PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

The Honorable Roy Reinard (R)

178th District

Bucks County

1983-2002

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

Transcribed by: Nathan J. Robinson

Heidi Mays (HM): I am here with former representative Roy Reinard, who represented the 178th District which consisted of Bucks County, from the years 1983-2002. Thank you for being with us here today.

The Honorable Roy Reinard (RR): Thank you. You bet.

HM: Could you please start out by describing your family background for us?

RR: Sure. I went to West Chester College, now University, and when I got out, I always had an interest in being in politics – I was a political science major – but our family had a, at that time, second-generation insurance company, which I went into after I graduated from school. But, I always had an interest in politics and ran for a local office in my township, and I got elected to that, and that spring-boarded me to where we are today. But, I have been an active insurance agent for the last 27 years, and all during my time in the Legislature, which kind of made me a little bit unique. There were only a handful of us that actually did more than one thing, and coming from the community that I represent, I thought it was important to be a citizen legislator, and that is basically the course I took, and I think it helped me well.

HM: You talked about your family business; was anyone in your family active in politics?

RR: Actually, it was. My great-grandfather was actually – wasn't born, but he moved to Arizona when the trains were making their way west, and he settled in Tombstone, Arizona – and he actually got elected in local politics in Tombstone, was elected Mayor in the late, late 1800s, and actually then was, when Arizona was becoming from a territory to a new state, got elected to the Arizona Legislature when it first became a state, and represented the southern part of Arizona there. I didn't even know about it until about 10 years into my service, when my grandmother, as a matter of fact, mentioned, "Oh, my father was a Member." And so, when I heard that, I contacted the state of Arizona and got a hold of all their records that they had on his name and a number of pieces of legislation that he dealt with and worked through. So, it was kind of neat to share it, and I've been out to Arizona a number of times. My parents have a house out there currently, and my sister lives out there with her family, and I have been to Tombstone, where he is buried, in the courthouse where he worked, and they still have a whole bunch of his memorabilia around, and they actually have a parade every year in Tombstone called "Helldorado," and it's a parade that he actually started. And it's a period of time when all of the locals, the men, won't shave for a period of about 60 days, and they go back to their scruffy days out on the range, so it's kind of neat.

HM: Why did you decide to become a Republican?

RR: Basically, when I was at West Chester, I had to register to vote; I was 18 at that time. It was a tough time when I was turning 18, because I was a freshman in college and the Vietnam War [1959-1975] was still going on, and it was at that time in [19]72, the

tide was pretty much anti-war in the country at that point, and a local professor from West Chester was running for a local office and I wanted to make sure I could vote for him, and it was time to register, and so I registered Republican, helped out my local professor, and from then on, took it back home and got involved politically in my area where I grew up and took it from there.

HM: Was there any reason why you ran for the House the first time?

RR: Well, when I was in college, I could never understand why anyone would run for an office that was two years when you could run for one that was six. For instance, the U.S. Senate versus the Congress. I could never understand why anyone would want to be a Member of Congress when you could be a Member of the Senate. So what do I do? I run for a two-year Office and run in 14 elections between the 20 years that I served, between Generals and Primaries. You know, politics is an interesting thing; the term of Office in the House being two years keeps you really close to your constituents in your district. You are always running. You are always active. You are always out, and you can't really get too complacent so, it is a nice part, if there is a good part, of a short term, that is one good thing about it.

HM: I think the first time you ran, your House seat was re-districted.

RR: Correct. Back in 1980, when they did the census nationwide, they realized that, obviously – which is a continuing trend in Philadelphia, moving out to the suburbs – and

Bucks County's population had grown significantly, enough that in [19]80 they created a new legislative district. That was the seat that I ran for. I had a three-way Primary, and then I had to win a General Election. I was the new guy. The local Republican Party was looking for someone young and someone that was new, because most of the people in the area that I represent were new residents, they had just moved there. I was the median age, roughly, of that, and they were looking for someone that would really grow with that area. That first election was in 1982, and it made me the first legislator for the 178th District.

HM: Well, what did you think of your first campaign?

RR: It was a lot different from the campaigns you see now. I guess anybody you speak to, when they look backwards, would say, 'Things were different then,' but things clearly were different when it comes to how you communicate. There were no personal computers at that time. There were no cell phones at that time. So, realistically, if you saw someone either at a meeting, or someone came to your office, or someone would have to actually pick up the phone to call you or send you mail, when you ran your campaigns, you didn't have the kind of dollars that you see, even in local elections today. There weren't media consultants and things along those lines on our levels. No one could afford to do mass-mailings or commercials. So, these things were more like stuffers and door-to-door and "hoofing it" type of campaigns. The early campaigns were like that, and, as the years went on, it was sad to see a lot of that leave, because it was much more convenient then to use a consultant and to use a mailing house that could get your

information out. And, the downside of that is, all the people who were there individually to support you, that would lick labels and put on addresses on envelopes, that would hand-address them, you know, because we couldn't mass-media. That kept a lot of people together, and as campaigns move away from that, that touch is a little bit gone. But, it was quieter and a little more gentler times in politics, both nationally, as well as locally.

HM: Did anyone help you, say, show you the ropes, as you were starting the campaign trail?

