

Raymond R. Tucker Oral History Interview – JFK#1, 06/26/67
Administrative Information

Creator: Raymond R. Tucker
Interviewer: Larry J. Hackman
Date of Interview: June 26, 1967
Place of Interview: St. Louis, Missouri
Length: 15 pages

Biographical Note

Mayor, St. Louis, Missouri (1953 - 1965) Member, President's Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations. In this interview, Tucker discusses his work with the Democratic Advisory Council, Missouri politics, and how the Kennedy administration affected the state.

Access

Open

Usage Restrictions

Copyright of these materials has passed to the United States Government upon the death of the interviewee. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

Copyright

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

Transcript of Oral History Interview

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts. Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

Suggested Citation

Raymond R. Tucker, recorded interview by Larry J. Hackman, June 26, 1967, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

Oral History Interview

Of

Raymond R. Tucker

Although a legal agreement was not signed during the lifetime of **Raymond R. Tucker**, upon **his** death, ownership of the recording and transcript of his interview for the Oral History Program passed to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

The following terms and conditions apply:

1. The transcript is available for use by researchers.
2. The tape recording shall be made available to those researchers who have access to the transcript.
3. Copyright to the interview transcript and tape is assigned to the United States Government.
4. Copies of the transcript and the tape recording may be provided by the Library to researchers upon request for a fee.
5. Copies of the transcript and tape recording may be deposited in or loaned to institutions other than the John F. Kennedy Library.

Raymond R. Tucker – JFK #1

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1	Initial encounters with John F. Kennedy [JFK]
2	Tucker's involvement with the Democratic Advisory Council
4	Politics in Missouri in 1960 and the reaction to JFK as a candidate
8	How the Kennedy administration affected Missouri

Oral History Interview

With

RAYMOND R. TUCKER

June 26, 1967
St. Louis, Missouri

By Larry J. Hackman

For the John F. Kennedy Library

HACKMAN: Mayor Tucker, did you know John Kennedy at all before 1960, and if so, what connections did you have with him?

TUCKER: My acquaintanceship with him was casual and, I'd say, not very intimate. I had met him three or four times. I'd chaired a meeting in Denver where he was the principal speaker at the time he was senator and he was contemplating running for the nomination of president. And I had met him once or twice while in Washington.

HACKMAN: When you were president of the American Municipal Association, had you had any connection with him on any specific legislation?

TUCKER: Directly, no. No. No, not directly in any way, shape, or form.

HACKMAN: How did you become associated with the Democratic Advisory Council?

TUCKER: That was always a mystery to me, too. I did not know the source of my appointment, although I was told later on that former President Truman [Harry S. Truman] had suggested my name to them as a mayor that might be used to serve on the council.

HACKMAN: What area were you primarily involved in in your work with this committee?

TUCKER: I attended the meetings of the committee. And the topics that were brought up, and the agenda, was usually formed before we got there. I participated in the discussions and tried to give the viewpoint of a city mayor on the problems which they were discussing.

HACKMAN: Did you think this council was at all successful or did it accomplish anything in the meetings you attended?

TUCKER: Oh, very definitely because those that attended were men of stature, outside of myself, and men such as Adlai Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson], Kenneth Galbraith [John Kenneth Galbraith], Paul Nitze [Paul H. Nitze], and men of that caliber. And they presented viewpoints which were subject to minute, I would say, investigation. And the policies were determined on certain things. And I think it was a very fine springboard from which the Democratic party could get, perhaps, additional publicity which they never could have gotten if it had not been in existence.

HACKMAN: Did you ever discuss this advisory council with the people from Missouri who were in Congress, as to what their opinion was of another group which was acting as a sort of spokesman for the party?

TUCKER: No. But I found no opposition from them because if there had been, they would have voiced it. And I would say this, that the advisory council was not in any way endeavoring to usurp the function of the elected official.

All they were trying to do was supplement the work they were doing and, perhaps, make their efforts more effective.

HACKMAN: Do you know anything about President Kennedy, at that time Senator Kennedy, being invited to participate in this group? I had heard that at one time he was asked.

