PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

The Honorable Michael E. Cassidy (D)

Blair County

80th Legislative District

1977-1978

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED BY: Nathan J. Robinson, Researcher
May 24, 2007

Transcribed by: Nathan J. Robinson

Nathan Robinson (NR): Good morning. I am here with Michael E. Cassidy, a former Legislator from the 80th Legislative District in Blair County, who served from 1977 to 1978. Thank you very much for being here with us, Michael.

The Honorable Michael Cassidy (MC): Glad to it.

NR: I am going to start by talking about your childhood and family life. Can you describe your early life, prior to your legislative career, and how it prepared you for public service?

MC: Well, I was born in Blair County, the county I represented. My parents moved when I was very young to Chester County, where, largely, I grew up, and I am the oldest of six kids. I graduated from Octoraro High School in Chester County—on the border of Chester and Lancaster County – and went to Penn State. I started out at Altoona Campus. I thought I was going to be a Forestry Major, but then I figured out how much math and science that really took, and I ended up gravitating over into Political Science, ended up to be a Political Science Major at Penn State, and it's from there that I actually got more involved in Blair County politics. At home, I came from a family that was political, in the sense that it talked about politics. I had an uncle who was a County Chairman in Knox County, Ohio, but my family didn't do a lot of direct political action. But, they did talk about politics; they talked about the news of the day. And, so, to that extent, we were a very political family, in that we were very interested in the current events, and that helped prepare me, as well. As a youngster in high school—a very undistinguished High

School career—I did spend a lot of time working. I had a lawn-mowing business; I mowed a couple of cemeteries, a few businesses, made awful good money for the day, and packed most of it away for college. And also, my outside activity I was involved in was the Boy Scouts, and I did become an Eagle Scout—well, I'm still an Eagle Scout. Once an Eagle Scout, always an Eagle Scout.

NR: That's right.

MC: And, I think that helped prepare me. And, just the fact that I grew up in a family that talked about politics and policy, that certainly helped prepare [me].

NR: Definitely. Do you think that you were interested in politics even when you were a Forestry Major, before you decided to change?

MC: Yeah, I was always interested in—now, I am going in to college in 1973, the last year of the Vietnam Draft, I believe. Obviously, Richard Nixon[1] is still in office. A very hot time for, you know—

NR: Right.

MC: —for politics. Everybody was political. At the Altoona Campus, I was in student government, but I was also President of the Political Science Association. We might

[1] 37th US President, 1969-1974; US Vice President, 1953-1961, US Senator, California, 1951-1953.

have had thirty members, something like that. Today you probably don't have thirty Political Science Majors in the club, University-wide—but just at Altoona Campus.

NR: (*laugh*) Wow.

MC: We had one Republican, who, by our Charter, had to be the Vice President, since a Democrat was the President, and then he went and changed Parties, so we had to change our Charter because we didn't have a Republican in the club. Obviously differently today, but if you're there in the last days of Richard Nixon—

NR: Right.

MC: —you didn't have a lot of Republican sympathizers on campus, especially when you had a draft. So, you know, I see some parallels to the same discussions today with Iraq, but students were very politically motivated at the time.

NR: How did you, personally, become a Democrat?

MC: Well, I sort of inherited it, and an ancestor of mine, Peter Cassidy [State Representative, Huntingdon County, 1823-1824], served in the State Legislature (from what was then Huntington County), Blair County, in the 1830s. So, my family were always Democrats. We have a document—my family came to America in the 1750s—some of the branches come a little before then. I have where Patrick Cassidy, the person

that came from Ireland was called—what did they call him? A Democrat—oh, a Democrat and a Catholic. In one document, where someone was referring to him, they didn't mean either of them as a compliment. (*laugh*)

NR: (*laugh*) I understand.

MC: But, nonetheless, they were part of that Democratic Party from the very inception of the Party. And, in Pennsylvania, they were called Democrats, even though other places, the Jeffersonians were called Republicans, but in Pennsylvania, they were largely called Democrats.

NR: So, you were still in college when you ran for office?

MC: Yes.

NR: And your age, as a Representative, was an important factor in your career, as you were the youngest Representative at the time. So, why did you decide to run at such a young age?

MC: When I went back to Altoona as a—my family is from Newry, right outside of Altoona—when I went to Altoona campus, at the same time, I ran for Democratic Committeeman in the precinct, because they didn't have one. Myself and another guy ran, became the Democratic Committee people in Altoona—I think it was eighth ward—

and worked on several local campaigns. When I went up to University Park, the next year, I moved my official residence, rather than at the University, out to my grandmother's house in Newry, where, actually, I lived on weekends and, you know, spent a lot of time, and, it's what my family always considered like home, you know, even when we didn't live there. And a vacancy came up on Borough Council, and so I was appointed to a vacancy on Borough Council. So, I was a Borough Councilman and I was nineteen, I guess, at the time—on Newry Borough Council. So, that was a big splash. Back in those days, too, the *Altoona Mirror* covered all these little Borough Councils very heavily because they had all kinds of interesting fights, and Newry kind-of stuck out; It was the only Democratic municipality in the county at the time. We had what they called a "Feminist Council." Women had a majority on council—

NR: Wow.

MC: —in 1975, which was extremely unusual.

NR: Definitely.

MC: In a Republican County, we had an all Democratic Council, too. On Council, I don't think we had any Republicans. I think the Mayor of the town was a Republican. So, we were sort of an anomaly, so the newspaper liked to cover us.

NR: Right.

MC: So that was well-known. I went to work then for—which also gave me some experience—I went to work for the Chamber of Commerce. I was what they called a "Youth Power Director." At the time, the Altoona Chamber of Commerce had a program where they helped place teenagers in summer jobs. [An] excellent program, and I'm sorry it doesn't exist anymore. But, you could apply and become one of their work force and, you know, whether you're good at lawn-mowing, hedge-trimming. We had a crew that sealed driveways, which we put together and sort of organized these crews and advertised them and people could call in and say, "Well, I need my grass mowed."

NR: Right.

MC: "I need my hedge cut." It could be all summer, or it could just be a one-time going on vacation, "I need somebody to cut the grass," which was the normal thing of it. Also, sealing driveways, all kinds of other jobs that are appropriate for teenagers. So, I was in that program one year sort of as an apprentice and the next year as the Director of that program. So, I got some exposure with that, as well. Now, where was I on this? This conversation—I just lost my train of thought.