RR: There were a lot. The whole learning curve was everybody that was involved, but I had, just like almost anybody that has a mentor of some sort, there were two people that were very key in, one, getting me to run when the party, I was saying, was looking for a candidate to get their endorsement. Actually, there was a woman that they really wanted who was involved locally and already had a little political base and an interest in school board issues and stuff along those lines. She had two young sons and she couldn't do it. And then there was the township supervisor who also was that way, but also had young children and really couldn't do it, so it dropped to me in third. So, I always have liked the number three, it has always worked out well.

HM: Did anyone from your family get involved in your campaigns?

RR: We were all novices, but everyone in my family, from my sisters to my mother and father, my aunt, my uncle and my cousins all on those very first campaigns, all put a lot of effort into it. They would go to our little tiny campaign headquarters and help hand-address things. They would go to malls and supermarkets and things to help me hand out things. They were always good with contributions, and as that went away, as far as our work and actually hand-doing the campaigns, they were always there all the way through it and always served as a great base for me. It is great to have your family around you.

HM: In your own words, can you describe the 178th District, specifically the people and their issues when you served?

RR: It is a very small area in Pennsylvania, roughly 65,000 people are in a House District. In some areas, that is a county or two; in Bucks County, with, I guess over 600,000, my district was very small, very condensed. It was only about five minutes long by ten minutes, you know, wide, in the other direction. It was really only one municipality and a piece of, like, four others. I didn't have any school districts in total. I had pieces of three. It was great that way, because I could get anywhere and basically be in my neighborhood, but it also had a downside, because if somebody wanted to campaign against you, they could put 20 road signs out, and they will be a household name instantly. It was just a very condensed, tight district; it was all suburban; it was all residential. I don't have any cities, towns, boroughs, main streets. Basically, from an aerial shot, looking down, it was just a giant residential development area. In fact, I don't even have apartments in my legislative district, so it is all owner-occupied, single-family.

There are some townhouses later on, but it is just a very condensed area, and a beautiful part of Bucks County.

HM: What was the political makeup of your District?

RR: The political makeup was solidly Republican when I got elected, and as more people moved from the city into our area – because our area bordered right along the border of Philadelphia – it became more and more mixed. You would get a lot more Independent voters moving in, and a lot more Democrats. A lot of the Democrats would convert to Republicans because the county is Republican-controlled and has been that way for a lot of years, but clearly, the mix had changed over time, and the current legislative district has been changed a lot of times because of re-apportionment, but the new one is larger in geography than it was and the mix has gotten a lot closer to – well, it is certainly not 50/50 – but the district is not the 75/25 Republican one that it was when I first got elected.

HM: Do you feel that you effectively reached the goal of serving your constituents whenever you were a Member?

RR: I do. Again, you know, I always liked the fact that I did something else. Whenever I had the opportunity to speak before a group, I would say that Pennsylvania really should be a citizen-legislature, much like most of the country. The majority of the states in the union, the Legislature meets only a few months of the year, most people obviously cannot

afford to do that full-time, so they have other occupations. Pennsylvania is in only a handful of states that actually meets on a year-round basis, much like when your kids are in school. When they are in school, we are in Session, when they are off for the summer, we are off, when they are off for holidays, we are off. And, I think that having a citizen legislature keeps you much more grounded to what is really going on. Everyone comes here when they first get elected, really being grounded and knowing, but as time wears on and you can serve here decades or two, or three, you kind of lose a little bit of that. For me, it was always, when we were in session, I was here, and when we weren't, I was back working just like everybody else in my legislative district was. So, I think it served me pretty well.

HM: After first being elected to the House and coming to Harrisburg, was there anything that surprised you?

RR: Pretty much everything. I grew up in the area that I represented. I had been there pretty much most of my life. I moved between the house that I was born in to the house where I actually am now, residing, and they were all very short, little lateral moves. To get to there wasn't very long as far as geographic distance goes. And, the big thing, when you come from the southeast, if you don't travel extensively in Pennsylvania, you just think that's the way it is everywhere else, and once you pass where we live in Bucks, when you are in that Philadelphia/Bucks/Montgomery/Delaware/Chester County area, once you pass Valley Forge going west on the Turnpike, things change, and there were far more farms then than there are today, but there are still extensively a number of

farming and agricultural interests that I had no interest – not interest – but, I had no knowledge, no prior knowledge about that. Certainly, I had never been to a strip mine. I didn't know about the different types of just construction-homes. Back when I got elected, the salary in the Legislature was just increased up to 25,000 and there were people on my street that had cars worth more than that, so that was really a big change. And, you know, where I represented, people's homes were expensive. They had large mortgages, and you would come out here and you could see the cost of what new housing was, and it was radically different, and then again, as you go into the Northeast and Northwest part of the state, again, it changes. There really are no big cities around, and even the cities that are in Pennsylvania were really nothing like the city that I was used to at Philadelphia.

HM: What did you think of the process on the House floor; of voting and just being down there in the mix of it all?

RR: I wasn't really an advocate of the way it was done. I actually like order, and I like to have – I know that if I am scheduled to be here, I like to have business being worked on, and if not, then let me go do something else. I just hate sitting around wasting time. The whole legislative process seems to be built around delays. Even if it is not necessarily on purpose, the delays happen, the stalling happens. I like the way Washington [D.C.] does it much better. I like when you are going to have a vote, that you have a scheduled time you can vote. You have a period of time that you can cast your vote, and then you can go back to doing what you want. For instance, on the Floor

of the House, we'll go into a Caucus, we'll talk about bills. Republicans will meet. Democrats will meet. Very few of us leave the Caucus not knowing the way we intend to vote on the floor. Debate could last for hours and hours, and the same things are being said over and over again. To me, just sitting through that, hour after hour, is a true waste of time and effort, and I would much rather know that I can go or I can come back at a scheduled time and cast my vote. My voting was important to me, and I always had around a 98 percent-plus attendance and voting record over a 20 year span, so it was important for me to be there, and I did, but the process could really be enhanced.

