington [U.S. President, 1789-1797] and Thomas Jefferson [U.S. President, 1801-1809], James Madison [U.S. President, 1809-1817], Alexander Hamilton [Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, 1789-1795; Founder of the Federalist Party] and I kind-of had a notion that maybe, I would like to follow in their footsteps now. I did so very modestly. But, they were an inspiration and they were motivational, and so I thought of one day maybe serving in a Legislative Assembly.

**HM:** You were a teacher before coming to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and you're currently a Professor at Juniata College. Do you feel that this is an extension of your civil obligation to educating younger Pennsylvanians?

**SHJ:** Oh, absolutely. As an extension of my boyhood dreams of doing something civically, why, I did enter the classroom and I taught Social Studies immediately upon my return from the Vietnam War. I wasn't in the classroom very long because I was elected by the people of Huntingdon County and Blair County. And now today, after I've served for 30-some more years in public office, I believe it is incumbent upon me to share with the next generation what this Legislature is about and what the people's

branch is about, and to share the experiences I had as being a Member of that Legislative branch, which is, as I mentioned, the people's branch.

**HM:** Did your relationships formed while in the Military, or experiences while serving, shape your tenure in the Pennsylvania House?

**SHJ:** Well, being a veteran in the Vietnam War, obviously that brings you face-to-face with persons who don't necessarily believe in our frame of governance – a representative democracy – and having been one of those many thousands that defended our frame of government and our way of life, yes, it has a searing effect upon a person. And as I served tenaciously in Vietnam, I tried to serve tenaciously to protect this way of life that we have – this political way of life, this frame of self-governance – here in Pennsylvania and America. So, obviously it did have an important impact on my life.

**HM:** Particularly, your close relationship with General [William Childs] Westmoreland<sup>2</sup>?

**SHJ:** Well, I developed – at least – a passing relationship with the General. I just, by almost happenstance, became an acquaintance of his. He had four stars and I had much less than that. I was just a young soldier at the time – a young Officer in the Army - but, I was called upon to provide him with information concerning our sensitive Operations in Southeast Asia, and that made it possible for him and I to have, at least, a bit of a

---

<sup>2</sup> WWII veteran and Commander of American military operations during the Vietnam War, 1964-1968; also served as the United States Army's Chief of Staff, 1968-1972.

friendship – an association – which endured after the War. Now, he and I didn't get to see each other very often after the War, but we did see each other and we had a chance to talk on the phone a few times. He was obviously getting advanced in his years but, yes, we continued the association after the War; and my life was richer for knowing Bill Westmoreland and he was a very fine gentleman.

**HM:** Did you come from a political family?

**SHJ:** No, not at all. No one on my mother's side [and] no one on my father's side had served in [a] political office whatsoever, and I was the first to be elected to a position in the House of Representatives. So, I do not come from a family that has a long lineage of political elected office. I was the first at the time.

**HM:** Who or what shaped you to align yourself with the Republican Party?

**SHJ:** That's partly tradition, partly where I grew up. The area that I became a Representative of years later is basically a Republican District. That isn't to say that there aren't Democrats there as well, and I had a very good relationship with them as well. But, it was traditional; however, those boyhood values that you made reference to a moment ago and those that were to serve me well in later years, the Republican philosophy was reflected in the area that I grew up in and one day then served as a lawmaker and legislative leader. So, I was very comfortable and I do believe that the Republican Party has principals and an ideology that is in concert with our "Founding

Fathers.” That is not to say, exclusively, that the Democrat Party is out of the mainstream completely and is absent any of those same values. But the two-Party system has served the citizens of our Commonwealth and the Nation, where you can have competing ideas come to focus in the legislative arenas here in Pennsylvania and elsewhere across the Nation. So, I was very comfortable, but I’m not so exclusive to say that there isn’t room for other viewpoints because, obviously, there are and, in a representative democracy, you have to have that opportunity for debate and conversation and out of that comes public policy.

**HM:** What made you decide to run for the Pennsylvania House of Representatives?

**SHJ:** It was an extension of what I thought about when I was a boy. And, the opportunity appeared shortly after I had come back from Vietnam and I sought the seat and, ultimately, was elected and then served for many years. But, it was an extension of what I often thought about as a young boy.

**HM:** You represented the 81<sup>st</sup> District, which included at various times areas in Huntingdon, Blair and Centre counties. In your own words; could you describe the District, specifically the people and their issues?

**SHJ:** A Central Pennsylvania District; rural and small towns; towns and townships; farms and small business, for the most part; people of European heritage; strong, rugged individualism, who would just assume sometimes to be left alone by government, rather

than involved with government. And that thread of philosophy still runs through the District, even yet today. But that isn't to say that they aren't strong defenders of our system; they clearly are. They have served in uniform and they continue today to have a strong civic pride about themselves. It was a very comfortable relationship that I shared with the people who elected me. We were always in step with each other. And I think a Representative should be. The very title, "Representative" means something, I believe, in our frame of government. And this Representative – myself – and the citizens I was elected to represent, we were never at odds in terms of how they viewed the great issues of our day here in Pennsylvania and how they were playing out in Harrisburg. And they were very supportive of me; not only as their Representative, but very importantly, they were supportive of me as a legislative Leader and that's important, because it may be difficult from time to time for a group of citizens in some part of Pennsylvania to see why an issue is being developed the way it is in Harrisburg and legislatively, and sometimes the Leader has to take a position that may not be completely square with how the people back home may feel. But, they had a very cosmopolitan view in that regard and they realized that my role as a legislative Leader was a step beyond being just their Representative. And they realized that Pennsylvania is a very diverse Commonwealth; it's a very diverse political landscape, with cities as large as Philadelphia and townships that only number a couple hundred people. So, they were very supportive of me, not only at the election when I had to stand for election, but also through the legislative season. They realized that, "Sam, their Representative," was also one of the legislative Leaders who had to help bring consensus to difficult and vexing problems that may not always appear as something that would be best for the 81<sup>st</sup> Legislative District, but they realized

that they had a role in this complex matrix, known as Pennsylvania, and they were very supportive, and we were always comfortable together; always.

**HM:** You successfully won 11 campaigns for your House seat. Could you explain the campaign process and how it changed from 1969 to 1990?

**SHJ:** Well, campaigns have become much more pronounced, in terms of the message and how the message is carried. When I first ran, campaigns, while they were very lively and I was engaged in a very lively campaign to win my first seat in the House of Representatives, they have become probably even more pronounced in the message and sometimes, much sharper than had been the case say, 50 years ago. But, all the things that we enjoy in our society, with regard to other messages, the political message has also been carried in those ways. The media has become very, very important as a medium – as a vessel to carry the messages. They’ve become much more expensive, the campaigns have, and these seats are contested very vigorously when a vacancy occurs. That isn’t to say that we don’t have, maybe, up to 25 percent of our seats go uncontested today. But, where there is a vacancy, where there is a close race, why, the fireworks are enormous today. But, campaigns have become more expensive, more media driven, just as the national campaigns have. These seats are sought very vigorously. Maybe some of them aren’t competitive because of one Party’s advantage over the other one, but when the vacancy occurs or when there is a close contest, why, the campaigns have become very complex, very expensive, very media driven. Much more so than, maybe, 50 years ago,

maybe even 30 years ago. But they've changed, just as everything else has changed in society.

**HM:** Did you enjoy campaigning?

**SHJ:** I enjoyed campaigning. Obviously, it was a different drill than day-by-day legislating – which I keenly enjoyed serving in a legislative Assembly – but, campaigns are personal, in many cases. I had the good fortune of not being engaged in those kinds of campaigns each of those times that you mentioned. Most often I didn't have an opponent, but when I did, I enjoyed campaigning amongst the people as I did the first time I campaigned and the people were very supportive of that. Obviously, as I mentioned a moment ago, campaigns can become very personal and you have to be a bit leathery and you have to be resilient [and] you have to be a good gladiator in the political arena. Many people may not be cut out for that type of human activity, but it's all part of this fabric that we know as Pennsylvania and the United States of America. You have to stand before the people and receive their consent. And it's part of that process and it can't be viewed as something separate from that process. And it should not be something that we view as not necessary; it's absolutely necessary and it's important for the Representative to get close to the people during a campaign, where edges and viewpoints are pretty edgy and pretty sharp. [It's] very important to the overall process, however. [It's] something that we must go through as Pennsylvanians and as Americans. As fatiguing as it might become, as cranky as it might become, it's part of our system and it's something that we must do.

**HM:** So, in response to somebody that might say, “term limits,” you would say that the election process is a way of enforcing term limits?

**SHJ:** The election process is term limits. A Representative has to stand for election every two years – the term of office is for two years; State Senator in Pennsylvania is for four years. But, in the case of the House, that means every other year – and the people can change their whole House of Representatives if they will to do so – every two years. Now, the electorate, the citizens, have never chosen to throw everyone out at the same time and incumbents, for the most part, get re-elected. But, you do have to stand for election and people control with their vote whether a Representative is to be returned or not. So, the election itself is a form of term limits. For those who want to further limit one’s service, I’ll leave that for the philosophers. I used to be engaged in that subject, but I guess, the jury’s still out. Several states rushed to enact term limits; Pennsylvania did not. Many other states did not and I think now that time has come and gone a bit, why, there’s no longer a rush to term limits. There are still those who write about it; there’s still those who speak about it. It’s something that probably we should continue to have a conversation about. But at the end, our Forefathers provided a system of term limits and that’s known as an election.

