

PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

The Honorable James Greenwood (R)

143rd District

Bucks County

1981-1986

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED BY: Heidi Mays, House Archivist
July 28, 2006

Transcribed by: Raymond Whittaker

Heidi Mays (HM): Good morning.

The Honorable James Greenwood (JG): Good morning.

HM: I'm here today with the honorable James Greenwood who represented, from the Pennsylvania House, the 143rd Legislative District from Bucks County. He served from 1981 to 1986 in the Pennsylvania House and from 1987 to 1992 with the Pennsylvania Senate, representing the 10th District, and from 1993 to 2004 in [U.S.] Congress representing the 8th District. Thank you for being here with me today.

JG: It's my pleasure.

HM: Can I start off by asking you what kind of influence did your family have on your early life and your future career as a public servant?

JG: Well, my dad was a very civic-minded guy. He was in real estate, but he became a Township Supervisor back in Northampton Township in Bucks County. He was the head of the fire company, he was the head of the PTA [Parent-Teacher Association], he was the President of the Rescue Squad; he was sort-of "Mr. Roll up your sleeves and get involved." So, I had that as a model and I think that certainly contributed to my interest in public service. Although, it really was never my intention to run for office; I kind of did it against my better judgment.

HM: Would you say your family was active in politics?

JG: Yeah, my father was. He not only was a Township Supervisor, but he got involved in Republican politics and in fact, he would get involved in these wars about who was going to be the committee person in all of the districts in the township. So, his district, I mean, his political territory was one township. It was a very important township in the 143rd State House District and, in fact, when I did decide to run for the House in 1980, I knew full well that I would do better than I should because we had the same name. And so, I did ride on his coattails a little bit. After I was elected to the State House, then he ran for the District Judge position; the District Justice. And so, his district for the District Justice seat was our home township plus several others in which I had just run for the State Legislature. So, when he was elected, I sent him a telegram saying, “Congratulations, but you can’t run on my coattails forever.”

HM: Would you say your father shaped you to become a Republican?

JG: I think, like a lot of people, we tend to first associate with the Party of our parents. That was probably why when I first registered to vote, it was as a Republican. The other factor was that when I was in High School, as a senior in a political science class, I fell in love with a young lady. And I asked her out for a date and it turned out that her father was a Republican State Legislator from the 143rd District. So, I ended up going over and volunteering in his office and his campaigns; less because of my burning interest in the issues, and more because of my burning interest in his daughter, I think.

HM: So, would you say that's how you became interested and involved in politics?

JG: Yeah, it was really from when I was working for my former girlfriend's father; she dumped me, but, [I] worked for him right after I got out of college. And what I would do is, I would get up in the morning and I would work out of his District Office for the most part, from nine o'clock in the morning until two in the afternoon. And then from three to 11 at night, I worked as a house parent at the Wood Schools with retarded and emotionally disturbed children. So, I had those two real interests. One, I became more interested in the issues of government and state government and then I had this great interest in trying to help kids.

HM: Could you describe your career and experiences before coming to the House in a little bit more depth; specifically your educational background?

JG: Yeah. I'm a product of the Council Rock School District in Bucks County; a very good school district. I went to Dickinson College, here in Pennsylvania, and graduated in 1973 with a Bachelor's Degree. My father had this real estate business and I'm sure he would have liked very much if one of his four children took over the business; none of us did. I was, I think, a fairly stereotypical baby-boomer in that I was going to save the world, and my initial way of saving the world was working with these children. As I said, I was a house parent. I had a whole bevy of fairly high functioning, but mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed guys. And I had a very happy childhood, very fortunate in that way and I saw these kids who had in some ways been abandoned by

their parents and here they were at this institution and it's a tough place to be. You know, all the kids have their own emotional problems and they tend to take it out on one another. And so, I was very committed to that work. In 1976, this fellow Jack Renninger [State Representative, Bucks County, 1965-1976], who served in the State House – he had served from [19]64-[19]76 or something like that – he decided to run for Congress and he asked me to manage his campaign, and I did manage his campaign; I managed to lose his campaign – we did. [19]76 was a tough year for Republicans; it was post-Watergate and Jimmy Carter [U.S. President, 1977-1981] beat Gerry Ford [Gerald; U.S. President, 1971-1977]. So, we lost by a whisker [and] I went into social work. I became a case-worker with the Bucks County Children and Youth Agency working with abused and neglected children. And that's where I met my wife. She was a case-worker in the office; it was an office romance. And it was, in that position, I was working there when Mr. Renninger, whose campaign I'd lost, called me and asked me if I'd run for his old House seat.

HM: And then you ran against the person that beat Mr. Renninger?

JG: Well, actually, no. When Renninger ran for Congress, it was against Peter Kostmayer [U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania, 1977-1992].

HM: Okay.

JG: And what happened was, Margaret George, Peg George, [State Representative, Bucks County, 1977-1980], she was a Democrat who was a fiscal conservative on the Central Bucks School District. She was elected in [19]76, in that same good year for Democrats, but by a fairly narrow margin; 800-and-some votes. In [19]78, she was re-elected by an even smaller margin, I think 600-and-some votes. And so, 1980 rolled along – and I liked Peg George; I might have voted for her – but he [Mr. Renninger] asked me to run for his seat and my first reaction was, “No I don’t. I’m a behind the scenes guy. I don’t want to run for public office.” And I remember saying, “I’d have to cut my hair. I’d have to buy a suit and have to be nice to people I don’t like, you know.” And I said, “I’m helping these kids. I like the work I’m doing with these kids.” And he said, “I think you can do more for children if you go to the Legislature.” And that was really the challenge for me. I had seen the way that some of the laws of Pennsylvania, I think, didn’t serve children very well. And I thought, well that’s a reason to go ahead and do it.

HM: So, could you describe your first political run?

JG: Yeah, I knew it would be difficult because Margaret George was very popular, obviously, in a heavily Republican district she was winning these races. It is, frankly, I think, harder to run against a woman sometimes. Men are more typically associated with, you know, things people don’t like about politics. Women, I think, people assume they won’t be chomping cigars in the back room, you know. So, I left my job in February of 1980 and I essentially campaigned full-time through November. And I think I virtually

knocked on every door in the District. I would get up in the morning and I would go knock on doors all day long and into the evening. And if it was raining, I would call voters. The woman who is now my wife – we were dating then; she wasn't my wife – she would look up phone numbers. I would give her street lists and she would look up the phone numbers and I'd call people and say, "My name is Jim Greenwood. I'm running for the State Legislature and I called to ask what issues are most important to you." And people were stunned. Who does that? So, it was a grueling campaign; just physically to go through all of that for such a long period of time. And I won by, I think, 636 votes, or some quite narrow margin like that. So, it was a good thing I did all that door knocking.

HM: Do you recall the demographic makeup of the District?