HM: Could you describe your first office?

RR: My first office was actually in the building that we are in right now. This building they call the Ryan building[1], back then, it wasn't, obviously. It was in bad repair. When you are a freshman Member, you get what is left. Everybody above you gets their pick of where they want to be. This place had many broken windows. It had, besides us inhabiting it, it had pigeons and squirrels, and it was not unusual at all to walk in and find a squirrel running around. And the birds, you just had to make sure that, when they were doing things, you were careful where they were. It was drafty. It was cold. The heat didn't work. It was a shame because this, at one time, was envisioned to be where the Governor was going to have his offices, and there was just a long delay in getting this building moving along, so we occupied it. I had two offices in here. The first office was on the first floor, and I realized that the birds – I was better off getting higher ground, so I

[1] Named after Matthew J. Ryan (R), State Representative, Delaware County, 1963-2003; Speaker of the House, 1981-1982 and 1995-2003.

moved up to a second floor office when I got re-elected the following year, and more offices were made available later in the complex, and we were able to move out of this building, and ultimately they restored it, did a great job with it, and named it after a prominent Speaker and, actually, a guy who – it was different eras, but – Matt Ryan and I had one interesting thing in common that no one else in the Legislature, House and Senate had, in we were both lifeguards in Ocean City [N.J.] on the beach patrol, and so we would always kid each other about that, and it was a good starting ground for us to come up and deal with all of these people. Because, we thought that keeping people under control on the beach was a difficult thing to do, but it was nothing.

HM: Could you describe your District offices? Have you always had a District office?

RR: I always did. I got elected just when the Legislature was starting to become more professional and district offices were starting to become kind-of an important thing, so people had a local way to get a hold of you, especially when you are over two hours away. I had, over the time that I was here, very few people just happening to stop in to the Capitol. You really have to go out of your way to do it. But, I did, every time I got an opportunity to speak in front of people, told them how beautiful the State Capitol is, and why it should be here, and the history of the floor of the State Capitol is Mercer tiles, which is from my home county of Bucks. So, it was interesting to have them up, to bring groups up, but, again, school trips were always difficult because there is a liability reason, so not as many schools and not as many kids got to get up here as I think should, and I think that schools should be encouraged to bring their kids up and really see history in the

works instead of, you know, just learning about it in the books. But, I only had two district offices. My first one was much like this building. I couldn't afford very much in rent in the early days of a district office. There really wasn't very much appropriated to legislators for their offices and staff, and, again, a desk and chair was pretty much all you could get, and it was a neat old building, an old farmhouse in Bucks County, but I had to move, because, just like here, it had holes in the roof and there was rain falling in on my desk on rainy days, and I ultimately moved to another building and was there probably for a good 16 years.

HM: Did you have any mentors whenever you first started in the House?

RR: The guy that was the closest to me in age – and, again, it was difficult back then. Today, the Legislature is much more reflective of a younger legislature. When I first got elected, I was 26 years old, and there were only a handful of us, four or five guys that were under 30. So, the majority of the people that you would interact with were older, many of them older than my father – the closest guy to me was a guy in Bucks County at the time. His name was Ed Burns [State Representative, Bucks County, 1973-1990]. Ed was still about 12 or 14 years my senior, but, compared to the rest of the guys. I look at it this way: Ed Burns, he actually was in the Korean War [1950-1953], a helicopter pilot, was shot down and was a POW. Went back to Bucks, was a teacher and got elected to the House. The other guys in the House, they were in World War II [1939-1945]. So, when you look at the age – I had the Vietnam War, because my number was pulled in the draft, but it was too high, so I didn't have to go. Ed was [in the] Korean [War], and the

other guys from Bucks served in World War II. So, he was the closest in age, and I sat next to him the balance of his time here. We had a good time, and he helped me out a lot, and I used that to help out incoming guys as they came through and got elected from Bucks County as well.

HM: Well, who did you help?

RR: We had a long list. It was myself and Jim Greenwood [State Representative, Bucks County, 1981-1986; State Senate, 1987-1992; U.S. Representative, 1993-2004], who ultimately went on to Congress, who were the young guys from Bucks County. From then on, you had guys like Tommy Tomlinson [Robert M.; State Representative, Bucks County, 1991-1994; State Senate, 1994-present], Dave Heckler [State Representative, Bucks County, 1987-1993] got elected, Joe Conti [State Representative, Bucks County, 1993-1997; State Senate, 1998-2006], all three of those guys went onto the Senate. There has just been a – all the current House guys have all gone through there. You can go backwards from [Charles] McIlhinney [State Representative, Bucks County, 1998-2006; State Senate, 2007-present], my predecessor, the person who took after me, Scott Petri [State Representative, Bucks County, 2003-present], Bernie O'Neill [Bernard; State Representative, Bucks County, 2003-present], all these guys, Kathy Watson [Katherine; State Representative, Bucks County, 2001-present], all these people came in after – Matt Wright [Matthew; State Representative, Bucks County, 1991-2006] - and are still there. One of the things that I realized, unfortunately, when I got reelected, there wasn't anyone here to help you. You were just shown your office, and they said "Go ahead." So, I had

always had a lot of things that I did that, over trial and error, would work, as far as ways to write, or different types of letterhead, or just how to organize, or how to get your office organized, or how to handle incoming mail, or whatever. And I put packets together, and it would be like an orientation thing when any new Member got elected. A lot of guys, they appreciated it, and they are still in use. It is kind of interesting.

