

PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
BIPARTISAN MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH:

**The Honorable John Barley (R)**

100<sup>th</sup> District

Lancaster County

1985-2002

INTERVIEW CONDUCTED BY: Heidi Mays, House Archivist  
July 25, 2006

Transcribed by: Heather Deppen Hillard

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

**Heidi Mays (HM):** Good morning.

**The Honorable John Barley (JB):** Good morning.

**HM:** I'm here today with former Representative John Barley, who represented the 100<sup>th</sup> Legislative District from Lancaster County between the years 1985-2002. Thank you for being here with us today.

**JB:** Well, you're welcome. [I'm] happy to be here and to be able to do the program.

**HM:** Thank you. Could you please describe your background and childhood for us?

**JB:** Well, you know, I certainly would describe myself as a businessman. I was always in business for myself in a family partnership, so, I guess, when I say myself, it was with a brother. My brother and I had a rather large – and we grew the business – a rather large production agriculture business with also a significant real estate component. Much of the real estate was farmland, but there were other aspects of the real estate, as well. We were not real estate brokers, but we did own significant acreage. So, [I was] very much self-employed. [I] actually graduated from high school and pretty much knew what I wanted to do; I wanted to be in the business of agriculture and my brother was very interested, as well, and we started from very meager beginnings with very little money, but were able to leverage what little we had and worked real hard and became, in terms of

Pennsylvania agriculture, became very successful and did quite well. So, that's, again, coming back to the single word; a businessman.

**HM:** You received the Outstanding Young Farmer Award of America back in 1979.

What kind of Award was that?

**JB:** That's actually a very prestigious award, and we're doing this interview in 2006, and as we're doing this interview, I am still the only Pennsylvanian that ever won that award. So, that was something, I think, of all the various recognitions that I was given, that was probably the recognition that I cherish the most. I was in competition with young farmers, at that time it was 35 years of age or younger, all over the nation. And, to be able to win that and to continue to have that distinction for Pennsylvania was quite an accomplishment. Now, that award was given by the United States Jaycees, but it was also sponsored by the Quaker State Oil Company and it was also sponsored by the John Deere Company. So, a lot of other Companies also participated in sponsorships, but they were the two significant sponsors.

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

**JB:** Not really. My father and my grandfather, who I didn't know real well – my grandfather, I'm speaking more on the paternal side – he died when I was an early teenager. But I know my grandfather was always interested in political happenings, in government, never served any position at all. And my father was very much the same

way. I believe the only office he ever held was the Judge of Elections for a period of time. It was actually before I was old enough to know of that. And my father also was asked to serve on the local school board to fill a vacancy. I remember him considering that, but [he] decided against it. But, he voted regularly and discussed issues. I mean, it was something that my family was always involved with. I enjoyed history, and government classes; Pennsylvania Civics in ninth grade, Problems of Democracy in my senior year, U.S. History – never cared very much for World History – but [I] enjoyed Pennsylvania and U.S. History and Geography. So, I think you had those certain instincts and that’s an interest I developed and then I got involved in various trade associations, professional associations. I served with the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry; I was on the Board of Directors on the Executive Committee – actually moving through the chairs to be Chair of the Lancaster Chamber back in 1984. And then after I was elected to the House, I felt that would have been a conflict for a number of reasons; time constraints, but also, here was a group that was advocating on certain public policy and I was on the other side making public policy. So, I resigned from that board. But, you know, all those type of involvements really did help me to develop that interest. I also served as a Republican Committeeman. That was my very first venture into any kind of elective public office, if you will. And that was my only elected office until I was elected to the State House. I served on the Township Planning Commission in my home township, Manor Township, Lancaster County. I ended up being Chairperson of that Board, of the Planning Board. But, that was really the extent of government experience. But, I had a lot of business experience. Again, I served on a Board of Directors for, at that time it was Commonwealth Bank, which was a predecessor of Mellon Bank, which is

now Citizens Bank, as they all evolve. But, they had a very extensive Agriculture Loan Division. I ended up being on their Board of Directors. So, there were all kinds of things that tended to tie me to policy. If it wasn't direct government, it was policy in other ways.

**HM:** Why did you run for the Pennsylvania House?

**JB:** You know, if anyone tells you there isn't a certain amount of ego, you know, it's a lie; let's be frank. So, there's a certain amount of ego that goes with serving in public office, and I think you either have that or you don't. Now, I want to say that it depends what you do with that ego. You can channel that to very good purposes, or you can allow that to, maybe, not be used in the best way. So, I had the ego to serve; I had the desire. You know, sure, did I have a desire to be part of making public policy? Of course, I was already doing it. In my career, in my business career, I was always ahead of the curve. I mean, I was on, like I used to refer to it as, the leading edge. Our business, and particularly the dairy production component of our business, we had a lot of tours from even all over the world, that would come to the farm and visit and see what we were doing. So, you know, again, I think its people that have the ability to be able to step out and in some way be a leader. And, you know, I guess I was just blessed with some of those leadership characteristics; I had that ego, I had that drive and the willingness to put that in a position that I could use that as an elected official. But, in my case, you really grow in the position. I don't know that when I was first elected I ever imagined what it

would entail and what the 18 years I spent in the position would end up being. But, you really do need that initial desire.

**HM:** Did anything in particular push you to run for the House?

**JB:** Well, I guess, one of the biggest governmental issues; my family owned a large parcel of land that was actually the base of our farming business, where the County landfill condemned a large portion of our property. It was a very unfair condemnation. I mean, I think everybody thinks condemnations are unfair, but I felt this was especially unfair. And we became very active in that, and it became an issue in 1977 where local governments, state governments, many, many entities and agencies sort-of rallied behind our cause and realized, yes, it was a very unfair and unjust attempt at a public taking. My family is probably one of the few families in the state or the nation who ever successfully had a Declaration of Taking, which means the Eminent Domain proceedings was actually filed and served and the County Authority that did that reversed that decision without ever going to court; it was done by public pressure. So, that certainly was something that pushed me more and more toward a desire to help make public policy.

**HM:** Could you talk about your first run for the House?

**JB:** Sure; 1984. In Lancaster County, and particularly back even in the [19]80s, and it was beginning to wane, but the Party, particularly the Republican Party, was very influential. And I mean, when I say the Party, I'm talking of the organization, certainly

with a huge majority of registered voters. But, the Party, as an organization, had a policy of endorsing candidates for public office. Not every County or not every Republican Committee does that, but in our County, even to this day, they do it. It doesn't mean as much today; the Party is not as influential as it was back in the [19]70s and [19]80s. But, the local State Senator that was in office for many years, probably close to 20, voluntarily decided to retire. Well, the person that was serving in the 100<sup>th</sup> District at the time decided to run for the Senate, so the district became an open seat; a non-incumbent. I determined, at that time, to become a candidate. I wanted to seek the endorsement of the Committee. Now, I was a member of that Committee, and I had been very active in local Party politics. I worked in any number of ways; voter registration drives, I was Campaign Chairperson for our local Congressman two years before that. I mean, I worked in the vineyards, as they say. When my Campaign began, it was December of [19]83, it was a sequence of events; the Senator announced his retirement, the local Representative holding the position said, "I'm going to run for the Senate," so I became a candidate contingent on the local Representative getting the endorsement for the Senate. I was not going to challenge him, which built goodwill with the Committee. I was the first one out of the box, out of the gate, so to speak. And I made a very, very conscious, very diligent effort – there were, I'm trying to recall, I believe that there were 56 Republican Committee people in the District. So, from the beginning of December through early to mid-January of that year, I visited every one – well, you start out sending a letter, then you follow up [with a] phone call – and I made the attempt and was successful. Now, obviously I ended up with a few of them being candidates running against me, so I didn't go visit them. But, I did a lot of work. I mean, I worked very,

very, very hard; very intensely for those six weeks to get that Party endorsement, because I knew that if I got Party endorsement, chances are the other candidates would drop out and respect the Party's endorsement. Well, there were 56 votes and on the first ballot, I had 22 and my closest competitor had 13, and on the second ballot I had the majority – now you needed a two-thirds majority – so, by the third ballot there was a move to declare a unanimous vote for my candidacy. And, I became the endorsed candidate of the Republican Party for the 100<sup>th</sup> District by mid-January of 1984, because that was a Presidential year; that was the year Ronald Reagan ran for re-election and the Primary is always earlier, it's in April on a Presidential year, so we always did our endorsements, we wanted to make sure they were finished before you circulated petitions. So, that way you could tell if someone started circulating a petition before the endorsement was over, well, how much value did they put on the endorsement? A lot of that was, you know, very intense inter-Party politics and I learned them very well; I became a pretty good student of them. So, lo-and-behold, all of my opponents dropped out except for one, and he happened to be the Mayor of the smallest borough on the fringe of the District. And he was an older gentleman. Even then he was older than I am now. I think he was, like, 65 or so; Victor Lennox. And Vic got two votes for the endorsement, that's all he got. But, he was, like, recently retired and, "Aw, shucks this was something to do." And we, of course, went into the Primary and he was my Primary opponent. I had no opponent in the General election my first time. I won every voting precinct except for the one that Vic lived in, and that was Mountville Borough, and I think, I mean, I don't have the exact numbers, but, I mean, he won that by, like, less than a dozen votes, if I recall. He barely carried his home district. So, that was certainly the most competitive election I ever had.

I mean, I had a Primary challenge, I guess, one time after that, but it was a pain; but it wasn't as difficult as that.

**HM:** You said that the person that represented the 100<sup>th</sup> District decided to run for the Senate that was Gib Armstrong<sup>1</sup>. And then his son actually replaced you. What was that –

**JB:** I don't know that I would ever agree that he replaced me; he followed me.

**HM:** Okay, you're right. He followed you.

**JB:** You know, that's a personal thing that I guess I'll just let it at that.

**HM:** Okay. I just thought that was an interesting footnote there. Could you explain the campaign process and how it has changed over the years?