NR: So, that was how you got involved politically, and why did you decide to run at such a young age for the House of Representatives?

MC: Oh, well, that was a very short conversation, and political scientists talk about how people are recruited, you know, and all this stuff—

NR: Right.

MC: —and the long thought processes that people go through and all the things that enter in—nothing entered into the conversation. I'd worked on the campaign two years prior, which the Democrats did respectfully—not respectfully—they did a respectable job on that campaign. Four years prior, for the State Rep[resentative], Democrats came very, very close.

NR: Okay.

MC: And this was post-Watergate, so the Democrats are doing well generally, but we had a weak incumbent. And, the person who ran the two years before didn't want to run again, and they went around to a few people, and, finally, Dr. Thomas Healy, who was a dentist and also the State Committeeperson and, some would consider [him] the boss of at least part of Altoona. [He was] very influential in Altoona politics—Democratic politics—called up and said, "How would you like to be the candidate?" And I said, "Yes." And that's how long the conversation took, and he says, "Fine. We'll do that, then." And, so, I filed nominating petitions. Nobody else filed, and so it was a very short conversation that led me to be the candidate, and, some people thought, "Well, he's just going to be the name on the ballot." I thought that there was a little bit of a chance, just

because the incumbent was so weak in previous elections. I think he came within four hundred votes of knocking him off four years prior.

NR: Wow.

MC: Heavens knows what's going to happen, and it happened. I ended up getting elected, but that whole discussion, that whole thought process of running for office was just an opportunity came up and I just said, "Yes," to it. I was going into my senior year at Penn State at the time.

NR: So, it was mostly the opening and the opportunity that pushed you?

MC: Yes.

NR: Not necessarily an issue at the time, or anything like that. So could you describe your first campaign?

MC: The first campaign was a pretty professional operation, considering we ran it basically out of my grandmother's house where I lived. I had a cousin of mine by marriage who agreed to be the campaign manager and handled the day-to-day things; kept the schedule, make sure I was in the right place. I played the candidate and stuck to my schedule and went the places I was supposed to be. Where we were very innovative was we used, then, the very modern science of campaign targeting. We did extensive

targeting of how to target our door-to-door – because we had very limited resources – how to target our door-to-door, how to target our mailing, how to target our radio. So, we had a very scientifically targeted campaign, which is something I had learned and picked up and studied. And, so we applied that to the campaign at a time when most campaigns did not do that.

NR: Right.

MC: We raised a good deal of money at the time. The party kicked in heavily, but I think I spent around nine thousand dollars, would be the equivalent of around thirty thousand dollars today. So, it was a well-funded campaign in that sense, certainly not by today's standards.

NR: Right.

MC: But, we did have money, so we did do some television, because it was a cheap media market.

NR: Right.

MC: We did radio. We did newspaper. We did billboards, something that I wouldn't recommend candidates do today. We had a very extensive yard-sign operation, both the

small yard signs like you see, but then we had these mini billboards that—former county chairman knew how to do those silk screens—

NR: Okay.

MC: —and so we took four by eight sheets of, not plywood, but, you know, the stuff you decorate walls with.

NR: Okay.

MC: And did huge four by eight [feet], really, bigger than yard signs, small billboards, and put them all through the rural areas. Every place we could get a farmer or anybody to put one up, we put one of those up, and you couldn't miss those. So, we did an awful lot of—it was a really first, top-rate campaign. We had also did something, which we did back in those days that you can't really do today because people are not as willing to be involved in a political campaign today as they were; we had a list, and I wish I could remember exactly. I kind of think it was three hundred, but it was certainly hundreds of campaign volunteers, many of which were only willing to do things out of their homes. So, we had people that made phone calls. We had people address envelopes. We never had a mailing house address envelopes, so, if we had a mailing, my campaign manager and a few other volunteers would drive these packets around to all of these homes, a lot of them with retired senior citizens in them, who would take the list, address all the envelopes, put the stamps on them, and give them back and we would do the mailing.

NR: Wow.

MC: So, we really had quite the campaign operation.

NR: So, you said that your family was pretty heavily involved in the campaign?

MC: Yes. My family in Blair County was very large. I mean, if you go out to the extended family, I mean, you live in a place since the 1750s, you end up with a lot of relatives, and my family recruited all of them.

NR: (*laugh*) Did they like that involvement? Did they enjoy [it]?

MC: Yes. Yes. Very much. Very much so.

NR: Good. So, you won by a fairly decisive margin in [19]76. I mean, from what you said, the Democrat only lost by about four hundred votes the election before—

MC: Four years prior.

NR: Four years prior. And, you won by around—

MC: Two thousand.

NR: Yeah, by around two thousand votes. So, do you think that it was your scientific method that set you apart?

MC: That certainly helped in the campaign, but the incumbent was embroiled in scandal. And, so—

NR: Right. And that was William Wilt [Blair County, 1963-1976], correct?

MC: Yeah, so you can't underestimate the value of that scandal.

NR: Right.

MC: I'm not sure that he would have lost if we hadn't been able to take advantage of that with a good campaign.

NR: Right.

MC: So, you don't really know. But, we had an excellent campaign that was able to take advantage of his scandals: a drunk driving charge in Harrisburg under very, sort-of, scandalous circumstances. Also, there was a land deal, which, really smacked of all kinds of favoritism.

NR: Oh wow.

MC: Now, that scandal, actually, our campaign generated with our—we did our own research; opposition research actually, uncovered that. So, that was generated by our campaign. The other scandals weren't; they just broke. So, we did everything right in that election.

NR: Was your second campaign, running as an incumbent, much different from the first?

MC: Yeah. It was different in that we had the Shapp [Milton Shapp, Pennsylvania Governor, 1971-1979] Democratic scandals really hit the papers and it was very, very difficult for Democrats. The Democrats were blown, were blown out that year. I mean, we went from—I don't remember the actual numbers—but we lost, I don't know, fourteen members or something like that, and in the General Assembly, we went into the minority. It was a very, very bad year for Democrats. Our campaign was, I think, about as good as the first one, except for things just didn't necessarily cut our way—

NR: Right.

MC: —in the same way. Because of the scandals, I had Primary opposition, which always hurts an incumbent, although, I think most of that healed up. The Republican Party had regrouped. The post-Watergate feeling that had worked in the Democrat's

favor was gone, and now you had an anti-Democratic, anti-Shapp atmosphere. Everything had changed, and, so, I lost by, again, about two thousand votes, I guess.