TUCKER: I... Just, it would be a hazy recollection. And I wouldn't want to make a positive statement because that is seven years ago. And he may have been, but I know that he did not become a member.

HACKMAN: How exactly did this group work? Did it do all of its work at these general meetings or did it work mostly through...? Did it assign its work to other groups or exactly how did it work?

TUCKER: Well, they assigned certain problems to certain individuals who then wrote reports and presented it to the meeting. And they then were refined, edited, deleted in its entirety or certain portions. And from that came the final efforts of the committee.

HACKMAN: Did your work with this group tie in with your effort to get a plank in the platform in '60 which endorsed a Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs?

TUCKER: I think it did by the mere fact that we became acquainted and I knew them. And when we appeared before the platform committee at the convention, why, they were sympathetic to our appeal and I think had a very, very definite viewpoint on the necessity of having such a plank.

HACKMAN: Had you ever talked to Senator Kennedy specifically about urban problems or this department?

TUCKER: No. I did not. And I would say that the majority of our work as an organization--of course, the American Municipal Association, at that time, and the United States Conference of Mayors, too--was for it. We worked through our executive directors and the staff in Washington, and, of course, appeared before Congress if necessary to support their claims.

HACKMAN: Did your strong position on this create any problems in your relationship with the state legislature?

TUCKER: Not that I was aware, because that relationship couldn't have been any worse than it was. I'd say it did not deteriorate the relationship. In fact, it may have improved it slightly because they say, perhaps, an outlet from their domination. And the may have become a little bit more tolerant.

HACKMAN: We were discussing this a minute ago. Did you have anything to do with the scheduling of the regional platform here?

TUCKER: No. No, I did not. I think that, as background for this, one should realize that although I was mayor for twelve years, originally I beat the Democratic organization for the nomination. And when I did that I ceased to be a friend of theirs. They never forgave me that I had beaten them. Consequently, my political influence in the party in St. Louis was not a dominant one. If anything, it was a very modest, if not only, maybe, nonexistent. I think the only contributions I told you I gave to the party was that during my administration, why, it was not necessary to apologize for it. And consequently, it gave them more time to sell their candidates. I did not try to take over the party. In other words, I let Jack Dwyer [John J. Dwyer], who was the chairman, run the Democratic party. I did not try to dictate to him. I cooperated when I was asked, if the cooperation asked was in accord with the principles I had.

HACKMAN: Did Dwyer usually work well with the regular Democratic organization on the state level?

TUCKER: Yes. Jack was a very astute and intelligent leader. He had been in it long

enough that he never stampeded. He knew how to get consensus. He knew when to talk; he knew when not to talk. He knew when to call meetings and when not to call meetings. And when he called a meeting it was a pretty good sign that there's not going to be much controversy, that all the sore spots had been given some balm and they were soothed over.

HACKMAN: Along this same line, as far as your relationship with the Democratic party in Missouri, you did not attend the 1956 convention. Is that correct?

TUCKER: I think that is correct.

HACKMAN: How would this have probably been, because of your own choice or...?

TUCKER: If I recall it correctly, I wasn't made a delegate to that.

HACKMAN: Let's talk then about politics in 1960. Do you remember attending the convention of the state party in Jefferson City in 1960? I think it was in May, when they adopted the unit rule and decided to support Symington [W. Stuart Symington].

TUCKER: No. No. I rarely attended any state conventions.

HACKMAN: Do you recall if any of the people who became delegates to the convention showed any reluctance to being bound by the unit rule for Senator Symington at that point?

TUCKER: Well, if they did, it was not of sufficient magnitude to cause any trouble. I think they all liked the senator and had a great respect for him. Consequently, they did not resist the fact that they were going there bound to him. Of course, they always felt that at the proper time he would release them and then they could make their own connections.

HACKMAN: Well, how did this develop then at the convention?

TUCKER: It did. He released them eventually.

HACKMAN: What were you mainly involved in at the convention? Was there anything specifically that...?

TUCKER: Purely as a delegate and to vote and to attend the convention. I was not active in any of its organizational structure at all.