**HM:** Former staff members have told us that you helped other House Members during re-election bids. Could you elaborate on that?

**SHJ:** Well, as a legislative Leader I had some obligation to support my army in the field, and I was glad to help those who sought my help. I don't know whether it was critically important to their election, but to the extent I could help them frame issues, public policy issues, to the extent I could help them sharpen their message and to project that message, I was happy to do so. But there are a lot of good gladiators out there and they didn't all need my help; they were pretty good at it themselves. But, when it was necessary or sought, why, sure, I'd be glad to help those who are trying to further advance this system of representation and self-governance. So, I was glad to help them in their phrase. It was invigorating for myself as well as them.

**HM:** After your first election to the 81<sup>st</sup> District, what would you say surprised you most about the House?

**SHJ:** Well, I don't know whether there were a lot of surprises. I did know that we were about to go through a transformation. It had just started when I was serving my first term, when it was realized that a state like Pennsylvania, if it was to have a modern Legislature in the latter years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and be best positioned for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, that certain things should probably happen in order to make it a modern and progressive Legislative Assembly. And those processes started to take place: annual Session instead of biannual Session; annual Budget instead of biannual Budgets; the Legislative branch staffed itself, so that it would truly, in every sense of the word, be a co-equal branch with the Executive branch, able to generate its own original information in terms of developing positions on legislation and pending ideas that are being discussed

by the citizenry; expanding the Committee staff; providing administrative help for the individual Representative, both at their capitol office and in their legislative districts; the Legislature exercising its oversight responsibilities much more vigorously – one of the historical and constitutional roles of a Legislative Assembly, the people’s branch, is to exercise what’s known as “legislative oversight.” That took on a much more robust character, starting in the [19]70s and carrying on in the [19]80s, with the enactment of things like the Independent Regulatory Review Commission, where all rules and regulations being promulgated by the Executive branch are to be reviewed by the Legislative branch to see whether or not those rules and regulations are consistent and in concert with the laws that were passed by the people elected by the citizens of Pennsylvania. So, the Legislature went through a transformation, and I would say that while that may not have been a surprise, that was a very basic and fundamental reform. The committee’s were open to the public. Sunshine Legislation was passed – a good reform – Sunset Legislation was passed, so that there would a systematic review of Executive branch Agencies and Programs. And yet today, often times, the Legislature will put a clause in Statutes that they are passing to require a systematic review of that law in a certain number of years. So, the Legislature became much more co-equal with the Executive branch, which was good for the citizens of Pennsylvania. That was very, very important.

**HM:** I think a lot of people take those things for granted.

**SHJ:** Well, they weren't happening as robustly before, before the [19]70s, as they are now. But it was all those things [that] were important for citizens and what the Legislative branch does – and should always recall to itself – is, we serve the citizens directly. We are elected directly by the citizens and we serve the citizens. It's the people's branch. And so, the citizen voice should be made as strong as legislatively possible in this frame of government, known as representative government. We don't have a direct democracy where everyone comes to meet on every issue of the day. We have a representative democracy and a republic, but we should always do everything we can to preserve the voice of the citizen and to strengthen the citizen's voice. That's the purpose of the Legislative Assembly; to give the individual citizen as strong a voice as legislatively possible.

**HM:** You helped to establish the Bipartisan Management Committee, which I work for, and change the electoral process for the position of the Chief Clerk. These are some of the examples that I have. Could you provide in depth all the strides that were made while you were in Leadership to professionalize the Legislature? You touched on several; specifically, I was thinking of the Bipartisan Management Committee.

**SHJ:** Well, I mentioned the Standing Committees because they are the building blocks in the legislative process, but this Institution – the House of Representatives, itself – also has an administrative function; it has a function to carry out the necessary day-by-day processes that all come together to make the legislative process possible, and for the most part that's an administrative process, and you mentioned the Bipartisan Management

Committee [and] you mentioned an elected Chief Clerk. When I first came to the House of Representatives, the Chief Clerk's position was purely a political position, who served at the pleasure of the Majority Party, not necessarily at the pleasure of all Members of the House of Representatives. And after all, the Chief Clerk position is a position that serves all the Representatives who have been elected by the people of Pennsylvania. So, we did professionalize the Chief Clerk's Office. We took it out of the realm of politics – not that politics is not an honorable word, because politics is what makes America and Pennsylvania what it is – but, we eliminated the sharpness, the edginess that goes with partisanship in the Chief Clerk's Office and I think that that has been a fairly good success. It depends on how people carry out the policies, the administrative policies that were set down by that group of leaders some years ago. In terms of the Bipartisan Management Committee, it has also helped to professionalize the House of Representatives, both for the elected Representatives and also the staff professionals which serve this Institution, which are very critical to the outcomes – the Legislative outcomes – of this Legislative Assembly. So, both of those things were done by a group of leaders in the [19]70s and into the [19]80s and it was all for the better, again, for the citizens. The citizens are better served today than when I first came to the House of Representatives by every measure. There isn't one instance where the citizens today could say that they're being underserved as compared to heretofore. Now, they may not always agree with outcomes – legislative outcomes, administrative outcomes – but in terms of this Legislature being able to better serve citizens, there is no doubt that it is much better positioned today in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, than it was 25 or 30 years ago when I first came to the House of Representatives. The citizens, again, are the beneficiaries of

these reforms. The Legislature has been professionalized; Ethics Legislation was put into place both for the elected Representatives and also for staff professionals. These things are all important for the citizens, and again, that's why there is a Legislative Assembly, to serve the citizens. That isn't to say that every day is filled with rainbows and that there's not some pain and suffering that goes on in the legislative process, because it is a process of give-and-take and consensus building. But, the citizens are better served today because of the tools that are available to their Representatives to serve them [are] much better today than before. Of the 50 Legislatures, Pennsylvania is one of the "leader states;" California is a "leader state;" New York; Illinois; Michigan – I could mention some more. That isn't to say that the outcomes are always what we would hope for as an individual citizen, but in terms of being able to do the people's business, [Pennsylvania has a] very progressive Legislature, and [is] better able to serve the citizens of this Commonwealth.

**HM:** What would you tell citizens whenever they come to the House for the first time and they are watching the process from the Gallery?

**SHJ:** Well, when they watch an Open Session of the House of Representatives it probably looks like a livestock auction to them, because you see all this random activity taking place and Parliamentary procedure is spewing and you wonder whether anyone's listening to it or not. There's a lot of activity that goes on on the Floor of the House of Representatives that is almost beyond explanation. I had that sense the first time I entered the halls of the House of Representatives as a lawmaker – how does anyone know

what's going on? But, it doesn't take long for you to realize that you can do more than one thing at a time and the lawmakers are listening to the Parliamentary procedure, the Leaders are guiding that process and of course, that would surprise any citizen when they come and see the House in Session. They wonder about all that and they ask questions about all that. And some of those things are not always easy to explain. It has often been said, "If you like sausage and laws you shouldn't watch either one of them being made." But, I would say that if a citizen would just stay around and about the House Chamber for awhile, in a couple of days it would all start to make sense to those who ask questions on their first day here, just as Representatives have questions the first day. It is random activity on the Floor of that House of Representatives at many moments, but then the House comes to order and the issues are debated vociferously. The House is a cauldron of divergent viewpoint, where all the regions of Pennsylvania come together. Laws are made on a very cluttered landscape of reality and perceptions and truths and untruths and rumors, hopes, aspirations, dreams – all those things are coming to bear – economic, sociology, politics – all those things coming to bear at one time on these issues. That's quite a cauldron, that's quite a stew, but that what it's about and the Legislative Assembly is about consensus. And it's quite an experience the first day you come to the House of Representatives. There's no other place like it in Pennsylvania, so there's nothing for citizens to compare it to something back home. They see this for the first time. There it is. It's somewhere between a riot and order. It's going okay though; that's what it's about. It's always been that way. That doesn't make it right, but it has always been that way, to include the first Legislative Assembly and the Constitutional Conventions that were held here in Pennsylvania. It's quite a process. It's the best forum

that anyone has ever devised on this planet, and my guess is that it is the best forum that anybody will ever devise. Where people come together into a marketplace of ideas you're going to have contest, and you're going to have conversations that are edgy and sharp, but that's okay; that's what it's supposed to be about. Order is something that you relate to; monarchies, aristocracies, [and] dictatorships – they're not things that we want.