**JB:** Oh, yeah. The campaign process from [19]84 through today, and I mean, I'm actively involved in it today, it has changed dramatically. It's almost like a revolution. I mean, I indicated the little story here that I told about the whole endorsement process. Well, in Lancaster County that was pretty much your campaign. And you know what? That was pretty efficient. It didn't cost a lot of money, you know, really. And you know, Vic was – “Okay, Vic, ‘atta boy!” You know, “You had every right in the world to run,”

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibson E., held the House seat from 1977-1984; currently holds the 13<sup>th</sup> Pennsylvania Senatorial District seat (1985-present). His son, Gibson C., held the House seat from 2003-2006.

– but he raised very little money. I don't remember what I spent in that first Primary, but it wasn't much. I bet – now realizing in 1984 terms – if it was 2,000 dollars that was it. So, if 2,000 dollars back then was 10,000 dollars today, that's still very minimal. But, the way campaigns were run, back then, you know, you did a little radio; TV was just not even something you thought of. You didn't have cable TV, so you couldn't even think of cable TV ads. The radio, that was relatively inexpensive. You always wanted to do your little weekly newspapers, which I think they still do that. Direct mail – I don't know. I mean, I never knew of any direct mail vendor that I went to; we did a letter. I had my campaign people, you know, some of my volunteers and mostly the Republican Committee people, because what I had built in at that time, I had volunteers that would help with all of that. They'd stuff the envelopes, you know, we would do a letter and we would mail that out and then, you know, I could depend almost exclusively on all of my Republican Committee people on Election Day being at the poll. And John Barley was the endorsed Republican candidate and they made sure that the voters knew that. And they did their job. So, today, you know, it's still worthwhile to have good people at the polls, if they know the voters. But, what has changed so much is, number one, the cost. The negativity and, you know, there's always been some negativity in campaigns, of course, but that has intensified. You know, bloggers are out there today and their goal for the most part – I have seen very few bloggers that have a goal of attempting to build people up, you know? Their job is to tear someone down and to be very personal, very nasty, extremely vindictive, so campaigns have become that way and, you know, I understand that. But, again, cable TV, network TV – I mean, golly, critical House races can be a half a million dollars today. It was unheard of – you wouldn't have thought

about that. I mean, even when I was elected, I think, the job paid 35,000 dollars a year, which, quite frankly wasn't bad; I mean, you know, it was respectable. And you'd have never thought of spending 100,000 dollars for a job that paid 35[000 dollars]. Today, they'll invest a half a million. So, I mean, it's just the direct mail, the vendors. There's a lot of money to be made by certain people, you know, political consultants. Our political consultants were our volunteers. I mean, yeah, we had a Party headquarters. We would do a – we still do, the Party still does – a dinner every year to raise money. But, there were various efforts to raise money to support the Party, but then the Party became the infrastructure and the campaign manager to run your campaigns. So, that whole system has really kind-of gone by the wayside. Now, again, that was probably even more so true in Lancaster, in Montgomery, in Bucks, in Delaware, all those real strong – Chester County. But now, today, these campaigns are run much more independent as little businesses. And that's the way candidates, I mean, that's the way candidates run their campaigns. They've gotten to be almost like little businesses, you know, raising several hundred thousand to millions of dollars in some of the Leadership cases. I mean, this recent Primary where Jubelier [Robert C.; State Senator, 1975-2006] and Brightbill [David; State Senator, 1983-2006] were defeated after they spent a million and half dollars, I mean, think about a small business that grosses 500,000 dollars a year. That's not small potatoes for a sole proprietor or small partnership. And, that's where campaigns are today.

**HM:** Were you successful in fundraising?

**JB:** Yeah. I learned how to raise money. And I didn't do it for myself; I did it mostly for the Caucus. Maybe I take some responsibility for where campaigns are today because John Perzel [State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1979-present; Speaker 2003-2006] and I were two people that just, for whatever reason, clicked. I mean, you know, opposites attract – often times that said in marriage; I don't quite mean it that way, but, business partnerships, but whatever – John had and has certain abilities and strengths that I don't have and I had certain abilities and strengths that really he didn't have, and we really complimented each other. And back in 1989, I went to John, and it was right after he was first elected to Leadership, and I said, "John, I think I have some ideas on how to raise significant amounts of money." I said, "I've done it for a school whose board I serve on that I actually was helping with a capital fund campaign." And I learned then, this was in [19]89, how you can go for the appropriate purpose and make a presentation to someone and ask them for significant amounts of money. You need to believe in what you're doing. I believed in the school, as a matter of fact, it was the Evangelical School of Theology in Myerstown, and I was on their Board, and they were doing a very huge capital campaign. I'm not going to name names of who I solicited; that would be inappropriate. But, we solicited someone who had recently sold a business, had a great business transaction, [and I] knew they had the wherewithal. And the President of the School and I went to visit him and in 1989, looked him the eye and said, "We would like you to contribute 75,000 dollars to the capital campaign," and they said, "Yes." I said, "Wow. This can be done." And I think that single incident, although it wasn't political, you know, the process is the same. So, I went to Perzel and I said, "You know, we need to put a major donor program together. We're not selling anything except, what will the

Republicans do if they're in the majority? If you think we offer a better alternative than the Democrats – I came in the minority; [19]84, Democrats were in the majority, Casey was Governor [Robert P.; 1987-1994], the Senate was tottering, I think it was 26-24 and then there was a fiasco where even in Philadelphia there was a Senator, I forget what happened there, then it 25-25 for awhile, with Mark Singel [Lt. Governor, 1987-1994; State Senator, 1981-1987] being the tiebreaker, so the Senate essentially was even Democrat for a short period of time. So, anyhow, we had that era where it was a full Democratic State. And that's the way Pennsylvania is; we swing. But, it was difficult for us to raise money and Matt Ryan [Matthew J.; State Representative, Delaware County 1963-2003; Speaker, 1981-1982; 1995-2003] was never a fundraiser. I mean, he was happy if he was in the minority or the majority; he got his bond work; he got whatever it was he wanted for himself and he didn't really care that much. So, Perzel and I were tired of it; it wasn't any fun and we weren't getting any good public policy. So, in late [19]89, we began to make preparation. And I'll never forget my first contact along with – we did hire a consultant, Dennis Powell, who to this day still assists with Caucus efforts – but, we developed the program, the three of us, and I went to visit a gentleman in Lancaster, and this is public record, because it was a campaign contribution, Steve Wallace, and explained to Steve what we were doing and if we could raise the money, how we could defeat enough Democrats to be in the majority. And we asked Steve for 25,000 dollars. He said, "You know what? I'm going to give it to you." He pulled a check out and wrote it out that day. *(laugh)* No one in the Republican Caucus ever heard of getting a single check for 25,000 dollars. And that's where I focused a lot of my efforts and, quite frankly, I know that my efforts brought the Republican Caucus into the

majority in 1994. And we ended up getting in the majority by Tom Stish [Thomas; State Representative, Luzerne County; Democrat, 1991-1994; Republican, 1995-1996] switching Parties, but I'm the one that spent – the election was Tuesday – from Wednesday until Sunday I spent practically the entire time personally working with Tom because he was desirous of changing Parties. But, I made that deal happen. So, you know, I love the politics of it; I enjoyed the politics of what I was doing more than the public policy, you know. And, you know, certain public policy I enjoyed, but I enjoyed the politics.

**HM:** Did you enjoy campaigning?

**JB:** Yes and no. There are certain aspects of it; I like the strategy of it, I like the – when it gets too up front and personal, probably I don't like it. (*laugh*)

**HM:** Let's see. Well, could you, in your own words, describe the 100<sup>th</sup> Legislative District?

**JB:** Yeah. The 100<sup>th</sup> Legislative District is pretty unique, and I'm sure practically everyone you interview tend to say that, but I genuinely believe there are reasons why. Number one; there are more Amish farms in the 100<sup>th</sup> District than there are in any other Legislative District in Pennsylvania. Now, we have several municipalities that fewer than 50 percent of the school-age children attend a public school because they are either Amish, Mennonite, are home-schooled or go to some sort of Christian school. So, it's a

very conservative District with a very conservative faith. Then, it's very intensely agriculture – and I knew all these when I was in office, I'm not too far off because reapportionment in 2002 changed that a little bit – but there were, at the time, I guess seven Legislative Districts, but the 100<sup>th</sup> District was one-third of the geographic area. So, it was much more rural than your typical areas of Lancaster County. The Susquehanna River is the western border, so you have a very intense, scenic area there of, we always called it the river hills. Another thing that makes that district unique is that it borders the Mason-Dixon line. And it was heavily settled – of course, the southern end which is the 100<sup>th</sup> District, the southern end of Lancaster County – was heavily settled by the Quakers. And you also had a very intense population of Presbyterians. Now, the old story was that the Quakers, of course, being pacifist would not bear arms, so William Penn encouraged the Presbyterians to come over and settle and they would protect the Mason-Dixon line; they'd protect the border. [There's] probably some truth in that. There continues to be some very deep roots with the Presbyterians in the southern end. And they're more or less mainstream Christians. There's not a very strong Quaker influence. Most of the Quakers have sort-of assimilated into other faiths or other churches. There may be one or two of the old Friends Meeting Houses that are still active, but there's a real influence. As a matter of fact, the young man who was recently elected in the Primary, Brian Cutler<sup>2</sup> – a fine young man; he's going to a great job representing that district – his roots go back to the Quaker beginnings. I mean, he's like, I think, a seventh or eighth generation descendent of some settlers in the district. So, there's things like that. Now, the northern portion of the district, which is more closer to the center part of the county, that's becoming more and more a suburb of Lancaster, of

---

<sup>2</sup> Cutler won the General Election in 2006; serving the 100<sup>th</sup> Legislative District, 2007-present.