NR: During your time of service—

MC: Now today, you say, "Two thousand votes is a landslide." It wasn't a landslide if you look, I mean, the number of people that voted in the Blair County elections was huge.

NR: Right.

MC: So, we were still playing, I think, within the five percent, you know, with winning by fifty-five [percent] or losing by forty-five [percent] around those areas. Okay.

NR: In your own words, during your time of service, could you describe your District, specifically the people and the issues that are most important to them, and the political makeup in the cities and towns, things like that?

MC: Well, it was a largely Republican District, with the city of Altoona, which was traditionally Republican, was trending Democratic. Now, that's not true today, but it had a strong Democratic trend in it. I had one ward of the city of Altoona, the largest ward, the area that used to be a separate municipality. It was a railroad town, the railroad largely built for housing, called Juniata. Let me correct; I think that was thirteenth ward.

I said eighth. It was thirteenth ward. That was the largest ward in the city and that was part of the 80th District, at the time. All the area surrounding it, to the Centre County line, I mean, to the Cambria County to Bedford to Huntington. I mean, essentially the whole county, except for most of the city of Altoona, was in it and also except for Tyrone and that end, which belonged to Sam Hayes [Samuel E. Hayes, Jr.; State Representative, 1971-1992; State Secretary of Agriculture, 1997-2003] at the time, and was really just an outgrowth of a Huntington County Seat. So, I had a very large District; a District that was difficult to travel around because it basically went—all the borders of Blair County.

NR: So, how did you reach your constituents in such a large District?

MC: Drive.

NR: Driving?

MC: Right.

NR: Okay. And did you have a District office at the time?

MC: Yes. I had a District office, and I was the first Legislator in that area to have a District office, so. And it was right in Newry. It was in the town that was fairly centrally located, but the reason it had to be in Newry was not just pure parochialism; it was just that we didn't have a budget for District offices. So, what I did was I rented a room that

used to be, a hundred years ago, a small doctor's office on the town square. It was owned by some cousins and they used it to keep their model train sets in—and, by cousins, I mean they were more like cousins to my grandfather. They were older folks. So, I rented that office, they moved the train set out—

NR: That was nice of them.

MC: —and it was enough room for two desks and some files, and that became my Legislative District office. And, the rent was real cheap, and when we would need a bathroom, we'd use their bathroom, and when we would need a kitchen, we used their kitchen. I mean, things that you just wouldn't think of. You couldn't do today. It was almost like having an office in your own home.

NR: Right.

MC: And, I paid a ridiculously low rent. They basically were donating the space. I didn't have the money for a full-time person, so what we did was, my campaign manager, who was also related, we put a phone in the office. That phone also rang in my home, at my grandmothers. That also rang at her home, and so the office was open half the day, but the phone rang in our homes the rest of the day, so the phone was always answered. So, that's the way we ran it for a while. Then, the Legislature in [19]77, [19]78 did provide some money for home offices, so we were able to go to full-time staffing of that office. So, the office was open five days a week, well, actually, plus Saturday mornings,

and I took it by myself on Saturday mornings, and then by appointment other times. So, our legislative operation was six days a week with official office hours, and then additional times as people required, and then plus, as a Legislator, you're traveling all over the place. So, then, as now, it was an exhausting job.

NR: Did you feel like, because it was the first year that there was a District office there, did you feel like your constituents were aware of that service and used it pretty heavily, or, do you think—?

MC: Yeah, it was a busy office. I'm not sure it was as busy as offices are today.

NR: Right.

MC: But, it could be, because we didn't have enough staff, and then you didn't have the staff in Harrisburg to back them up, so it couldn't have been. But, it was a very busy office. At least when I was there, I think there were always people waiting, and it was a very popular thing to open up a home office. I didn't get any grief about opening it up. Nobody thought it was a waste of money. Everybody thought it was an awfully good idea.

NR: So, what did you think of the Capitol when you first came as a Representative in 1977?

MC: Well, I mean, it's a beautiful, almost imposing building, and when you first see it—well, I had seen the Capitol before.

NR: Right.

MC: So, I mean, it wasn't my first time walking in. And, after a couple years up here, you sort of get, you know, you forget to look around. But, it is, I mean, it's a beautiful building, and, in those days, it was falling apart. It was still a beautiful building, but you could see the water damage in the murals in the rotunda where you could see the white chalk, kind of, and, you know, you could see the murals flaking apart because of water coming through. Things were not, of course, as bright as they are now, but the Capitol was in dire need of repair, but, even then, it was a beautiful, imposing building.

NR: How did you feel as you were being Sworn-In?

MC: I don't know. Certainly not any different than any other Member. I mean, it's a very proud moment the first time you are Sworn-In as a Member of the General Assembly. And, I think, it's just great pride, and, of course, your family is very happy, and your campaign people that are up are, you know, ecstatic, and this is something that many of them thought wasn't going to happen, and it did. And, so, I mean, it's just a moment of great ceremony and pride.

NR: What was it like serving as a rank-and-file Member in the late Seventies, and how did it compare with your expectations?

MC: Well, when I first came here, I was in the 620 Complex, which is now broken up into offices, but, at the time, was mostly open space. And, how this was, is, I had a desk here, I could lean back, put my elbow on the desk of Representative Gray [Clifford Gray; State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1977-1982] from Philadelphia, who was sitting behind me; he leaned back, put his elbow on another Legislator's desk, and it's like the old pictures of the turn of the century insurance offices.

NR: Right.

MC: I mean, that's what it was like, and then you had a few shared clerical desks in the middle, and that was it. You had a desk, a two-drawer file cabinet and a phone in a room with, you know, a number of other Legislators. And, what struck me is, here I am, about twenty-one years old at the time, I had more staff support and more office space as essentially an intern working for the Chamber of Commerce than I had as a State Legislator.

NR: Oh, wow.

MC: Then, after I voted for the State Budget and got in lots of trouble for it, the Shapp Budget, as they called it, but, anyway, I became—they formed a special Subcommittee

on Veteran's Homes, which was important to my District because we were converting a closed State Hospital into a Veteran's Home. And, so, I got a small, semi-private office where I actually got my own secretary, and a lot of Members moved up to getting their own secretary or one secretary being shared by two rather than by many. So, we were staffing up at the time. So, I had a small office in an L-shape that just had room for, like, my desk, a chair in front of it, and a secretary's desk facing the wall on, sort of, part of the L. And, that was just luxurious space (*laugh*), but, when I left, that was converted into a closet.