JG: Yeah. It's a very suburban district. Bucks County was a rural county up until right after the Second World War. And at that time the Fairless Hills Steel Works was built in Lower Bucks County. The GI Bill gave soldiers from Philadelphia money to put down on houses and built Levittown. And so, Lower Bucks County was developed first. My District was Central Bucks County: it was developed later and it tended to be a higher socio-economic – after kind-of the first blush, people started to move into larger homes and larger lot sizes. So, it was a pretty high socio-economic demographic and, as I said, probably 2-1 Republican.

HM: Do you know if the District has changed at all?

JG: I think it's still pretty much the same. You have more and more people who have moved more recently from Philadelphia and so you get a little bit more of a – you have people who maybe were Democrats in Philadelphia and become Republicans. They might register Republican, but they don't always vote that way, so it's become a little bit more swingy. It is a socially moderate District. People expect you to be fiscally conservative. They work hard for their money and they're not, for the most part, benefiting from entitlement programs. But, they're also pretty well educated and they are for instance, pro-choice; they're social moderates.

HM: Is there anything that made the District unique?

JG: Made it unique? A little bit of its history. Washington Crossing is in that neck of the woods, it's in the 143rd; at least it was. I think maybe it's changed now. But, it's where George Washington crossed the Delaware [River]. And in fact, right after I got elected to office, I was appointed to be a re-enactor so, every Christmas Day for 16 years I would leave the kids and the Christmas tree and put on my uniform and cross the river with George.

HM: Did you like campaigning?

JG: Did I like campaigning? I think anyone who's done a lot of campaigning knows that it takes a lot to kind of get started. You know, you wake up in the morning and you have

a schedule. You're supposed to stand at a shopping center and you're supposed to do this and you kind of don't feel like it because you get very varied reactions. But, I would push myself and once I got there, then I'd just get into it, you know, I'd just get into the swing of it. And you're really trying to maximize the number of people you can interact with and maximize their reactions. I learned a lesson from the late Senator [Henry] John Heinz [U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania, 1977-1992; U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania, 1971-1976] in [19]76, when he came in to campaign with my Congressional candidate. When we would stand at a shopping center, he would go up to people and say, "Excuse me, may I say hello?" And what are you going to say? "Sure." And then you're in. And a lot of people would just like stick out their hand, "Hi, I'm Congressman so-and-so," and voters will, you know, back away. So, I've spent a lot of time in my career doing just that. And when you campaign in front of a shopping center, Person A might come by, they're wonderful, they're warm, they're intelligent, they're considerate, and they say, "I'm so glad that you're out here campaigning and may I ask you your view on such and such an issue?" and you have a nice little chat and they go in. The next person may call you a "crooked bum" and, you know, blow you off and you kind of have to shake that off and be ready for the next one.

HM: So, how do you think campaigning has changed in Pennsylvania through the years?

JG: I think campaigning, in general, has become much more bitter. You know, I've always said about politics that there are two kinds of people that go into it: first kind is people who are interested in public service. They consider it a sacrifice, they consider it

a duty and they're there for the purpose of trying to make positive change and improve lives of their neighbors. Other people, I think, go into politics to settle an identity crisis; they're not quite sure who they are. But, if you put Representative, or Senator, or Congressman, or Governor in front of their name, then they feel like they know who they are. And the danger with that is you're afraid to lose the job because then you're afraid to lose your identity. And when people are that attached to the job, they'll do anything to get it and anything to keep it. And that includes the most brutal, personal, nasty kind of campaigning and I think that's gotten worse over time.

HM: Did you have any nasty campaigns?

JG: I prided myself on never going negative. You know, I think it's a funny thing; people will tell you they hate negative ads and the pollsters keep saying, but they work and that's why people run them. But, I think that's cynical. I think that if you make it clear I will not go negative in this campaign and you say it over and over again, that people do respect that. Now, I've had some campaigns, not really when I was in the Legislature as much as when I was in Congress, where – and it was usually the Third Party candidates who know they're probably going to get two percent of the vote – and so they're, you know, slashing and slashing and slashing. And being a human being, I have punched back a couple of times too; it's hard not to.

HM: Did you ever run for more than one seat at a time?

JG: No. I ran for the State House three times: [19]80, [19]82 and [19]84. [19]86, I took the risk: our State Senator retired and I decided to go for it, meaning that if I lost that campaign, I'd be out, which is great incentive to work hard. I had a three-way Primary and won that Primary and was elected to the Senate. [I was] Re-elected in [19]90 and then I had the luxury of being mid-term of a four-year Senate term, so I could run for Congress in [19]92 sort-of risk-free. I think, maybe in one year, I might have run for Delegate to the Convention while I was running for re-election, but that's it.

HM: Okay. What were your first impressions of the House whenever you came to Harrisburg as an elected official?

JG: Well, I was kind of an outsider. Because I was persuaded against my better judgment to run for the Legislature, I was not one of these guys who, you know, in third grade was practicing his speech for President. So, I was an outsider. I felt, and then I was, again, a Baby Boom Generation guy and I was 29 and had kind of an afro. And as a Republican, I wasn't, you know, there weren't a lot of social worker Republicans coming in. I remember, distinctly, my very first Committee meeting. Because I was a social worker, I had asked to be on the Health and Welfare Committee and I remember receiving in the mail my first packet of bills from the Committee Chairman. I think there were three bills in there and boy, I thought I'm going to read every word of these bills and then I started calling people about them and calling experts in the field, and so forth. And they, of course, were all Republican bills; we were in a one vote majority, I think it was a 102 to 101 or something like that. And so, I came to the Committee meeting and

the first bill came up, Republican bill, and I spoke and I said, “This is a good bill. I’ve done some research on it. And the second bill came up same thing. And the third bill came up and I said, “Now, this bill I can’t vote for” and I started to say what’s wrong with it. And the Republicans were like, “This is one of ours,” and I literally didn’t know what that meant. I mean, I didn’t know that, “Oh, I’m supposed to vote for it because it’s a Republican bill.” And so I was, you know, that didn’t go over well. And one of my first legislative battles was I went after the Leadership’s, they have these sort of “slush funds” where money would be appropriated to these funds and they could use it for all kinds of things. They had millions of dollars in surplus and I went after it. Well, that didn’t help my popularity. So, I really felt, most of the time that I was in the House that I was a bit of an outsider. But, I also, because I was not one of these guys who would just go along with everything, the Leadership, I think, began to have some grudging respect for me and realized well, we have to pay some attention to him.

HM: How long do you think it took you to figure out custom?