HM: Could you tell us about some of the activities that you participated in outside of the House?

RR: Well, my passion right now, besides my family, my wife, et cetera, is golf, and, I guess, the greatest thing outside the legislature that the legislature brought to me was the ability to play golf. When I first got elected, again, you had a lot of idle time on your hands. I was 26. Four years later, I was around 30, someone asked me to go play golf, and I just never did before. It was a little brutal, at first, but I have stayed with it, worked hard on it, and knocked myself down to like a six handicap right now. Back then I liked to ski, but today I don't ski at all because it's too cold. It has changed a lot of things around, but the other thing that is an important activity, and it isn't really an activity, but one of the things that the legislature introduced me to, my wife. So, through that process, we met, got married, and the rest is history there, as well.

HM: Can you explain the role of camaraderie through intra-caucus, inter-caucus, and individual relationships?

RR: Sure. You are surrounded by basically 253 people around here besides staff, so it is a large concentration, and as a legislator you are pretty much the king of your own domain, at least with inside your own office, and it is just natural. You spend so much time together that you are going to start talking to people and you get friendly with people. You are appointed to certain committees and then you get to know those guys a little bit better. It is a shame that when people watch PCN [Pennsylvania Cable Network] or anything that covers the House, you are going to see that it looks like bedlam, because people are walking and it doesn't look like anybody is paying attention. There is talking going on, and all that. But, unfortunately, it is the largest room in the Capitol. It is the only place that you really, a lot of times, can get to see people and actually talk to them about, either the legislation you are working on, or other things that you are interested in, and it is really pretty constructive. I have had some really good friendships that started from here, and I am still in touch with a lot of the guys that I served with, even though I have been out now for almost four years, you know, you don't trade those in for anything, but it is a little bit different than the real world and the private sector. Today you have the best technology, you have the best staff. You have cutting edge of whatever you need. There is nothing that you need to make your job, and to enhance your job to do it better, to communicate better with your constituents, et cetera, that you cannot get instantaneously. Also, research, I mean, the research arm here is outrageous. If you have an interest in doing anything, you can be talking to experts within hours. You do not have to go out and find a consultant and pay someone to do this kind of stuff. It is there. It is provided for you. So, the Legislature today is really well prepared to do the work that they are doing.

HM: You served on several committees while you were a Member of the House: Insurance during your entire career, obviously. Conservation from 1983-90, Finance from 1989-1992, Business and Economic Development from [19]93-96. Could you describe some of the important issues or aspects of your committee work throughout your tenure?

RR: Sure. Insurance was important to me because, again, I was an insurance agent, still was during my time here. I was the only practicing insurance agent in the Legislature, and that probably tells you something. There weren't any insurance agents. There weren't any doctors. There weren't any dentists. There weren't any nurses. And, they probably all realized this same thing: Why would you want to go up there and do that when you could be in your profession? But, I represent, and professionally, I represent the interests of my policy-holder, not the insurance company, but actually the consumer, and that was always the position that I had taken in the insurance committee. I always looked at it from the consumer's standpoint, so there was a number of things over the 20 years that we did, and to explain a lot of it is a little bit boring, but one of the key things I did was that I put in a protection into the law now on insurance companies from being able to rate surcharge you or increase your rates after an accident. They were allowed to do it, but, what would happen in the past is that they would never consider your deductible, and very often, someone would have a 500 or 1,000 dollar deductible, and the claim would be less than the deductible, but they would still receive a surcharge. And, I just didn't think that was right. And, a lot of times people wouldn't turn in a claim, but

the claim would still be on their record because there would be a police report, and the insurance company could use that, if you have two within the three-year period, to cancel your insurance, and, again, I didn't think that was fair. We created a dollar limit, and said that the claim had to be over that dollar limit, as well as the deductible for them to surcharge, and that deductible was tied to an inflation that the insurance department has to adjust every two years. So, it is providing a large amount of protection today. When we first started it, it was 500 dollars in excess of your deductible. So, again, if you had a 500 dollar deductible, if the claim was under 1,000 dollars, they couldn't charge you a surcharge. Today, the surcharge is 1,250 dollars over the top of your deductible. So, when you are looking at it, you are really getting a sizeable amount of protection, and the key was that we didn't want to have people just lose their insurance after a small accident, and, again, that is why you buy insurance in the first place. But, you know, there were a lot of things that we did, otherwise, through insurance. A lot of things were more jargoned than of exciting issues.

HM: Did you have a favorite committee?