the city. But, that's true in many areas. But, I think what makes it unique [is] the agriculture; very intense agriculture, but it's now much different than it was in [19]84. You no longer have the smaller, average-sized farm where a family lives there and makes their living, and so on, farming. That's still true with the Amish and the Mennonites. But now it goes from the small-time very conservative Amish, Mennonite farm to the large, much more – they're still family owned – but, they're much larger, on a much larger scale, much more efficient. I mean, again, there's a few of the townships – I know the one township, Bart, which is a very intense agricultural township in the southern end, there's only two farms that are not owned by the Amish. And when I first took the office, the Amish were really just beginning to move into the area. So, there's been that revolution, which you don't have too many people talk about their district being overtaken by the Amish. (*laugh*)

**HM:** No. What about the political makeup?

**JB:** It's still very conservative. Not as right-wing – I want to make sure that I say this properly – it's very conservative, so, you know, when you call – we would be very conservative Republicans. But, I think the 100<sup>th</sup> District is more mainstream conservative. What's happened in Lancaster County, our Party has been somewhat infiltrated – if that's not too strong a word – by the remnants of the Christian Coalition, they call themselves Lancaster County Action, but now they're sort-of dying out as well. And they became extremely dogmatic. I mean, there were two or three churches in Lancaster and if you weren't a member of one of those churches, you know, you didn't

quite meet the litmus test for elective office and the stamp of approval of the Republican Committee. Well, that's what sort-of caused the [de]mise of the Republican Committee. Now the Chairman is back to the person who's Chairman, Dave Dumeyer, much more of a mainstream conservative Republican. The 100<sup>th</sup> District was always more mainstream conservative Republican; it was never drawn quite as far to the right on the dogmatic, fundamentalist Christian issues. Now, they were very pro-life, anti-gambling, you know, that's fine; that's a solid position, that's where the Catholics are, and that's a good example. The many of those strong Party activists, if you were Catholic, you weren't good enough, because you didn't quite meet their litmus test. So, I saw that whole evolution of change. And now, fortunately, I think its swinging back from the right a little more toward middle mainstream Republicans.

**HM:** Representing a rural district, what issues did that present with your colleagues here in the House?

**JB:** Well, you know, obviously I was interested in agricultural issues, both from a personal point of view and also from the district. Small business, business issues, [with my] background in the Chamber [and] being a business person all my life, I took a strong interest, of course, in business issues, cutting taxes, you know, I never saw a tax I didn't want to cut; I was that kind of guy. You know, the least amount of government is the best kind of government. I mean, I knew those clichés quite well. I still think that, you know, basically for the most part, it's still accurate. But environmental issues, I would say probably the greatest challenge I had was DEP [Department of Environmental

Protection]. It's just an Agency that has, over the years, grown tremendously. You know, as the bureaucracy becomes entrenched and now we have either civil servants or they're covered under State Employees Unions, you know, it's like, Administrations come and Administrations go, I hate to admit I'm old enough – I'm 60 years old – and I've seen enough of these things happen, many of those bureaucrats if they're not out and active, they're hidden somewhere and they resurface, you know. So, that's the one that I saw that was the most challenging that way was the environmental. Even with my municipalities, you know, if they had a stream crossing issue, oh, it would drive them crazy getting a permit to replace a bridge, a small country bridge. Farmers, and particularly the Plain farmers – another thing that was a real challenge, and these were very specific to the district – the Amish would have what they call 'echo housing'. It's where they have a small home for their grandparents, or maybe on the other side of the generation if the young kids, in their early 20s, get married and want to stay there in the business, they got to have another house. Well, DEP drove us crazy trying to get permits for on-lot septic, you know, sewer, because we didn't have public sewer in much of the district. So, trying to have a reasonable environmental balance so that business can prosper and create jobs, and yet certainly as someone who is involved in agriculture, I understand that the land is a valuable resource and we need to be conservationists, but we cannot be radical about it. And, I don't want to say that I would clash, but, yeah, I would differ with some of my colleagues on that. But, that was fine. I mean, we could agree to disagree at time. I think I did pretty well, you know, with that, and again, I learned that. That's what I said earlier in the program; I think you learn some of those things as you go along, and that was one that I probably learned how to do.

**HM:** Was Octoraro Orphie in your district?

**JB:** Octoraro Orphie? *(laugh)* Oh, Groundhog Day, I always got the short end of that. You know, after they made that movie out there, whatever it was, “Groundhog,” something or another. You can tell I wasn’t enamored by it.

**HM:** I wasn’t surprised by your comment just now, because after reading the debates –

**JB:** You get some of the debates? We’d always – I ended up with the job – apparently, back in the day when some of the old timers could speak Dutch – I can’t speak Dutch. My Amish and Mennonite constituents could. And by the way, they don’t vote. Very few of them. I mean, the Amish will vote 20 percent of those eligible, versus 50 percent of the normal registration numbers – but, there would be debates between some of the older Members that all knew Dutch about the Groundhog on Groundhog Day. So, I was never able to carry it that far. Yeah, Octoraro Orphie he got a lot of coverage back home and we tried to hold our own, but after they made that movie in Punxsutawney, why, you know Phil, he just kind-of took the stage every year.

**HM:** He certainly did. Through redistricting and reapportionment, your district did change through the years.

**JB:** Oh yeah. It always got smaller.

**HM:** Yeah. You said it got smaller, but, is there anything else that changed with the district? You said the suburbs, you [had an] increase in the suburbs?

**JB:** Well, my home township, yes, the areas in Manor Township that were closest to the city – and quite frankly, the northeast corner of Manor Township is only about two miles from the Lancaster city line, and I would say from [19]84 until 2000, that was the last year that I actually circulated petitions in that district, [there was] a vast change in that constituency in that portion of the district. They became much more transient; meaning, the people would not be nearly as permanent. There was actually substantial amounts of public housing that were built in those areas. And, gee, I mean, here’s an area in the township that my father – who’s still living, by the way, 95 and just as chipper as can be and still likes to talk politics when we get together – but, he would say, “Yeah, John, you know, back then that farm so-and-so, there at Maple Grove” – which is right on the line – “I used to go there and did this, did that.” Well, today there’s public housing there. Now, obviously, there was not a farm in my day, but probably in the last 50 years, a lot of that area transitioned from farming to residential post World War II, okay. Baby Boomers went in, well, parents of – I guess I try to claim to be the leading edge of the Baby Boomers – but, our parents, that generation kind-of developed that. Now, that’s becoming affordable housing for the people who want to leave the city. So, there’s a much greater portion of minority ownership and occupancy of that area. I mean, when I was first elected, quite frankly, I don’t know how many minorities lived in the District, but boy; there weren’t many of any race at all. That’s more significant. So, yeah,

because I know one thing I used to say, you know, if I wanted to get signatures for my petitions I'd go over to Manor Ridge, west Lancaster, that whole area, and you'd go door-to-door, because, it was built in, like I said, the [19]50s when all of the houses were very close together. You could pick up signatures because every other house, at least, was registered Republican, in some cases one right after the other. It got to the place, as that changed, where 50 to 75 percent of the block wasn't even registered anymore and the only, for the most part, the only registered Republicans were the older people who hadn't moved out.

**HM:** Do you feel like you effectively served your constituents goals?

**JB:** Oh yeah. I was probably the best – I don't want to sound arrogant, but – I was probably the best Legislator, certainly in that district, up to that time for having the constituent service. Now, that doesn't necessarily reflect negatively on my predecessors because, here in Harrisburg, in the State Capitol – and it happened in both Caucuses – they tended to focus more on constituent service and my predecessor never had a district office in the district; he did not have a district office. I was the first legislator to open a district office and I opened two because it was very large geographically and, believe me, it's parochial; the people in Quarryville and Solanco, they are the southern end, and they don't like them people up there toward the city. *(laugh)* So, I had an office in Quarryville and I had an office in Manor Township area, which was the largest populated area. And, that served the people well, oh my, and after I left the office, I got calls for, oh, two, three years, about, "John, we can't get the help that you used to give us. Can

you help?” So, I mean, I was good at that and I enjoyed that and I had good people. I kept my people long-term. The person that was in that position after I left, I think, had more district office help turnover in four years than I had in 18, and so the people that were being served became very – you know, you need continuity in the people business. This is a people business; it’s dealing with people, and I felt that’s one thing I always prided myself in and that was a good judge of people, because I was always the owner of the company and I always, from the time I was 17 years old, I was an employer. And I developed instincts of knowing characteristics of good employees. And I had a lot of good staff people. I mean, most of my staff people left because they were retiring or, maybe starting a family, or for some reason other than any kind of difference.

**HM:** Something of note also, you only took two days off after having a double-bypass surgery in [19]92.

**JB:** Yeah, you know, I talk about being in the business of farming or the business of modern agriculture, and I don’t say that for any reason to show any disrespect for calling it farming, but farming is a business and anybody that’s in it for any reason other than business reasons probably isn’t going to be successful. So, I’m a business man that happened to be in the business of farming. Now, you can be a business person that happens to be in the business of running a restaurant. My main business interest was dairy. So, if there’s a business that’s any more demanding, I can’t think of it. Restaurants are right on par. You’re under the gun twice a day, seven days a week, you know, 365 days out of the year. So, you know, that’s me; that’s my instinct. So, you

know, I had to have a bypass and, you know, I did not have a heart attack – you know the thing that bothered me, I went in the hospital April 27 of [19]92; the Primary was the 28<sup>th</sup>. And I didn't feel bad; I was having a little tightness and I told the doctor, I said, "I got to get this checked." He said, "I don't know." He said, "I don't think it's a whole lot." I said, "Doc, something's wrong." He said, "Well, if you want to get a heart cath[eter], I'll send you in." I said, "Yep, that way I'll know." Well, they never let me out of the hospital. They said, "Man, if you have a heart attack, you're going to die. We got to fix this thing." So, I said, "Yeah, but tomorrow is Primary Election Day, and I haven't missed a Primary for, I don't know how many, years, ever, you know, and I don't want to screw up my perfect voting record and I can't get an absentee ballot." And the doc, you know, he said, "Well, you're not going out of here with me signing off." He said, "I can't prevent you. (*laugh*) I'm not having that on my," you know, I guess, "my liability ledger, if you die." So, I succumbed; the family convinced me that I better stay there [on] the 28<sup>th</sup> of April. I woke up that morning and they got a kick out it, because the doctors and the surgeons said, "You know what the first thing you wanted to know?" because there was a competitive election in the 98<sup>th</sup> District, that we were trying to beat Tom Armstrong [Thomas; State Representative, Lancaster County, 1991-2002], who defeated one of my good friends two years before, he said, "As soon as you woke up you wanted to know who won the election in the 98<sup>th</sup> District." (*laugh*) We finally beat Tom Armstrong, but it took us 10 more years. (*laugh*) But, that was an experience. So, yeah, I came home from the hospital, and, you know, I don't remember exactly what day, but you're absolutely right. Dave Hickernell [David; State Representative, Lancaster County, 2003-present], who is now a Member, was on my staff, good guy, and, I said,

“Dave, I don’t think I better drive.” I said, “Would you drive me up?” I had an office; I had a nice office. I was in Leadership then, so if I got tired I went and laid down. But, I knew what my capabilities were; my restrictions. So, yeah, that’s a long story about that, but, that was the old dairyman in me; the cows had to be milked, the job had to be done.

