PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

The Honorable Mark McNaughton (R)

104th District

Dauphin County

1997-2006

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED BY: Heidi Mays, House Archivist
August 21, 2006

Transcribed by: Raymond Whittaker

© Copyright, Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Office of the Chief Clerk

Heidi Mays (HM): I'm here today with Mark McNaughton who represented the 104th Legislative District from Dauphin County and he served between the years 1997 to 2006. Thank you for being here with me today.

The Honorable Mark McNaughton (MM): Thank you for having me.

HM: I wanted to begin by asking you, what kind of influence did your family have on your early life and your future career as a legislator?

MM: Oh, my father and mother, they were involved in just, not necessarily politics, but public service. They stressed giving something back to the community throughout my entire life as I was growing up; doing all the right things, you know. It was just, they were a tremendous influence. My father, especially, when I ran for office; he was there by my side, helping me on my first campaign. My mother did some of the typing for the flyers. And my sisters and brothers were out going door-to-door with me. My kids were going door-to-door. They financed my campaign, my father, without him, and my mother, I would not have been able to run for elected office because we weren't the endorsed candidate. We ran against the endorsed candidate, so we were an outsider looking in. And we have a very close-knit family. It was amazing to see my cousins working the polls with me, out of nowhere. Democrats, actually (*laugh*) working the polls for me; I'm a registered Republican and I ran as a Republican and my staunch Democratic cousins from Steelton came out and helped me run for office and that's how we won our first term.

HM: Would you say you always had political aspirations?

MM: Absolutely. In fact, it's funny you'd mention that. When I was in high school, my best friend – still my best friend – a gentlemen by the name of Jeff Smith, also a guy who helped me run for office. After we won, the night of the election, he said, "Mark, I can remember you sitting in my basement with your feet up against the wall telling me that you were going to be in the House of Representatives when we were in high school." And my first elected office I ran for was in high school, actually; ran for senior class president and I lost by seven votes. So, I actually lost my first campaign. But, it was a wonderful experience, but yes, I always did have political aspirations.

HM: You said you have relatives that are Democrats. Well, what influenced you to become a Republican?

MM: Well, I think that had a lot to do with my father and mother. My father is an accountant by profession, he's a CPA, a fiscal conservative, socially conservative. I grew up in the Catholic Church and I'm Catholic faith; Central Pennsylvania. I just like the lower taxes. I like the laissez-faire government[1], you know, the hands-off government aspect of things. I don't like to have my life meddled in by government and I don't think others should have their life meddled in by government either. All those, I believe, are the role of government. To help those who can least afford to help themselves, I think, is the role of government, but its not to sustain someone forever; such as the welfare state.

[1] French phrase used interchangeably with "free market" doctrine that maintains that private initiative and production is best when left alone free of interventionism by the state.

The welfare system, I think we need to revamp some of that. I think it's there to help, but I don't think it's there to carry you forward and can make your life for you or your livelihood. I think you should be able to do that on your own. I think government can assist you to do that, but those are Republican core values. You know, I'm a pro-life Catholic. Those types of things made me become a Republican.

HM: Could you describe your career and experiences prior to coming to the House?

MM: Absolutely. When I was a young man, my father and mother didn't have any income to speak of, so my two sisters and my brother and I would clean my father's office buildings on weekends. I was the youngest of four children and my job was to – you'll like this story – my job was to pick up the paperclips and the staples out of the carpeting. For every staple and paperclip I picked up, my father would give me a nickel. For every one that he would find upon inspection, he would take a dime. Needless to say, I never made any money doing that. His office building was clean, but I never made any money. So, that was how I started out at a young age and I worked my way through high school; I always had odd jobs. When I got out of high school, I went to college, of course, and I worked during college in the family business; building houses out in the field, applying shingles and framing, carrying lumber and digging ditches; any of those types of tasks just to learn from the ground up the construction industry which our family was in. And after graduating college, I moved into construction management and doing land development for the McNaughton Company and I worked there approximately 12 years before I ran for the House of Representatives.

HM: And your degree was in?

MM: My degree was in Finance and Management from Elizabethtown College, actually. My entire family has an accounting background: my brother is an accountant, my brother-in-law's a CPA, my father is a CPA, I have a degree in Finance. Seems numbers work in our family.

HM: And whenever you were in the House, you also completed a degree in addition to your –

MM: Absolutely. When I was in the House of Representatives, I started law school in 2000 and I graduated in 2003 from Widener University School of Law.

HM: Very nice. Can you tell us why you decided to run for the House of Representatives? Was there any one reason?

MM: The one reason was the timing was right. Senator [John] Shumaker [State Senator, 1983-1995] had occupied the Senate seat here in Dauphin County and the Senator fell ill and passed away. And Jeff Piccola [State Representative, Dauphin County, 1977-1995; State Senator, 1995-present] was serving in the House of Representatives at the time; he was here for 20 or 22 years. A very well-liked incumbent; I liked Jeff. I wouldn't dare run against him as a Senator or as a House Member, but he did a very good job in the House of Representatives. And, you know, he was very solid in his position. Well, he

ran for Senator Shumaker's seat here which left his seat vacant and I happened to reside in the 104th Legislative District which Jeff represented. And the timing was right to run, because when the turnover happens like that, after someone's been in for 22 years, you have a better chance of winning than going up against an incumbent who has years of service. So, the timing was right. I've always wanted to do it and my family and I discussed it and we said the word "go."

HM: How hard was your first campaign?