RR: My favorite committees were the two that I chaired. I was chairman, originally, of Urban Affairs, which is kind-of funny for a suburban guy. But, it worked out great for me, because Philadelphia was so close. Back then, Governor [Edward G.] Rendell [Pennsylvania Governor, 2003-2011] was Mayor, so we would interact a lot with the City of Philadelphia. We did a lot of meetings and met with the Governor – the Mayor at that time – a number of times on issues that were important to the city of Philadelphia. And, I

think, as a suburban guy, I was a pretty good steward of the urban issues, and, you know, trying to do what we can state-wide to help our cities, not just Philadelphia, but Pittsburgh and the other small third-class type cities that we have in the state, to get their economies and make them have enterprise zones and things like that that would really help them attract and grow business in their area and get more people to come to the downtown. That's really what our whole focus was: trying to get cities to attract people to want to live there instead of having cities be places that they want to flee. You are seeing a huge reversal in that now in the city in Philadelphia. Young kids that move and get their first job, they want to live in the city. That is where the night life is, that is where the restaurants are, that is where the people are. And, again, as they grow older, get married, have children, it is natural that they are going to want to move out to the suburbs, and that's great, too. But, both are thriving at this point, which is great, but the second committee that I chaired was the Liquor Control Committee. Pennsylvania, whether you like it or not, has an old, old system of dealing with the way we retail alcohol, and it goes all the way back to the end of the Depression. And, when the Depression – not the Depression, I'm sorry, Prohibition - when Prohibition[2] ended, the United States Government just turned to the states and said, "Listen, you guys, state by state can decide how you want to handle the issue of alcohol sales in your state." Pennsylvania basically created a system that is still in place to this day: the Liquor Control Board. And, what we do is, our Liquor Control Committee, actually, deals with all legislation that affects liquor sales in Pennsylvania, and Board, obviously, would enforce those laws. And, again, state stores have come a long way. When I turned 21,

[2] Period in the United States (1920-1933) when the creation, distribution, sale, import, and export of alcoholic beverages was illegal

Pennsylvania's liquor stores were a counter-store. You walk up to a counter. There was nothing out that you could look at. Everything was on shelves behind the counter, and you had a big atlas in front of you, and you could pick what you wanted, but that was it. You couldn't browse. Stores later went on to become a little bit more user-friendly, but they were still lacking in selection. One of my goals as chairman of the Liquor Control Committee was to make Pennsylvania a better place for the consumer, knowing that Governor [Richard] Thornburgh [Pennsylvania Governor, 1979-1987] tried many times to deal with breaking up the liquor store system. Governor [Tom] Ridge [Pennsylvania Governor, 1995-2001] tried to privatize the system. Knowing that it was a tough road to hoe, what we wanted to do was at least enhance the system we have and make it better for the consumers, and I think that if you have seen stores now, the fact that you can buy corkscrews, the fact that there are gift bags, all of that goes back to our legislation that allows, through statute, the Liquor Control Board to actually do these things. You can now buy wine glasses in our stores, but you know, that was all an enhancement of upgrading the stores. Then, one of the major issues was when we upgraded the hours, because Pennsylvania stores were only open six days of the week. The second largest shopping day of the year, of the month, of the week, is Sunday, and stores were closed on Sunday. There was an epic battle to pass legislation of mine that would allow stores to be open on Sunday, and it took a number of hits, a number of tries, but ultimately we were successful, and Sunday sales have been extremely successful and profitable for the state, as well as really good to the consumer. Because, again, you plan your Sunday meal not always on Friday, and that bottle of wine that you wanted to get, not always could you. And we certainly wanted our people to do it, the legal way. I mean, Pennsylvania is

surrounded by a number of states that are all open on Sunday. Bucks County is bordered by New Jersey. Our stores are local. I live ten minutes from the Jersey border. I mean, I wanted something available for us in our own state, so Sunday sales were very successful.

HM: Why was it so hard to open it up? Who was against it?

RR: You know, this is a Quaker state, not by religion, but by history, and there were a lot of religious issues and people that were concerned about alcohol on Sunday. There were people that just thought it was a tradition. There were other people, who, if they could – legislators – if they could, would welcome prohibition again. There were people that were trying to falsely protect children from underage drinking. Well, nobody goes into state stores in Pennsylvania underage and gets served. I don't care if it is Saturday, Tuesday, or Sunday. And, it was a new concept. It was something where, even the people that supported it weren't sure how to gauge it, because you weren't sure how your own constituents were going to react. We didn't have polls on it. We didn't have censuses that were done. It was just the right thing to do at the right time, and it was a battle. It failed by a vote. It came back and got passed by a vote. Then, it got reconsidered and failed by a vote. And it, ultimately, got passed by one or two votes, and went on to be passed in the Senate and signed into law. But, since then, the issue became such a powerful one for the consumers that the people of Pennsylvania were so verbally in support of the convenience that the legislature now has also changed the store hours for beer wholesalers and you can now buy both beer and wine on Sundays.