**HM:** Could you explain your feelings during your first Swearing-In Ceremony?

**JB:** You know, I guess I thought about that little bit on the way up, because, you know, that was a big day. That was just, like, an awesome day, as the word is used now; that was truly awesome. You know, this Capitol is very beautiful; it’s very ornate. You know, it’s like, it’s, I don’t know; it was like a whole different world. It was pretty different from, you know, the seat of a tractor or the rear end of a cow, you know.

**HM:** Sam Hayes [Samuel, Jr.; State Representative, Blair, Centre and Huntingdon Counties, 1971-1992; PA Secretary of Agriculture, 1997-2003] described the action on the House floor as a “livestock auction.” Would you agree with that?

**JB:** I think a livestock auction is more orderly. (*laugh*)

**HM:** (*laugh*) Okay. Does everything truly have its place? Is it more chaotic as a rank-and-file Member or as a Leader?

**JB:** It's more hectic as a Leader; much more hectic. I don't know if it's more chaotic. I don't think it's as chaotic, because as a Leader, I think you know more about what's going to happen, but it's more hectic. You know, because you have the Members, the rank-and-file Members, that are in chaos and they're coming to you, "John, how long are we going to be here today? What are we going to be voting [on]? I want to go play golf." So, you know, you've got to put up with that. You don't do that as a rank-and-file Member. That would be my impression of that.

**HM:** Okay. Could you describe your first office in Harrisburg?

**JB:** Yeah, we're in the Capitol Annex<sup>3</sup> – it was in the Capitol Annex on the first floor, not far from the room we're in, and there were about five of us in there. I believe that I was the first class, as we called ourselves, the 1984 election cycle, that where each Member had their own personal secretary. Now, the secretary's were not, like – we just had a small office and then there was an outside, like, hallway so-to-speak, where the desks were arranged with little dividers, and that's where our secretary's were. But, yeah, I did have my own office. It was quite adequate, but, you know, back then you didn't have Fax machines; you didn't have computers. I thought the Mag[netic] Card typewriters were something from outer space, you know. I wasn't even familiar with them. I was like, "Wow. That's neat." So, it was in the Capitol Annex.

**HM:** You said you had a district office; did you have a district office immediately?

---

<sup>3</sup> Dedicated in 2004 as the Matthew J. Ryan Building after the former Speaker.

**JB:** I did. I had the two district offices. I ran both of them part-time, I thought that was all I had to do, and realized, probably after into the first term, I think, that we needed to have them open full-time, because we just got more, you know – success breeds success, as they say. You do something for one person and they tell another and pretty soon, you know, our offices were very busy.

**HM:** Did you have any mentors whenever you first started?

**JB:** You know, I have to say they weren't a direct mentor and unfortunately, the gentleman died the year that I was elected and I know that I would have called on him far more, but the one person who I would say was a mentor for me back from Lancaster, was Sherman Hill [State Representative, Lancaster County, 1965-1976]. Now, Sherman Hill held the seat in the 100<sup>th</sup> District for, I'm not sure how many years but, a number of years. And Sherman was a fine man and he did a lot to advise me in my political career. And, I would have to say that Sherman – although not directly here. Now, if I look at the person in Harrisburg who mentored me, and again a fine gentleman, Representative Shuler, Jere Shuler [State Representative, Lancaster County, 1983-2002]. You know, I always said about Jere Shuler; if there's ever a person on earth that I would consider to be a fine gentleman, it's Jere Shuler. And I don't know who would be a finer gentleman than him. And, I mean, that's just the way Jere was. Jere sat right beside me and, boy I'll tell you what, he was a big brother. He was just that. He was about 10 years older than I, maybe a little more than that, maybe a dozen or 14 – Jere's somewhere in his 70s – but, he made sure I didn't make any mistakes, didn't vote the wrong way, and kept me

on track. So, I would have to say that the direct mentor, because of the way we were seated and everything, was probably Shuler; good guy.

**HM:** Did you help anybody as they were coming up?

**JB:** I think if you'd talk to Jerry Stern, Jerry Stern [State Representative, Blair County, 1993-present] would probably tell you that he looks to me as a mentor. Jerry sat beside me for, I think it was, four years. To this day, Jerry and I are very close. I consider Jerry Stern – there's not many Members that I consider to be friends. You know, in Harrisburg you have a lot of rented friends and I found that out so, so, so quickly. You know, they rent you for what they can get out of you; they're not your friends. And I knew that, I always said that. I always said, "Look. Pinch yourself; this isn't reality, you know. They're not your friends. They just want something from you." Because, it's just like life; there's only a few people you can really count on, but it's worse here. I mean, I could use other words to describe them, but I won't. But, we can talk more about that; I'd be happy to share more about that. But, Jerry is a friend both in the profession – I don't even like to call this a profession, because it's something different than a profession; it's something different than a business. It's just government; it's making laws – but, Jerry is a great friend and I think I did help to mentor him. I'd like to think that I had some influence on Dave Hickernell. I don't know how direct a mentor, but, you know, Dave started working for me when I was first elected to Leadership. And so, you know, we worked very closely together. Dave's a good man. He was a good balance for me. You know, he's not as much of a risk-taker as I am, but when he worked for me,

that was good, because he had that balance. And, he's just a good solid guy and I'm sure he's learned some things from me. There's some younger folks around the Capitol and staff. There's a fair amount of people that I brought in on staff and I didn't make very many mistakes when I hired someone to be on staff. I wouldn't hire political hacks like some people. You know, some people wanted folks hired just because, you know, for not the right reasons. If I hired somebody and wanted them to have a job here in Harrisburg, I wanted them to have a job because I knew they were good people. So, there's some of those folks still [here], I mean, Jay [James] Howes is someone – I'm going to go have lunch with him today – he's the, I don't know, Policy Director for the Republican Ag[ricultural and Rural Affairs] Committee. I hired Jay for staff back in 1994. He's here to this day, doing a great job. Mentor? No, he's not a colleague, but, you know, we learned a lot together. So, you know, I could point to a lot of people like that.

**HM:** One of the other questions we usually ask is about camaraderie; would you say that there's camaraderie in the House?

**JB:** Some. Yeah, some, you know, I mean, when you're in a close working environment like that, sure, there is. But, it's a different camaraderie. It's camaraderie like you have anywhere, you know. Whether you're in a club – you know, I was in the Jaycees; there was camaraderie there. You have camaraderie when you're in high school or a college. But when you leave, you go other ways and that camaraderie or that, whatever, you know, with few exceptions and there may be a few of those friends. So sure, there's camaraderie. But everybody – you got to understand the makeup or the – I referred

earlier to ego. There's a lot of ego in this body. That's one thing that's probably greater than, you know every Member – this is very broad and I'm trying to make kind-of a point here, but – you know, their ego is such that they think they can do it better than the Leader that's there, or, you know, whatever. Because that's why they're there; they're Leaders, you know. So, that tempers the camaraderie a little bit. Guys like Art Hershey [Arthur D.; State Representative, Chester County, 1983-2008], I loved to sit around with Art. You know, Art's a farmer, so we had things in common there, you know, as well. Oh, I can think of half a dozen guys that I really enjoyed, you know – Perzel and I. We always had some good camaraderie. I enjoyed going out with Perzel, a few beers, and, you know, other than business. [We] probably didn't do that as much as we should have with either one.

**HM:** What role does seniority play in the House?

**JB:** It's very important.

**HM:** And how did seniority affect you as a Member?

**JB:** I was lucky. You know, I often use this; people who know me well will say, "Yeah, I heard John Barley say that often." In real estate, I told you earlier I made some good money in real estate, there's three things that matter; location, location, location. In politics there's three things that matter; it's timing, it's timing, it's timing. I was here, I got elected and took office in [19]85. After the 1990 election, six years in the minority

and with not much seniority, I got elected to Leadership. Now, there's not very many people – you go back through the archives – that did that. So, again, I guess I'm going to say it was the proven leadership that I have. And, I never doubted my abilities, again, your strengths are your weaknesses, your weaknesses are your strengths. That's another John Barley cliché that I didn't originate, but I kind-of like it. So, all of my strengths that I developed in being an independent, entrepreneurial, hard-driving business person, I didn't know anything else. I started at 17; I didn't go to college. I took a couple courses after I was out of school, nothing ever significant, because I didn't have time for that. I knew what I wanted to do; I wanted to be in business, I wanted to make money and I wanted to be successful. And I was. I got married, raised a family. I have four outstanding kids, you know, two of them and a nephew running the business now, you know, very successful. So, all of those things carried over, I think, to me being very aggressive, hard-working – I told you the little story about raising the money; well, hey, I was the guy who was able to raise the money for the Caucus to run campaigns. You know, what do they say? You know, when you take advantage of an opportunity when you have somebody that was probably willing to do that. I mean, I worked hard, so I earned the right. But, the timing was such that it worked perfect. We had a Member, and he still does some lobbying, Rick Cessar [Richard J.; State Representative, Allegheny County, 1971-1994]. Rick Cessar is from the Allegheny County area and Rick was in Leadership and, you know, nice guy. Rick's a great guy, you know, sort-of lighthearted type of guy, and a lot of people said, "John, I don't think Rick's all that effective in Leadership, so we want you to run against him." I said, "I'm not going to run against Rick, because he's a nice guy. But I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'll go see Rick