JG: Figure out what was going on – I remember a very, very tense time. And that was, Dick Thornburgh was Governor [1979-1987] and he was promoting his Welfare Reform Bill [1982]. And part of it said that if you were able bodied, you aren’t going to qualify for welfare benefits. And one of the Democrats had an amendment that said that, “you couldn’t be thrown off of welfare unless you first had been offered a public works job and if you were unwilling to take the public works job, that then you would be thrown off.” And at the time, that seemed reasonable to me. I thought they made a pretty good

argument, which was: if somebody doesn't want to work, then they shouldn't get welfare. But, if someone says, "Yeah, I'll sweep the streets or I'll rake the leaves in a park," then they should be able to work off their welfare. Well, but that wasn't part of the program. Well, you know, in the State House, there are these boards with all the names of the Members on them and so when we came to the vote, the Republican board was all beautiful green lights and the Democratic board was all red lights or the other way around; the Democrats had all voted "yes" for this thing, all Republicans had all voted "no" and I was the one and only green vote in that sea of Republican red. And my seat was in the first row of the House, and I remember Sam Hayes [Samuel E., Jr.; State Representative, Blair, Centre and Huntingdon Counties, 1971-1992; Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture, 1997-2003], the Majority Leader, and Matt Ryan [Matthew J.; State Representative, Delaware County, 1963-2003; Speaker 1981-1983, 1995-2003] and Rick Cessar [Richard J.; State Representative, Allegheny County, 1971-1994], the Whip, all with their elbows on my desk telling me I needed to change my vote. And I wasn't going to. And they just held the vote open and held the vote open. And there I was, this brand new kid and as I said, I think we were in a one vote majority, so this made it. And finally I said, "Well, I am going to vote for this; I'm not going to switch my vote. But, if you come back," because they were telling me what was wrong with this, "but if you come back with a better version, then I'll switch." And so, they did and the next day we got a compromise. And that was a good lesson for me. That taught me that if you don't cave in – and it ain't easy – if you don't cave in, you can really make change.

HM: I don't think very few people go up against those gentlemen that you just talked about there.

JG: Yeah, it was pretty tough. And I'll tell you what, I've seen people go to Congress – you know I ended up in the Congress – and when Tom Delay [U.S. Representative, Texas, 1985-2006] is in your face, (*laugh*) you know, having been able to stand up to the Leadership in the House and the Senate when I was there, and I did the same thing in the Senate. I remember Bobby Jubelirer, [Robert; State Senator, 1975-2006; Senate Pro Tempore, 1984-1992, 1994-2006; Lt. Governor, 2001-2003] who's my good friend, just furious with me about a vote. And I would say to him finally, "Don't threaten our friendship over this." So, you have to do that. I mean, if you're not going to do that, what's the point?

HM: Can you describe your first office here in Harrisburg?

JG: Well, I was in the building in which we're filming this [Ryan Office Building]. It was a little office. I think initially, I think I shared a secretary, but for me, I was here. I mean, the building is gorgeous. The Capitol Building is one of the most beautiful capitols in the country. The House of Representatives is just magnificent. So, I thought I was on the top of the hill.

HM: Do you remember the first time you saw the House Floor in action? What did you think of that?

JG: Well, because I had worked for another State Legislator, for a State Legislator as a young man, I wasn't shocked. So, I had seen it before. I had observed it; I had sat in the gallery, and so forth. But, being on the Floor, you know sitting down there and, you know, people send you flowers on your first inaugural day and when you go in there and you put your hand up and take the oath of office in that magnificent setting, it's a very sobering experience. And it should be taken very, very seriously. It is the "People's House." Very important; literally life and death decisions are made there. And, you know, the thing about it is, of course, people criticize politicians and they have since Rome, but the people who are in that Chamber, they mirror the population of the State. And some of them are brilliant and some of them are less brilliant and some of them are polite and some of them are rude and some of them are eccentric and, you know, all kinds and all walks of life, but that's the way the process was designed to be. And these legislative bodies are the places where conflicts are settled. And it's not supposed to be pretty, it's supposed to be rough-and-tumble, and it is.

HM: Did you continue to read all the bills that were placed in front of you?

JG: *(laugh)* Of course not. You do your best, but, you know, one of the realities is if you're interested in a lot of issues, you get very busy and you do have to rely on your staff to read bills. I remember when I was in the Senate and I had been elected to the Congress and I was leaving, and Senator Holl [Edwin; State Senator, 1967-2002], God rest his soul, was known as one of the most cantankerous, tough guys in the Senate. And

he was just hard to get along with. I mean he was a sweet guy in some ways, but he was tough. And I had two bills – I was the Chairman of the Urban Affairs and Housing Committee – I had two bills on condominium law; the most boring stuff in the world and each bill was as thick as a phone book. And we had passed them in the Senate before and this was the Conference Committee Report and there was no controversy. And so we were in the Republican Caucus right before and the Majority Leader Loeper [F. Joseph, Jr.; State Senator, 1979-2000] said, “Okay, now Mr. Greenwood has some bills.” And I said, “These are such-and-such bills. We passed them in the House, passed them in the Senate. These are the Conference Committee Reports, no big changes.” Senator Holl looked at me and he said, “Have you read every word of these bills?” And I said, “No, Senator I haven’t read every word, but my staff and my lawyers have and they assure me it’s alright.” And he looked at me and he said, “You’re staff isn’t going to run for re-election. I am!” And I said, “Then you read the damn bills, Senator!” (*laugh*) I could do that because I was leaving the Senate then.

HM: Has technology helped at all in the process?

JG: I think technology has helped in the process a great deal. You know, when I look at the State House on television and see that they have laptops and I assume that the bills, they can read the bills right there on their laptops and they can communicate. That has to be a huge advantage. Of course, you can read the paper bills sitting on the Floor as well, but the ability to search, the ability to have that material with you when you travel and at

home, I think really should enhance the process. And anything that advances the flow of information has to be good for the system.

HM: Did anybody mentor you as you were coming up?

JG: Yeah. Ed Howard [Edward L.; State Senator, 1971-1986], was a State Senator. He'd been elected, I think, in 1974 or something like that, maybe earlier. I had gotten to know him before I ran for office. And when I was asked to run for office, I went to see him, and I said to him, "Is it possible to be in public office and maintain your integrity?" And he said, "It is, but it's not easy and, you know, you have to be pretty tough." And so, he was very much my mentor. He had his own airplane and so I had it very nice when he was in the Senate and I was in the House, because I'd get up in the morning back in Bucks County, drive 20 minutes, get in his airplane, we'd be in Harrisburg in a half-hour and ten minutes later, we'd be here. So, I didn't have that big two-and-a-half hour drive everyday, and we could go home every night. And that was quite nice. And so, we spent a lot of time together. And he was also always viewed as kind of an "outsider" and one who was only so willing to go along with the system. And I learned a great deal from him, yeah.

HM: Did you help anybody after you had all this vast experience?