HACKMAN: What was your own feeling toward Senator Symington at that time as a presidential candidate?

TUCKER: I thought he had the ability, but I thought his chances were very slim because he hadn't organized well enough to obtain the nomination. In fact, I think he was resting on the fact that perhaps he might be a compromise if they got into a deadlocked convention. I cannot quote him, I'm just.... That's my own feeling.

HACKMAN: Do you know anything about the rumors that existed at the time of the convention that Symington would have dropped out then if he would have been offered the vice presidency?

TUCKER: Well, I wouldn't hardly know that because any talk of that character would be between the principals.

HACKMAN: What were your feelings toward Senator Kennedy at that point as a presidential candidate?

TUCKER: Always had the greatest admiration for him. And I thought he possessed all the qualifications essential for a president. And I figured we'd be in very, very safe hands if we were in his.

HACKMAN: Can you remember the reaction of any of the other delegates from Missouri at the convention to Kennedy's reaction?

TUCKER: You mean the reaction to the senator's, to Senator Kennedy's...?

HACKMAN: Yes. To his nomination.

TUCKER: Well, I think they were delighted. They figured they had a candidate with whom they could win.

HACKMAN: I had heard in some cases they were disturbed about the religious factor in Missouri. I thought maybe you...

TUCKER: Well, in Missouri we have a section which is known as the Bible Belt. And, consequently, they always felt that the religious question would be an issue in any campaign whether it were for the governorship or state senator in those districts because that was the feeling in the district. However, I think once and for all that was eradicated when Senator Kennedy was elected president--and he carried the state of Missouri. I don't think that feeling now is as severe as it was. I don't think any problem like that would exist now.

HACKMAN: Much the same question in reference to the choice of Senator Johnson [Lyndon B. Johnson] as vice president. Do you remember any reaction on the part of the delegation since Symington, who at one point was favored for the vice presidency, didn't get the nod?

TUCKER: No. I don't think Senator Symington was interested in that at that time. And I know that the mayors were delighted to see Senator Humphrey [Hubert H. Humphrey] get the nomination because he had been a mayor and he would be sympathetic to their problems. And they felt as though they had an ear into which they could pour their woes.

HACKMAN: Now, I'm talking back in '60, when Johnson got the vice presidential nomination.

TUCKER: Oh, no. No. No. I think at that time there was no definite feeling that Senator Symington was going to get anything or that he had been promised anything. And I think, too, as I have told, it is a political game, the vice president is the personal choice of the president. And whatever he wants, that's the game.

HACKMAN: I had thought maybe that some of the labor people from St. Louis reacted to that nomination. I know they did in several other delegations.

TUCKER: Well, if they did, they accepted it. So....

HACKMAN: As far as the presidential campaign that year, what, if any, role did you play during the campaign?

TUCKER: Active?

HACKMAN: Yes.

TUCKER: I was active in St. Louis for the ticket. That's about all. I didn't go out of the state.

HACKMAN: To what degree did the Democratic organization in St. Louis work for Kennedy? Were they at all reluctant or were there any problems there?

TUCKER: Oh, well, no. If I recall correctly, he led St. Louis with a hundred thousand majority. And you don't have any of your workers dragging your feet when you come through with that.

HACKMAN: Do you recall what Jack Dwyer's opinion was--of Kennedy as the candidate?

TUCKER: I think Jack was very well pleased, excellent.

HACKMAN: What about the Negro vote in St. Louis? We had talked earlier about Jordan Chambers [Jordan W. Chambers]. Do you know if the Kennedy

people worked through the regular organization in dealing with the Negroes or how did they go about this?

TUCKER: The exact manner in which they handled it--as I told you earlier that I worked through the organization here and through Jack Dwyer, and the details of what they did in the organization I would not be familiar with. I didn't at any time try to take over the party because I had enough to do to get some of the things done I was trying to.

HACKMAN: What do you recall about Kennedy's visits to St. Louis? Can you recount some of those?

TUCKER: Yes. I was with him on several and always crushed in the crowd as they greeted him. And he was met with great enthusiasm here, and people had great admiration for him. He engendered a feeling of, I would say, pride and respect. We were happy to have him as a candidate.