and I'll tell Rick that I'm thinking about running against him and I'd like to run against him, people are encouraging me, and I may do that." But, I said, "I'm not going to just declare a war. I wouldn't want to be treated that way and I'm not treating Rick Cessar that way; he doesn't deserve it." So, I made an appointment, I'll never forget this, he was up in the fourth floor up in the Capitol in his office, and I made an appointment to see him and, oh my, I think he made me sit there for a good hour or more. I waited and I went in and I said, "Rick," I said, "I'm thinking about running for Caucus Secretary" – that was the position he had – and I said, "I just wanted you to know before I send a letter out or tell any of my other colleagues." Rick looked at me, and he said, "John," he said, "I think that would be a great idea." He said, "We need some new blood in this Leadership team." He said, "We need some guys like you that have your level of energy," and so on. And I'm like, to myself, "Oh my God. What's going on?" And then he finished it by saying, "And by the way, I've decided not to run for re-election Leadership because I'm going to run for County Commissioner the following year and I don't want to have the distraction of being in Leadership." Timing. I walked from that office – the Floor was coming in Session – I left that office, went down to the Floor of the House, went to other colleagues in Leadership who did not know it. I am not only telling them I'm running, I'm telling them Rick Cessar isn't. *(laugh)* And I just went from Member to Member to Member that day, got a letter out right away, and I had an opponent, Lois [Sherman] Hagarty [State Representative, Montgomery County, 1979-1991] – who now does some lobbying – she ran against me, but I was ahead of the curve; it was timing. So, that's how I got into Leadership. I mean, that's a long answer to seniority, but, yeah. Normally, I'd have been sitting around here until I don't know what

year until I would have had any kind of seniority or clout; it was long. It would have been probably [19]96 or [199]8.

**HM:** Well, as a Member of Leadership, you had the opportunity to work closely with your Leadership and Democratic Leadership. What was your role?

**JB:** Well, I started out as Caucus Secretary, which has a relatively minor role in actual functions. It was a good opportunity. Perzel and I worked closely together. Outside the Capitol, I did a lot of political work. I helped a lot with the campaigns, but, you know, the Caucus Secretary doesn't have a lot of immediate responsibilities. I think you call the role when the Caucus organizes. But, it is an opportunity to get involved and be part of the team and have an input. So, you know, it was a great place for me to begin. It was a great opportunity, yeah. And then, you know, I had other positions.

**HM:** Right, then you went to the majority, and then you became –

**JB:** No. I went to Caucus, oh, it wasn't Chairman; I was never Caucus Chairman.

**HM:** Whip?

**JB:** Policy; Policy Committee Chairman, or whatever. No, I went to Whip when we went into the majority. I had, I think it was, Policy Chairman. I was Caucus Policy Chairman for one term, Secretary one term, and then we were still in the minority [and in

19]92 I was Policy Chairman. Now, back then the Policy Chairman ran the campaigns. So, I ran the campaigns and that was after the [19]92 election, prior to [19]94. [19]93 and [19]94, I ran the campaigns and I was Policy Chairman. I held some Policy Committee meetings and some things like that. That's the position Mario Civera [State Representative, Delaware County, 1980-2010] has today.

**HM:** Okay.

**JB:** And, I enjoyed that because I liked the campaign side of it. So, I raised money, ran the campaigns and we came up one short on election night; we were 101 to 102. And I'm the first person since 1982 – so there was 12 years – I was the first person to run campaigns to ever come anywhere near that close and didn't spend as much money as some of the others. The Leadership team did not work with me that year, unfortunately, as closely as they should have. There was a little bit of inside, you know, competition, which is not unusual in Caucus politics. I think had it been a little more cohesive, I think we'd have definitely got that elected majority in [19]94. But, that's what I did that second shot and then, I referred earlier to the probably most significant thing I ever did, as an impact to public policy, [which] was convincing Tom Stish to switch. I mean, the Republicans are still in the majority. I made Matt Ryan Speaker. He never appreciated it, but I did and, you know, it was me. Because most people would have went away on election night. I mean, I was low that night. I'll never forget that night; I was feeling bad. Tom Ridge [Governor, 1995-2001] got elected Governor, Republicans had a Majority in the Senate and here I came up one short. But you know what? That was the

dairyman in me. That was the ‘twice a day, every day,’ ‘don’t give up,’ ‘get out there and figure out another way.’ You know, Sam mentioned the cattle sale. I thought about something today – and that’s another thing; I guess I’m the kind-of guy that developed the ability to make decisions. You know, I talked about real estate. I bought a lot of property at public auction, and in the time it takes the auctioneer to get the gavel from there to there, and say, “Sold,” what is that? A second? (*laugh*) I’ve made million dollar decisions. And, some people do that; not a lot. One percent of the population. And, I have some of those abilities that not a lot of people have. And I think it’s those abilities, instincts, characteristics that helped me, and I tell you what; I don’t take defeat easily. I know when it’s time to cut your losses and run, I’m a business person. But, that’s different than defeat. There’s a way to cut losses and get, you know, move on. But, that was being defeated when I came up with 101 and they had 102. And, I got to tell you, George Hasay [State Representative, Columbia, Luzerne and Wyoming Counties, 1973-2006] called me and George said, “John, I think Tom wants to switch.” And he said, “You need to go talk to him.” And George was helpful; I’ve got to give George a lot of credit on that. George is a good man. And I just practically, between visiting and calling and so on – I remember I called Matt Ryan and I said, “This guy wants to switch,” and he said, “Nah,” you know, he wouldn’t even believe me. And it was like kicking and dragging, and finally then he drove up there, well then, he was all excited after he saw that I had Stish already sign the voter registration card to become a Republican. That changed the – I’d have probably been kicked out of Leadership along with John Perzel and, maybe, Matt Ryan would have survived, I don’t know. But, all of us would have been kicked out of Leadership in [19]94, because if we’d have stayed in the minority, the

Members would have been unhappy. So, that really changed, that changed the modern makeup of this House significantly. I don't know if they would have got to the majority in [19]96, I don't know if we could have done it or not. You know, anyhow.

**HM:** Wow. *(laugh)*

**JB:** Yeah, not very many people, you know, day-old politicians are like day-old newspapers. And I'd like to expand on that. You know, down on the farm we chop those newspapers up and use them for cattle bedding, so they lay on us and shit all over them. So, you know, that's kind-of – no one cares about that today. That's 12 years ago, you know. *(laugh)*

**HM:** Well, how did you all work together to resolve these legislative issues, with, you know, both the Democratic and Republican Leadership.

**JB:** Oh, I never, I mean, we were in the majority, so when we got into the majority, we were in the majority. It was a little tough for that first year, because we had a couple of renegades; we had Ed Krebs [Edward H.; State Representative, Lebanon County, Democrat, 1991-1994; Republican, 1995-2002], we had Pat Carone [Patricia; State Representative, Butler County, Democrat, 1991-1994; Republican, 1995-1998], we had the folks that switched from Democrat. I mean, God bless him; Stish was a great team player, but some of the other ones, you know, they were – it's like Perzel said to me one time, he said, "Barley, let's get a bunch of buttons made up, 'I'm the 102 vote.' We'll get

102 of them so everybody can wear one, you know, they're the most important vote." In some ways, that's not any more difficult to govern with 102 than it is with 110, you know. Because when you have 110 everybody says, "Oh, you don't need my vote," you know. "You can let me off." But, we've had a lot of good successes. I mean, when we were in the minority I didn't care that much; I hated Casey's policies. I mean, I said I hated Casey's policies, I respected him and, you know, he was a great man personally, but I did not like his policies. And there wasn't anything I could do, nothing I wanted to do, because there was a Democrat majority and the Senate would cave. And they had to govern; I'm not being extraordinarily or extremely critical of the Republican Senate, because they had to govern, and they had to agree on certain things, but, you know, that wasn't fun. But when we got into the majority, you know, you worked with Ridge and there were a lot of disappointments. I mean, I never thought Ridge was as – I was a little more conservative than Ridge. I liked Ridge; I like Tom Ridge, but, you know, it was tough to get some of the things that I would have liked to have seen. But, we got a lot of good stuff, so, I mean, you know, it's a give-and-take. I got along good with Dwight Evans [State Representative, Philadelphia County, 1981-present]. When I got to be Appropriations Chairman, you know, you talk there and again about opposites, you know, an Afro-American from Philadelphia, man, Dwight and I – hey, I know how to do business because, you know, I was successful and you treat people fair and they treat you fair.

**HM:** What were some of the most difficult issues that you encountered as Appropriations Chairman?

**JB:** I never looked at that as being extremely difficult; it was demanding. Maybe if I could just characterize it as being more demanding. Yeah, there were a few issues from time to time, but, again, I had leadership abilities. I knew how to be a leader; I knew how to get the job done. Maybe at times I was a little too forceful. I told you before; your strengths are your weaknesses. So, maybe I didn't have any patience and didn't take, maybe, as much time to include and involve the outside and rank-and-file Members as I should have. Although I think I did pretty well at that. But there came to a point where I said, "Hey, look, the buck stops here. We're moving ahead." So, I was able to do that. I ran the Committees, would you say, with an iron fist? I don't know; I ran them efficiently. There was no nonsense. And if you're on the Appropriations Committee and we want to move a bill out, that's why you were put on there; to move the bill out. You don't have to agree with the content of the bill, but understand you need to agree that we're putting that bill out of Committee because the fiscal note says thus and so. It's not about whether it's about pro-abortion or anti-abortion, or, you know, no, no, no. This is about the job that you're here to do; it's the fiscal job. So, I learned that that was an important role and I think I filled that pretty well. Was that demanding? Yeah, I don't know if you would call it difficult or not, but it was demanding.