**HM:** As you prepared for battle on the House Floor, how did your staff help you?

**SHJ:** Oh, the staff helps to marshal information necessary to wage the argumentation, the debate that's going to take place – you can't get it done without them. I have the greatest admiration, the highest regard for those men and women who are professional members of the Legislative staff in the House of Representatives, and the Senate as well, in our bicameral Legislature. The citizens, again, are best served by having professional persons working with their Representatives in the honing of positions, as we try to reach consensus on public policies. It will not get done as well without the professional staff as it gets done with them. And that has changed a good bit as part of the transformation that I referred to before. When I first was elected to the House of Representatives there were only a couple of staff persons in the whole House of Representatives. It would be impossible for just a handful of staff persons to marshal the informational base that you must marshal when trying to reach consensus on difficult public policy issues. I have the highest regard for the professional staff in the House of Representatives and the Senate. And the citizens, again, are best served when you have a professional staff than when you don't have [one], and we have it in Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians can be proud of our

state. We rank very, very high in terms of the professionalization of our Legislative process, without any question.

**HM:** When you began, how many Members shared an office, and how many staff people were in that office with you?

**SHJ:** Well, six of us who were elected as Representatives shared a very small parcel of space in the Main Capitol Building, and there wasn't room for any staff persons in that little crypt, but there was a secretary who did the clerical work for us. There was not a secretary for each Representative and the Standing Committees didn't all have staff persons. So, when I first came here it was very spartan. Now again, the purpose isn't to make life better for the Representative, the purpose is to make this Legislative Assembly, this Legislative branch better, more responsive, for the citizens of Pennsylvania; that's the purpose. And being able to correspond with your constituents in an effective, efficient way is only accomplished through administrative staff. But when I first got here, it was very spartan. But of course, we could go back to even earlier times in our Colony's history and it was even more spartan. But as we were beginning to close the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and embark on the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, we had to professionalize the Legislature. It couldn't be a throwback to the 1700s or the 1800s. I guess when I first got here there was six of us in one little room. We got the job done, but it's getting done better today.

**HM:** Well, to expand on that, you helped create and establish the Capitol Preservation Committee the Capitol Restoration Trust Fund and Co-Sponsored legislation with

Speaker K. Leroy Irvis [State Representative, Allegheny County, 1959-1988; Speaker 1977-1978, 1983-1988] to obtain the South Office Building<sup>3</sup>, the Old Museum Building, which is now the Ryan Building<sup>4</sup> – which is where we’re at today – and the Capitol Annex<sup>5</sup> for use by the General Assembly. What led you to these decisions to, I guess, expand on the concerns you had?

**SHJ:** Well, your previous question answers the one you just asked. Obviously, the Legislative branch was shoehorned into a building that was constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century and it was not going to be able to be a progressive State Legislature if it was going to be constricted in that way. It needed space and room to play out its Constitutional role, and there were steps taken, as I mentioned before. And then the building itself was suffering under these constraints and restrictions and the crowded conditions that were existing. And the building was actually being defamed and it was – whole quarters were being covered up with plywood to try to partition available space so that the Legislative branch could carry out its functions. That was no way to treat this grand edifice known as the “People’s Capitol of Pennsylvania.” And so, space was obtained for the Legislature and those buildings that existed at the time and the one that was added to the Main Capitol Building, the East Wing as we refer to it. This wasn’t a one-person effort; this was the effort of those of us who were the Leader team at the time. Each did his or her part in making the Legislature a better Institution and to make this Capitol building as grand as it is supposed to be, to represent, to manifest our citizen-

---

<sup>3</sup> Rededicated as the “Irvis Office Building,” in 2006.

<sup>4</sup> Rededicated after former Speaker, Matthew J. Ryan, who served from 1963-2003; Speaker of the House, 1981-1982 and 1995-2003.

<sup>5</sup> Now named the “East Wing.”

based republic and frame of government. But, a lot of people worked together and so did the rank-and-file Members. They were very supportive of it as well. So, it's a team effort; the Legislature is not a one-person endeavor. It is a team effort. That's one thing you learn quickly when you come to a Legislative Assembly; it's not about me, it's about all the people of Pennsylvania, and the Leaders work as a team. And the Leaders themselves are a microcosm of the Legislature and they discuss and debate how certain things should take place in a Legislative Assembly; it's part of the job of a legislative Leader. But all these things were for the good, and when people come to this Assembly today, they see something that their parents and their grandparents wouldn't have seen when they visited here. Obviously, someone who comes to this building today seeing it for the first time, they may conclude that this is the way it's always been; but it wasn't always this way, and it's the way it should be, and that took a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of lawmakers in both the House and the Senate. And it was all done, again, for the citizens of Pennsylvania. This Capitol Building represents all the toil of our forefathers, when they were trying to establish a frame of government that was the best frame at that time, and continues to be the best frame of government on this planet. This building is about citizens and the people who have been elected to carry out the hopes, desires, dreams and aspirations of its citizens.

**HM:** As the citizen's population moves from place to place within the Commonwealth, redistricting is part of that process. What was your role as a Leader in helping, I guess, ease some of the pains of redistricting? Because as we said, you served Huntingdon

County, Blair County and Centre County, and that wasn't always true with each redistricting process; so, could you comment on this process?

**SHJ:** Well, reapportionment conjures up many thoughts of pain and suffering. It's not an easy process. It's something that came to us through a [United States] Supreme Court decision known as Baker versus Carr [1962], which said in just a few words that all Legislative Districts, both in the House and the Senate, have to be of equal population or close to equal population. Before the Supreme Court Baker versus Carr decision, you had some Districts that were comprised of only a few thousand people and you had other Districts that had tens and tens and tens of thousands of people. And, in terms of citizen voice and the strength of citizen voice, the District that only had 3,000 people, why, their voices would be stronger than a District that had tens of thousands of voices expressed through their Representatives. So, the Supreme Court said that Districts have to be nearly equal in population as humanly possible. And that's a process; you have to go through it every ten years as a minimum, and here in Pennsylvania, we have a Legislative Reapportionment Commission in the Constitution of Pennsylvania that states that there is to be a five person panel convened for the purpose of drawing District lines to reflect changes in population over the previous ten years. That Reapportionment Commission is made up of the Majority and Minority Leaders in both the House and the Senate, or their designees and a fifth person, who is to be selected by the four Legislative Representatives. And those five persons together are then responsible for redrawing the District lines for both the House and the Senate, and that's a painful process. That's a painful process for lawmakers; it's a painful process for citizens who don't like to see

their Legislative District tampered with. They don't like seeing their towns subdivided for Legislative purposes. Now, there are Constitutional safeguards, but at the end of the day there is no way you can reapportion Pennsylvania and make everyone happy about it. It is a process fraught with unhappiness. And I'm one who went through that process. As the Majority Leader, I served on the Reapportionment Commission and I can tell you, it's a difficult process, but it's something that we have to go through and at the end of the pain and suffering. I guess it's eminently fair to say legislative districts should be quite even in population. I can give the arguments as to why they shouldn't be, particularly for one representing a rural district; that makes our districts very large geographically. But, representation is about people and the districts were getting out of round in terms of population, so it's a bit of pain that we have to go through; but I wouldn't wish it upon anyone, as one who has gone through it. Not just as a Representative whose district's lines were changed; I had to actually go do it, and it's a difficult process and no one is happy with the outcome.

**HM:** You were going through it at a time with limited technology, too.

**SHJ:** Oh, sure.

**HM:** Right now, they have the added advantage of having computers.

**SHJ:** Sure. We did it with hand calculators and pencils and papers, and it's a gigantic process. It takes days and days and months and months to hone out all the things that you

have to take into consideration. Today, the process can be speeded up from a technology standpoint, but the pain and suffering is still there. Any time you put a line on the face of Mother Earth, that's a line of conflict and, often times, difficulty. We have to do it; we have to have borders; we have to have lines in a lot of different things that we do as human beings. We have National borders; we have state borders; we have natural borders; [and] manmade borders. But, borders and lines are to divide and separate persons and their land and when you do that, conflict is inherent and reapportionment isn't free of that agony. It's a process given to us by the [United States] Supreme Court Baker versus Carr. But after all, probably citizens should have an equal voice in their Legislative Assembly, and that's why we go through it.

**HM:** Touching, again, on technology; as you were leaving the House, the House was going through some major changes including cameras on the Floor and laptops on the Floor. What was your experience without these media devices and do you think that the Commonwealth is better served with these?

**SHJ:** Well, when I first came to the House there was a rule that you couldn't have any electronic media on the Floor of the House of Representatives. We changed that in our Rules of Procedure and allowed it – on a limited basis – but, allowed it. It probably has been helpful if you take the long view. Every age has known some new process or technology. We didn't go from stone tablets right to computers. There were a lot of other things in between like typewriters and other types of – what they referred to of in that day as – technology. Obviously, with the computer age that is upon us you can

marshal information much quicker, much more efficiently, much more thoroughly, much more robustly – all those things, so it's good. But, after all of that, it is still the citizen and his or her Representative that guides the legislative process. Computers don't make decisions; computers just help those who have been elected to make decisions. But, it is much more electronic today. The House Chamber is lit brilliantly with all the computer technology that you just referred to, and the same is true of all the offices; much, much better than had been the case. But, in this instance, the House of Representatives and the Senate, they reflect larger society. This is true no matter where you may go across Pennsylvania and America. The whole society is computerized today, for the most part, and that's been a helpful tool. But, the computer cannot replace the Representative; the computer cannot replace the staff professional; it's still a human Institution, and representative government is a human process. These are tools that help us do our work, but they are not the process itself, and they are not the principal themselves. And as we look back some years in the future [and] we look back to today, there will be more innovations, but I would say that we will still be the same; that being Representatives, representing men and women known as citizens.