NR: Oh, no. (*laugh*)

MC: No longer used for an office. It was converted into a closet. It is up on the Senate fifth floor hyphen now.

NR: That says something about the size of the office at the time. (*laugh*)

MC: That tells you about the size! (*laugh*)

NR: That's good. Would you, from the way you described the schedule of your District office, it seems like you would have considered yourself a full-time Legislator, correct?

MC: Oh, there was no doubt about it. And, as a matter of fact, and I campaigned, and at the time—and some of those discussions we are having today on legislative reform—I

campaigned on being a full-time Legislator. Pennsylvania was moving to staffing and Legislative pay that would make it full-time. There was a lot of public support, that it ought to be a full-time job, and I campaigned that I would be a full-time Legislator, and I was running against a part-time Legislator. So, I said I would be a full-time, I said I would have a District office. That was actually part of the campaign in 1976.

NR: Wow. So, were there other Members of the House at the time that were part-time Legislators?

MC: It was beginning to be a full-time job no matter what you called it, but, yeah, there were a lot of part-time Legislators.

NR: Was the seniority system a big issue when you were serving?

MC: No, I think that was, like today, the seniority system was largely accepted. As, I think, it is today. We don't have a lot of support in the Legislature today that we ought to be able to elect freshmen Committee Chairman or anything like that. And, it was true then. Probably, freshmen Legislators had less to say, generally, although, that was changing, because with the legislative reforms and modernizations of the Sixties and Seventies, part of that was that rank-and-file should have more say about the processes here and shouldn't have to sit out, serve an internship, you know, where you are seen and not heard before you are able to move legislation or speak on the Floor, or whatever. So, that was changing.

NR: Who were the leaders at the time?

MC: When I first came here, Herb Fineman [State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1955-1977; Speaker of the House, 1969-1972, 1975-1977] was the Speaker. Herb Fineman was indicted and convicted for obstruction of justice under some rather strange circumstances. He was found innocent of the main charges but found guilty of obstructing the investigation on selling college admissions. But, Herb Fineman, who was actually a big legislative reformer, I mean, the prime mover of the reform movement, as far as modernization of the Legislature, resigned his seat, and K. Leroy Irvis [State Representative, Allegheny County, 1959-1988; Speaker of the House, 1977-1978, 1983-1988] became Speaker. The venerable James Manderino [State Representative, Westmoreland County, 1967-1989, Speaker of the House, 1989] became Majority Leader. On the Republican Side, you had Bob Butera [Robert J. Butera; State Representative, Montgomery County, 1963-1977] as the Republican Leader, and Matt Ryan [Matthew J. Ryan; State Representative, Delaware County, 1963-2003; Speaker of the House, 1995-2003] as the Whip, and Caucus Chairman was Sam Hayes, also from Tyrone.

NR: What were your experiences like with them, and how would you describe their leadership styles?

MC: I always got along with Sam Hayes. I mean, he was a bordering Legislator, and a real gentleman. I still get, you know, get along with him very well and talk to him once in a while. So, the city Legislator, the person that handled most of Altoona, was John Milliron [State Representative, Blair County, 1975-1978], who is a lobbyist in town here today. And, so, we had a good relationship, and I had known him before. Good working relationship with the Legislators up here. My age made me a novelty, so everybody knew who I was, whether I knew them or not, but being a freshman Legislator is being a freshman Legislator. I mean, you still have to learn the ropes and find your way around and make those connections and do those kinds of things. So, I don't think that my position as a freshman Legislator was terribly different from other freshman Legislators. And, we had a whole batch of young Legislators, which came in in [19]74, [19]76 because in the post-Watergate area, both in Congress and here, the ages plummeted. I mean, long experience was not the electoral advantage that it used to be. And, so we had a number of Legislators that were twenty-four, twenty-six. I mean, I might have stuck out that I was twenty-one, but only by a couple of years, so it wasn't that shocking.

NR: So, you mentioned the staffing changes during your time. Did you feel like there were other major changes in the wake of Fineman's reforms? Do you think that there were other—?

MC: Oh, clearly. Committees became operating entities. I mean, in the Sixties, committees, you know, they just met to report out a bill at the request of leadership. They really didn't, you know, meet, discuss. They didn't even have a place to meet and

discuss. And, when I was first was like, for example, on the Agricultural Committee, we met at a large table in the Chairman's office, where some of the Members stood around the outside, some of the Members sat—the more senior Members sat at the table, and had a quick vote and left. You didn't have a lot of hearings and things like that. I mean, but, committees were really empowered by that system, because once committees had staff, committees were able to hold hearings, take time to discuss legislation, which they may or may not do now, but at least it's their option. I think they probably do more of it. And, when I became a Special Subcommittee Chairman for Veteran's Homes, that's all we did, was hold informational hearings, you know; how the process is going to develop in the nursing home system, what are we doing at Hollidaysburg, which was the nursing home in my area, which I was very concerned about getting that up and running, for employment reasons. And so, it was also a time when the National Conference of State Legislature was recommending more legislative involvement, administrative oversight of regulations. So, not only to hold hearings, but to have staff working on watching the regulatory system. There was a general feeling that the regulatory system was sort-of too far away from their statutory authorization and then the Legislature really should be following up what happens with laws they pass and how the administration is enforcing them. So, that was something new at the time, and I introduced legislation back to begin a formal legislative oversight system in Pennsylvania.

NR: Did you have any mentors as you began your career in the House?

MC: You know, nobody asked me that before, and I'm not really sure. I think, at home, of course, my Uncle Bob was very active in politics. By then, he had moved back to Blair County. You know, Dr. Heely, the County Chairman was an anti-Papist. Back home, I certainly had political mentors. In Harrisburg, probably less so, other than John Milliron, who was the neighboring Legislator and only had two more years experience than I did, [and] Representative David Wright [State Representative, Armstrong, Clarion, Jefferson and Venango Counties, 1977-1996]; kind-of the guys that I palled around with when we were up here, that was the support network. And I have to think, many senior Legislators were helpful. I don't know that they spent the time to really be mentoring them. Legislators at the time, like now, are just very busy people. Gil DeMedio [A J DeMedio; State Representative, Washington County, 1967-1982] who I worked with a lot, was Chairman of the Military and Veterans' Affairs Committee, so I spent a lot of time working with him and his staff, you know, Bob Hollis. So, I'm not sure anybody really picked up that, a direct mentoring role here, although, back in the Legislative District, I certainly had people that were involved in politics and played a role.