**HM:** Well, I think House Appropriations Chairman was one of the most awesome responsibilities, trying to pass a good budget for Pennsylvania, year after year. Could you explain the budget process?

**JB:** Sure. The budget process begins with the Governor giving the budget address, and that's what the Governor would like. Then you hold the Appropriations hearings and the hearings are the opportunity for Members, both in the House and Senate, to question the various budget, well not only budget, but Cabinet officials as well as Boards and Agencies that rely directly on State Government. They come before the Appropriations Committee and that's, again, that's somewhat demanding that process of the Chairman. Some Chairman don't take it seriously and they'll have someone else in the Chair. I did that a little bit, but for the most part, I chaired those hearings and I ran those hearings very structured. I didn't put up with a lot of, you know, riff-raff, so to speak. And when the hearings are over then, you know, you begin to formulate, "What will this budget look like? What do we want in it?" and then we'd introduced a budget. When Ridge was in office, we were loyal Republicans; we'd introduce Ridge's bill. Then you got down to the nitty-gritty and began to negotiate. See, that was the whole thing through the Ridge era; we didn't have to involve the Democrats much at all. Now, I gave Dwight a fair shake. I figured; you know what? Some day I may be in the minority. I never was; I wasn't here long enough. But, I respected that. I respected Dwight for what his position was; he was the Democratic Chairman. And I would work together with him, but then, you know, at some point, you begin to negotiate with your colleagues in the Senate, staff would begin it, and it was very much an insider's game and I don't think it's changed much. And it probably has to be. You know, you can't govern and negotiate with 203 people and 50 more. I mean, why do we elect Officers of Corporations? We have stock holders, we have Boards of Directors and we have Executive Committees, and we have a CEO. So, the Government of Pennsylvania, we run that similar to the way we run

businesses, and maybe not as efficient, at times. But, when the negotiations were completed and you had what you thought was acceptable, then you brought it back to the Members and you went to Caucus and you told them what was in it and, of course, everybody wanted to know what was in it for them. *(laugh)* Surprise, surprise. And, you explained all that and answered the questions and, you know, the next job was to make sure you had the votes. We never had a problem getting the votes throughout the Ridge years, but then again, we had surpluses; I mean they were good years. The economy was good and we were carving up surpluses and still reducing taxes. So, I was pretty fortunate for that. The toughest budget year – and I was just a Caucus Secretary then and we were in the minority and Casey in [19]91 had that big tax increase, when he taxed everything that moved, and then some, and literally, you know, people that cleaned houses, I mean, you name it – that was a tough budget year. We were here until, I think August, and they needed about 10 Republicans and half the Republicans that voted for that budget ended up leaving that next term, because they saw that it was the wrong thing to do.

**HM:** Were all your budgets passed on time?

**JB:** I think, yes; the short answer is, yes; and I believe that I may hold the record to this day for the earliest complete budget that was ever passed and signed into law, at least since we are on the annual budget. See, Pennsylvania, years ago, had a bi-annual budget, a budget, you know, for every other year, and then, I think, after the present Constitution [Convention of 1968] they went onto the annual budget. Now, after I left, the first year

of Rendell [Edward; Governor, 2002-2011], they had a goofy early budget, but it wasn't complete; it didn't have, like, half the stuff in it, and they never had that budget finally [and] totally resolved until, like, December. So, the budget that I had, I believe it was late April, that was a complete budget passed and it was over with.

**HM:** What legislation are you particularly proud of?

**JB:** I don't know. Like I told you earlier, I never felt that legislation – I never did much of that, but if I could – I know you mentioned earlier in our interview that Sam Hayes came up and I know there was a time there where Sam put up a bunch of bills in that repealed old, outdated bills. So, I'm the kind-of guy that if I could've repealed laws I'd have felt like I was doing more than making new laws; less government is best. I never was big on getting a lot of stuff passed. You know, I like the political process, I mean the greatest accomplishment I had was getting the Republicans into the majority in [19]94; period; end of story. Now, did we do good things after that? It wasn't my bill, but we moved Worker's Comp Reform forward. I don't even know who sponsored the bill; it didn't matter. That Worker's Comp was because John Barley got the Republicans into the majority in the House; pure and simple. Things like that were great accomplishments. To make Pennsylvania a state that was a little more environmental friendly, I tried to work hard with the conservation districts to get more orientation toward Ag, particularly for the Ag community. I never got that totally to where I wanted it, but, I made some headway there and I think, to this day, it works a little more efficiently. Helping other Members get their bills passed. I tried to be what a true Leader was; a Leader, a true

Leader, is someone that has some authority that's been delegated to them by those who vote for them, and then they're responsible to take that authority and use it effectively for the benefit of those who entrust that authority to them. Now, that's true if it's Leadership or if it's the electorate in the district and I've tried to approach it that way. Some Members, I think, tend to get authority and power confused; power is a dangerous word. No one, no one, in State Government of Pennsylvania has power. They may think they do, but I think – this is 2006 when we're recording this in July – there's two Leaders in the Senate that found out this Spring how much power they had, and they both – I knew them both personally; I worked with them – they both thought they were pretty powerful. But the electorate taught them that the title 'Senator' preceded their name; 'Representative' precedes your name. That's some authority that's given to you on Election Day. There's 13 hours when people determine if you are worthy of having or continuing to hold the title of Representative or Senator or Governor and they have the ability two, four or whatever years later, to remove that. It's not like a Bachelor of Science degree that you go to school for four years and earn and you become John Barley, B.S. It follows your name; you've earned it. So, that's how I approached accomplishments. That authority that I was given – and if I could use that to facilitate other Members and the principles that I thought were good for Pennsylvania.

**HM:** *(cough)* What was your reaction the first time that you stood on the rostrum as Speaker Pro-Tem? Did you ever think that you had higher aspirations?

**JB:** Oh, I would have loved to have been Speaker. I'd have been Speaker someday if I'd have stayed there. I mean, who knows? I mean, Lord almighty only knows, but that wasn't to be. So, yeah, I think I would have been, I mean, if I would not have left in [20]02, I would probably be Majority Leader today. I always supported John Perzel. I mean, to this day we're very good friends, and I think the world of him and I'd have never, ever ran against John Perzel for any Leadership position because I just looked at him as a capable person. I wish I were there today to help him with some of the challenges that are there because times have changed. I mean, there's not much civil – I don't regret leaving in [20]02, because this is not a fun place to operate anymore. I mean, it's pathetic; it really is. And it's gotten to be so uncivilized.

**HM:** In which way?

**JB:** Oh, the rhetoric, the attacks. I mean, I just saw this morning on a news clip where they're on Perzel now because he's on the Board of Directors of some company that may end up remotely doing business with Pennsylvania. You know what? When I was in here, because my business was successful and we were making money, I took so much crap from the press and, you know what? I never did a thing, never, ever, ever, a hint of anything that was improper. People may not have liked it, they may have been jealous, of course. There are a lot of jealous people in this world. But after awhile you say to yourself, "Is this worth it, for 70,000 dollars? I don't think so." So, what has happened, you know, our Founding Father's originally designed this Legislative-Representative Government, they wanted successful people to sacrifice some time away from their

farms, families, businesses to serve here, and then go back. So, you know, did I support the full-time Legislature? Yes and no; I never felt I was a full-time Legislator. First of all, if the most money I can make in my life is whatever the salary is today, I don't care if it's 100,000 dollars, I don't deserve to be here representing people, because if I'm not any smarter or any more capable than being able to make 70 or 80,000 dollars, then I'm not smart enough or capable enough to make decisions for Pennsylvania. So, that part there, you know what? Full-time, part-time; no, that's a tough sell to Joe Lunchbug working for 35 grand a year, because they look at somebody making 70 or 80[,000 dollars] as rich. And all that has just with bloggers and with the press has just gotten so nasty. And like I said, they're after Perzel today. Well, you know, quite frankly, I had to buy – a little tidbit; I think I was named the Best-Dressed Legislator in one of the reports, you know, one of the little blogs that were out back in the early years, like maybe, 2000 or so – but, just an example; you dressed in a suit and tie everyday, you had to have a couple of suits, and it was more expensive to be a Legislator just to have a wardrobe, you know. On and on and on, but anyhow, I'm getting carried away on some stuff.

**HM:** No, that's okay. On one of your platforms, I think you supported safety for Pennsylvanians. Can you tell us where this stems from and in light of 9/11 [2001], do you think that safety is still a critical issue?

**JB:** Yeah, I think every politician pounced on that post-9/11 stuff, where you really did need to be more aware of safety. I think, you know, I think that has probably at this time

now as we're doing this in 2006, I think it's kind-of dissipated, mellowed a bit, but that's I think, what it stemmed from.

**HM:** You've already touched on several of these issues, but I don't know if you'd like to add anything else; how do you think the House has changed from the time you started in [19]85?

**JB:** It's definitely become more – I don't know if I want to use the word 'professional,' but – it was a little more laid back. So, it's more intense, it's more uptight. The politics of it are just so much more bitter than what they were. And I think internal politics, I think the inner-Party politics, are much worse than they were. And I know they were always competitive, you know?

**HM:** To what extent do you think that technology has changed the process?

**JB:** Big time; yeah, big time. I mean, like I mentioned, when I first came in we didn't even have Fax machines. I know computers were around, but we weren't – I'm sure they were in use to some extent, but not that rank-and-file Members were aware of it. I mean, it's immense; Blackberry's, and, oh my. I mean, I did turn my cell phone off for the interview but, I had one of the first cell phones; 1986, I bought a cell phone and, I think I paid 600 dollars for it and paid probably a dollar a minute, maybe not quite that much, but it was expensive. But, you know, I had the business I was trying to run and I was up here and, you know, it was like a revolution; it was great.