JG: I tried to. I tried to. We sort of kept the office kind of in a close circle for awhile. When I went to the State Senate, a fellow by the name of David Heckler [State

Representative, Bucks County, 1987-1993; State Senator, 1993-1997], who had been Ed Howard's Chief of Staff in the Senate, well, he wanted to run for the Senate and I wanted to run for the Senate and we kind of had a stare down. And he said, "Alright, you run for the Senate [and] I'll run for the House." So, he ran for the House and I was able to – he was a pretty savvy guy already, but – share some of my experiences with him. And then when I went off to Congress, he moved over to my State Senate seat and so that was kind-of nice. And we were all sort-of cut from the same cloth: Ed Howard, Jim Greenwood, Dave Heckler. And then, Joe Conti [State Representative, Bucks County 1993-1997; State Senator, 1998-2006] also sort-of cut from the same political cloth; fiscal conservative, social moderate. He went to the State House and then to the State Senate seat. And now Chuck McIhinney [Charles; State Representative, Bucks County, 1998-2006; State Senator, 2007-present] took the seat, and now he's running for the Senate. And now, here in 2006, I'm his Chairman of his campaign. So, yeah, I think it's good to pass on experiences.

HM: What role does camaraderie play in politics?

JG: Most people who retire from office will tell you one of the things they miss is those relationships, because when you do work together on an issue or even if you work at odds on an issue, you know politics is not dry stuff. As I said, it's where conflicts are resolved. And so, it's a place where emotions can run high. So, camaraderie is wonderful; you spend time with these people, you're away from your family and you go out to dinner, and so forth. But, you have to be careful because you don't want to start casting

votes to help your colleague, your friend. You have to remember your responsibilities to the people who elected you. As I mentioned earlier, there was a vote in the Senate one night; it was on property tax reform. And all the Republicans were voting against it and the Democrats were for it and Governor [Robert] Casey [Governor 1987-1995] was for it and there were four of us in the Senate who agreed with it. And it was winning and it did win because of us. And as I said, Bob Jubelirer, President Pro Tem, very dear friend in the Senate, was brow-beating me pretty good on the Floor. And you know, you would think a good friend like that comes and asks you for something, because of your camaraderie, you want to vote for him. And I had to say to him, “Bob, don’t threaten our friendship here. This is my vote. This is what I believe my constituents want me to do and I’m going to do it.” And so you have to be careful, you know. It’s true in Washington [D.C.]. I’ve spent 12 years in the Congress and they say in Washington, “If you want a friend, get a dog.”

HM: Does camaraderie, I guess – you have these debates on the House Floor and the issues are such that there is this antagonistic relationship going on. Are you able to walk off the Floor and just put it all behind you then?

JG: I think you certainly can and there’s a long tradition of Members of Congress and Members of State Legislatures battling like mad in the debate and then you know going out for a beer. And that’s a good thing. I think that what gets in the way of that is when people start to question one another’s motives in the course of a debate and that’s poison. Now, I think it’s great if I say, “I believe in policy, this should be the policy for education

or what have you.” And someone stands up and says, “I completely disagree. I think that’s wrong policy and here’s why.” And you have a good debate. And you know you should follow some kind of logic and rationale. And the goal should be getting to some point where we can all agree and all be better off. When people start saying, “The gentleman is only pushing this bill for his re-election, doesn’t really believe in it.” Or, “The gentleman is only doing this to score political points.” When you question someone’s motivations, then I find it very difficult to then be friendly with that person afterwards.

HM: You participated in House sporting events. Is that true?

JG: House sporting events?

HM: Softball games, maybe?

JG: No, I didn’t. I don’t think so.

HM: Okay. Do you maintain any close relationships with any former House Members?

JG: Mostly the ones that went on down to Congress. John Peterson [State Representative, Forest, Venango and Warren Counties, 1977-1984; State Senator, 1985-1996; U.S. Representative, 1997-2006] and I served in the State House and in the Senate and in Congress together. On the Democratic side, Joe Hoeffel [Joseph M.; State

Representative, Montgomery County, 1977-1984; U.S. Representative, 1999-2004] did, as well, and there were other Members that came down to Washington [D.C.]. You do tend to lose touch with people when one group is in Harrisburg and the other is in Washington. So, unless they either are from my home county, or came down to Washington, you do tend to lost track of them.

HM: What legislation do you feel was your most important?

JG: I think the most important bill that I got passed in the State House was probably the Trauma Center Bill [Act 209-1984]. I awoke one morning and got my morning newspaper, back in the early [19]80's, and read of a fatal car crash. And the story said that the woman had been MEDI-VAC'ed up to a hospital in Lehigh Valley. And I wondered why they didn't take her to the nearer hospital, Doylestown Hospital or St. Mary Hospital in Newtown. Wonder why they took her all the way up there? She might have survived. So, I came to Harrisburg that morning for Session and I asked the staff of the Health and Welfare Committee about this and she said, "Oh, well, you know, we don't have a system of designating Trauma Centers in Pennsylvania." Trauma Centers are places where you direct the multiple system trauma – head, severe lacerations, that kind of thing – and that the staff there is equipped, they have 24-hour coverage, and they see so much of this trauma that they become very good at it. And I said, "Well, why is that?" And she said, "Well, the Department of Health tried to designate it, but the hospitals went crazy because, you know, if you're not designated as a trauma center, you lose business." So, we took a different approach and said well let's work with the

Hospital Association and the Medical Association and the Nurses Association and we started to say, how could we do this in a way that would be fair? And they thought the answer was to have a Trauma Systems Foundation or a group that would consist of representations from these groups and they would make the designations. And so, we passed that bill and as a result of that, Pennsylvania now does have trauma systems and Trauma Centers and it's become very, very sophisticated. And clearly, people are alive that wouldn't have been alive otherwise; lives have been saved. And people have avoided being paralyzed and all kinds of de-habilitating injuries. So, it's nice to be able to look back and all of those hours of, you know, b-s and say something really positive happened.

HM: Would you like to relay that last personal story?

JG: Yeah well, not long after we established the Trauma System and I served on the Board and helped designate these Trauma Centers, [I] would read all these case reviews, reports and so forth. And my wife and I were in New York at the Pennsylvania Society Dinner and the phone went off and we got a call from the hospital that our son – he was 16 years old – had been in a terrible car crash and had been taken by helicopter to the nearest Trauma Center. And we left the dinner and jumped in the car and drove back to the hospital and his liver had been nearly severed, his kidney was damaged: he was in bad shape. And afterwards the doctor came out – and they didn't really know who I was – and they said, “He's going to make it, but you know he's lucky and the reason he made it is because we're a Trauma Center and we have a team that has seen this kind of injury

before.” And I thought, well, that’s pretty ironic that our son’s life was spared, in some degree, by legislation that I sponsored.

HM: That was what you would consider your most important legislation in the Pennsylvania House.

JG: Yeah.

HM: What about the Pennsylvania Senate?