**HM:** Could you describe an average Session day?

**SHJ:** Hectic. Representatives are called upon to do a lot of things; help constituency with Executive branch agencies where they may have some difficulties; you have to prepare yourself for the legislative day, which includes a whole potpourri of legislative bills – House and Senate bills that have to be considered in one way or the other. A

legislative day is a very hectic day, and not unlike the workplace almost wherever you may go in our society, but there is only one House of Representatives and there's only one Senate in Pennsylvania. There is no other place like these two places in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They're unique in that way – one of one. And it's a very hectic day, [a] very, very hectic day, and you have to sift through that very hectic day and bring order out of it and it does; the Legislature brings order out of a very hectic circumstance. But, it is hectic; phones are ringing no matter what legislative matters you might be pursuing. If people are being besieged by black flies, they don't much care what bill is being considered in the House of Representatives, they want to know whether DEP [Department of Environmental Protection] is going to spray their river or not for black flies. It's very hectic. Gypsy moths [and] bridges going down in the Juniata River – which happened to me when I was a Legislative Leader – that's very distracting for the citizens back home. Their distractions impact on how they go about doing their daily chores, and they want to know how you're going to solve it and how you're going to expedite a solution, while simultaneously you have to be considering those House bills and Senate bills which are coming up for a vote. [It's] very hectic; no one complains about it, but it isn't always specific. It's very hectic.

**HM:** If an average day for a Member is hectic, how is it for a Leader?

**SHJ:** Hectic. *(laugh)*

**HM:** More hectic?

**SHJ:** More hectic, because the Leaders are responsible for organizing the House Agenda for that day, and the Leader has to take into consideration what else is going on in the Representative's life – not just their lives, but the lives of all these other Representatives and what's impacting upon their decision making, what's gnawing at them, what's going on in their legislative districts that can cause their temperament to change and cause their focus to change. The legislative Leader has to understand all those things. There are moments when the House isn't prepared to make a decision on a weighty issue, it's best to wait until the next day or the next week, and after long, hard battles on the Floor of the House and the Senate, it's best for the citizens to allow those Representatives and Senators to go back home to their Districts and get away from the Harrisburg process awhile [and] let all those frayed nerves heal and mend and let the Representatives talk with their citizens. Leaders have to know and really, citizens need to know, that the legislative process is a process that is very taxing and there are times when you just have to stop it for while, otherwise the temperament of the legislative process changes and not necessarily for the good of the citizenry. I know pundits often talk about recesses which are taken by the Assembly, but those recesses are important to allow healing to take place and to allow Representatives and Senators to go back and be with the citizens who have elected them, so that there are not always in Harrisburg, physically detached from the men and women who have elected them to serve in the House of Representatives – it's very important. Again, pundits will write about the Legislators and another recess, but healing has to take place and the legislative process is very taxing [and] fatiguing mentally. It taxes your temperament and your ability to deliberate on issues, so it's good

to take a break every now and then and get away from that and leave the feelings heal. But, it's also important for Representatives and Senators to be back with your citizens too. It's a very important part of the legislative process.

**HM:** Could you explain some of the significant changes that occurred within the Republican Caucus during your tenure, largely, with your guidance?

**SHJ:** Well, what happened in the Republican Caucus is not different than what happened in the Democrat Caucus, because we do these things Institutionally. It wasn't just the Republicans who were providing staff persons for Standing Committees, as an example; the Democrats were as well. It wasn't just Republicans who were taking the steps necessary to remove the Chief Clerk Office from the sharpness of partisan differences; Republicans and Democrats both worked on that. The Bipartisan Management Committee, which you mentioned, that was done by both Republicans and Democrats. From an Institutional standpoint – from a House of Representatives standpoint – these things do not happen in just one Caucus; they happen in both Caucuses, and so I would be pluralistic and say that both teams were working on these things together because, in fact, they were.

**HM:** What are your feelings towards lobbyists and were they helpful to you as a legislator?

**SHJ:** Lobbyists, people who have been asked by a group of citizens who have some common purpose and some common set of goals and objectives, to represent them – they’re not elected, but they are selected by a group of persons, such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, nurses, farmers, pharmacists, whatever – and this rather homogeneous group selects someone to work for them to petition the government, to look favorably upon what they believe to be public policy and important to their way of life, their profession, and that’s what a lobbyist does. A lobbyist comes to Capitol Hill and asks Representatives and Senators to kindly consider what their membership, professional membership, their group of citizens, would like to have considered by the Legislature. And they get very vigorous in their pursuit, and after all, citizens have a right to petition their government. That’s a basic Constitutional guarantee and they do that in part through a lobbyist. Now, everyone elects a Representative, but that’s the plurality, that’s the diversity. But then individual groups, they want to have their specific viewpoint heard by the Representatives, and so lobbyists are hired by various citizens. Almost everyone has a lobbyist. Most citizens don’t realize that. Senior citizens probably would say, “We don’t have a lobbyist.” Well, AARP [American Association of Retired Persons] is a lobby group and they have lobbyists and they ply the halls of the Legislature, asking that senior citizens be given every due consideration. And all the other professions and groups of people – there’s hardly a person that doesn’t have a membership in something or other. And even if they don’t have a membership, their group is still being represented, with or without their support. So, lobbyists are helpful. They help bring sharp focus to a how particular group of citizens feel about an issue; they’re helpful. Obviously, they have to be considered at some length because, for after

all, it's the individual citizen who is being represented and not just groups of people. James Madison in [The] Federalist Papers<sup>6</sup> talked about factions, and he talked about the need to diminish the violence caused by factions – that's not physical violence, but the clashing – and he thought that a representative government would best do that, and he's right. But people still have a right to band together in an organization; sportsmen, farmers, urban dwellers, those who own property and those who rent property, nurses, teachers, auctioneers – they all have an interest in public policy, so they hire a lobbyist to express their point of view. It's all part of the process of being able to petition your government. Again, there have been a lot of pages of punditry spilled on whether lobbyists are good, bad or indifferent and usually they are not viewed in very bright light, but they've been here and they're going to be here and people do have a right to band together as an association and they have a right to pick someone amongst them or to hire someone to go petition the government on their behalf. Now, I haven't come out foursquare and everything that's done in terms of lobbyists practice – you know, different lobbyists pursue their activities in different manners and some are of high repute and, from time to time, some have stepped across the line. But, that's no different than any other group of citizen; we all get outside the bounds of propriety maybe from time to time. But, a good Legislature can take all that into consideration, and the Legislature actually does a pretty good job of that, regardless of how it may be viewed some miles from the Capitol. The lobbyists do not control the legislative process; the citizens control the legislative process through their Representatives. And the voice of the single citizen, in a letter or a telephone call or a personal meeting back in the district, [is] very effective lobbying and I always encourage citizens to stay involved.

---

<sup>6</sup> Number 10 of a Series of 85 Articles written collectively by Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay.

**HM:** Turning a little bit to legislation – you stated in a previous interview that you were most proud of your Farmland Preservation [Act 442, 1987-1988]. Was it an uphill battle to pass this legislation?

**SHJ:** Farmland Preservation was an important enactment. I was on the Conference Committee – the six-person Conference Committee, the House/Senate Conference Committee – that wrote the final version for Pennsylvania’s Farmland Preservation Statute, and it is the leading Statute of its kind in the United States of America. And Pennsylvania has now preserved more farmland than any other state in the Union. It is the “leader state” without any question. We here in Pennsylvania, without any doubt, can proudly say that we have the best Farmland Preservation Law as a matter of public policy, of any state in the Union. That was one hallmark bill – piece of legislation – that I was part of; there were many others. I did a lot of work in School Subsidy. Into the [19]80s when the Department of Transportation was having a very difficult time maintaining our highways and bridges, we brought about a revenue package that made it possible to really forge ahead with regard to the construction and maintenance of highways and the maintenance and construction of new bridges. That work, by the way, is never done. That issue will reoccur quite often in the legislative Assembly, but at that time, that was landmark legislation. Customized Job Training, Military Code – there are all kinds of bills that I was part of, but Farmland Preservation was important. Not only important for those who are engaged in farming, but it’s important for all citizens who, number one, need a source of homegrown food and fiber. We should not become dependent upon

other nations of the world for all our food and fiber. That puts America at risk; that puts Pennsylvania at risk; and so, we have to have a viable agriculture and that takes place on farms. We also, as citizens, enjoy open space and all the amenities of open space. Obviously, agriculture provides an open space policy that is of economic and material benefit, as well as being open space. So, it was an important piece of legislation. It is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation from a public support standpoint that was enacted by the Legislature in the last 10 or 15 years. It receives widespread support, not only in the Legislature, but any time a ballot question was advanced to the voters, the voters have always supported Farmland Preservation. So, that was an important enactment amongst many important enactments. Of all the things that we do, the education of our young people, K[indergarten] through 12 [grade], is enshrined in the Pennsylvania Constitution. And so, I was very proud of my efforts with regard to School Subsidy and the financial resources that we provide our 501 school districts to support public education across Pennsylvania. There is no service that is more widely spread, more uniformly spread across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, than is public education. Every part of Pennsylvania has a public school; every part of Pennsylvania has a young boy or young girl who needs to be educated so that they can be good citizens. And the Legislature is charged constitutionally for providing a fair and efficient system of education and that takes resources, and I was proud to be part of that. But there are a lot of things in the legislative process that I was proud of, not only [of] myself, but [of] my fellow lawmakers because, again, it's a team effort, and through the years, the Pennsylvania Legislature has done very, very well by the citizens of Pennsylvania.