MM: Ah, it was brutal. I didn't work. I actually stopped working at McNaughton Homes. I ran for office everyday from February until, that year the Primary, I believe, was in May. I knocked on doors everyday. I started at ten in the morning. I'd finish at seven or eight o'clock at night, all weekend long. We had campaign meetings every Monday. I'd usually come in about midnight and get up the next day and start it all over again because I was the sign crew. (*laugh)* I was the door-to-door crew. I was the campaign organizing crew. We had maybe seven or eight people, total, including my father, my mother, my sisters and my brothers, and a couple of my best friends. Other than that, we had a very small campaign team but, yeah, it was a lot of work. And I had a lot of pushers, too. I had a young lady – I call her a young lady – Janet Harriman, she's probably 70-some, 80 years old, and she pushed me every day. She worked in the campaign office because she was a volunteer who believed in me. And a gentlemen who ran my first campaign by the name of Nick Dininni, pushed me everyday. But, it was a

shoe-string campaign, believe me. We did things on a shoe-string; it was pretty neat to see how we could make a dollar go and become two.

HM: Well, did you have competition in the Primary?

MM: I did. I did have competition. My Primary opponent was Jeff Haste [State Representative, Dauphin County, 1996]. He had run for the Special Election to replace Senator Shumaker; he was selected by the committee people in the 104th Legislative District. And he beat me for that run-off, so he was able to run for the House of Representatives. And I told them all I was coming back in the Primary; I was going to run against him in the Primary, even though I lost the Special Election vote, but I'm coming back after him in the Primary. I think he was in office for about two months and I was running against him; didn't give him a chance to establish himself as an incumbent or establish a record or anything of that nature. So, it was really two unknowns running against each other in the Primary. That's really why it worked.

HM: How did it compare to subsequent campaigns?

MM: It was as difficult. It wasn't as expensive. It wasn't as ugly as some of the following campaigns. It was a lot of work; all my campaigns were a lot of work. I had very well financed individuals run against me on three separate occasions. But, the first campaign wasn't anything like the next campaigns. The next campaigns were very personal: they were personal attacks against myself and against my family. You know,

they were very hurtful campaigns not only to myself, but to my family; to my mother and father, especially, because they take a very good pride in the family name that they have built up for 35 years. And people have no regard for that anymore. They don't care. They'll tear it down at any chance they get. And that's what the next campaigns were; they were a bunch of negative attacks, but you had to weather the storm. And they were very costly; the next campaigns were hundreds of thousands of dollars.

HM: Did you enjoy campaigning?

MM: I enjoy campaigning. More so, I enjoy getting out and just meeting the people. The 104th Legislative District has great people; it really does. I mean they are the dearest, kindest individuals that you can meet. You know, there are a couple of rogues; you always have that no matter where you go, but overall, the people in the 104th Legislative District are absolutely fantastic. They welcome you into their home and they'll have you in for dinner, they'll bring you pies and trinkets and they'll stop you on the street just to say hello to see how you are doing. Not necessarily that they want anything; all they want to say is, "Hi" and to talk and they're great. It's really a wonderful experience. I wouldn't trade it for the world.

HM: What else can you tell me about the 104th?

MM: The 104th now comprises 26 of the 40 municipalities of Dauphin County. It runs from Susquehanna Township, which is its largest municipality of about 18,000 people, to

small boroughs that have maybe 100 to 150 people in them. A lot of it is rural, which is farm land, mountainous. We have a lot of State Game Lands; we have a lot of State Parks. We have a little portion of Swatara Township, a bit of Paxtang and Pennbrook. We surround the city, for all intents and purposes, to the north. And then to the south, of course, is Ron Buxton [State Representative, Dauphin County, 1993-present]: Steelton Borough and so forth. But, it's really interesting, because it's a real dichotomy of people. You have an agrarian society which is northern Dauphin County where you have most of the farmers. And then you have the service end of it which is Susquehanna Township which is mostly professionals, you know, so you have a metropolitan aspect to it and you have a rural aspect to it. It takes about an hour and fifteen minutes to drive across it from one end to the other. (*laugh*) It has fabulous restaurants. It has great trout streams; the four best trout streams, I believe, in Dauphin County are in the 104th Legislative District for fishing. So, it's really a beautiful, beautiful place.

HM: Are there any special concerns when your District is so close to Harrisburg?

MM: I think for local legislators it's tough because they're expected to be everywhere. No matter if you're in Session or not, you're expected to be at that picnic that's right up the street. On weekends, you have no excuse for not being at something. Even during the week, there's no excuse for not being at something. So, if somebody is having a picnic or there's a Boy Scout service or there's some meeting of an organization that wants you to be there, you have to go. It's unfortunate, because it takes a lot of time away from your family. You don't get as much family time as you should when you're a

local legislator, because everybody demands you to be there. And if you don't show, then you're no good and you're this or that or you're the other thing. And I've always tried to put my children first in every aspect of what I'm doing. And that makes it very difficult, you know because if my children have a soccer game, I'm going to the soccer game. I'm sorry; I'm not going to be at your meeting. Or if there's a basketball game; I coached my daughter's team last year-we were 14 and 0 [and] we won the championship, but I had practice twice a week and I had games on weekends and that's just the way it goes. You know, I'm sorry I'm not going to be at your meeting; I'm going to do this. I think that started to work against me because that is my focus and people don't care for that. It's always, "What did you do for me yesterday?" or, "What are you going to do for me tomorrow?" They really don't care about what you have going on because whatever they have going on is more important. And I think that's part of the reason why I'm moving on out of the House of Representatives. You know, I'm going to spend more time with my family; my daughter goes to college and I'm going to coach my son's team this year. So, we'll see how we do.

HM: Was there anything that surprised you whenever you first came to Harrisburg as an elected Representative?