HM: I think another issue with the state liquor stores was the sale of wine on the Internet, and you were involved in that, as well. [Act 10-2002]

RR: That's right. That was a separate issue, but they kind-of ran in the Legislature at the same time. Again, the wine selection in Pennsylvania had been criticized historically for a number of years. There are now some really up-scale state wine and spirit shops, although not all stores are, but when you find one of those, you can really find a lot of great, really interesting wines. Chairman [John] Newman[3] of the LCB has done a lot on things called "Chairman's Specials" that kind-of promote some of these wines where they buy large lots of odd lots of wines from all over the world and then moderately price them. But, even so, there are still wines that you can't get in Pennsylvania, and you could, for instance, go on the internet to the vineyard directly, and buy them direct, but, in Pennsylvania, it was against the law. So, what we wanted to do was, say, if the wine is sold, basically, in Pennsylvania, you have to buy it in Pennsylvania, but if the wine is not sold in Pennsylvania, we want to have our residents have a way to legally buy wine that is easy to come by. You don't necessarily need a wine broker to get it. You can go simply go out, and you find a vineyard. They all have wine clubs that you can join and such, which would be great, but the caveat was that the law prohibited you from doing it legally. A lot of people have done it anyway. A lot of people work in New Jersey and have it shipped to their work, but we wanted to give an outlet for people to actually go out and bring wine in that they'd like. A lot of people have gone to Napa Valley and

[3] Jonathan H. Newman was appointed as a Member of the Liquor Control Board in 1999; Chairman, 2002-2007.

Sonoma and they did wine-tastings and they found great wines, and they come home and they can't buy it. So, this is what we were going after, and fortunately, that was passed, as well, and consumers have the ability to do that, and it is a really simple process.

HM: Can you talk about the State Swimming Pool Safety Act, and what were the issues in regard to that?

RR: As I mentioned previously, I was a lifeguard and, to me, water and safety was always an issue. Over the six years that I was on the beach patrol, thousands and thousands of people were in front of me, and it was an awesome responsibility. But, Pennsylvania had a horrible statistic that over 30 children a year drowned in back-yard swimming pools. To me, I had always thought that most municipalities had a pool, at least mine did. The municipality that I lived in had an ordinance that said that you had to have a fence of a certain size, and the safety equipment, et cetera. But when I looked into the issue of why there were still so many drownings in Pennsylvania of young children, I realized that, basically, half the municipalities in Pennsylvania did not have any kind of local pool ordinance for some reason. And, a lot of that is, you know, government intervention, and people don't like mandates. They don't like their township or the local borough government to tell them they have to do something, and the political role for whatever reason wasn't there, and children, in my opinion, were in jeopardy. And, so, you know, I went on a quest, and it was a long process to ultimately come to a bill that was passed in Pennsylvania. It took – even among supporters – it took a lot of effort to basically say to their municipality that if you don't pass your own ordinance; we are

going to mandate this state code on you. That is actually what we did. The difficulty with anything when you put it into the law, is that if things change, technology changes, if there is a better way to do it, if you put it into a statute one way, it doesn't get the advantage of that. What we did is, we created a basic standard, and then we tied it to the BOCA[4] code, which governs all types of development. The BOCA code actually has a section on swimming pools. So, what happens is, our statute has this basic fencing requirement: height, the way the slats on the fence have to be, and then we tie it also to the current BOCA code, so it's both. So, that code, as that continues to enhance over time, and it has been time already since it passed, it keeps getting improved along the way, so that is kind-of a unique way that we did that law. And, you are still going to see drownings occur in Pennsylvania, and there are a whole lot of reasons for it. No bill that we pass, no law that we put in place, is ever going to take away parental oversight. If you have a child, and they are in the water, you need to be there. If you have a pool, and you have children, that pool needs to be off-base unless you are there. And, pool covers have come a long way. There are pool covers that many adults can stand on, and it doesn't cave. If you are going to have a pool, that is the type of cover that you should have. There were sad cases where people have pool covers, and a young child walks on a pool cover, and the little inch of rain that was sitting on that pool cover, when the child's weight gets to it, all turns to a foot or more, and the child is on a slippery surface, and drowns on top of the pool cover. So, if you have a pool, you have an awesome responsibility, but we're not going to stop it, but we think that the pool legislation that was passed has gone a long way to help protect children in Pennsylvania.

[4] Building Officials and Code Administrators, now the International Code Council

HM: Could you tell us how the idea came about for the Community Trust Fund Act [Act 130-2000]?

RR: The Community Trust Fund is a piece of legislation that I – boy, this was probably the longest piece of legislation that I ever had, in work and progress, to ultimately get passed into law. I actually started it my second term, and it was the last thing I passed in my 20th year – I tried every single year to get it through the legislature. But, what had happened is that in my second term, a guy I knew came up to me and said, "I am really concerned. I have a retarded daughter, and I am taking care of her myself. I don't need any government help or intervention. I don't need any support. I have provided life insurance and all for her after I'm gone. But, the worry I have is all of the federal aid and programs that would take care of her as a dependent when I am gone all have income limitations tied to it. So, if I do the right thing as a parent and provide for her after I'm gone, I'm now going to exclude her from state and federal aid that is set up to take care of children when their parents are gone. So, it seemed like it was a catch-22. You couldn't do the right thing. If you wanted to do the right thing, you did nothing, and you let the child be destitute, and then everybody steps in. But, what we wanted to do was create a way for a parent to actually do that. What we ultimately did is, we said that the assets that they have that they want to title to a child, they would title to a trust. The trust, then would dedicate that those funds would be directed toward that child's care, and things from televisions, to, you know, cosmetics, you know, anything that could improve their quality of life along with their living standards and whatever they need for their food and whatnot. The second component was, that when the money was donated to the trust, and

when that child ultimately, who is an adult, someday dies, those moneys, and whatever money was left over, would be used to bring in other children who didn't have those resources to also provide those better qualities for their life as they go through. And, it was something that everyone said, "Alright, it sounds great, but how are you going to do that?" It took extensive work. I went through, probably, seven different Executive Directors in the Health and Human Services Committee to ultimately work on this, but, I'm happy to say, it is in place, and anybody that has a child with any type – and it's not any one malady, but any type-of a malady – has a way to provide, after their death, for their child's health and well-being, and knowing that it's not going to put them in any jeopardy, and also knowing that they are going to help other children along the way.