**HM:** There was quite a media hoopla over your attempt to repeal outdated laws from the 1700s and the 1800s. Could you explain why you were trying to get these antiquated laws off the books?

**SHJ:** Well, when I would meet the citizens back in my legislative district, or when I was speaking in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I often heard a beck-and-call; “Instead of just enacting new laws, why don’t you get rid of some of the old laws?” And, I finally said, “Maybe we should get rid of some of the old laws.” And it was quite amazing indeed to see what statutes were still remaining on the law books of Pennsylvania. Laws that went clear back to the colonial days that have absolutely no relationship whatsoever to how we are conducting our public affairs today in Pennsylvania. So, yes, I initiated an effort to get rid of a lot of old laws and we got rid of dozens and dozens and dozens of old laws. And yes, it did receive a lot of attention and it was an interesting story for those who write about the enactment of statutes in Pennsylvania – the reporters. They seem to enjoy writing those stories, at least for a while. They were refreshing and it was a flash back into history, too. It was a good exercise. Obviously, the Legislature has to do more than just repeal old laws, but it was a good exercise, and one that should continue and has continued now. I see from time to time some lawmaker is introducing a few bills to get rid of some of our antiquated laws. Yes, it received a lot of attention and there was a lot of interest, and it was a good thing to do.

**HM:** Do you remember what some of them were?

**SHJ:** Oh, the floating of logs down rivers [HB 1625, 1991-1992], and what should be done when logs break away – they had to be marked in a certain way, according to law, so they could be returned to their owner, just like a dog would be returned to their owner. The flailing of certain citizens in the city of Philadelphia for certain infractions of the law [HB 1626, 1991-1992] – we still had statutes dealing with the public flailing of citizens for transgressions. There were many, and some of them were very humorous too; but they weren't humorous at the time. We were looking at these statutes through our eyes today and not trying to take into consideration what society was in need of when it was but a colony or a couple of years removed from being a colony. They were very important statutes at that time, but society and times have passed by and today they became relics and irrelevant. So, we got rid of some of them, and that effort should continue. Citizens are right; we should go about the business of recodifying our laws from time to time and get rid of the superfluous statutes that just clutter the law books of Pennsylvania. The citizens are right.

**HM:** Moving back to the House Floor for a second – you stated in a previous interview that you miss debates on the Floor of the House. Do you believe the debates now are the same as during your tenure?

**SHJ:** Well, the personalities change and issues change and the moments in history change; and so, I guess they're not exactly the same today as they were then. But, the debates that are being conducted today by elected Representatives, they're important debates. They're talking about issues that are important to we, the people of

Pennsylvania. There were a group of us in the [19]70s and [19]80s and into the [19]90s who did debate quite a bit, and I did enjoy engaging in that debate, although I didn't engage in every debate. But, you do have to do that; that's the purpose of a House of Representatives, to discuss in open forum the great issues of the day, and the citizens define what the great issues of the day are. For instance, right now a Governor<sup>7</sup> has just come forward with another budget and out of all that, an issue that seems to be getting as much ink as any, is the question that I referred to a moment ago; the black flies. There are very few issues, so far, in the newly proposed budget submitted to the Legislature by the Governor that has garnered more attention in the Susquehanna River Basin than is the question of whether or not we're going to have money to spray for black flies. So, the issues debated are citizen issues and they're important today, they were important yesterday, and they'll be important in the future. But, yes, as a lawmaker and as a legislative Leader, I engaged in debates and I engaged in debates because that's the purpose of a Legislative Assembly, to discuss these ideas vigorously and to have robust conversation about what the public policies for the citizens of Pennsylvania are to be. And you don't do that by being silent; you have to stand up and represent citizens and do so vigorously, and hopefully, effectively.

**HM:** Can you discuss your relationships with past Administrations and with the Senate Leaders and with the Leadership of the House of Representatives?

**SHJ:** Well, the Legislature has to have a relationship with the Executive branch. That isn't to say that there aren't differences. There are Constitutional differences and there

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward G. Rendell, the 45<sup>th</sup> Governor of Pennsylvania (2004-2011).

are individual differences. But, the Legislature does have to work with the Executive branch in order to conduct the people's business. Those relationships will be very upbeat on some days and very frayed on other days; that's part of the process. There will be days when the Legislative branch is at odds with the Executive branch and vice versa. But, if you step back, over time there has to be a relationship between the Legislative branch and the Executive branch. Despite all of the separation of powers and the legislative oversight, responsibly the Legislature – which the Executive branch usually doesn't cotton to; they don't like legislative oversight – but the Legislature should do it for the citizens. And in terms of internal relationships, the Legislature has to work with itself, both internal to the House of Representatives, and the House and the Senate, betwixt themselves. And there has to be a relationship between Leaders. This is a team effort and it's not done by one person, or one Leader, or one branch. And we have to continually remind ourselves that we're all here for the citizens. And while there has to be a bit of gymnastics in this relationship, the gymnastics can become an end unto themselves. The gymnastics, the vigorous pursuit of public policy between the two branches and between the two Chambers, that should take place but it should not be eternal in of itself. This process is supposed to bring about consensus and problem solving and helping citizens. If the process becomes an end unto itself, well then the citizens are not best served. Now, there will be those days when the citizens believe that the process has overcome the goal of serving citizens – usually not. And in those instances where it has, a bit of time will heal that and you can get on again with deliberative consideration and consensus building. But, that's an important part of the process. Again, this is not a monarchy; this is not an aristocracy; this is a representative

democracy. And in that, you have a lot of give and take, as it should be. This is a beautiful process and citizens can jump in and join in the fray, and those citizens who do engage themselves, find themselves to be very effective. This democracy, this form of government, this representative form of government, is not just for a few people. This is not a spectator activity; this is participatory. Some citizens choose not to participate as vigorously as some others, but those who do participate, they find it to be a responsive system. But, there has to be this give and take; give and take between the Legislative branch and the Executive branch, and in this bicameral Legislature; give and take between the House and the Senate. But, you do have to get along; you do have to work for consensus.

**HM:** Were some harder to get along with than others?

**SHJ:** Well, it's a human institution. Some people have different set of interpersonal skills than others. Each has their own personality; some are better at consensus building than others, some are good at just causing tumult and getting people buzzing. At the end of the day you need some consensus builders too. You need all of it. It's all an important part of this equation known as the legislative process and doing the people's business. But, they're all different. Leaders carry out their leadership responsibilities a bit different, one from the other. But in the end, they all do a pretty darn good job of getting the chore done.

**HM:** You've had quite a few debates with Democratic Leadership. During the debate on Emissions Control, on February 27, 1980, you blasted Representative Manderino [James J.; State Representative, Westmoreland County, 1967-1989; Speaker, 1989] saying, "You know what his purpose is in the House and it's not public. It starts with a "P," but it's not public; it's political." What was your relationship with him, I guess off the floor?

*(laugh)*

**SHJ:** Jim Manderino and I were the best of friends, actually. We obviously had to represent in our Leader roles various viewpoints and he did so vigorously in his role and very effectively, and I had a responsibility as well. And that just happened to be a piece out of one debate on one day. Yes, he and I were debating and I can recall that debate; it was a vigorous debate. He was taking the position that emission standards were with us and we might as well get on with the program here in Pennsylvania. I remember it was back in the early [19]80s. Actually, that program probably hadn't yet quite come to the fruition that we now understand it to be, and probably Pennsylvania should continue, at that time, to resist Federal encroachment on certain processes in the individual states, including here in Pennsylvania. – that's another relationship which we haven't yet discussed; the State/Federal relationships. It was my view at that time that we shouldn't yet surrender to these Federal encroachments and Jim and I had a very, very vigorous debate. We had lots of debates. I can recall the day that I was a proponent of legislation to repeal a tax on electricity imported into Pennsylvania from places like Niagara, and that was very important for many of our citizens in Pennsylvania who depend upon the Rural Electric Cooperative for their basic electricity. And Pennsylvania had enacted a tax

that would put a tax on the electricity coming into Pennsylvania that the Rural Electric Cooperatives were purchasing on behalf of their utility customers. It was a terrible tax and it was one that was enacted during a difficult budget season and Representative Manderino was part of that, and he had to come to closure on the budget and this was a tax that made that closure possible at that moment. But, we had a resurgence in our economy and it was possible to repeal that tax. Well, Representative Manderino had put an awful lot of time in on getting it enacted and I was going to put in an awful lot of time to get it repealed, so we had a very vigorous debate on that – we did repeal it, by the way. And on that day with regard to Federal emissions, we did okay on that day too – but, Jim Manderino and I, we were very good friends, and he was a good Leader, and he was a good Representative, and I enjoyed our moments together. But, he had a role to perform and so did I [and] we both pursued it with great spirit. But, I have always enjoyed the good working relationship with Leaders; Representative Irvis, Representative Ryan, Representative Seltzer [H. Jack; State Representative, Lebanon County, 1957-1980; Speaker, 1979-1980] – all those Leaders in the House at that time. With the current Leaders, most of them were just beginning their service in the House of Representatives, and they were good Representatives who were destined to be good Leaders and so, time goes on. But, Manderino and I were the best of friends; we really were. And most everyone knew that. At the end of the day, why, we would end with friendship, and we would usually tell each other when we began the day whether we were going to be in contest; we didn't surprise each other. We would give each other the courtesy of telling the other this was going to be a difficult day.