MM: Quite a bit surprised me. One is, I've never started work at three in the afternoon and worked till two in the morning. That is very unusual for me. I started at six AM and ended at six PM. Here is more, you start at six PM and you end at six AM, so I had a little change in my hours; you know my sleep habit was a little off for awhile. I say that

facetiously, but you know that's when things get done sometimes here and you have to be able to adapt. You can't be rigid in your thought process, you can't be rigid in your beliefs. You don't compromise them, but you learn how to compromise. There's a big difference between compromising your beliefs and compromising yourself and learning to compromise. You may not get the whole pie; you may only get a piece of the pie. Well, you should be satisfied with your piece of the pie, because a lot of guys in here don't even get a piece because they don't learn how to compromise; they don't want to be reasonable, they want to be steadfast in their position. And that's okay, but in a place where there are 202 other individuals besides yourself, you need 102, 26, and 1. Well, you know what? If you're steadfast all the time, I don't think you're going to get 102, 26, and 1. I'm sorry, that's just the way it goes. So, you learn to compromise, you learn to be reasonable, you learn to negotiate. I think you learn personalities; all those types of things I didn't realize came into play in the job. I really didn't. I had my core beliefs and then I was steadfast for awhile and then I thought, "You know what, I'm steadfast and I'm not getting anywhere. Maybe if I only want a piece of the pie, I can play?" Well, I realized, you know what? They'll let you play if all you want is a piece. And its okay and it can actually be very effective, in your piece. And so, that's what I started to do; I started to focus on a piece of a larger piece of legislation like the MPC [Municipalities Planning Code]. Focus on a small piece of that or home-schooling, just not being the champion of home-schooling; just a small aspect of home-schooling where you allow the kids to participate in extra-curricular activities. Something that you can champion that they want that's reasonable. And so, that's what I started to do and I learned that if you do that, you'll be okay in here. I think that's a tough lesson. I believe a lot of folks

coming into the Legislature in the future are coming in with these preconceived stated positions and I don't believe they should do that; I don't think you should be steadfast in your position before you even know what the job entails.

HM: Did anyone help you out whenever you were first elected?

MM: When I came in here, the first people to take me under their wing, if they will, were John Barley [State Representative, Lancaster County, 1985-2002], he was Chairman of Appropriations at the time, and John Perzel [State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1979-present; Speaker 2003-2006] became a very good friend of mine. And I had a mentor in Dauphin County by the name of Frank "Chick" Tulli [State Representative, Dauphin County, 1991-2002]. Chick showed me a lot of different ropes. And I was fortunate – you know, everyone wants to bash lobbyists. You know what? I think that's totally out of place. Lobbyists are actually very helpful individuals. I have a lobbyist friend, Rocco Pugliese – Stan Rapp, he's with Greenlee [Partners] – Rocco's with Pugliese Associates, but, they also help you because they've been around so long. They have such a wealth of knowledge of how the place operates and how to do things and, you know, they even talk to you: "You know, you need to be reasonable here. You know, you should maybe try it this way. We've been around a long time and we've seen that this works." They have a wealth of knowledge and they share it with you for nothing. You know, they don't ask for anything in return and they become very good friends of yours and they're a great resource when it comes to certain issues. I don't know why everybody blasts lobbyists. I think they're a great aspect and they're advocates for their

cause, but they also have a wealth of knowledge about how the place operates. It's a very unique work environment; it's very unique. You won't find this work environment anywhere else.

HM: Now that you're planning on leaving, do you feel like you helped anybody else along?

MM: Along the way, I tried to. I'm sure there were Members here that I was able to help. You know, there's so many that you come across; so many people that you can help. I've help quite a few constituents, I know that. Tons of constituents, because that's what you do. You do a lot of constituent service. They run up against government and you know government needs to be reasonable and they're not, sometimes. So, you need to step in and say, "You know what guys? Come on, let's work this out." And you do, it usually works out for the better. But, there's, of course, there's people that you've met that you've helped along; whether it's on an issue, whether it's the way they approach an issue, whether it's the drafting of a bill, or, you know, input from an area of expertise. I was an expert in homebuilding/land development; that's what we did, that's where I came from. Pat Vance [Patricia; State Representative, Cumberland County, 1991-2004; State Senator, 2005-present] is an expert; she's a nurse, you know, so when it comes to medical stuff, we defer to Pat Vance. You know, there are lawyers in the House of Representatives, so when it came to certain legal issues, I would defer to them. You know, there are insurance folks [and] you defer to them. I've never seen a group of

individuals who are so intelligent and so witty as in the House of Representatives. They have great unique individuals in the House of Representatives.

HM: How did you work with your Leadership to achieve legislative goals?

MM: Well, first you get to know them. You have to be reasonable. You have to know what their goals are, also. So, first, you find out what's their goal and can you support their goal. There are many times, you know, I couldn't support a particular goal of a particular Member of Leadership, but I wouldn't toy with them. I'd say, "Look, here's my position and this is why I'm in this position. This is why my constituents want me to have this position. So, therefore I'm not going to be able to help you on that issue. However, I can help you on these other four. So, yeah, I'll help you on these other four. I'll rally support for these other four issues. You know, I'll be one of the leaders; I'll stand on the Floor and speak in favor of it. But, in return, you know what? I have this little issue over here that I really need your help with. And I'd like for you to be able to support it." And it's a negotiation. And I think we have a great Leadership team. I've worked with John Perzel. I was fortunate enough to serve under Matt Ryan [Matthew J.; State Representative, Delaware County, 1963-2003; Speaker 1981-1983, 1995-2003] before he passed away. Sam Smith [State Representative, Armstrong, Indiana and Jefferson Counties, 1987-present] has been a great Leader; Don Snyder [State Representative, Lehigh County, 1981-2000] was a fantastic Floor Leader. I have nothing but good things to say about all of them. Brett Feese [State Representative, Lycoming County, 1995-2006], fantastic Appropriations; when John Barley was here, he was a very

good friend of mine and a good Leader. I think we have a great Leadership team and I'm always going to be supportive of them, because I think they have the right focus. Are they always right? No. (*laugh*) I say that facetiously, but are they always right? No. But, neither am I.

HM: Do you remember how you felt during your first Swearing-In Ceremony?