NR: Right. Can you explain the role of camaraderie in the House, and how that played a role in your—?

MC: Different then than now. I mean, House Members, when you were in session, just spent all their time together, and I mean, till two and three o'clock in the morning. You worked in Harrisburg, you went to committee meetings, you went to dinner together in, usually, fairly large groups, then you went to certain legislative bars together, which,

became somewhat scandalous. And then, after that, then you went to the same after-hours clubs, like the—I'm not sure they were totally legal, but, you had a Democratic club. We went over to the—I can't think of what the name of the other was—some of these social organizations.

NR: Right.

MC: At one time it was the Moose downtown, made famous by K. Leroy Irvis's lawsuit. I can't remember the one that was the West Shore that was always open late in violation, I think, of liquor control rules and reg[ulation]s. So, you were out every night you were here very, very late, and everybody was—Republicans and Democrats and everything. There was more division between the House and the Senate. I mean, the Senators went to Catalano's, or there was another place in town that the Senators and maybe a few House Leaders ended up going to. Rank-and-file, and, you know, Committee Chairman or whatever from the House, went to Lombardo's, went to Harry's Bar, went to some of the clubs, in large groups. And, the press did, too, and the press was there. I mean, so, reporters were there, what staff we had were there, and what did you talk about? Well, you talked about sports, you talked about whatever, but you also talked about legislation. Did you make agreements on legislation sitting down at the bar? Yes. You did all the time. And, it's just like power lunching today, or going to lunch today and, you know, coming to some agreements about what has to be done.

NR: Right.

MC: You did that afterwards. So, there was a great deal of camaraderie. And, it was less professional, but more of a twenty-four hour thing. I mean, when you were in Harrisburg, you were just immersed in this, and it's not like you went home at six [o'clock] and watched television for a couple hours and then went to bed and came into the office in the morning at nine [o'clock]. It didn't work that way. You went straight through. In that sense, you were always working, but it was more fun.

NR: Yeah, defiantly. So, you said, on a professional level, it wasn't that shocking that you were so young, because there were other young Members. But, how did you find it on a relational level, with other Members? Do you think that it played a role at all?

MC: It may have. I certainly didn't notice it. What's key here is how well you're willing to interact with other people on legislation, how reasonable you are, and everybody has a vote. It's not like, "Oh, well he's too young to have a vote." I mean, you have a vote on the Floor of the House because you were elected to have it. So, they have to deal with you at least on that level.

NR: Right.

MC: And so, I really didn't have any problems, I don't think, dealing with my colleagues, and you didn't have those kind-of divisions like you have today. I mean, today there's less interaction between people on the Republican side of the aisle and the

Democratic side of the aisle than there were in my day—when I was first up here. Staff were more collegial. I think it was a little bit different in time. You still have some of that today, of course. But, I just didn't notice that that was any problem, other than I was still a freshman. I think that was more important than my age.

NR: So, what were the major pieces of legislation in which you were involved, and what was your role there?

MC: Well, my major legislative work was oversight of developing of the Veteran's Nursing Homes, retirement homes system. That's where I probably spent most of my legislative time. I was also interested in the legislative modernization and reform movement. I introduced legislation, I think, the first legislation, to provide for a regulatory review process. Parts of that initial legislation became law in later years. As a staff person, I worked on that, as well. I introduced legislation having to do with parking for handicapped; "blue-line" legislation. At the time, there was model legislation going around, which I introduced in Pennsylvania, where, instead of having a sign up, a blue curb would mark handicapped-only parking. And, you probably have a list of my legislation there. I can't think of some other things, but, I think, the ones that I really worked on before was the blue-curb legislation and then legislative oversight were major ones that really, kind of, strike me. There were other things dealing with—we had a problem in my District: black lung. And, I think I had some legislation along those lines. Somebody said, "Well, what happened with all that?" And I said, "Well, they're all dead, unfortunately." So, there were things like that.

NR: Why did you feel that legislative oversight and regulatory reform was such an important issue?

MC: I mean, you're talking about the 1970s, 1960s. The size of the State Government and the Federal Government had just, you know, just ballooned. I mean, it was just this huge bureaucracy, now having, with their regulatory power, a huge impact on people's lives, and a huge ability to shape legislation by the regulations that they promulgate to implement legislation. And there was a feeling that there was a huge disparity with this gigantic bureaucracy and this relatively under-funded, small, legislative branch trying to keep control over that. In other words, because they are doing all of this at our behest, the Legislature had to pass the laws giving them authority to regulate and to carry out these laws, but we had lost control over that part of the process, and that part of the process was ballooning, and the resources allocated to that part of the process was ballooning, and the Legislature was still stuck with a 19th Century sort-of Institution.

NR: Right.

MC: So, we were trying to get sort of parity and regain control over legislation, because regulations have the force of law. They are no different in that sense than statutory law. So, the Legislature had to regain some control over that process, and I felt that very strongly. And, I think, I don't feel as strongly about that, because I think today we have

more capabilities of balancing the power of the Executive, but there is a feeling at the time that the balance of power was strewn way in favor of the Executive branch.

NR: Interesting. Do you remember a very difficult issue or vote that you had to deal with?

MC: Well, the budget; the so-called Shapp budget of [19]77 was just played up as the political issue of the era.

NR: Right.

MC: I think, looking back, I mean, that's kind of silly to think of that as the major media issue of the time. And, it was. I mean, it was the major—day in, day out, that was all that was important was the bloated Shapp budget, just to pay for Shapp corruption. I mean, you look back, and I'm thinking, "Boy, that was a real," I mean, to think that was the issue of the time. But, it was. I mean, that was the major difficult issue of the time.

NR: Did you struggle with that vote?

MC: Oh yeah, I waited. I waited. I was one of the last holdouts. I was one of the last two votes to pass the Shapp budget, which is one of the main reasons I lost the next election.

NR: Right. What committees were you involved in, and—

MC: I was on the Agriculture Committee because my District was largely, although I had part of the city of Altoona and some of the small boroughs, it was agricultural to a large extent. I was on the Labor Committee because I was always interested in labor law. I had done a small internship, which I forgot to tell you, when I was college with the AFL-CIO-COPE, the political action wing of the AFL-CIO [American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations], although I was assigned to work on a Republican Campaign. I worked on the Senatorial Campaign of Dick Schweiker [Pennsylvania Governor, 2001-2003] for that internship. I had taken labor law in college, so I was interested in labor issues, so I went on the Labor Relations Committee, and that was sort of like the committee I was sort-of intellectually interested in. Military Affairs [Committee] because of the constituent concerns in my District and the Veteran's Homes issue, which I was tied up in, and the other one was the Agriculture Committee. So, I was just on those three committees, and I became Chairman of a Select Committee on Veteran's Homes, under the Military and Veteran's Affairs Committee.