**HM:** There were several, unfortunately, deaths of Members while you serving. For example, Mr. Manderino, Bill Telek [William; State Representative, Cambria County, 1979-1990] [and] there was also the death of former State Treasurer Budd Dwyer [R. Budd; State Representative, Crawford County, 1965-1970; State Senator, 1971-1982; State Treasurer, 1983-1987]. Can you tell us how you, as an individual, and as a Legislative body responded to these?

**SHJ:** Well, you respond in a very human way. Representative Manderino and I were, we were gladiators together in the House of Representatives and he was taken from us and that was very, very painful. Representative Telek was one of our rank-and-file Members. He lost his life tragically here in the capital city. That was another personal friend of mine. When death strikes the House of Representatives it's no different then when death strikes an individual citizen's house. It's a very sorrowful moment. These are people who have been elected by citizens. They are important in their communities, they're important in their counties, they're important in Pennsylvania, and they come here and you develop a brotherhood and a sisterhood and when one of them is taken away, why, you not only lose their life but those citizens lose their voice for awhile until a new Representative or Senator can be elected. And, yes, when Representative Manderino was taken from us, why, you know, a friend was taken from me. It's a very sad day. And there were others; we just mentioned a few. Representative Arthur Early [State Representative, Delaware County, 1979-1982] died while he was here in office. Representative Tony Cimini [Anthony; State Representative, Lycoming County, 1975-

1990]. We could go through the whole list, but they were all good Representatives and citizens lost their voice and we lost a friend.

**HM:** There were also troubling times in the United States and Pennsylvania and within your district during your tenure. How did you personally respond to these and how did you feel about these events, specifically Three Mile Island<sup>8</sup>?

**HJS:** I was in my office very early usually, on most days, and I remember – I was in my office – I was the Majority Whip at the time of Three Mile Island and I had the local news, which became national news, which became International news within a matter of minutes. But it was still early; people hadn't yet come to the Capitol Building. I remember hearing that and still not knowing what the dimension of this difficulty might be. I knew that this was going to be a gripping experience for Central Pennsylvania, for all of Pennsylvania, for America and the world. Fortuitously, Governor Thornburgh [Richard; Pennsylvania Governor, 1979-1986] was the type of Governor that was able to quickly grasp the situation and provide the necessary leadership. He was in his early days of being a Governor. He had not been in office but a few weeks when this happened and this does become an Executive branch responsibility, with the Legislative branch providing whatever support may be necessary, in terms of resources or enactments to help the Governor and the Executive branch agencies. But, it clearly was going to be a retching experience for quite awhile. Hurricane Agnes<sup>9</sup> is another example, where much of Pennsylvania was completely inundated with raging floodwaters. [It] devastated

---

<sup>8</sup> Nuclear power plant in Middletown, Pennsylvania, less than 10 miles from the Capitol; partial meltdown occurred on March 28, 1979.

<sup>9</sup> Hit the Eastern Coast of the United States in June, 1972.

families [and] devastated communities and counties. It was really a retching experience for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But when you live through these things, why, it has a searing – it's not unlike war – it has a searing impact. Obviously, some of these things have longer duration than others, but regardless of the duration, they're painful at the time. And they're not painful just for the Representatives or the Senators or Governors; they're most painful for the citizens. And you have to reflect that pain that's being felt by citizens and you have to also reflect the hope that citizens hold, in terms of how their government will respond. And, for after all, one of the purposes of the government is to respond in the time of emergency, when the welfare of the citizens are at risk, when the safety of citizens [are] at risk, and you have to be very responsive. You have to be empathetic and sympathetic. You have to be sensitive and you have to be effective in your response. That's the role of a Representative; that's the role of a Leader; that's the role of a Governor. That's one of the reasons why we have this frame of government.

**HM:** A little closer to home – the Huntingdon Prison Riots. How did you comfort and disseminate information to your – ?

**SHJ:** Well, from time to time there's unrest across your correctional system. It's a difficult responsibility of the Commonwealth to provide this type of service for the citizens, to provide for their safety and welfare, but you also have a responsibility to those who are being held because of things that they had done wrong against society. And, from time to time, those institutions become so fraught with tension and stress that

you have unrest. Again, that's a responsibility of the Governor and the Commissioner for Corrections – Secretary of Corrections – to respond to on a daily basis. But again, the Legislature has to be at the ready to provide whatever resources may be necessary beyond the usual, and to provide whatever change in enactments that may be necessary. But, back home in the district, many of these citizens that I represented were also corrections officers, and their families were concerned about the welfare of their husbands who work in these two correctional institutions. So, you have to be empathetic with them and you have to work with them, and I tried, not only during times of unrest within the prisons but also during the more quiet interludes, to maintain a relationship with those who served as Correctional Officers. They have a very difficult job. Every day – 365 days out of the year, 24 hours a day – they have to work in a volatile situation, and you have to maintain a relationship with those families, which I tried to do through the years. They provide a tremendous service for society and it's a very stressful service – it's every day. They're on line everyday, and you just can't wait for the moments of unrest; you have to work with them during those other interludes of quiet and contentment. And you have to be empathetic, and you have to provide voice for them during these moments. You have to be sure that the Department of Corrections is not only just trying to quell the unrest but also sensitive to the families who are very aggrieved because of the professional situation which surrounds a loved one of their family. So, I worked with the Governor and I worked with the Department of Corrections. The House of Representatives and the Senate itself does not administer the Department of Corrections, but because I had constituents and because I had neighborhoods near those institutions, you have to be

very, very sensitive to the needs of those communities and those families, which I tried to do.

**HM:** In a more upbeat note, have you maintained relationships with any Members still serving in the House today?

**SHJ:** Oh, sure. *(laugh)* When I come back to the Capitol it's like a family reunion. I still know most of the Members who serve in the House and the Senate. I served with them when they were relatively new in their service, so I maintain a closeness. I do it in a way, however, that they don't feel that I'm being intrusive and I'm still trying to be a Leader or a lawmaker. There's a line. I don't try to coach their daily activities, but they've been my friends through the years, on both sides of the aisle, both Republicans and Democrats. We have a great friendship, and I also maintain friends who have also left the House of Representatives and to the Senate, so, I try to stay in contact with them. It's a very friendly relationship.

**HM:** Who do you believe considers you to be a mentor?

**SHJ:** Oh, I don't know. You'd have to ask others. *(laugh)* But, I've tried from time to time when someone would come to me with a question, why, I try to share my experience and whatever I've learned myself through these many, many years, and I continue to do that. Representatives still will call me and ask how it's being viewed from the citizen's standpoint – having been in the House of Representatives and also a member of the

broader society – they ask questions. And when they ask, why, I share with them. But I don't call them first.

**HM:** Do you believe that you've mentored anyone, or would anyone say that you were a mentor to them?

**SHJ:** I don't know. I certainly did try to try to help some. I've given speeches for them, I've guided them in what the message should probably be and how the message should be delivered effectively, so the citizens would be understanding and receptive of what is being tried, both on the public policy issue and electorally. But, I've tried to help Representatives; sure, I have.

**HM:** Did you have any mentors as you were coming out?

**SHJ:** Well, when I came to the House of Representatives it was basically a World War II Legislature. Almost everyone was old enough to be my father, and in most instances old enough to be grandfather. It was a Legislature that was populated with World War II lawmakers. And that was a great generation and they were good lawmakers. Persons such as Percy Foor [State Representative; Bedford, Fulton, and Huntingdon Counties, 1961-1974], Frank O'Connell [State Representative, Luzerne County, 1967-1978], Ken Lee [Kenneth B.; Sullivan, Susquehanna and Wyoming Counties, 1957-1974; Speaker, 1967-1968 and 1973-1974], Al Kahle [Alvin; State Representative, Venango County, 1965-1974], Heath Alexander [George W.; Clarion County, 1963-1972], Jim Gallen

[James; State Representative, Berks County, 1965-1992]; they were all here before I got here. If you would look at a photograph of the House of Representatives – and there are such things – and you saw all of us in the House Chamber for our class photograph, you could see that one stood out as being very, very, very young compared to the rest. But, I was the beneficiary of a lot of good advice. Those persons who came out of the Depression, came out of World War II, they were seasoned in life's experiences. And they were very helpful and they were good lawmakers too. They didn't have the tools available to them at the time that the Legislature now has available to it. They did not have the professional staff that the Legislature now has. And so, I believe that the Legislature today is better positioned to serve citizens than was [in] that earlier day. But that didn't make the Representatives any lesser a person or any lesser a lawmaker; they were good citizens. But I had people that – Percy Foor, as an example.