MM: Oh gosh. Yeah, I can even see it. I had on a blue suit. I had on this red paisley tie. I had this big bouquet of roses on my desk in front of me. I still have the picture. And there was my Bible with my name on it. And just the circumstances and the beauty of the ceremony and the House Chamber at Swearing-In is absolutely breathtaking. And the buzz of the individuals around and, you know, having my children there and my family there. I can remember it now, but at the time, it's one of those things that you don't remember at the time: it just goes so fast and you're just so caught up in it. And it was just absolutely wonderful. But, I can still see my desk and I can still see the roses. You know your chest is puffed up about 12 times bigger than it is. Yeah, it was something else. And you know what? It was no different from any Swearing-In Ceremony. They were all that special. They really were.

HM: Well, we're going to talk about your legislation. What legislation or issues do you feel were your most important?

MM: Oh, well home-schooling was a big issue in my legislative district, so I championed home-schooling causes. Organ donation is near and dear to my heart. We donated my son's organs; we were able to save five individuals because we donated his organs. And so, organ donation is a very big cause of mine. Anything having to do with prevention of killing innocent children; that would be the abortion issue or the pro-life issue, they were always my causes. You know, those types of issues. Tax cuts, of course; anytime I can cut taxes. Baby, I'm going – I was right there. I was right all over that one – and then, anything having to do with local government, so municipalities – you know, I'm on the Sub-Committee on Boroughs; I'm the Chairman, there. And boroughs, for all intents and purposes, they get beat up on by townships, by the DEP [Department of Environmental Protection], by PennDOT. The rules of the game are different for boroughs than they are for townships and it's unfair. So, I'm trying to champion the causes of the boroughs and the Borough Associations to make it a little bit more fair. You know, those types of issues. The local government issues are near and dear because they're the ones that affect the constituency more than anyone else. If someone in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania thinks that I, in the House of Representatives, have a bigger impact on their life than their local township commissioner, they are sadly mistaken because that's really who has the impact on whether or not they can stand on the street corner, whether they have to be in at ten o'clock or whether they can ride their skateboard up and down the sidewalk. I mean, those are all local municipal officials directly impacting how one operates their life. And so, we have to keep an eye on that.

HM: You also sponsored bills that repealed acts that seemed obsolete. How did you take the steps to repeal those bills?

MM: Well, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a long history. You know, it's a couple of hundred years old and there's been legislation drafted throughout the history of the Commonwealth, since the 1800s – you know, late 1700s, 1800s, and they're still on the books. These pieces of legislation, for all intents and purposes, have no actual effect of law, but they're still on the books. So, if, perchance, you go back and find one of these that's applicable, it could be the most bizarre law that would affect your life. We need to remove those from the books so you repeal them. We went through and we found tens and tens and tens and tens and tens of old legislation that needed to be repealed. So, we started to put in repeal bills to at least try to clean up, modernize, if you will, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's laws with what's going on in society today. That's all we're trying to do. And it needs to be done constantly and over and over and over again. Oh, there's hundreds still that have to come off the books, but let someone else champion that cause. I'm sure there will be someone else coming up who will want to repeal a bunch of legislation. It's a good thing, you know, it really is. It's a good thing and needs to be done from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's perspective.

HM: Do you remember any of them?

MM: Oh, gosh, no. We did so many. I wish I could remember the ones we did from the 1800s. They were just so bizarre. I mean, some of them had to do with wagons. And

some of them had to do with, you know, how many horses, and its just stuff – you sit there going, "I have cars. I don't have horses and wagons any longer." So, we had to repeal those.

HM: I think some of the issues that are affecting legislators today that I think are pretty controversial and I think you've taken a stand on: same-sex marriages and also on the Pennsylvania Gaming at racetracks. What are the nature of these issues in today's Legislature and how are we, as a Legislature, trying to resolve these issues?

MM: Well, we'll take the same-sex marriage issue: It's one, a foundation issue from the faith perspective. Being Catholic, obviously, we don't endorse that type of relationship or that type of marriage. But, it goes further than that; if you have same-sex marriages – or, however its defined – marriage, it may not even be a marriage. The difficulty you have is, what's the criteria or the standard to determine whether or not it's a marriage? Because if you have a common-law marriage, which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania says you are no longer permitted to have – a common-law marriage; all that was required was for two people to say, "We're married" and hold themselves out as being married – well, then they receive the same benefits and so forth and so on. But, the laws aren't drafted to recognize that. So, when it comes to leaving inheritance, when it comes to claiming someone's pension, when it comes to participating in someone's healthcare benefits, those aren't the standards that are necessary, that don't meet with saying, "I'm married to this gentlemen or this woman." There's no criteria. So, you have people that could actually abuse the system very easily. For example, you're my friend: we walk

down the street, you say, "Hey Mark, I need healthcare benefits. Why don't you and I say we're married and I'll go on your healthcare benefits?" Because I'm your friend, I'll say, "Okay." So, we hold ourselves out and say we're married. No paper, no formal proceedings, no nothing. You receive benefits from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. You move out a week later from the apartment that I rented and you keep benefits on me. Well that is an abuse that could occur throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that could cost hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars for the taxpayers of the Commonwealth. I don't think that's right. You know, there has to be some kind of criteria, some standard; bright-line rule. And I think a marriage between a man and a woman is a bright-line rule. That way it prevents any abuses on what is a "marriage." The churches aren't going to recognize and perform the ceremonies. They won't in the Catholic Church, therefore, how is that then recognized by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania if the marriage is not a formalized marriage. So, it creates a lot of problem; it creates a lot of problems. And my last issue on the same-sex one is a constitutional argument. Sexual orientation is not protected anywhere in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or in the Constitution of the United States. If it's not a protected right, why should we elevate it to such, over and above what our Constitution already says? So, that's the same-sex marriage issue. We'll get off of that one. What was the other one you asked me about?