HACKMAN: Did you ever discuss the St. Louis or the Missouri situation with him during the campaign?

TUCKER: No. No. I did not. And later on after I was reelected in the spring, I was in his office and we talked about St. Louis and Missouri and the political setup. But previous to that time he knew.

HACKMAN: Do you remember what any of the specifics about your conversation were?

TUCKER: No. I wouldn't remember. That was in '61. That's six years ago.

HACKMAN: Do you know anything at all about his efforts to get support of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* at that time. I think he did have one meeting with the Pulitzers [Joseph Pulitzer, 1913-1993 and Joseph Pulitzer, 1885-1955], I believe.

TUCKER: Oh, that would be normal for a candidate to do that because the press is a great medium for him. It can be good or bad. As I heard Frank Taylor, who was the managing editor of old *Star-Times* here and also then went on to Chicago to be managing editor of the *Chicago Sun*, said, "A newspaper can never elect a candidate, but they can defeat him." So it behooves any candidate to have a good press so he isn't defeated.

HACKMAN: That's one way to put it. Did you ever talk to him during the campaign about what his approach might be to urban problems if he got elected.

TUCKER: Oh, no. No. No. I don't know. I guess I'm a little bit diffident about doing

a thing like that. Here's a man that's trying to be elected president of the United States and that I should inject myself into his life and ask him for fifteen or twenty minutes to talk about the problems in St. Louis. I figure if he's the proper man to be president, when he's elected, he'll give me time to talk about that.

HACKMAN: Well, why don't we go on to the administration then and talk about any connections you had with the administration as far as trying to get urban legislation or trying to push for this Department of Urban Affairs.

TUCKER: Well, the pushing for the Department of Urban Affairs, as I said, was done through our duly accredited and recognized organization of the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association. The American Municipal Association now is known as the National League of Cities. And every effort they had to push it, they did. It was brought up in their conventions; it was endorsed by both of them. They represented a very large segment of the voting populace and, consequently, had more weight in Congress than the word of any individual. I did appear several times, as their president, and as president of both, to express their viewpoints on the subject as well as many other of the majors. And, of course, eventually it became a reality, perhaps not in the exact form they wanted it, but it's there; it can be molded now into something that will be worthwhile because the cities need somebody whose sole responsibility is in solving their problems.

HACKMAN: Skipping back to something I just missed, did you work at all with a fellow during the campaign called Phil Des Marais [Philip H. Des Marais]? Do you recall him? He was a Kennedy person in this area.

TUCKER: No.

HACKMAN: Did you make any visits to the White House during the Kennedy period other than the...

TUCKER: Yes. I mean to.... I've been to his office, if this is what one might call a visit, several times with the mayors when we were either presenting him an invitation to speak someplace or attend some meeting or to present, perhaps, our viewpoints on some specific subject. Then we were there with a delegation from St. Louis to invite him here to start the bicentennial in St. Louis. And he came here. And we, of course, also invited him, when we were there to invite him, to be present at the dedication of the Arch when it occurred and visits of that character I made.

HACKMAN: Was he usually receptive to your problems as far as city problems went?

TUCKER: Oh, very, very, very, sympathetic.

HACKMAN: Did you discuss things in enough detail to get any understanding of how much depth of understanding he had on these problems?

TUCKER: I think it was apparent from his conversations that his knowledge was more than superficial. And ours, of course, was presented to him in the form of a memorandum which his staff would make a memorandum on a memorandum and bring it down to the point where it wouldn't take too much of his time to absorb.

HACKMAN: Were there any specific members of his staff that you usually worked with, do you recall?

TUCKER: No.

HACKMAN: I think you had explained this earlier. I had asked if you ever took any specific city problems to the White House level, which you commented...

TUCKER: Not that I recall. Any specific city problems which we had, we usually carried them to Washington, to the senators, to our congressional representatives. And they, in turn, then would take them up with the proper segments of government to see that they were solved.

HACKMAN: Did you find that your senators were very sympathetic to your problems?