**HM:** How did seniority affect you as a Member?

**SHJ:** Well, when you first get here it affects you the way you wouldn't want it to affect you. (*laugh*) Seniority is still a very important condition, in terms of your position in the House of Representatives, or the Senate for that matter, here in Pennsylvania. The people with seniority have the chairmanships; those who don't have seniority don't have the chairmanships. So, seniority is a very, very important part of the legislative process. People damn it and condemn it, but no one has been able to come up with another system. Seniority is very, very important. So, when you first get here, as I first got here, you didn't view that with a great deal of enthusiasm. But, the longer you're here, the

more you understand it – and of course, the more you enjoy it because you’re gaining in seniority. I was elected to be a Leader very early in my legislative career, so I was able to achieve things before I got a lot of seniority. I was able to do things because I was elected to be one of the legislative Leaders, which helped me to move along a little faster legislatively, than if I just had to wait my chronological term to be a committee chairman. But seniority’s an important part of the process, and for all those political scientists and all those pundits who want to invent a different way, I ask them to please come forward.

**HM:** What was the hardest issue you encountered as Leader?

**SHJ:** Well, as a Leader you have to be concerned about the welfare of the Institution. You’re a custodian of the Institution; you’re a steward of this system. You have to be sensitive to the needs of the Representatives and the issues that they face as human beings. Obviously, questions of salary come into play. That was something that a Leader was expected to do; that being, from time to time, provide salary increases for Members of the House and the Senate. Those needs are not always well received by the citizens, and so there’s conflict between the citizens that have elected you to be a Representative and the need to be a good Leader and provide appropriate emoluments for the Representatives and Senators and Judges and Governor and Secretaries. And those salary questions are often times in conflict with the citizenry, and it’s not easy to bridge that gap of understanding and willingness to accept. Now, my district was at least tolerant, but it was always difficult. It was not a bridge I couldn’t cross, and again, I say my district was – if not in support of what I had to do as a Leader, with regard to legislative salaries, they

were at least – they understood that Sam probably had to go do that, which I did have to go do that as a Leader. You get into social issues like abortion – very divisive. It fractures the legislative Assembly, just as it fractures society. And a legislative Leader has to balance all that – all these personal feelings which are very deep and strongly held. [Another] difficult issue; welfare. That was an issue that had to be addressed during the time I was a legislative Leader. Welfare had fallen in disrepute amongst wide numbers of our citizenry on one hand. On the other hand, there were still those persons who needed help because they weren't able to help themselves for one reason or another. That's also a divisive issue, and it was one that had to be confronted by the legislature, because widespread numbers of citizens had become knowledgeable of situations that weren't easily explained from a public policy standpoint; it had to be addressed. And so, when it was addressed, why, that caused a division within the legislature, just as it causes division amongst society as well. So, there are examples of difficult issues. But every issue has its own complexities and its own pain and suffering. Every year the legislature has to pass a balanced budget. It's one of the most difficult enactments that the legislature faces in any one year; and it faces it every year. And trying to balance spending programs, which are being requested by the citizens on one hand, and providing the revenues that are necessary to sustain those programs, also coming from the people – trying to bring those two divergent ends together is not an easy task, but it's something that the legislature has to do every year and you have to have a balanced budget, says the Constitution. Making that all come together for a place as complex and as diverse as Pennsylvania, where you have a place as big as Philadelphia and a place as small as Coudersport, trying to bring all those divergent ends together into one thing known as the

budget enactment, it's difficult. But, the legislature doesn't whimper; it has to confront these issues. I would always say to Representatives, "This office that you hold is not a ceremonial office. This is an office of decision; this is an office of consensus building; this is an office of making things happen for the better, and sometimes you have to do work for the better that doesn't appear better. Sometimes the citizens view it as appearing worse. But you got to do it; it's not a ceremonial office and there will be a bit of pain and suffering that goes with this." But, that the role of a lawmaker; that's the role of a Leader.

**HM:** As a follow up; could you explain the tone of the House, even your office, during the difficult time of the Welfare Reform Bill, during the [19]81-[19]82 Session? There were bomb threats, State Police were outside of your office, [and] people were camped out in the rotunda.

**SHJ:** All those things, because as I mentioned a moment ago, it was a very divisive moment. You had, on one hand, a large segment of our society, known as taxpayers, saying that the Legislature would be remiss if it didn't direct its attention to – what became popularly referred to as – Welfare Reform. On the other hand, those who, for whatever reason were receiving welfare – most of whom were in need of welfare, but maybe some that weren't in need, that's what was causing citizen unrest – but, you had these two dipolar forces working in opposite directions. And for those who felt threatened that their benefits were going to be taken away, that caused them to come to Harrisburg in legion. They came here by busloads and the spontaneity of those groups of

people caused some concern for the safety of the Institution and, yes, the appropriate security officers were called to help maintain the order and peacefulness so that the legislature could make a deliberative decision. But it's very divisive, and when you're the Leader – I was the Majority Leader at the time – there's a lot of responsibility on your shoulders to make sure that the Assembly continues its march toward decision, and also maintaining a degree of tranquility so that that decision can be made in a deliberative way, and also to provide for the general safety of the lawmakers and the citizens and the staff who are all part of this process. [It was] very divisive; very controversial; something that had to be done, was done, and the citizens were appreciative of it having been done. And for those who needed to continue their benefits – those who were in true need – continued to receive benefits. So, it was a good effort on the part of the legislature, but it was very controversial, very emotional and, yes, you had people who were actually living for a while in the rotunda. And my office was right there on the edge of the rotunda, so I had a front row seat – not only in the House of Representatives but also in the rotunda. And it was testy, but if you have the interest of the citizens and you have the respect of the citizens, if you have the respect of the Representatives, if you have good public policy proposals, you can work through those things – and we did. And there was an enactment. And then the next day we went onto something else that was controversial.

**HM:** You talked about being a young face in a sea of elder gentlemen in your earlier days. You were one of the youngest elected Leaders to the House.

**SHJ:** I wouldn't say I was the youngest Leader, but I was pretty young when I was elected. I suppose somebody else has a record somewhere, but I don't know as I was the youngest ever elected to Leadership, but I was pretty darn young.

**HM:** How did you acquire that position so rapidly and what qualities do you feel – ?

**SHJ:** Well, I don't know how it all comes together. When I was first elected to the House of Representatives I didn't envision myself becoming a legislative Leader. It isn't that I, maybe, wouldn't want to do that, but I just didn't think that there would be much opportunity for someone from a rural district in Central Pennsylvania, because you have to be elected by your peer group and, obviously, those areas that have the largest populations have the greatest number of votes in who's going to be the Leader. Because after the general citizenry votes in November, why, then the elected Representatives come together and vote by secret ballot who they want to have as their leaders, and I was nominated and elected, so there were went; we went to be a Leader. It's hard to say what all went together. That's something that has to be answered by other people, but we were elected and we did the best we could.

**HM:** Okay. How did you become Pennsylvania's Secretary of Agriculture [1997-2003]?

**SHJ:** Well, that's an Executive branch appointment. I never thought that I would serve as a Secretary in the Executive branch because I staked my service in the Legislative

branch, but a circumstance occurred and I was asked if I would consider coming back to be the Secretary of Agriculture and, because of the circumstances that existed at that particular time, I thought that I should do that. So, I was appointed and confirmed and I served there for six years as Secretary, in the Executive branch – a role reversal. I went from the Legislative branch to the Executive branch, but my service in the Legislative branch put me in pretty good stead. I clearly understood the governmental processes necessary to make programs viable and attractive and effective for the people of Pennsylvania. That governmental experience put me in good stead. But it was a role reversal. I went from being in the Legislative branch to the Executive branch and all those things that you and I talked about before came into play, and obviously, there are days when the Legislative branch and the Executive branch are at some odds with each other. But I would have to say when I was Secretary, we were never at odds. Never. Never ever. We had a good run.

**HM:** Mr. Hayes, you seem like a very serious man. Do you have any humorous stories from the House Floor that you would like to share? *(laugh)*

**SH:** *(laugh)* Well, there were a lot of humorous days. We had a young Representative by the name of Dan Clark [State Representative, Juniata, Mifflin, Perry and Snyder Counties, 1991-2002]. He came in from Juniata County, a neighboring District of mine. When the Committee on Seating was assigning seats, why, I suggested that those who serve in Districts not too far removed from mine geographically, that they be in some close proximity to me in case during a legislative process in the House that I would have

to, maybe, have conversations with them so that our part of Pennsylvania understood what the issues were and how, maybe, we should approach the moment of decision. Well, young Representative Clark, in good spirit – he was always providing me with plenty of advice – more than maybe I needed from somebody in their first term, or second term, or third term – but it was all in good spirit and good humor. But I would tell him in return that maybe he should become a little less chatty, in terms of offering me advice on the Floor of the House of Representatives. Well, he kept it up, so I moved his seat – I told him I might do that – and I did it. Of course it was very humorous; I had another Representative come and sit in his seat and I sent him back to the back benches. It's difficult in an interview like this to impart the hilarity that went with that, but when I visited here a few weeks ago, the current Majority Leader mentioned to the whole House how I had done that. But, that was good – there was a lot good humor that goes along with the very serious nature of the legislative process. Oh, there were a lot of fun times.