HM: I think the Gaming –

MM: The Gaming Bill? I just think that gaming should be a destination oriented activity. You go to Atlantic City. You go to Las Vegas. I don't think gaming should be around the corner. I don't believe it should be used to educate our children; the revenue. And gaming preys on those who can least afford to play. It's always the guy who takes his last dollar who thinks he's going to hit it big and he and his family are going to be millionaires. You know what? You don't build billion-dollar casinos and hundreds of millions of dollar casinos at racetracks because you lose money.

HM: How has your law degree helped you formulate legislation? Because, just listening to your conversation now, I was thinking, "I bet you that law degree has come in very handy."

MM: Oh, absolutely. Well, the constitutional argument and being able to –

HM: Sure.

MM: – to make that constitutional argument and explain why. That's all because of law school. Being able to stand on the House Floor and make an argument; for example, the home-school legislation that Bob Godshall [Robert; State Representative, Montgomery County, 1983-present] and I supported to allow children to participate in extra-curricular activities. I made the argument that we have anti-discrimination laws all the time on the books. You know, you can't discriminate because of race, you can't discriminate because of religion, you can't discriminate because of your sex, you know, whether

you're male or female, but yet, we're going to discriminate against these home-school kids. I mean, we're trying to do everything we can to rid ourselves of discrimination, but yet, we're going to allow the school districts to discriminate against a class of individuals. It's not right. So, it's a simple discrimination issue. They don't want to see it that way, but that's exactly what it was. It was okay for them to practice discrimination against home-schoolers, but oh, we can't discriminate against any other class of individuals; just home-schoolers. And that was an argument that was developed directly from law school because you know you learn what is discriminatory, what is on the books in way of laws that protect discrimination against individuals or classes of individuals. And then you can use that to develop an argument to support your position. I did that quite a bit.

HM: Did you ever get frustrated in these legislative issues?

MM: All the time. All the time. You know, you have a very bright group of individuals and as hard as you are working for an issue, they're working, sometimes, just as hard, if not harder, against your issue. And I have a nemesis in here, I say it tongue and cheek: nemesis, Kate Harper [State Representative, Montgomery County 2001-present]: very capable Representative, women Representative who's an attorney by profession. A very, very capable, very intelligent, very articulate – and, she's just a go-getter. And she and I go head to head on certain local government issues and I had a bill I was doing and, boy, did she thwart it with this maneuver. She taught me a good maneuver, but she thwarted it because of the way I had drafted the legislation. It was okay, I mean, I learned the tough lesson. It was good. But, yeah, as hard as you work for an issue, believe me there's an

opposition out there that's working as hard, if not harder, against a particular issue. To get anything accomplished in here takes an extremely long time and a lot of work. And that's a good thing because when you're done at the end of the day, most of the time it comes out okay. If you allow the system to work very rapidly with quick changes, we end up with something like California where you know they run billions of dollars of deficits and they do everything by referendum and its just screws up their own government. And I don't think that's the way government should run. But, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania takes a long time to do anything, but that's a good thing.

HM: What's the hardest legislative issue you've ever had to face?

MM: Boy, that's a good question; there are quite a few. I hate to fight the fight and lose. The gaming issue for example. That was a tough issue; did everything we could to fight that one, worked against it for years. Taxes, protective legislation, like we tried to do protective legislation for AMP because AMP was in my legislative district when they were going to be taken over by Allied [Signal] now Tyco. Those types of issue, I think, they're the toughest ones. The other tough one, the toughest two were in my first term: the one was the gas tax that Governor [Tom] Ridge [Governor, 1995-2001] wanted. That was hard to put up that vote. It was beneficial and it was necessary, but it's hard to make the argument of why you needed to move a gas tax. I think the other hardest issue that I faced in this Legislature in my term was the voucher issue; school vouchers. My children attend private school, but I was not in favor of the voucher program. And that issue cut very deeply with my constituents. It pitted me against the Administration. It pitted me

against my Leaders in the House of Representatives. It pitted me against my Senator who was in the Senate; he had a different perspective than I did. So, it was tough because I was pretty much a man of myself. Myself and Ron Buxton, in Dauphin County, I believe, were the only two opposed to the vouchers. Our Senator was for it; our other colleagues were for it. I had John Perzel breathing down my neck: he was for it. Matt Ryan, Governor Ridge – he sends Mark Schweiker, then Lieutenant Governor, Mark Schweiker [Governor 2001-2003], into my office. You know, that's pretty intimidating. And here I am, 34 years old, as an elected Representative, sitting there telling the Governor "no." That was a tough issue.

HM: Since you will be leaving at the end of this Session, is there anything you'd like to have accomplished?

MM: There's always more things you want to have accomplished, you know. I think we did okay for the 104th Legislative District while we were here. I wish we would have put the landfill in northern Dauphin County to bed. We came into the House of Representatives, we vowed to close it; we did. But, they keep coming back wanting to open it. I just wish we could put it to bed so that we no longer have to worry about whether or not that's going to open. And unfortunately, that's in DEP's hands now. Unfortunately for me, because it would be a real easy decision for me to make. I'd put the "no" stamp on it and leave it alone and that would be it; it would go in the archives somewhere. Hopefully, we'll be able to address that and finish that before the end of the

year and put that behind us. I would love to be able to do that. Other issues? Sure there are other issues that you wanted to achieve, but you got to turn it over to someone else.

HM: Would you like to comment on any of your committee work throughout your tenure?