JG: I think probably the most difficult, but rewarding challenge I took on in the Senate was to change the law with regard to teacher strikes [Act 88-1992]. Pennsylvania had Act 195 on the books and Pennsylvania was notoriously the “teacher strike capital of the country.” We had more teacher strikes in Pennsylvania than all the other states combined and they were awful. You know, when the negotiations break down and school is supposed to start and it doesn’t or it starts and then it stops and the parents are outraged because they’ve got to go on with their lives and most families have both parents working now, and who’s going to watch the kids? The teachers are unhappy, the kids probably like it, but a very, very distressing situation. And the teachers had the upper-hand. They could force tax increases, you know, they just weren’t going to go back to work and it was an intolerable situation. So, I took it on. And everyone had said it’s impossible. You know, “You’ll never make a change. The teacher unions are too strong.” I sat down with the teacher unions, I sat down with the School Boards Association and we just

started to work and work and develop a compromise. And the compromise basically said that, after the strike had gone on for so many days, it had to stop and the teachers at to go back to work and they had to go into arbitration. And it's, from all I can see, it's worked very nicely. There are very few teacher strikes now in Pennsylvania and no one feels that they're getting a raw deal out of it.

HM: How about Congress?

JG: In Congress? What have I done worthwhile in the United States Congress? One of the things that I started to work on in the Pennsylvania Legislature was head injury. And I set up the Head Injury Foundation in Pennsylvania and helped people with brain damage, usually from car crashes, motorcycle crashes and so forth. I pursued that in Congress and got that passed. I continued to work on the Health Committees and so in Congress, I passed a lot of bills that had to do with – and I still was interested in children. So, like, bills that would encourage pharmaceutical companies to test drugs for children; to make those drugs available for children. Probably the years of Congress that I enjoyed the most were my last few years when I was the Chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Sub-Committee, and there we did investigations on things like Enron, where I had all these guys from Enron in front of me. And I investigated a company called M-Clone, which Martha Stewart notoriously had been invested in, and I subpoenaed Martha Stewart's telephone records, and so forth. So, we did a lot of good stuff and I enjoyed that very much.

HM: How have your issues changed through the years, or have they stayed the same?

JG: I always had an interest in children and continued. I was in the Education Committee, did a lot of work on juvenile justice when I was in the Congress; always interested in kids, I love kids. I love their innocence and it pains me to see children in any kind of distress. And so, I continued to work on that. I became more and more focused on health issues. But really, I think there's a strain that goes all the way from my State House days through the State Senate and into Congress and it was largely an outgrowth of my earlier days as a social worker; health and welfare issues.

HM: What do you think is key to getting legislation passed?

JG: How to get legislation passed? I think it begins by identifying a real problem. There are a lot of bills that are, you know, solutions in search of a problem that look good, but you know, what's the big deal? When you see a real problem, like we don't have Trauma Centers or like we don't have drugs for kids, and usually, if there's a real problem, it's because it has defied solution. And so, if you want to create a solution you have to round up the stakeholders, you have to sit down, you have to negotiate and you have to be willing to compromise. And you have to say that getting the job done is more important than politics, it's more important than who's in the majority, and it's more important than trying to get, you know, go down in a blaze of glory. My bill was really good, but you know those bums wouldn't pass it. But, you I think being able to compromise and being

able to have everyone come out feeling they have some respect in the process and they all gained a little bit; maybe not as much as they wanted to. I think that's how you do it.

HM: Did you ever get frustrated whenever – ?

JG: Oh, of course. I mean, holding public office is about 80 percent frustration. You know, most bills don't become law. And they don't become law because either, there's just never enough time to get to your bill, there's certain other issues that are pressing, or you feel that people are making irrational arguments against it. You know, one of the most frustrating things is when people will come up and say, "You know, your bill was really good and I'm sorry, but I just can't vote for it." "What do you mean you can't vote for it?" "Well, my District, you know, doesn't want it." So, yeah, it's meant to be frustrating. The whole division of powers that the framers of the U.S. Constitution and the State Constitution created was meant so that power was not easily wielded. And so, that means frustration, but if you persevere you can get things done.

HM: How are you able to balance the issues of the District against your own personal beliefs against the interests of Pennsylvania?

JG: Yeah. Probably, I spent a lot of time in classrooms; I did throughout my political career. And wherever you speak, the question is: how do you decide when you're supposed to vote in favor of what you believe or what your District believes? And that's sort of a fundamental question. And my answer always was that my job is to do what I

thought a majority of my constituents would want me to do if they knew what I know. And so that's an interesting formulation. It's your job to know these issues and it's not their job. The people back home have their lives, their careers, their families, their issues and so they're not reading these bills, they're not listening to the debate, they're not doing the research, they weren't there for the testimony of the witnesses at the hearings and so forth; you were. And so, you gather that information and you – now, I think it's not good; I think it's wrong to say, "I know what my constituents want, but my personal beliefs, my religious beliefs, whatnot compel me to do this." If you can't represent your District, you shouldn't stand for election. But, there are times and there are many times, when a good bill looks bad on first blush or a bad bill looks good at first blush and people back home expect you to vote a certain way. And if you're worth your weight, you vote the other way. And I always resented people who would say, you know, "This is an awful bill, but you know, people don't know how bad it is, so I have to vote for it." That's not your job; your job is to vote intelligently and then go back and lead. And you go to the town meetings and you get beat up and people say, "How the heck could you vote against that bill?" And then you say, "Let me explain it to you. Let me tell you what I learned from a witness." And if you're good, they'll say, "Oh, okay." But, again I think it goes back – if you're so desperate to hold office that you can't vote your conscience, then you're not doing your job. You have to be willing to take the political risks, I think. And if you take enough political risks, people will respect you for that.

HM: Did you have a good relationship with your constituents then?

JG: I did. I always felt close to my voters. I always tried to stay in touch with them. I spent a lot of time on the phone talking to people and usually my m.o. was if I get love letters from my constituents, I have the staff answer them. I get hate mail from the constituents; I pick up the phone and call them. Some people thought that was nuts, but I always thought you know this guys really upset and you know pick up the phone and say, “Hi, is this Mr. Smith?” “Yes.” “This is Jim Greenwood, I got your letter.” “Oh.” I said, “I guess you were pretty angry when you got that letter.” “Yeah, I was.” “Do you want to talk about it?” Three-quarters of the time, three out of four times, they’ll say, “Sure.” And three out of four times they’ll say, “Hey you know what? I didn’t know that. I really appreciate it. I’m glad that you called.” Of course, one out of four just stay mad and don’t want to be anything but mad, so, you don’t call them again.

HM: How were you able to use the experience that you gained from the Pennsylvania House to take it to the Pennsylvania Senate, and then to take the experience you gained from that experience to Congress?