**HM:** What about laptops on the House Floor?

**JB:** Yeah, I never got onto them very well. Actually, I've become much more computer literate and savvy since I left. The problem with the Legislature; it's not reality. I mean, you're surrounded by too much support. Yeah, you don't even have to have an original thought if you don't want to; you know, you go to a staff person and say, "What do you think I ought to do," and they give you your thoughts. There's a little too much of that, and I realized, I've become much more computer literate and I do more of those things for myself (*laugh*) than I did when I was up here.

**HM:** What about cameras on the House Floor?

**JB:** Good, bad or indifferent; it never bothered me. I mean, I don't think it's a bid deal. It doesn't bother me. It never bothered me. I thought it was fine.

**HM:** You don't think it changed the process?

**JB:** Oh, probably, especially the people who think they're important, you know.

**HM:** Okay.

**JB:** The Greg Vitali's [State Representative, Delaware County, 1993-present] of the world that like to stand up and talk, you know. But, they always did, so, maybe a few of them like to – I liked Greg, but I pick on him a little bit.

**HM:** You talked about the media in the current tenor of today. What was your relationship like with the media whenever you were a Member?

**JB:** You know, I got along, I think, decent with the state-wide media, because they knew I was a good Leader, and they knew that I did good things for the state. But in Lancaster, I hated them; I hate the Lancaster media. I have a dislike; I know I shouldn't hate people, so I don't want to say I hate them. But, I have a dislike and a disrespect, maybe, because of the hypocritical nature of the family that owns – the Steinman family – that owns the Lancaster newspapers and the people that operate it. I mean, there's no competition in Lancaster, they own everything; they own the weeklies, they own the dailies. I don't think there's more than one or two weeklies that they don't own anymore. Channel 8, network news, you know, has snippets, you know, little bits and pieces, so people don't really get – but, their editorials – and they're lazy. It's a family-owned business and they're raping it for all the profit they can. So, you have these bloggers – there's a guy that got on my case, his name is Ron Harper, probably one of the earliest – I probably shouldn't have even mentioned his name; he doesn't even deserve it – but, you know, I bet there's a lot of people here in Harrisburg in Leadership today wished they'd have come to John Barley's defense, rather than stood back and said, "Hmm, that's kind-of funny that he's being raked over the coals," because I was the victim of one of the first

bloggers, and that guy would have never got any traction and he didn't deserve any. I mean, he is a very, very, nasty, hypocritical person, okay? But, the Lancaster newspapers, because they're lazy and reporters are underpaid and lazy, they would call him, and if he said it – it' didn't matter if it was true – you attributed it to him. And that's what the bloggers, that's where they all get their legs today. You know, it's just kind-of like the cameras. All right, so if 100 people in your District watch PCN [Pennsylvania Cable Network] and one out of 100 would call you up and, "Why'd you do that?," or, "Why's that happening?," you know, so what? It wasn't a big deal. But, when the press, the mainstream press, starts picking up on the fringe people, because they're lazy, they don't want to do their work, they're underpaid – and that's what happened in Lancaster. And this thing today, which started under my Leadership, there's a Convention Center in Lancaster city, I started the whole thing, but it's gotten totally out of control. With my Leadership gone, there was no one there that really had the ability to guide it properly. And yet the newspapers, it's now being disclosed after six or seven years, own like, the majority of the interest in it. On one hand, they rail against pork. Like, the editor of the Sunday News – this is recently – had an editorial in it about the "buckets of lard the Legislators are bringing home." When on the other hand, something his company, the company he works for, owns, is getting the biggest share; they're getting the heaviest weighted buckets of lard. They've gotten something like 15 to as much as 25 million dollars for the Convention Center. So, you know, you hit a nerve; I dislike the local press immensely. I disrespect them both personally and professionally. And, quite frankly, I think you'll find that people that critique the press independently will tell you that the Lancaster press is one of the least professional of its kind.

**HM:** How did you respond to their criticisms?

**JB:** Wrong. You know, that's one thing that I wish I'd have been much more in their face like I am now. I tried to take advice from people that were well intended, but my gut always was – I mean, I had problems; one of my family businesses was handling bio-solids for land application. It's like sludge from wastewater treatment plants, and they accused us of any number of things, none of which were true. Now, my instinct was to go to them eyeball to eyeball and say, "What they heck to you do with your stuff when you flush the toilet everyday? Tell me where it goes? I'm providing a solution." Instead, they beat me up because our family grossed, maybe, a million dollars a year. Well, you know, they didn't do the math; you know, that was all profit. And it was a Governmental Agency. They would editorialize on Farmland Preservation, you know, they were all, "This is the best thing since sliced bread." But if the Barley family, who happened to own large portions of real estate, received – did what they editorialized in favor of – but, if the Barley family received payment for Conservation Easements it was wrong. It had to be something not right about that. You know, that's what I said earlier. I made kind-of a brief reference to when I left; I didn't leave because I felt I lost or wasn't up for a fight. There's a time to cut your losses because it isn't worth it. I mean, I left because, you know what? I got sick and tired of so-called friends stabbing me in the back. My State Senator is probably a man who betrayed me more than anyone had ever betrayed me in my life. And I said, "It's not worth it. If people want to be like that I don't want to be part of it. I'm out of here. I don't need to do this. You know, I'm a

multi-millionaire, so I certainly don't need the money." You know, I wasn't going to subject my family to unjust, you know, type criticisms. You know, we had just closed on a huge 15 million dollar real estate transaction that involved the County Landfill and they just beat the crap out of me on that. I wasn't getting any support out of my own Leadership. You know, Matt Ryan was kind-of sitting back, "ha ha-ing" it all, because Matt and I were never close; I never respected him and, you know, he, whatever, never cared all that much for me because I was never his boy. But that was fine; I understood all that. And then, you know, it was like the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation]. So, it started like, "Oh, you know, the FBI is investigating Barley." "Okay. What for?" Well, somebody told me one time, you know, the FBI can indict a ham sandwich if they want to, and I thought, "Why am I going to spend a million dollars or more of my money to defend myself from something that I know doesn't need to be defended, because there's nothing there?" So, I said, "This is it. I'm out of here." You know, what time does is amazing. But, I met the FBI Agent who did that investigation. Now, it was interesting, because I became someone he was interviewing while he's investigating someone else, who I will not reveal. I became what he called an "informant" and I didn't volunteer; I was contacted. He said, "You know Mr. Barley that was the most bogus politically motivated investigation I was ever assigned to." He said, "You never did one thing wrong." Now, the sad part about that, that never made the press, because the FBI won't do that. But I had the satisfaction, you know, God Almighty gave me the satisfaction, within four years to have somebody tell me that. *(laugh)*

**HM:** Did Speaker –

**JB:** So, you know, they were the not so fun times here, you know, when people that, you know, I told people, you know, people said, “Well how does it feel not be here?” I said, “You know what? It does feel good to get up in the morning and not have to go to meetings and have to worry about which of your so-called friends is attempting to stab you in the back that day.” That I never missed. And the farther I got away from it, the less I missed it. But, you know, I don’t want to bad mouth it; you know, there’s competition everywhere, but, you know. Go ahead.

**HM:** Did anyone stand beside you through this?

**JB:** I think John Perzel did in the way that he could. You know, I mean, yeah, and I’ll leave it at that. I don’t have anything bad to say about John; John’s a friend. He’s a good guy. I mean, I don’t agree with everything [he does], he doesn’t agree with everything I do; that’s fine. That’s why we were good. You know, we were good. John and I have had some good conversations. I think John misses me and I miss being able to serve in Leadership with him. I think we would have done a better job than the current team. I’m sorry. I’m going to tell you that. I’m just being honest about the history and I think Pennsylvania lost because of what happened. You know, I know Matt Ryan’s dead, but I think he was the cause of a lot of it. Because he feared a John Barley/John Perzel tightly knit Leadership coalition, because they could have removed him. I don’t think either one of us ever would have, but people, in life, are insecure. The greatest challenge I faced were those types of individuals and some senior staff. You know, staff of, whether it’s

the Majority Leader, the Speaker, they're so doggone insecure. They'd be out in the real world somewhere, and so they were worried that Barley was going to try to bump Perzel, or Barely was this or Barley was that. They didn't know what was in here. I'd have never done that. I was loyal to John Perzel and, you know what? John was loyal to me. But they would plant, you know, all the little – that's politics. And, unfortunately, some people – I was, because I was in a family partnership all my life and I knew what it was required to deal with those issues and I could move above them; I could move beyond them. There were times that, maybe, I was unhappy, but I could move on quickly because you had to.

**HM:** What type of relationship did you have with lobbyists while you were here?

**JB:** Oh, lobbyists were fine. I did okay with the lobbyists. They have a role and I'm one now. I don't do much direct lobbying. I don't want to do that. I do mostly business development. But, yeah, lobbyists were okay; I didn't dislike the lobbyists.

**HM:** Okay. In 1988, the Legislature voted themselves a 34 percent pay raise, similar to the vote of last summer. Do you believe the public outcry was the same in [19]88 as it is currently?