MM: I was fortunate enough to serve on some great committees. I served with Karl Boyes [State Representative, Erie County, 1981-2003], he was my Finance – I was on the Finance Committee. Karl Boyes was a great Chairman there. Finance is a wonderful committee and so is Judiciary, because I would say 97 percent of the legislation that comes through this place comes through those two committees, and then Appropriations. I never wanted to be on Appropriations because I didn't want to sit through three or four weeks of hearings as the various departments came in. I say, "No, don't put me on Appropriations, but I'll take Finance and Judiciary." But, those two committees are a lot of fun, Judiciary, especially, now that I have a law degree. You really get to see how many lives you do affect with the Criminal Code or the Crimes Code. The various issues on, especially, now, with the sexual predators and violent sexual predators and defining those and how do you track them and so forth and so on; that all comes through the Judiciary Committee. Those types of things, protection of police officers and those types of issues in the Judiciary, they're near and dear to everyone because that's everyone's public safety. The Finance Committee, of course, you deal with all the information that has to do with the budgetary process and financing of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and how you're not allowed to spend more than you take in because we

have a balanced budget, here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But, yet how do we derive revenue or how do we give tax breaks to a certain group of Individuals without setting it up in such a way that would be deemed unconstitutional. There's a lot of inner-workings and behind-the-scenes work that you have to do with the various committees and then in the drafting of legislation so that it sustains itself and isn't overturned by the courts. Local Government, I think, was the most fun I had just because that – I was the only builder/developer on the Committee out of 25 Members; most of them were municipal officials or municipal solicitors, so needless to say, my viewpoint was a little bit different from the other 24 individuals. But, it was good for the Committee and we did really good legislation out of that Committee. And then, of course, Game and Fisheries, one of the most miraculous things I have ever done with my children was we go with the Gaming Commission and they tag a bear every spring and while they're tagging the bear, you're permitted to hold the bear cubs. And you should see the wonder in the children's eyes as they're holding a live bear cub that weighs a pound and a half or two pounds and has blue eyes. You know, they're wild animals, but they're just this little thing in your hand. And to see my 11 year old hold this little bear and hug this bear, it's just really – It was great.

HM: Were there any special issues that came before you as the Sub-Committee Chairman on Boroughs?

MM: Procurement issues, there's two right now, in fact: one, we handled and it's over in the Senate and hopefully, they'll be all done. There were about 19 different laws we had

to change for procurement of goods and services by municipalities and boroughs and other organizations. They haven't been changed for 15 or 20 years. It was a very low dollar amount that municipalities were allowed to spend before they went out to bid. So, we wanted to raise that threshold so they can purchase more goods because obviously, the price of goods have gone up substantially and then with the price of oil going up, it's even skyrocketed more. And so, their buying power with the dollar amount they had was very small. All power, by any government, is derived from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: we grant it. So if we don't grant them the authority to do it, they can't do it; same with counties, same with local municipalities. So, all those – we have 2,500 local municipalities – they are always back in here trying to have us grant them more authority. And it's a balancing act. How much do you give them versus how responsible will they be? I think my elected officials are all very responsible, but we have individuals who don't think their local elected officials are very responsible. So, it's a tight balancing act what you can achieve in that regard. Now, we're doing the police pensions. We're trying to consolidate all the police pensions and local police pensions because an individual police officer can work in my municipality for 15 years, get hired by the municipality next door, and those 15 years don't count towards his pension any longer; there's no portability of his pension. So, he has to start all over, after having worked for 15 years trying to build something up. And with a consolidated system, that would no longer be an issue; it would no longer be a problem for local police forces. That's a very difficult issue because there are so many people involved. But, we'll see; hopefully, we can accomplish that one by the end of the year.

HM: How do you think the House was able to deal with major issues of a national or a local flavor? Such as flooding or 9/11 [September 11, 2001], those are some serious issues. Do you think the House was able to affect the way that Pennsylvanians lived?

MM: 9/11 was more of a Federal issue. What that did was a wake-up call for all local individuals. I mean, we have, the citizenry in the Commonwealth, are always first on the call, they are always first to volunteer, they are always first to defend, not necessarily just their own home, but their neighbor's home; whether neighbor being New York, or neighbor being New Jersey, or neighbor being Mississippi or Louisiana. We are always first on the scene to jump in and assist. And I think that's something that we, as Pennsylvanians, we passed down to our children. And I think we're always diligent and we're always on the look out in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I believe, frankly, that we have a leg up on everyone else in the country because we do pay attention. 9/11 was a wakeup call to tell us that we need to be more diligent, we need to be more observant and this is what you need to look out for. We did some changes here in the House of Representatives, I think, which were necessary to try to keep this complex open, but yet protect the individuals who worked here. The flooding issue, you know we've been dealing with flooding in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a long time; it started back in Johnstown [1889]. And we had [Hurricane] Agnes [1972] and then we had another one in [19]76, and I can go through them because I lived through a couple of them, not the Johnstown one, by the way. But, I did live through Agnes and a couple of others. So, the flooding issue to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is nothing new. We flood here quite a bit throughout the State at various places. Not to the extent that they

did down in New Orleans, but for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to sustain what it did numerous times; we've had some substantial flooding. And we know how to react to that and I think we do. And I think we tried to do a good job taking care of our own, making funds available, you know making our rescue squads available for those who need it. And I think Governor [Edward] Rendell [2003-2011] did a good job sending the folks when it was necessary. I think it was the right move.

HM: Have you witnessed any of the technological advances since you've been here in the House?

MM: Oh, technological advances since I have been here in the House? Oh gosh, in my lifetime – I just can't imagine how someone who is 70 or 80 years can live with all the technological changes, because I can't keep up with them, myself. When I first started we had cell phones, now we have PDA's [Personal Digital Assistants] or, you know, portable calendars. And your Email comes to your hand. In 1997, Email was just starting to catch on, but you didn't receive it wherever you went. You didn't have access to it like you do today. The phone systems are completely different. The computers are completely different; everything is done by Email now, everything is paperless, as much as possible. Even the fax machine works very little. It's a much more rapid Email. For example, when I started on the House Floor, we did everything by paper. We would have reams of paper during budget time and sine die. We have Calendars A, B, C, D, E, F, G and then Supplemental Calendars and they would be stacked on your desk. They'd be eight to ten inches high. You could barely see over the paper that you had and there was

always more paper coming down the aisle. Now, you have a computer screen; everything you want is on the computer. I have no paper on my desk. It is amazing. Now, I know how to get around in the computer. Even when they come by and say, "Do you want" – because they have to offer you a printed copy – "Do you want a printed copy?" "No. I don't want any paper on my desk." It's just a computer screen. It's tremendously different. I can sit there, if we're in sine die, and folks at home are watching on PCN [Pennsylvania Cable Network], they will Email me directly to my desk on the House Floor about a particular issue that we are discussing and give me their thoughts and ask me for my thoughts. And, you know, if they see me speak, they'll send me an Email saying, "You said this and this is where I disagree with you," or "This is where I agree with you. You could have said this, also." It's tremendously different. It's a lot faster and a lot more instant communication. And it keeps you, I think, a lot closer to your constituency.