NR: How was your experience, as a freshman Member, being Chair of a Special Subcommittee?

MC: Well, it worked out very well, I mean, I can't recall who was on that, but, I mean, we had a small group that, on the committee, all of them were very interested in moving the issue forward. A band of brothers. I mean, there were no partisan splits. I mean, the

only thing we wanted was to keep this process moving. We had one Veteran's Home, at the time, in Erie. Obviously, one Veteran's Home in Erie does not make a program. We wanted to open the Hollidaysburg, and at the same time we were searching for another sight more in Eastern Pennsylvania so we'd have Western, Central, Eastern, and we were just extremely active in legislative oversight and in promotion of the program.

NR: Did you, as a Legislator, have a relationship with the media?

MC: In the District, I did, but, not in Harrisburg.

NR: Well, as a freshman Member, it's probably harder—

MC: Yeah, but Altoona was its own media market, and then, Johnstown, well, Altoona-Johnstown is today considered one media market, so both Johnstown and Altoona covered local Legislators heavily.

NR: How did you feel that relationship was?

MC: Well, it was basically a good relationship, I think. I don't think I had really had problems with that relationship. I had a problem with the Shapp Budget and sort-of the Shapp so-called corruption scandals sort-of taking on this life of their own, much like the Legislative Pay Raise did today; same sort of thing, and most of it was nonsense. But, how they dealt with me, I really didn't have a problem. And radio was more important

then. We had a lot of radio news. Every station had a radio news division, which is not true today. So, I would be talking to radio news directors all of the time. They'd be calling you for quotes on just about everything. I mean, today, you have to go, you know, pound down the door, "Please take a quote from me." The local media called local legislators all the time in Altoona, and I'm not sure if that's true today.

NR: Did you have much interaction with lobbyists here in Harrisburg?

MC: Yeah, and that hasn't changed much over the years. There were a lot of lobbyists in the 1970s, and you dealt with them all the time. And, I dealt with labor lobbyists, obviously, on labor issues. A friend of mine was actually with the Pennsylvania Farmer's Association , PFA, which is now the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau. [He] actually used my office as his camp when he was on the Hill. I'm trying to think of who else. But, just the whole range. I mean, US Steel had a lobbyist up here, Phil McFarron, who, they wrote a lot of business/labor issues. We dealt with some tax issues.

NR: What did you think about them at the time, and has your opinion changed?

MC: Well, I never was a cynic about the legislative process.

NR: Okay.

MC: I mean, in Blair County, if you said, "Well, which side is he on?" Well, I was an organization politician. A young man, but, I was with the Democratic Organization. I was not in the opposition camp. So, I was not cynical. I had worked with the AFL-CIO on campaigns. I was not cynical about that process. I want to keep lobbyists—I mean, I know what their job is, you know. I don't want to be owned by one, and that was part of my campaign against my predecessor was, he was owned by some of them. I don't want to be owned, but, I mean, was I willing to work with lobbyists and get information from them and hear from them? Yeah. I didn't have any problem with that at all, and, in that sense, my outlook toward the legislative process was probably more mature than some new freshmen, and I don't know where I got that. Well, one of my mentors, actually, a political science professor, Lou Leopold at Altoona Campus, Lou was also a ward leader in the city of Altoona. Lou was also a distant cousin of my grandfather's.

NR: Okay.

MC: So, all these connections to Lou Leopold. Lou Leopold was my first political science professor, so himself, being sort of an organization politician, you know, a ward leader, and all that, and being one of my political mentors, I think I had a more mature view of politics than some.

NR: Okay. What aspect of your job as a House Member did you enjoy the most?

MC: I liked working in Harrisburg on the nursing home issues. I mean, as a freshman, as a young person, I was able really, I felt, to make a difference on that issue. So, I enjoyed because I realized that I was probably, as young as I was, as new as I was in this process, I was probably a key person on that issue. And, that was a good feeling.

NR: Right.

MC: In the District, I liked, sort-of the, I liked a lot of the community meetings. I liked, really, going out and meeting with people. I didn't always like sitting in the office, as some people would call it, "holding court," where, you know, people would come in and say, "I have this problem. I have this problem. I have this;" I did that. Nowadays, only the staff does that, mostly, but I did that. But, I didn't really enjoy that as much, so the office hours were painful to me. But, I did like going out to community meetings, and I was heavily booked. I did get to the point, by my second year, where I hadn't had, like, a day off, you know—every day, including Sundays, usually you had something going on for like the first year and a half. And, I thought, "Oh, my gosh." You know? "I've got to get a little time." So, my dad and I and my uncle went to Ireland for eight days, and so that was my only vacation in the two years, and I mean, including weekends, mostly.

NR: Wow.

MC: So, that got a little tiring, and, if I had been reelected, I probably would have had to start figuring out how to regulate time. Legislators have all of this pressure to do all of

these things at once. I mean, you could full up every minute of every day with no exceptions very easily. I mean, I think there is more pressure on rural Legislators that way, and I've had a lot of them tell me that. Plus, you have this drive to everything. Then, urban Legislators, I think, have the advantage that they can sort-of share. There is a community group, usually represented by several Legislators, as long as somebody shows up, they really, you know, don't care. When you represent, like, a whole county, like Blair County, if you don't show up, nobody else is going to, and then they're pissed. So, you know, like the pressure to actually go to things is—at least, I felt—well, you know, they say, "You have to come. If you don't, nobody else will." I mean, you have to be there. And, so, you really didn't feel like you could turn somebody down or say, "I'll get some other Member of the delegation, I mean.

NR: You had to be there.

MC: You had to be there, so, it was a tiring job that way.

NR: So, would you say that the hours and the schedule and the demanding office obligations were your least favorite thing about the job, or was there something else?

MC: I mean, I still enjoyed that, it's just that, I mean, that would get to be too much at some point. And, I always used to joke, but it wasn't entirely a joke, since I represented a part of the city and I represented a part of the rural area, I mean, farmers would start

calling you in the morning about seven o'clock and figure, well, they'd already been up three hours—

NR: Right.