**JB:** No, we voted another one in [19]97 or [19]98 or [199]5, was it?

**HM:** I think.

**JB:** Okay. I'll tell you what happened in this pay raise; first of all, the bloggers. Again, I go back. I don't know when people are ever going to view this, but some of the people that were responsible for this, if they'd have realized, if they'd have just defended John Barley a little bit and put a stop to some of that crap back in 2000, some of this stuff wouldn't have gotten the legs it's got. So, the bloggers – but, there was another thing; this was different. In [19]95, and I mentioned earlier my good friend Jerry Stern, and Jerry said this to me, he said, “John, you came to me,” I came to him in [19]95, and convinced him to vote for the pay raise. And he said, “I'll never forget your words. You said, ‘Jerry, you'll never have to vote for another one, because there's an escalator in here; cost of living.’” Well, I'm going to go back and give you a cliché from the farm; pigs get fat, hogs get slaughtered. It's about being greedy. Now, the average person understood the cost of living every year. But when you've got a cost of living every year, and then on top of that, you know, you wanted to take it, you know, it was too much; it was greed. And then it was just that whole piling on. No one ever – and plus, they hid, they ran, they hid, you know. They should have just – whenever I had something like that I'd go to the County Fair, I'd go to my wherever, and a guy would come up and be me up on it and I'd say, “You know, you make some good points. You really do. I guess we just differ a little bit, but I can't say you're wrong and I'm right.” So, you know, it's easy for me though to sit here and say how that should've been. I'd have voted for it. If I'd have been here, I'd have been advocating for it, because I know how it was for Perzel. I understand where they put him. I know how, I told you, the pressure of Leadership,

“Oh, we need a pay increase. My superintendent is making 100,000 dollars and I’m making 70,000 dollars.” But, the public didn’t see it that way; and the bloggers just –

**HM:** What aspect of the job as a Member did you like the most?

**JB:** The politics.

**HM:** The least?

**JB:** Dealing with the backbiting and the politics of the staff; yeah, the senior staff. We had so many senior staff that most of them are gone now. The three that I can think, in particular, are all gone, but, you know, it was the politics of dealing with them, because their egos were bigger. One of the senior staff that I worked with real closely, I told him one time, probably, you know, I said, “Look, if you want to be the Chairman of this Committee, go get 300 signatures and then get 55 votes, or 54 votes, whatever, to get elected to Appropriations Chairman, then you’ll be the Chairman and not the staff guy.” And, you know, that’s probably one of the toughest things to deal with, the ego, because, you know, staff has a lot of influence, you know, they have a lot of long-term knowledge that maybe the Member doesn’t necessarily have. That’s one of the tougher parts that I had to deal with.

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

**JB:** Oh, I don't know. I don't know that I can point to a single issue that I thought was extremely difficult; I really don't. I mean, you know, it was always a challenge. The hardest issue, the hardest aspect of the job was the local press, for me. I hated it. I hated it.

**HM:** What, in your opinion, are the obstacles that make it difficult to bring about change in the Legislature?

**JB:** What do you want to change and for what reason? You know, I mean, I guess that's the question I'd ask; "Tell me what it is you want to change?" I don't know how much change needs to be there. I don't think you should change seniority. I don't think it's all that bad. Most people that don't like seniority, they just can't achieve it, you know, for whatever reason. I mean, you replace something with something else and there's going to be problems with what you replace it with. So, I don't think it's all that bad. I really don't. I mean, I don't think it's that bad. We're going through an issue in Lancaster County at the moment where they want to go put this Home Rule question in; they want to go from a County Commissioner to maybe a County Council, and all that. I'm totally against it. I'm saying, "Hey, what are you doing? You're addressing symptoms." It's the people in the positions that matter, so if they're not doing their job, change them. Don't change the system; the system's not broke, it's the people filling the roles within the system.

**HM:** Did you have a fondest memory?

**JB:** Oh, I guess, there's been a lot of good times, you know? I mean, I've had a lot of good times. I don't know. I think probably the absolute fondest memory is that first Swearing-In, you know, my mother was there and she was a proud mother. *(laugh)* So, you know, my family was there. Now, they were much younger, you know. The kids weren't – it didn't mean as much to them, but it meant a lot to my mother and my dad was there, but it meant more to my mother. I don't know. I had a lot of good times; I had a lot of fond memories. I mean, I loved Chairing the Appropriations Committee. I was good at it and I loved doing it. I tell you, you know, as corny as it sounds to some people, I did enjoy Chairing the Committee hearings, you know, the Appropriations hearings. You learned a lot and I enjoyed that. So, I would say, until toward the end when it got, you know, the press and all that stuff got out of control, I definitely enjoyed my tenure on Appropriations.

**HM:** Do you have any amusing stories you can share?

**JB:** You know, probably the funniest thing, and I was in the minority and Bill DeWeese [H. William; State Representative, Greene, Fayette and Washington Counties, 1979-present; Speaker 1993-1995] was Majority Leader; I don't remember what year. We were debating Bovine Somatotropin – and you just wrinkled your brow – It's called BST. It's a hormone used in dairy cattle to enhance milk production. Natural, safe – and this is back in the [19]90s [and] it was fairly new. And there was a fad to try and outlaw it in

certain states, and it was not based on science or anything. And I knew what I was talking about because I knew the dairy business. DeWeese gets up to the Majority Leader's podium and you know how DeWeese is so poetic with all his words, you know, so Bill's there and he didn't have a clue. He barely knew what his staff had written down on the issue and he was trying to read that and he's not real good at that, because he likes to go off on his euphemisms or whatever they are. So, after awhile DeWeese says something to the effect of – and I'm paraphrasing – about bulls giving milk. I immediately got up to the microphone, was recognized – Leroy Irvis [K. Leroy; State Representative, Allegheny County, 1959-1988; Speaker, 1977-1978; 1983-1988] was Speaker – Leroy recognized the gentleman from Lancaster. I said, "Mr. Speaker, if I could respectfully remind the Majority Leader from Greene County that cows give milk, not bulls." Oh, the whole Floor – because it's not very often that somebody got one on Bill DeWeese, because it was a slip of the tongue; that's something. I bet if you ever ask Bill, he would probably remember that. But, that was kind-of a funny thing, you know. But, yeah, you know, I don't know. There's lots of other things. That was a moment; insignificant, but I remember it.

**HM:** How would you like your tenure to be remembered?

**JB:** I think I would want people to remember me, number one; for some of the accomplishments I had in the district, of course. The Quarryville Library, the multipurpose building for the Stevens College of Technology in Lancaster. I really helped that school. I believe in it; they're a great trade school. There are some other

things I know that I did were, you know, very good, they were just done for the right reasons. They weren't done for political reasons, per se, they were done because they were great. The Little League ballpark in Solanco. You know, how many generations of kids are going to be able to – I got a 250,000 dollars grant that, it wouldn't have happened without that. I admit, being in Leadership and being Appropriations Chairman allowed me the opportunity to do some of those things I couldn't otherwise do. I would hope that I could be remember for, in whatever way, for that effort that I put forth in [19]94 to get the Republicans into the majority in the State House and some of the good policies that we were able to enact that followed that. I mean, I don't know, what else is there? I don't know, you do it because it's what you do, and that's how I approached it; it's a responsibility that the voters in the 100<sup>th</sup> District expected me to do and I tried to do what they asked of me and I tried to do it to the very best of my ability. And that's me; I'm very intense. So, you know, hopefully I'll be remembered, and I think I am already, as someone who worked hard and someone who really did care. You know, the guy that followed me was voted out this spring and I think a lot of it was because he didn't measure up to John Barley. Whether that was fair or not, he didn't, and the voters said, "Hey, you know, we want a change." So, you know, I think that's a good thing to be remembered for; working hard and doing your job.

**HM:** Since you've left the House, what have you been up to?

**JB:** Well, at first I, you know, tried to sort things out a little bit and I did a little bit of independent agricultural consulting, small business consulting, and I had some real good

successes. I helped some families to really get businesses turned around. And then, I wasn't as busy with that as I wanted to be. My sons and my nephew now own our business; they have 11,000 acres of land, a huge, huge modern family-owned agriculture business. And that was becoming light years ahead of me, so I said, "I want to stay out of their way." You know, I have some money invested in it, but they've done extremely well, so I guess I enjoy being proud of what they're doing. But, I was kind-of getting, you know, sort-of, you know, I'd kind-of like to find a business, and I was kind-of looking around for something. I was dabbling in real estate, which I have a kind-of knack for; I bought a farm with a partner and we sold it and made a couple hundred thousand dollars profit in a short time. Just, you know, things that I knew how to do and was blessed to have the capital to do. But, a year and a half, soon two years, I have bought a business, it was – George Wolfe owned it – a lobbying business that focused mainly on agriculture and environmental issues, and more business environmental interests. So, that has gone extremely well; I've enjoyed that. I now have an office on Pine Street, here in the Capitol. I don't do much direct lobbying; I do more business development. I do work with, you know, clients, but I've grown that business; I've more than doubled in the 18 months or 20 months, I've more than doubled the book of business. And, I've just enjoyed the heck out that, that's, you know, helping people. Its kind-of an extension of being in Office, so, that's been good.

**HM:** Lastly, what is your advice for new Members?

**JB:** Well, you mentioned Sam Hayes and I got to say, I'll never forget this, when we first came in, you know, Sam had this saying, "Keep your powder dry." I don't know if he said that in his interview or not, but what he meant by that; don't commit hastily on issues. Make sure you know where you really want to be and need to be and, you know, think through things thoroughly before you commit. And, I think that's good advice. You can't be on the fence, you can't be wishy-washy, but don't be hasty. There are some issues in life – you know this is life. May I say this? Fifteen percent of the issues are pretty well defined for most anyone, and they vary, but to the left. In other words, they're, maybe, somewhat liberal. Fifteen percent are very well defined, but there's, what? Seventy percent that remain in the middle, that a lot of people have a lot of differing opinions on and no one is necessarily right or wrong on those issues. So, be open minded enough, yes, you can feel strongly that I'm definitely against those 15 percent – if you're conservative – those 15 percent on the far left, or if you're liberal you're definitely against – Lita Cohen [State Representative, Montgomery County, 1993-2002]; wonderful woman. You know, she affectionately would describe herself – she used to tell me this – "John, I'm a liberal, red-head, pro-choice, Jewish woman and I'm a Republican, you know. I'm an anomaly." Lita and I became friends. I didn't agree with her on the fringe to the left, she didn't agree with me on the right, but you know what? We did a lot of good stuff together. So, that's good advice to new Members; don't stereotype your colleagues and the people. Be open and listen and try to do the very best to try to build the bridges where you can build them; don't burn them. And I'm probably a little guilty of burning some bridges that I shouldn't have burned. You know, you're either for me or against me, and that's often true in business, but it's not as true in

politics. So, try to work together with folks when you can, and if you positively can't, you know, don't burn the bridge; don't be disagreeable, but learn that there'll be another day when maybe you'll stand with that person.

**HM:** Okay. Well thank you for that advice.

**JB:** You're welcome.

**HM:** Okay, well this concludes our interview. Thank you very much.

**JB:** Okay. I've enjoyed it.