HM: So, would you say the process has changed?

MM: The process of communication has changed tremendously. The process of drafting legislation, fighting for your legislation, reading it three days on the House Floor, you know, following the Rules of the House and the Rules of the Senate, the process of legislative passage has not changed. That process stays the same. And it should be a constant. The process of whether or not we're allowed to read it on paper or on Email or whether it's on a computer screen, that should be a rule that should be flexible and it has been and it's been able to adapt with the changes in society.

HM: Were you witness to any changes in the House structure?

MM: The House itself? The establishment?

HM: Yeah. The rules of the House, anything like that?

MM: Not too many rules have changed. They've pretty much stayed the same. There's been some adjustment in the rules to try to make them more open for the public to have access to records or to information. Those kinds of changes, I think, were good changes. You know, the rules of the House are slow to change and they should be, because if you constantly are changing the rules, no one knows what the game is. And it's hard to become an expert in the rules; I think we have 77 rules or 78 rules. It's hard to become an expert in all the Rules. You got to read them and constantly read them again. I have them on the House Floor, the Rules of the House, so I know whether or not I can ask a Parliamentary Procedure question or whether or not I can Move for Table or, you know, whatever. I try to keep the Rules with me just so I know what's going on in that aspect of things.

HM: What was your relationship like with the Media?

MM: Terrible. I don't care for them. I don't think they're fair. I don't think they're honest. I don't think they're forthright. I think they make up stories where there isn't

one just to try to get readership. They have their favorites and then they have their non-favorites and if you're a non-favorite then, I think, you bear the brunt of whatever it is that they want to print about you. For example, I was elected in 1996, took office in [19]97. When I ran for office in [19]96 there was a legislative pay raise in [19]95. I told them I wasn't going to take the pay raise. So, I took the pay increase and gave it to children living in my District to go to college. I sent 61 children to school; 61,000 dollars I gave away. There was never a story printed about that in the press, ever. But, there was a story about me printed in the press about I might be going to this convention and the Commonwealth taxpayers may or may not be paying for it. May or may not be paying for it, but that's the story. May or may not be paying for it, but he's going. Well, where's the story? There isn't a story. That's the kind of thing the press does. I don't care for the press, at all.

HM: Is that just the, I'm guessing, the *Patriot News* that would be the local newspaper?

MM: Right.

HM: Or the TV stations.

MM: The TV stations were very fair. You know, Mike Ross was the first reporter I met when was I up here; God rest his soul, he passed away recently [2006]. [A] Tremendously wonderful man. Always fair, always tough, but always fair. He never blindsided you. He never made you look worse than what it is you were saying about

yourself, you know. He didn't take your interview and chop it up and piece it together so what you said was completely different from what you actually said; where the *Patriot News* will do that, time and time again.

HM: One of the things that you just mentioned: maybe you'd like to comment on it now was the Dollars for Scholars Program. I think that's what you were talking about.

MM: Yes. I did that in memory of my son. My son, Christian, passed away in 1997 at the age of four. And we set up the Dollars for Scholars Program where we would take the legislative pay increase and hand it out to individuals going to college in the 104th Legislative District. And I didn't do any of the selection. We had a selection team set up. It was operated through the Big 33, which is an organization here that hands out a half million dollars of scholarships a year, so they had the criteria; they reviewed all the applications, and they chose the winners and all I did was fund it. It was a great program. It was really neat. And to hear from the children who have graduated; they send you notes, you know, "Thank you very much for helping in my career," and they tell you what they're doing. And it's really something to still see that they remember and they write back. And it was one of the positive things that you can do from this place and unfortunately, you know, it didn't get much recognition, but that's okay. The kids who benefited know and their parents know and I know. That's all I need to know.

HM: You were recognized with community legislative awards during your tenure such as the Guardian of Small Business Award in 2003. Can you tell me; are those awards and recognitions just nice to receive?

MM: Oh, well, it shows you're doing the right thing and it shows you're effective. I received National Legislator of the Year for the Northeast Region from the National Association of Homebuilders for my work on local government issues. And I received a 40 under 40 Award prior to coming here for recognition of business experience and an influential business leader. It's really nice when you can achieve those things. It's nice when they give them to you and you don't know it's coming because somebody else recognizes the fact that your hard work is paying off. You think you're doing a good job, you hope you're doing a good job, and then somebody tells you you're doing a good job, you know, then you put it all together. Because everybody, everybody, I don't care who you are, likes to be praised in what they're doing. And I tried to do that with my staff. My staff tries to do that to me. They give me all kinds of praises like, "When are you leaving?" and so forth and so on. (*laugh*) But, yeah, it's nice to receive an award from time to time.

HM: What aspect of your career did you like the most of being a Representative?

MM: I probably liked doing the town meetings and the meetings with the citizenry groups. And going out and telling them what's going on in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this is what we're doing, this is what to expect, this is my position

[and] if you don't like it, please tell me why. I really liked the interaction with the constituents; that was fun. I enjoyed that and I enjoyed the debate and the tussle of the House Floor. You know, the back-and-forth and sometimes it gets pretty, "rough and tumble," as Bill DeWeese [H. William; State Representative, Fayette, Greene & Washington Counties, 1976-present; Speaker, 1993-1995] would say. But, it's worth it and it's a lot of fun. But, I think those are the two aspects I like the most: meeting with the constituents and then the rough and tumble of the House Floor, the debate and you know how to try to defeat an issue or get your issue passed.