MC: —and people from the city would call you at, you know, ten o'clock, or so at night, figuring, well, you hadn't gone to bed yet, so. So, your phone rang from like seven in the morning to ten or eleven at night. And, when I left the House, I usually would turn off the ringer so that my grandmother didn't have to answer the office line, but if I was there, I always had it on so I could get called. And, I did get called sometimes in the middle of the night. Somebody would have something that they at least thought was an emergency.

NR: Right.

MC: One time somebody called me that they had a snake in their basement at probably about two o'clock in the morning.

NR: (*laugh*)

MC: And, of course, there's not a lot I can do about this at the time, so I asked him to describe the snake, and it was pretty clear that it was all black, very large. I said, "Well, that's probably a black snake. I don't think that it's really going to hurt you." [I said] that I would "call somebody in the morning for you." And, I called an Ag[ricultural]

Extension Agent at the time and said, "I have somebody with a black snake in a basement. I really don't know how to handle this." They said, "We'll take care of it for you." You know, so Penn State Ag[ricultural] Extension saved me from the great black snake controversy.

NR: (*laugh*)

MC: But, that was a call, like, in the middle of the night, and somebody just figured they didn't know who to call, and called their State Legislator.

NR: Call your State Legislator. (*laugh*) Do you have a fondest memory of serving in the House?

MC: I can't think that one issue, or one moment, really sticks out. I'm not that kind of person anyway, I don't think, "Oh, well this was a great moment." It was a great time. I'd say it was two very exciting years. But is there a moment? No, I don't think I'll pick a moment.

NR: Do you have a favorite story that you tell?

MC: Well, probably the snake story. Nowadays, when we're back to legislative reform, I tell people stories, you know, that people say, "Well, I want to go back to the good old days when you had a part-time Legislature," and all that and, you know, a return to

citizens' legislature. I tell the stories of what a citizens' legislature really was. It meant that, like, my predecessor, like, it was getting to be a full-time job, he was paid fifteen thousand dollars as a Legislator and twenty thousand dollars as a Community Affairs Assistant Director in the Harrisburg office of Bell Telephone. We had a lot of guys like that. I mean, there was some corporation that was paying their legislative salary, in a sense. You know, I mean, he was making thirty five thousand dollars a year, but most of it was being paid for by Bell Telephone. I don't think that's good for legislation.

NR: Right.

MC: And I don't think the public is well served with that kind of system. And, I think it would be very easy to go back to that.

NR: Right.

MC: So, I tell that story, and others. I remember when one of the former Chairman of Appropriations retired and, you know, he told the Legislature, he said, "Well,"—Marty Mullen [Martin Mullen; State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1955-1982] was his name—he told the Legislature, "Well, when I first came down here," he says, "nobody was paid anything so everybody and," you know, "everybody and all the Republicans were on different corporation or public utility payrolls," he says, "the Democrats out in Pittsburgh, well, they were all on the Westinghouse payroll. We had other guys that were

all on local government payrolls, where you would be a local government clerk and a Legislator, you know."

NR: Right.

MC: I don't think that's a great system.

NR: It's a little conflict of interests.

MC: Yeah, somebody else is paying your tab, and you have a lot of guys down here, too, that were lawyers, so their law offices really picked up their costs. I mean, they still got paid for being in the firm, even though they weren't necessarily doing the work. But they may have been referring a lot of business in and helping get the name of the firm out there. You had a lot of real estate people. Again, that may be good advertising. That doesn't mean that those Legislators were bad people or that, I mean, they didn't do good things for the state; they did. But, there was just a huge built-in bias. And, I think that really warps the legislative system, where, in recruitment—very unusual, the way I got recruited—but how a person selects to run for the Legislature. If you end up with a system where only people with either independent wealth or who are sponsored can afford to run, well, that changes what the Legislature is like. It doesn't mean that they're bad people. It just means that that's going to, it is going to have a real impact on the Legislative Institution.

NR: So, what did you do after you left the House?

MC: After I left the House, Milton Shapp was still Governor, so they gave me a spot as the Director of the Bureau of Standard Weights and Measures in the Department of Agriculture, and I was over there for six, eight months, something like that until the Thornburgh [Dick Thornburgh, Pennsylvania Governor, 1979-1987] Administration caught up with me and cut me loose. But, during that time, there was TMI [Three Mile Island], which is one of the reasons why I stayed on. Anybody that had anything dealing with monitoring of anything, which my division did, kind-of stayed on for a while because they didn't want to reshuffle the bureaucracy in the middle of the TMI aftermath[2]. So, the Foods and Chem[icals] guy and the Weights and Measures guy—me—got to stay on for a couple of extra months. And then, when they reorganized the Department of Agriculture and finally caught me and sent me on my way, Jim Manderino, the Majority Leader, hired me for Democratic Legislative Research. Several years later, when the Democrats went into the minority because Democrats took the majority again in [19]82, Mark Cohen [State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1974-present] became Chairman of the Labor Relations Committee, and for Jim Manderino, I had worked labor issues, so it ended up being worked out that I would be the new Executive Director of the Labor Relations Committee, and I stayed there for eight or nine years with Mark Cohen. Mark Cohen was elected into Leadership, and I just moved up with him.

[2] On March 28, 1979, a partial core meltdown on Unit 2 of the nuclear power plant occurred.

NR: Okay. How did it feel being a Member of the House, and then after being in the Department of Agriculture, to move back to Legislative Staff?

MC: Well, I think that's a hard move in a sense. I mean, I understood that I had to really play a very, very different role. And, I wasn't a Member that long. So, I mean, I tried to get myself mentally ready to play a different role and try not to act as a former Member because I didn't think that was really appropriate, and it wasn't a good long-term strategy for developing a career here.

NR: So, did you feel like your experience as a Legislator impacted your career?

MC: Well, it definitely helped. I mean, it definitely helped. I mean, I understood—as some other staff did that had done campaign work and other things—but I understand the pressures on Legislators.

NR: Right.

MC: I understand the home pressures. I understand the political pressures. I understand what has to go into that decision-making process maybe better than a lot of other new staff people would.

NR: So, do you see a lot of your former colleagues from your time in the Legislature through working on staff and—

MC: Oh, yeah.

NR: —do you have a lot of contact with them?