HM: Can you tell me what role seniority plays in the House?

RR: Seniority is, outside of Leadership, seniority is everything. Up until only recently, it has really been a recent trend where leaders have been elected that weren't mainly the more senior Members. But, basically, it is much like any Armed Services. It is much like, you know, even, again, as a lifeguard; you know, every year you were in, you get a little more status, you get to pick which beach you want to be at. Same thing here; you get elected, "seniority" and "majority" are the two key words in the Legislature. When I got elected as a Republican, the House had just turned from Republican to Democrat, so, in my case, I got elected and served my first 12 years in the minority. As a minority Member, you really have, legislatively, very little opportunity to do a lot, other than looking at bills as they are coming over from the Senate, and trying to see what you can

add successfully in amendment. And, I was lucky in the 20 years of legislature, I passed over 22 pieces of legislation. So, in my early days, I used that amendment process to get the issues that were more important to my district into play, before the House, and ultimately, get before the Governor for signature. But, seniority, also, really is important, because from your first office, to your staff, to how much staff you have, was all a pecking order. And, back again, going back, to 20 years ago, if you weren't, like, the leader, everybody else was pretty much the same. It didn't matter if you were rank-and-file, or you were a committee chairman, there wasn't a whole lot to do in Harrisburg. If people come out and visit Harrisburg today, they are going to see a different kind of city than we saw when we first came up here. There were very few places to eat. There were very little things to do. The city really wasn't very attractive, and a former House Member, Steve Reed[5], ultimately left the Legislature and has become the Mayor of Harrisburg, has been there for 20-plus years, and has been responsible for a lot of the turnaround in Harrisburg. But, over that period of time, Members would hitch up with each other, would drive out to someplace and have dinner together. There was a lot of that going on, a lot of camaraderie back then, but as the legislature changed and became more professional, you had the opportunity where seniority wasn't playing as much, everybody got kind of – you all had your desks and you all had your staff, and everything became a little bit more upgraded and professional. And, I think that it's a good thing. You don't really have to fight for your desk space anymore. It is still seniority from your committees on down. It is still seniority by whether you become a chairman or not, so your tenure here definitely comes into play. If you are here long enough, you get

[5] Stephen R. Reed (D), State Representative, Dauphin County, 1975-1980; Mayor of Harrisburg, 1981-2009.

[*inaudible*] from your family a lot, and I never had an interest in hanging out in restaurants and bars, so it was nice to have other things that could take up your time. Again, the city didn't have a real night life, so you kind of had to fend for yourself, and again, I said that golf made it for me, but other guys found other things. There were legislators here that liked to draw, and they did art. You would see a lot of guys had bikes, and they would go biking along the river. Some would run. They had all different interests to kind of give them down time while you're up here. Because, you would spend as much time here – many of these guys spent more time here – than in their home districts, because they had to travel so far.

HM: Did you have one fondest memory of serving?

RR: You know, I'd have to say, meeting my wife. That would be a very difficult thing to overlook, but, legislative-wise, I think it was – I was really lucky that I got in young and retired after 20 years on my own decision to get out, when it was right for me. And, retired with a lot of people thanking me for service, wishing I was still there. I got a lot of letters and notes and calls from constituents as well as Members, saying, you know, "It was great having you there." Those kinds of things are really nice feedback. You always hope you're doing the right job, you always think you're doing the right thing, but that kind of feedback was great. That's a pretty fond memory. You have your memoir to an extent. There is a legislative history now, like what we are doing today, your archives, where this stuff is protected into the future, and it is always going to be there. It is nice that your record is out there and will be preserved. And, you know, again, it was lucky

enough for me, I have had four years, and hopefully many more, to look back on things that I did that today are really making a difference, and we have talked about a number of them. There is a plethora more, but I know that it has made Pennsylvania a better place, so that is, probably, outside of meeting my wife, the most rewarding.

HM: What would you say was the hardest issue you encountered as a Representative?

RR: Boy, there were quite a number of issues. The hardest issue is when you get an issue, without being specific, I can tell you really the position you are in. When you are a legislator and you feel one way and the majority of the people in your district feel another, that is a real squeeze, and it happens. I can remember a lot of times that I said, "Listen, I got elected based on – I wanted to do three things: first, I represent my legislative District; second, I represent my county; and third, I represent all the people of Pennsylvania." You know, you still have your own convictions that you have to be true to, and a lot of times something of the day may seem like the hot thing, "We should do it." But, if you don't believe that is right, I just had a hard time saying, "Well, I can support that." There were times where I actually went the other way than the majority of people in my district might have thought was the right vote, and I would vote the way that I think, based on my morals, convictions, what is right. Fortunately, I never had a problem with elections because of it, but that is probably the biggest quandary, test, whatever you want to call it, that a new legislator has to deal with: "How am I going to deal with an issue? Am I going to be a barometer for the people of what they think? Am I going to be a populist?" Or am I going to be, "You elected me to do a job. I have

looked at this. I have studied this issue. This is what I think is best for the masses." And, again, they are not all the same. What is good for my district isn't always good for the county, and vice versa, and what's good for Bucks isn't always good for Pennsylvania, and, you know, you have got to make those tough calls. There are examples all the way through where this same situation was – I didn't do what the people maybe wanted in my District. I didn't represent, necessarily, entirely what the people of Bucks County might have wanted in an issue, or what the people of Pennsylvania might have wanted, but I thought it was the right thing to do. And, so, that would be the moral test that I use.