HM: What did you liked the least?

MM: Working from six PM to six AM. (*laugh)* I hate the fact that sometimes we sit around here and House is extended, House is extended, House is extended and they do it at 45 minute increments so you can't go do anything else. You sit at your desk and your 45 minutes is up and then all of a sudden House is extended for another 45 minutes. Well, give me an increment of four hours. I mean, extend it for four hours, if you know it's going to be four hours, so I can go do something else. Or at least I can start focusing on doing something else. But, when you're only permitted to focus for 45 minutes, by the time you get yourself set up to actually apply yourself you have 30 minutes left. And then you're looking at your watch going, "Okay," so then your 30 minutes now becomes 20 because you have to shut it down early. So, you, for all intents and purposes, you don't get anything accomplished other than writing a couple of Emails or a couple of letters. That, I think, is the most frustrating part about this place.

HM: Did you ever consider running for another public office other than the House?

MM: I don't know if I'd ever do that; I might, you never know. I consider lots of things; we all do. But, you know, we have good Congressmen, we have great Senators. You never know what the future may hold. Right now, the future holds for me going out to the business world and hanging with my children and watching my daughter go off to college and those types of things.

HM: What's your fondest memory of serving in the House?

MM: Boy, I have so many. I have so many. That's a tough one; to pick one of the fondest memories is very difficult because I have so many. You know, I have memories of Matt Ryan; Uncle Matt, great guy. John Perzel, Gaynor Cawley [State Representative, Lackawanna County, 1981-2006] from the Democratic side of the aisle. Going at it with Bill DeWeese. I think the best memories you have here: a lot of them occur outside of the House of Representatives, but yet still with House Members. You know, whether we're sitting around just talking and b.s'ing, as you would say, it's just really interesting to see the perspective of where individuals come from throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; how they were brought up, what's their foundation. I think that's the most fun I have: when we're outside of the House and still interacting with House Members: [that] is, I think, the most fond memories that I'll have of this place. And that's all the time, you know, that's all the time.

HM: Do you have any amusing stories you can share on tape?

MM: (l*augh)* No. There's a lot of amusing stories. Just the crazy stuff people do. You know, the one story: Gaynor Cawley - it was late at night and I think Ridge was trying to get his vouchers passed. And we were in Caucus and Gaynor Cawley, he's a Democrat, comes walking in and he has dollar bills hanging all out of his pocket and out of his hat and, you know, hanging everywhere. He's like, "Hey you guys, Ridge is handing out the dollars. Get in there and get yours!" You know, trying to get the votes for the vouchers thing. But, he's just that way; I mean Gaynor Cawley's that way. You know he had this legislation; he did legislation about protecting bobcats or something. So, we gave him the nickname, like the fools we are, we gave him the nickname "Bobcat Cawley." So, we're sitting in Caucus – not in Caucus – we're sitting in Committee meetings and we name him "Bobcat" and he starts making the noise of a bobcat and it's like, you know, those kinds of things that people do. It broke the ice. It was pretty funny, but Bobcat Cawley that's – he's leaving this year, too and he's going to be sorely missed because he is a very funny, dedicated Representative.

HM: What would you say your greatest accomplishment was in the Legislature?

MM: That's a good question. Probably the changes to the Municipalities Planning Code which made it, I believe, fair from a municipality's standpoint for timeframes for criteria for contributions from developers for improvements to municipalities where they have an

impact. I think that would probably be one of the greatest ones that we've had. The other one was a small one which people don't think is a big deal, but a lot of home-schoolers do, is allowing them to participate in extra-curricular activities. Those two I believe are the two greatest ones from a legislative perspective. I think the best thing we did from a constituent perspective was settling the lawsuit in Dauphin Borough. When I first came into office, Dauphin Borough was suing the Department of Transportation because the Dauphin Narrows highway structure was supposed to go through and they didn't like where it went. And we were able to negotiate a deal between Dauphin Borough and the Department of Transportation and then Secretary Brad Mallory to settle the lawsuit, to allow the highway to be built so that 70,000 cars a day can benefit from this infrastructure improvement. And we did it; we did it in six months timeframe. And the highway went in: it's magnificent, and now the bottleneck is now up in Lewistown which used to be formerly Representative Clark's [Daniel; State Representative, Juniata County, 1989-2002] District. Now, I believe it's Adam Harris' [State Representative, Juniata County, 2003-present]. The bottleneck is no longer Dauphin Narrows, so that's all I got to tell you; it's no longer the Dauphin Narrows. Between that and the closing of the landfill, those were our two greatest accomplishments from a constituent perspective.

HM: How would you like to be remembered?

MM: As a guy who did a good job for his constituents; worked hard, was fair but firm.

HM: Are you going to remain active in politics?

MM: I'd like to. You know, its fun to be king, but even more fun to be kingmaker. But, yeah, I'm going to dabble in politics. I'm going to stay very involved in Dauphin County politics. We have a new Chairman in Dauphin County. I have great colleagues in Dauphin County that I'm going to support. You know, I'm going to champion Republican causes wherever I can. I believe that we have an opportunity this fall for the Governorship, hopefully. I believe we need to change the direction of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I think it needs to be more Republican. And yeah, I'm going to stay active. Can you tell?

HM: I thought, maybe. You talked a little bit about your plans after leaving the House. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

MM: No, I'll be around. You know, you'll see me come and go. Hopefully, I may even have a maxis up here on the Hill. I would like to be able to do a little bit of lobbying and practice of law and we'll see what we do.

HM: My last question: do you have any advice for new Members that are starting their careers here in this next term?

MM: I think the only advice I would give them is to not take a steadfast staunch position prior to coming here and understanding how the process works because I think that can make you ineffective before getting here.

HM: Well, thank you very much. This concludes our interview.

MM: Great, thank you.