JG: Well, I think it’s a very good transition to do it the way I did; to spend six years in the State House, six years in the State Senate, 12 years in the Congress. I think by the time I got to Congress, I was a mature Legislator. I knew how to get the job done. You know, I’ve seen candidates run for Congress, for instance, and their platform seems to be, “I never ran for public office. I’m not one of these career professionals.” Well, okay, and I’ve watched those people come down to Washington [D.C] and just completely crumble. Because, the first time the President of the United States calls them up and

says, "I need a vote", they tremble and go down and switch their vote. And if you've stood up to Governor's, if you've stood up to the Speaker of the State House or the President of the Senate, by the time Tom Delay comes up to you and starts poking his finger in your chest, you can look him in the eye and say, "Hey, I ain't doing it." And I think that's an important thing. I can tell you a Tom Delay story, if you like; I had an amendment to a bill that every year the appropriations bill came up and every year I took this amendment and every year I would win and it was not something that most Republicans wanted. And so, they were very upset about it and so they asked Tom Delay to not make my amendment "in order." In the Congress, you don't automatically get the right to offer an amendment; it has to be made "in order." And so, I found out that he was putting the word out that I wasn't going to have the opportunity to offer my amendment. So, I went to a group of my friends and I said, "This morning another bill is coming up and I want you all to go out there and put "no" votes up because I need to send Tom Delay a message." So, the bill came up and I was standing at the Floor doing this [*thumbs down gesture*] and my friends put the "no" votes up. And Delay saw that I was doing this and he came over and he said, "You can't take this bill down just because you're mad at me about the other bill." And I said, "Well, actually, Tom, if you look at the count, I can and I am." And I said, "I think what you mean to say is, it's not nice." And he said, "Well, it's not nice." And I said, "Well then it's not nice for you to tell me I can't have my amendment tomorrow." And the time was clicking off the clock and we had, like, 30 seconds to go and I said, "You have to tell me that you won't block my amendment." He said, "I won't block your amendment." I said, "Now you have to tell me that you're going to make sure that I have my amendment made in order." He said,

“I’ll make your amendment in order.” And now there was about ten seconds, I said, “Tom, now you have to tell me I’m pretty.” (*laugh*) He said, “Alright your pretty.” And I went thumbs up and all my friends changed their votes. He got his bill; I got mine. And, why do I tell that story? Because it’s, I think, an example of holding your ground, you know, not afraid to use the power that you have available to you, using your colleagues when you need to and being good natured about it.

HM: What was the amendment?

JG: It had to do with family planning and it had to do with, I think, it was an international family planning bill and I’ve been a big supporter of international family planning.

HM: How were you able, as a Legislator, to deal with major events that affected the ways Pennsylvanians lived?

JG: I’m trying to think of what kind major events. What kind of major events?

HM: Well, there’s been so many. There’s been natural disasters, such as floods and 9/11 [September 11, 2001], specifically in Washington [D.C.]?

JG: Well, I was in Washington when 9/11 occurred. I had a meeting at 8:30 that morning and someone interrupted the meeting and said I need to go back to my office. I

went back to my office and they had said a plane flew into a building and I thought, you know, a Piper Cub flew into the World Trade Center or something, and saw the television and saw what happened. And immediately, I said, “This is [Osama] Bin Laden; this is the work of Bin Laden. He’s been trying to take down the World Trade Center before.” The other plane struck, I sent my staff home, except for my Chief of Staff, and we stayed to wait to see what the Speaker wanted us to do; were we to say or leave and the word from the Speaker came to leave. We were going out to get into my car and were just leaving the office building when the Secret Service came by in a van with a guy with his head out the window saying, you know, “Run. There’s a plane coming for the Capitol.” And the plane that went down in Western Pennsylvania was headed for the United States Capitol. And it was pandemonium, people were running red lights and it was like a scene from Godzilla. I mean, just people running across the Capitol grounds. We went off too, we got out of town, and went to Annapolis and it was very difficult, because we didn’t have a communication system then. It was that event that caused the Speaker to give everyone Blackberries¹, so that we could be in touch. But, we finally came back and we were told; we were at a meeting surrounded by armed guards and no one knew what was going to happen next, and the Leadership - the Speaker, and the Leaders of the House and Senate – were off in a bunker and they called in from the bunker. And they said that they were going to have a news conference on the steps of the Capitol that evening, but that the Members were to stay away because we still didn’t know if we were being targeted or the Capitol was being targeted. And I remember driving by and seeing the helicopter land on the parking lot of the Capitol and the Leadership getting out and I said, “You

¹ The BlackBerry, released in 2002, supports push e-mail, mobile telephone, text messaging, Internet faxing, Web browsing and other wireless information services.

know, I'm not going to stay away." And so, I parked my car and I walked over and you could see other Members walking in and we all stood there. And it was an act of defiance to stand there. And then, of course, someone started singing, "God Bless America" and we all did that. And it was a very, very poignant moment. Then came the anthrax attacks and we were told we had to leave the Capitol; we couldn't stay. And I remember getting calls from some constituents calling me a coward and that really hurt. You know, we wanted to be there, but we were told we had to leave.

HM: So, how did security change in light of that?

JG: Everything changed. Everything changed. The Capitol remains surrounded by concrete barricades. If you go to the United States Capitol today you will see people with machine guns standing on the steps. Members still are often told to stay underground, to walk to the votes between their offices in the tunnels rather than stay above ground. For awhile we were told to not drive to the Capitol in the same route every day. You know, Members of Congress have these lapel pins and we were told not to wear them. So, it was unnerving. My daughter was a page in the House and I was scared for her. She's an intern in the House now, she's 20, and I still worry about the nation's Capitol being a very sweet target for some very bad people.

HM: How about the current war that's going on now? How is that affecting Pennsylvania?

JG: Well, you know, 9/11 happened and I remember before 9/11 – one of the things in Congress that’s interesting is you can ask for top secret CIA [Central Intelligence Agency] briefings – and I asked for a top secret CIA briefing on weapons of mass destruction [WMD] in Iraq. And again, this is before 9/11. You go into the Intelligence Committee rooms, these sound-proof rooms that are bug-proof rooms, and CIA guys came in and they took out photographs and they showed chemicals and they showed rocket launchers and they showed equipment that they believed was being used to create biological weapons. So, I was convinced and most people were. It pains me when people say that the President lied about weapons of mass destruction: President Clinton [U.S. President, 1993-2001] believed there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, President [George W.] Bush [U.S. President, 2001-2009] did, most of the Congress did, most of the leaders of other nations, Tony Blair, the Israelis, believed that there were weapons of mass destruction there. And of course, we know that Saddam Hussein did have a WMD program and much of it had been dismantled after the first Persian Gulf War. So, the fact that we didn’t find them there has caused a lot of people to second guess and the fact that we’ve lost well over 2,000 people and 40,000 or some Iraqis; it’s just awful. And I voted for that and you carry that in your conscience. You say, you know, “I sent those guys into that war and all those families who are grieving on both sides, you know, war is, in fact, hell.” But, I have to keep reminding myself that there are people in this world, and lots of them, who believe that if you don’t practice the precise kind of religion – and I don’t mean just Islam versus Christianity or Judaism but, Wahabbi Islam or you have to be a Sunni and not Shiite, you have to be a Shiite and not a Sunni – if you don’t believe in exactly the same religion that they do, then you’re

supposed to be killed by them. And they believe that and they're dead serious about it. And that's why this war and it is going to be global and it is going to be protracted and I think in the end, we have no choice but to fight these people and fight them to the death because that's the way they're playing it.