MC: I still have some contact with them. I shouldn't say a lot. I have less contact, like most people up here, that, you know, we do less going out in the evening. Basically, when work's done, it's not usually very early, but, I mean, I go home, you know, to a wife and son rather than going out all night with the boys as it was.

NR: As an active member of the staff of the House, you have witnessed a lot of technological changes. How have those changes affected the legislative process?

MC: I think the bad change is people talk to each other less. It's a less collegial body. From the research perspective, what you used to do is you had to talk to a lot of lobbyists that might have better information than you did. You spent a lot of time as a staff person over in the State Library. Of course, today, with the Internet and with all the resources, I mean, you just sit at your desk at the computer screen and just, I mean, you can just download ten times more research and information on any topic than you could ever get before with weeks and weeks of work. So, I mean, that's the big change, and that I do less walking around—any staff person today—does less walking around talking to people, which is what we used to do, and an awful lot of time with "Google Scholar" or, you know, something like that.

NR: Yeah, definitely. Now that you are an established member of the legislative staff, do you feel that you have influence over policy issues that rival your experience as a Legislator at all, or?

MC: No. I'm not elected to have agenda control.

NR: Right.

MC: I mean, that's for the Leaders of the Legislature elected by the Members of the Caucus. I've always understood that that's not my job.

NR: Right.

MC: Can staff people be more influential than some freshman Legislators? Maybe, but that's only in that they develop the research that's being used to push legislation. But, it's certainly, it's not their role to be setting the agenda or doing that sort of thing.

NR: You've also been very academically active since your legislative service, and you completed your bachelor's degree in [19]89 and, later, you went on to get a Master's in 2005, both from Penn State, at different campuses. As someone with a degree in Political Science, and a Master's in American Studies, how do you think the study of politics and

history relate to the actual day-to-day work of politics, and do you think that they are separate or inseparable, or just complimentary?

MC: I think they are inseparable. I've always taken courses and tried to write papers and do that stuff on development of the Legislative Institution, development of political institutions, historical development of Pennsylvania. That's my area of interest. I'm interested in Pennsylvania history, especially the development of political and social institutions. I'm interested in the historical development of the General Assembly and its processes. I'm interested in the legislative process in general. So, all of those things tie in. I've always liked to be able to step back and see the big picture. I think that's why I'm not as cynical as some about the process. I mean, sometimes you get down there and you look at this little thing and say, you know, and you get kind of cynical about that, and, "What's his motivations there?" I think stepping back and looking at the whole process and the whole Institution gives you a different perspective. The Institution needs Legislators with different motivations, whether they be ideologues; whether they be Party loyalists; or people that want to be issue experts. You need all of those people in the legislative process, and you shouldn't say, "Oh, well, he's an ideologue." You need him. But, if you had all ideologues, I mean, the place would come to a grinding halt. If you didn't have the parliamentarians and the people who care about process, it would come to a grinding halt. I mean, the Legislature needs all the varieties of Legislators that we have.

NR: Right. And, you've done a lot of work, also academically, with the PPSA [Pennsylvania Political Science Association]. Correct?

MC: Yes.

NR: What, specifically, have you been—?

MC: The Pennsylvania Political Science Association, which I joined through my relative Lou Leopold many, many years ago and started going to meetings, I started to become more active with them, mostly with their conferences. I've presented papers at conferences, but, usually, what I've done is Chaired panels of practical politicians. So, what I've done is recruit practical politicians to come in and discuss issues of interest to academic political scientists, and that's kind of been my role: that every year I try to set up a panel or two on subjects that might be of interest to the members of the Political Science Association who are, by-and-large, members of college faculties throughout Pennsylvania, either in Public Policy or Public Administration or Political Science.

NR: Do you feel like you still continue to remain active and engaged in politics and the political process here?

MC: I'm not as active and engaged in the partisan campaign, home elections kind-of things as I used to do. I leave that to younger people with free weekends. You know, I have a teenager in high school band and I don't have free weekends anymore to devote to

that, so I leave that up to other people. I think the nature of my job in leadership right now, which is to keep Members informed about bills on the Floor of the House. I'm not, sort-of, developing or promoting policy as I did when I was with the Labor Relations Committee. It's a different role, so that I'm less involved with, sort-of, like, the policy-making front. What I'm more involved with is trying to make sure Members have the tools to make decisions.

NR: Right.

MC: And that's the difference, in part, of being on leadership staff and being on committee staff. I enjoyed committee staff, to an extent, more because it allowed you to focus on an issue area, and to promote issues you're concerned about, your Members were concerned about, but you were, too: minimum wage, or whatever, which I still get involved in. But, it's a different sort-of job, and it's less policy oriented and more trying to make sure Members have the tools they need.

NR: Have you ever considered running again?

MC: No. I ran three times. I spent a lot of money doing that. I can't afford it. And, now that I live in Lancaster County, I live in a District where a Democrat has no chance whatsoever, so that I won't even be tempted to run.

NR: (*laugh*) So, as a former Legislator, and someone with an abundance of experience in the House, both as a staff member and as a former Legislator, what is your advice for new Members of the Legislature?

MC: Well, I try not to give new Member's advice, especially how they should run. Every Member has to set his own pace—

NR: Right.

MC: —and set his own style. It is determined, in part, by, I mean, the skills and perspectives he brings to the job, but also what the District expects of him. So, I don't really presume to tell anybody how to do that. I will tell new Legislators, or anybody that will listen, that the Institution is important, and that the Institution has the ability to balance the power of the Governor; that the Institution has the ability to offset the pressures from interest groups; that the Institution has the ability to staff Members so that they can respond to their constituency, is all very important. And, so the extent that I'm willing to give advice, it's on those institutional issues. Not on how any Legislator should conduct himself.

NR: Well, I'm going to give you the last word, if you have anything else to add about your time here, both as a Member or as a staff member. Is there anything else that you think we didn't cover?

MC: No, I think you've covered everything very well. The only thing that I have been spending more time on lately because I get closer to retirement, and that is who is going to come after me and after us in legislative staff. So, I find myself spending more time working with interns, developing current staff or people that are interested in government, and spending what little free time I have occasionally teaching a course over at Penn State, again, working with people that might be of interest to government. I think it's very important that we have a citizenry that understands the legislative process, and since I enjoy working with the legislative process, I enjoy talking about it, I enjoy teaching about the legislative process. And, so, if I have developed a new mission, that's probably it.

NR: Okay. Well, thank you very much for being here with us today.

MC: Thank you very much. I enjoyed it.

NR: It was very informative. Thanks.