**HM:** What were your leadership experiences as Majority Leader, versus being a Minority Leader? And, some have commented that, maybe, being Minority Leader may have contributed to your retirement. Is there any weight in that?

**SHJ:** Well, there are very few people who wouldn't prefer to be in the majority, particularly those who have leader tendencies. You always strive to be in the majority. That's part of the legislative process and the majority has a great deal to say with what the agenda's going to be. That isn't to say that the minority shouldn't be heard – that isn't to say the minority doesn't have a good idea or two, or three, from time to time,

because they obviously do – but, the majority is the Party of action in the legislative Assembly. It's the coordinator of activities; it's the initiator of activities; it's the Party that controls the ebb and flow of legislation on a daily basis, both in committee and on the Floor of the House of Representatives, and I would be less than candid if I said I didn't prefer the majority to the minority.

**HM:** Can you tell us how your constituents influenced your tenure, especially rescinding your first and original resignation letter?

**SHJ:** Oh, when I announced I wasn't going to run for re-election, well, it was a response that I wasn't expecting. I thought that the citizens would say, "Well, it's been a long time [and] a good run; okay." But, that isn't what they said; there was a roar when I made my announcement. I went back to my district that weekend and it was incessant, absolutely incessant, to the extent that some citizens were actually upset with me that I wouldn't continue. So, it became easier to say, "Okay, I'll continue," than it was to say, "I'm going to step aside." So, I ran again, but it was a unique experience. And it was one that I didn't completely expect. I figured the citizens would say, "Okay," but they didn't.

**HM:** They'd let you be a private citizen again?

**SHJ:** They didn't want that. And even when I announced the second time, it was – they were probably a little more understanding. There was still earth tremors, but they were more understanding the second – they were completely beside themselves the first time I

announced. And I don't know what all that meant, but I said, "What the heck. I enjoy this and I love the people, so I'll do it again." I didn't leave because I was dissatisfied with the legislative process or frustrated or disillusioned. I went out on a high. The Legislature's a great branch; it's the people's branch.

**HM:** What are your fondest memories of serving in the House?

**SHJ:** Serving the principles upon which this system rests. You can't help but be motivated if you look around that House Chamber and you see the history there. The principles that were given to us as part of our birthright as free Pennsylvanians, as free Americans; they are fond memories. They may be a different type of fondness, but they are fond memories, just sitting there and looking – looking at those great historical prints, having flashbacks to what it took to make this noble experiment possible. I mean, this is a noble experiment that we are still engaged in. [Abraham] Lincoln [U.S. President, 1861-1865] said at Gettysburg<sup>10</sup> [that] we are still testing whether this nation, or any nation, so conceded and so dedicated can long endure, and we're still doing that. That just wasn't at Lincoln's time. They were surely doing it then, but we continue it yet today. So, my fond memories were being allowed to be a participant in this frame of government known as self-governance. Not everyone in the world has this experience, and it is a very fond and affectionate feeling – very much so.

**HM:** You had a very short farewell speech, whenever you left. You stated that you were too emotional at the time to speak. Is there anything you'd like to add now?

---

<sup>10</sup> Paraphrasing part of the "Gettysburg Address," from November 19, 1863.

**SHJ:** Oh, I won't give a speech now, but obviously, I had no reason to leave. But it was, maybe, the right kind of way to leave. I would certainly much rather leave the way I left than to be run out of town on a rail, either by the citizens or by the other Representatives. So we went out with a very high crescendo. The tide was in, and I think that's a good way to leave. I could still be here and enjoying it ever so much and respecting it ever so much. It was a very short speech and I'm not lacking in words, usually, but I didn't think that that was a moment for me to give a stirring address, so I just said farewell.

**HM:** After reviewing your career of 22 years [in the House], do you have any regrets?

**SHJ:** None whatsoever. They were all a part of three decades in the House and then another six years as Secretary, couple that with five years in active duty in the Army and Vietnam. I've had a good run. I've appreciated the run. It was a good run. No regrets whatsoever, and I'd do it all over again and I'd do it exactly the same way. It was very, very good.

**HM:** Very recently an Agriculture Building at Penn State Main Campus was named in honor of you, thanks to a bill passed by the General Assembly. Do you recognize your career as Secretary of Agriculture of State Representative as defining your career?

**SHJ:** Well, I think that probably both of them have aspects unique to themselves that will have been a watermark of some sort in both branches of government. Obviously, I

was in the Legislative branch much longer than I was in the Executive branch, but the time that I was in the Executive branch we tried to get things done in a quick pace sort-of way. I knew that you don't stay as a Secretary for decades, and so there had to be things accomplished and we had to go at breakneck speed, but we did those things. We did those things on behalf of agriculture in Pennsylvania, [on] behalf [of] all of the citizens of Pennsylvania, because much of what the Department of Agriculture does doesn't just affect those who are affectionately known as farmers. All citizens of Pennsylvania are affected by that Agency and what it does – every citizen is affected by that Agency and what it does. But, just because of longevity in the House, I probably really defined who I was governmentally and what I did then, even as Secretary of Agriculture. That isn't to say that I would necessarily say one is more important than the other – I wouldn't say that. But I will say this; the Legislature is the people's branch. And that may give you some clue as to my feelings.

**HM:** How do you – ?

**SHJ:** And, public administration will be defined by the political aspects of what comes through the legislature. The large issues of the day – the large issues of the day, maybe not the lesser issues of the day, but the large issues of the day – will in all likelihood be defined by what the legislature decides to do and not do. Now, it's not responsible for the actual issuance of a driver's license. Those are matters reserved to the Executive branch, but the large public issues of the day – whenever that day may be – they'll be defined, public administration will be defined by the public law. And the public law is an

enactment of the legislature as it was intended to be, and I think it will continue to be that way. Both branches are critically important, but the legislative branch is the branch that makes us different than almost all other nations of the world. Almost every nation in the world has an Executive branch, but not every nation in the world has a legislative branch quite like we do. Recently, we just went through an election in Iraq. They weren't about the business on that day of electing an Executive branch. That election was the election of a legislative Assembly, and that legislative Assembly will decide what the Executive branch is to be, both in terms of who and what. But when that lady held her hand up<sup>11</sup>, she was voting for a national Assembly – the Legislative branch. That's where all of our hearts should be.

**HM:** How do you want your tenure as Representative to be remembered?

**SHJ:** Well, when it was necessary for me to be a gladiator – and you have to be a gladiator from time to time, particularly as a legislator Leader – I would hope that I was viewed as a fair gladiator when it was necessary to raise the sword in the process. As a legislative Leader, I hope I was viewed as being one – or as a statesman – one of consensus building, rather than a divider; one that wanted to solve problems, rather than persist in problem making and mischief. I'd like to be a statesman, rather than a mischief-maker, although from time to time you need a little mischief making to bring focus on issues. I would hope that I was viewed as a Representative that continued to keep faith with the people that elected him in the first place. I would hope that as a

---

<sup>11</sup> Referring to media photographs and videos of the first democratic election held in Iraq. This event also marks the first time that a woman was allowed to cast a vote in Iraq. The confirmation of voting in Iraq is to dye the individual's thumb black or purple.

legislative Leader I'd be viewed as a person who had a broad view of Pennsylvania, from the cities to the rural areas, from the towns to the townships, from the suburban to the rural, from those who are in comfortable means and those who aren't in such comfortable circumstance. So, I hope that I would've been viewed as someone who had the larger view. I would hope that I would be viewed as someone who was a good steward of the Institution, because those who are present in the legislature at any one time, they have to also be good stewards. They have to make sure that this Institution continues as an Institution, so they can do what it's intended to do, constitutionally. So, I would hope that I'd be a good steward. Fair gladiator, good leader, good Representative, good steward – I hope. But the same is true in the Executive branch. As Secretary, I had to make decisions with regard to the enforcement of rules and regulations – enforcement of the Law – so, I would hope that I would be viewed as someone who is fair there. A good steward of the Executive branch, a good reflector of those who are dependent upon you as a Secretary, just as a Representative has to keep faith with the people who elected her or him, as Secretary you have to be someone who keeps faith with those that you're supposed to be providing a public service for. Executive branch has to have a long view as well as a short view. You have to think about the future as well as the present. So, regardless of branch, I would hope that that's how I would be viewed. I suppose it all depends on who the judge is, but I would hope.

**HM:** Well, thank you, Mr. Hayes –

**SHJ:** Sure.

**HM:** – for sharing with us your wonderful stories and memories of your time here at the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. This concludes our interview.

**SHJ:** Thank you very much.

**HM:** Thank you.