HM: What role do you think the media is playing in politics today?

JG: Well, the media of course has an important, central and vital role. If it weren't for the media scrutiny, I think people in politics would do the wrong thing, over and over again. We manage to do it even with the scrutiny of the media. So, it's a very, very important role, but then, of course, like everything else, there are good reporters and there are bad reporters. The good reporters are observers, they see what's going on, they dig, they investigate, they get to the facts, and they unearth those facts and they present them to the public. I think the bad reporters are very much like bad politicians, they trying to do a cheap, shallow act to get some glory. And so you have reporters who make cheap-shot articles. You've got reporters who get the facts wrong sometimes on purpose and they bring their biases to the job. And that hurts the system and hurts it badly because it enhances cynicism. And the more cynical people get, the less likely they are to vote and it becomes a vicious cycle.

HM: Here's a loaded question for you; what was your relationship like with lobbyists?

JG: It's a very fair question. What is one's relationship with lobbyists? First off, to me, lobbyist is not a bad word. To me, a lobbyist comes from meeting people in the lobby. So, members of elective bodies, whether the State House, the Congress, the Senate, are walking in to vote and people say, "May I speak with you for a moment?" Now today, people mostly meet in their offices and so forth, but still do it in the lobby. If you represent an association interested in international family planning or child welfare or the AFL-CIO or the taxi cab drivers or the oil industry, you have a right in our system to express your views. I mean, the whole purpose of this system was so people could express their views. Three-hundred million people can't go to Harrisburg, I mean, 11 to 12 million people in Pennsylvania can't go to Harrisburg, and 300 million people can't go to Washington [D.C.], so they form associations and they hire people to speak for them. The system works pretty well if the lobbyists are truthful. And so, I welcomed lobbyists into my office to give me information and present sides of the argument. As everyone knows, the first time they lie to you that's it; you can't ever have them back into your office again because that's very dangerous, to be walking around with bad information. And I think where it can be corrupting is when, and it's very tricky, but when the money is associated with the lobbyist. I think that's where you get problems and I've always been for all kinds of campaign reform because it's one thing to say, "I'm going to vote this way because this person's persuaded me." It's another thing to say, "Yeah, they gave 5,000 dollars to my campaign." So, I think that can be a problem. I think one of the interesting things about Harrisburg – and I imagine it's still the same, I don't know if it was, but – very frequently, at the end of a days legislating, it was time for dinner and lobbyists and Legislators would start to pair up. And I don't advocate this,

I didn't do it a lot myself, but I won't say I never did it. And you know, it looks awful, a lobbyist is buying the Legislator dinner and drinks and, you know, that's corrupting and perhaps it is to some extent. The reality, part of the reality is, is that the Legislator got a free dinner, yeah, but the lobbyist got a free dinner because the lobbyist would have to pay for his own dinner unless he was able to say to his association, "Well, I took Representative Smith out to dinner." They probably spent most of their time talking about football, but that's part of the process, I guess.

HM: What role, as a Legislator, did you enjoy the most?

JG: I liked solving problems. And, you know, it's only one part of a Legislators job, is to write bills and vote on bills. The other big thing is to solve problems in the District. So, whether it was a very dangerous intersection that was killing people and you had to get that fixed or whether it was the Trauma Centers or whether it's people who are kids in juvenile detention facilities being harmed, whatever it is. When people come and say I've got this awful problem and you have the power to help me, would you do it and you get results; that's just a real honor to be able to do that.

HM: How about the least?

JG: That I hated. What did I hate? I hated when people cast votes they didn't believe in. I hated, I think probably the thing that I hated the most about politics was this sense that we have to keep the majority or we have to get the majority and anything is worth doing

to get the majority. So, Republicans fight the Democrats and they get the majority and then they have to hold it at all costs. So, that means never let a Democrat have a bill. And the Democrats will do the same; never let the Republicans have a bill. [Or] Vote against their bill not because it makes sense or doesn't make sense, but because we have to beat them. Whatever they say, just attack, attack, attack. And you see that so much and it's like, what's the point? We can't pass this bill because it will make the Governor look good or bad and its like, why bother being elected to a public office if that's all you care about? I would rather be in the minority and get something done. And the way I think politics should work is there's an election; somebody wins, somebody loses. Now, you have a couple years to get something done. And you should compromise and in the next election cycle, you should say, "We compromised and we passed this bill." "Now, if we Republicans had been a stronger majority, we would have done it this way." Or you know, if the Democrats could say the same thing, "We would have done it this way." And then you go back to the electorate and you say, "We got you a half-a-loaf, but if you put more of our Party in, we'll get you the whole loaf that you want." And that's the way that it should work, but I guess that's too idealistic.

HM: How do you think the U.S. House and the Pennsylvania House differ?

JG: People ask me when I went to Congress what was the biggest difference and I said, you know, in the Congress we do all the same things, but at a much faster pace. It is pedal to the metal. It is a function of having 600,000 constituents instead of, I think, when I first arrived here, 30,000 or something like that. It is physically a larger area, so

you have to almost literally run from building to building to building to cast your votes in the hall and then run back to your office and run to committee meetings. The level of controversy in the Congress is much higher. When I was in the State Legislature, maybe once a year you'd have a vote that was so controversial that you could lose your seat over it. You get to Washington [D.C] and if you're not voting on flag burning or gays or guns or abortion or war, it's not an average day. And so, the intensity is greater, the pressure, I think, is greater, the pace is faster.

HM: Do you have a fondest memory of serving in the Pennsylvania House?

JG: Fondest memory of serving in the Pennsylvania House? I don't know that I can say that I do have a fondest memory. Some of its silly stuff. Of course, you have a great fondness for those days when you get a bill passed. But, you know, its silly stuff. Like, I used to sit in the front row of the House and the pages would come and I would be in long debate and I'd get hungry and I'd send them out for a Philadelphia Cheese Steak every day and just sit there and joke around with your colleagues and eat lunch while your legislating; no particular moment. But, just working and playing at the same time.

HM: How about throughout your career?