HM: How would you like to be remembered?

RR: You know, I was the kind of legislator who would walk into the restaurant and hopefully wouldn't be identified, you know, hopefully I could go hang around, just be normal. You know, I answered my own phone. When someone would call, I would say, "Just call me Roy." I never signed a letter with my last name. You know, I just wanted to be just like everybody else. Again, being the fact that I was also working, I felt a little closer to it. But if someone starts throwing your title around, first thing I would say, "Just call me Roy." And, I think that I want to be, besides legislatively, I would like to be remembered as someone that just, you know, cared, and was just like everybody else. Just someone that wasn't pretentious; didn't walk around a few feet higher than the rest, and you know, I think it's worked out. I was involved in a lot of things here. It was nice to retire from here and go back to work full-time, because working full-time in one job

versus working part-time in two, this feels like semi-retirement now compared to what I had when I was doing both. And, it's been nice. It has been really relaxing, but, again, I think the key for me was that I own a business, so I was able to come up here. I was able to leave here and go back to my company. I always had support there to make it be the time. I could spend the right amount of time here. But, I also was able to get in early and get out early. There is a real key to being, you know, still, you know at my age, I'm 51, but still having, hopefully a lot of years ahead of me, and knowing my 20 years of state service and another three years, three and a half years of local service, are over. And, you know, I think I left it better than when I got there.

HM: Well, in addition to your, still full-time, job with your company, what else are you doing these days?

RR: Well, legislatively, obviously I'm not in the Legislature, but I am still I was appointed by Governor [Mark] Schweiker [Pennsylvania Governor, 2001-2003], to the PHEAA board, the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, and I have been serving on that for four years. It gets me back to Harrisburg about two or three days a month, which is just fine, because it gives me time to meet up with all of my old buds that are still here and guys that are still in the legislature and I get to stop by and say, "Hello," to them. I am on their Executive Committee, so that helps, and there is a PHEAA Foundation Board that I am also on. So, you know, it keeps my hand in it. The majority of those board members are active Members of the House and Senate, so I still stay in touch. My wife is actually a lobbyist in Harrisburg. She has been a lobbyist for

20-some years, so we still have our political conversations, and I can still let her know, from a legislative standpoint, how I would feel, so all that is great. It is a lot of fun. I've always had an interest in politics, you know, as a political science major in school. I actively still read the clips and what's going on. I have a pretty good idea of [*inaudible*], and I have my opinions. A lot of times the legislature goes in ways, and I say "If I was still here, I wouldn't vote that way." That is just the way it is going to be. You are not going to have 253 people working on something and have 100 percent consensus agreement. And you are not always going to have – you know, husband and wife don't agree on every issue, and you are certainly not going to have political Parties agree on every issue, and you are not going to have constituents or the people of Pennsylvania always agree on everything you do, but, again, that moral compass. If it is on the right, pointing the right direction, and you use that, it should be a good barometer, and you should do just fine.

HM: Lastly, do you have any advice for new Members?

RR: It is a different Legislature. It is a different constituency today. There was a time, when I first got elected, someone may not have liked the individual Member, but there was a lot of respect for the Office. The same thing federally: Congressmen, the President, those Offices were always an Office of respect. You may have not liked who was serving presently, but you would always be respectful. I think that if there is one thing that I have seen constantly be eroded over the last 25 years, it is the climate of the constituent, the voter. Voting – everything involved with that climate is hurting the

numbers and the voters, because the number of people that show up to vote in Primaries, in general, has been decreasing year after year. You are getting less and less people interested and involved. If they are not involved and interested enough to vote, you are going to have a hard time getting quality people that are interested and involved in running. Whether it be in local offices, school board, whether it be for your township or your city or your borough councils. And if you don't have people interested in that level, then you don't have really people ready to be interested in serving in the state and in the congress, and I just think that the tenor of campaigns have gotten to a point that it, you know, disgusts everybody, and I am just fearful that is just going to continue to have politics as normal. It just shouldn't be that way. I mean, you should be able to agree or disagree with someone's position, but still do it in a respectful manner. And, if there is one thing that I would like to see in the federal and state and local campaigns is a change. I would like to see the constituents and the voters say, "I am not going to put up with those types of campaigns anymore. I am going to vote 'no' on you if you run a negative campaign. If you are not running an issue-oriented campaign, you are not going to get my vote." And, I think, if you do that, you will have a lot more interest in voting. You know, I spoke to all the fourth grades in schools in my district for all the 20 years I was in – that is when they do state government – kids are overly enthusiastic about government and voting and the process and how it all works in fourth grade. Something happens between fourth grade and 18 years of age where they just don't have that interest any longer. It is hard to get them to register to vote. It is impossible to get the younger voters out to the polls. And, you know, the senior citizens of the day, the people my age and older are the ones that are showing up. You need the diversity even at the polls, in the

polls, to have the right candidates elected to represent the masses. So, that is the one area where I think I would love to see a change.

HM: Thank you very much. This concludes our interview.

RR: Well, thank you very much for having me.