JG: I would say that, you know, I've had opportunities to spend time with Presidents. When you get on Air Force One and you sit in the President's Office and you fly from Point A to Point B – I've flown to India with President Clinton, and I've flown back-and-

forth between Pennsylvania and Washington [D.C.] with President Bush – you get to sit and talk about issues. You come down those stairs [and] you get in the Presidential limousine and you continue the conversation. That’s pretty cool stuff, yeah.

HM: In reviewing our research files there was an article of your heroism regarding an elderly gentleman near Altoona, from September 1989. Can you recall that?

JG: You did your homework.

HM: Yeah. Can you recall that incident?

JG: Yeah, I remember it very well. I was in the State Senate and we had gone to a fundraiser for Bob Jubelirer. He had an annual golfing outing and I didn’t golf, but I played tennis, so he wanted me to play tennis with some of the contributors; I did that. And two of his staffers and I were going – I was on the Senate Campaign Committee –we were going off to another town in Pennsylvania to recruit a candidate for the Senate. It was evening and we were driving on a multi-lane highway and it poured buckets, I mean it was a blinding, blinding rain. And as the rain eased off – I remember I was sitting in the back seat, the two staff guys were in the front seat – I looked across the grass median to the other lane and there was a car moving in the same direction as we were in the other lanes. So, obviously going right into traffic and cars were blaring their horns and swerving, tractor trailers serving and this car was going down. So, I said, “Guys, look at that! That guys driving,” you know, “somebody’s going to get killed.” And they said,

“Well, what can we do about it?” I said, “Well, what we can do about it is speed up.” So, I said, “Speed up and get way in front of him and then pull into the grass.” So, we pulled into the grass, I jumped out of the car and ran out and I stood in the lane in front of the guy’s car going, you know, “Stop! Stop!” The guy slowed up and went right around me and kept going. So, I ran back to the car and I said, “Do it again, speed up!” [We] way up ahead of him. This time I took off my shirt, standing in the center of the road going like this, the guy tried to go around me again, but I got him slowed down enough that I opened the side door. I got in the car, grabbed the steering wheel, pulled it into the grass, put my foot on the brake and the car stopped. And it was an old man and I said, “Have you been drinking?” And he didn’t smell like alcohol and he said, “No.” I said, “Well what happened?” He said, “Well, in that rain I guess I got switcher-ooed.” And the poor guy was like an Alzheimer’s patient and just didn’t know where he was or what he was doing.

HM: Well, that certainly was a remarkable story.

JG: It was quite an event. Of course, the guys that I were with, being good politicians, immediately called the newspapers so I got good publicity out of it.

HM: What would you say the hardest issue you ever faced as a Legislator would be?

JG: I think the hardest issue was abortion. Abortion is the issue that divides people so bitterly. It brands you on one side of the issue, you know, you take one side of the issue

or the other and you're kind of branded for your career. It obviously involves religion, it involves life and death, it involves women as opposed to men, it involves women in very vulnerable and intimate situations, and different religions come to different conclusions about it. My conclusion was, precisely because different religions have different conclusions; it's a place where government doesn't belong. And so, I'm pro-choice; that doesn't mean I'm pro-abortion, no matter what the other side says. It means that I think it's a woman's call and I think there are reasonable limits to that. I think as you get later in the pregnancy, past viability, then the fetus is sufficiently developed that a woman should lose the option, at that point. But, I believe its part of separation of church and state. I believe it's fundamental to what William Penn, who was a great crusader for religious freedom, would have wanted us to do. And so, I lead in that issue and that made me the great hero of the pro-choice community, but you know, a demon to the anti-abortion community. And so, people who otherwise might like you and respect you, disdain you personally, they take it very personal, and careers can be made or lost on this issue. So, I think that's a very difficult issue to deal with because one side sees you as a champion of freedom and women's rights and the other sees you as a baby killer and there's no middle ground.

HM: What would you say your greatest accomplishments were?

JG: What were my greatest accomplishments? You know, it seems odd but I don't think of them in terms of this bill or that bill. I mean I think the Trauma Center stuff was good. I think teacher strike stuff was good in the General Assembly. Some of the stuff that I

did in healthcare and children's issues I'm very proud of, but I think your contribution over – and mine was over a 24-year political career – is less about the specific bills, people won't remember you for that, but it's really, I think, about the level of integrity you bring to the process and the professionalism with which you act. I hope that people will look back on my career and say, "Boy, he called them as he saw them. He made tough political choices. He wasn't afraid to lose an election. He didn't go after people personally and he did what he thought was right and he tried to be prepared about what he did." I think you do that, that's more important than the frames I have on my walls with, you know, bills and pens and that kind of thing. It's really about your reputation, your honor.

HM: Do you have any amusing stories you would like to share?

JG: Other amusing stories? Oh, God. I was, during the most recent election, in 2004, I had one of these great rides on Air Force One and we were in the limousine and we'd come from a rally in Ardmore, Pennsylvania. And [George W.] Bush was high from the rally and Senator [Arlen] Specter [U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania, 1981-present] and I were in the limousine and the streets were filled with people waving to the President. The Presidents waving back and waving back and all of a sudden he turns to Specter and he says, "Hey Arlen, some guy out there just gave you the finger." (*laugh*) Kind-of made him human.

HM: Have you remained in politics since leaving the U.S. House?

JG: The job that I have now with the Biotechnology Association is one in which we have a very strenuous advocacy role in stem cells and on a host of issues. So, I'm involved politically in that area. I spend a lot of time still on the Hill and the House and the Senate. I've tried to low-key my role, although I am chairing a campaign for a friend of mine who is running for the State Senate now. But, I need to be, you know, fairly bi-partisan now.

HM: Lastly, do you have any advice that you would like to give to newly elected Legislators?

JG: Yeah, when I mentioned to you that when I was considering running for office when I was 29 years of age, I asked Senator Howard if you can keep your integrity in politics and he said that you could, but it was difficult. And people think that when it comes to maintaining your integrity that it's, you know, are you going to take bribes? I think one time in my 24 years, some guy offered me a clock and I called the Attorney General. But, that's not what challenges your integrity. What challenges your integrity is pressure that comes from your colleagues and particularly from Leadership. And you go into one of these Caucus meetings and all the troops are rallied, "We got to go out there and pass this bill. We need every one of you. We're a team even though," you know, "you might not like this bill. We have to deliver this." And you sit there and that's when you decide whether you have integrity or not. And you stand up and say, "I can't be with you today." I mean, the hisses and boos and you're not on the team, you know. You have to

be able to handle that. You have to be able to be respectful and say, “I just can’t do it. I don’t think this is the right thing to do. I’ll work with you, but I’m not going to cave.” Because as soon as you start that process of saying, “I’ll go along with the team,” you’ve sold yourself short, you’ve sold your constituents short.

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

JG: My pleasure. Thank you.