TUCKER: Extremely cooperative. Yes. No problems there at all. In fact, Senator Hennings [Thomas Carey Hennings, Jr.], who was living at the time, in the early part of my existence, I had known for years and years. And Senator Symington I had known for many years, too. And the congressional representatives, I knew them in intimately so I could deal with them and talk to them. They were very, very cooperative.

HACKMAN: Were you ever involved in any of the appointments to federal offices in the area or was that usually done through the congressional delegation, too? Do you recall if you ever objected to any?

TUCKER: No. I wouldn't have objected to any. I figured that was within their purview. And they would nominate the ones they thought should have it, as I would have objected if anyone would try to dictate to me whom I should appoint.

HACKMAN: Could you comment in a general way on maybe comparing your problems in the Eisenhower [Dwight D. Eisenhower] period in relation to the federal government and the ones under the Kennedy administration? Was there any shift in the amount of problems you might have taken to the federal level rather than the state level?

TUCKER: Well, I think, as time went on, more and more problems were taken to the

federal government because the states seemed to be impervious to giving any thought to problems at the urban level. And, consequently, the cities began to go to the spot where they'd get a sympathetic hearing and get some action. So I don't think it was a marked change, but a gradual increasing, I would say, ignoring of the state because the state was ignoring the cities.

HACKMAN: Could you talk about specific departments that you had to deal with. You had mentioned HEW [Department of Health, Education, and Welfare] previously as being pretty hard to get anything done with. Would you want to explore that a little?

TUCKER: Well, Tony Celebrezze [Anthony J. Celebrezze], who was the secretary, was a former mayor. And he was the one, I believe, that told me that he had a hundred and twenty-three separate divisions reporting to him. Well now, I don't care who you are or what you are or what your ability is, you cannot handle a group like that. So, necessarily, there are a lot of these divisions, I imagine, that are operating as though they belong to themselves and establish their own rules and regulations. So that would be the primary basis for my remark.

And I've had, also, the intimate knowledge in certain areas where action has been taken, I would say, on sufficient evidence that you are finding, in many areas now, when you're getting into this pollution question. I was amazed recently to find out that there's a very, very large percentage of cities in this country that do not have drinking water which is approved by federal standards which would, to me, indicate that they have been lax in following through. And I think the worst thing is this: I hear that the federal government has no definite standard for drinking water and they only have control over the water which is used on transportation that's engaged in interstate business.

HACKMAN: Were you involved in the Kennedy years in any effort on legislation in the area of pollution, do you remember?

TUCKER: No. No. No. At that time, no. And I... This question of pollution, you know, isn't of recent vintage or origin. It's been on its way. It's going to be here forever. And it's foolhardy to believe, too, that you can reach the point where you'll have no pollution. That to me is not only improbable but impossible. And I think what they have to do is to operate a constant program of research in cooperation with private enterprise to not only establish standards and criteria to meet the changing conditions but also to foresee what may be the conditions in the future. For instance, many drugs are being used that I don't believe have been thoroughly tested, as is proven by the fact that they take them off the market periodically. And certain pesticides are used which are contaminating water which they never thought would occur. So, I mean, what you have to do is to foresee the future as well as the past. Those are the bases for the remarks I have made.

HACKMAN: Do you remember if you had any opinions on what you regarded as failures of the Kennedy administration in this period as far as urban affairs

are concerned?

TUCKER: No. I think the great failure of the federal government has been the fact that in some cases they promise an awful lot. And they get the general public aroused to the point where they expect great things to happen. Then these are not financed properly and the great things do not occur. As a result, the mayors get their ears pinned back by the general public as to why they didn't do it, when they are not responsible.

Then, I guess, it may be the system but I always was disturbed in public housing and other programs where they would not finance them for more than a year or two at the most. And some of them will require that you set up an organization and a division in your own government; you invest money and get it all set up and then no money is appropriated and you are sitting there with a group of people that's costing you money and they are doing nothing. Then you relieve them of their responsibilities, discharge them. And there again you have another disturbance at the local level.

I think if these things were programmed, if they'd say, "We'll do this for five years," then you'd have a choice as to whether or not you wanted to get in for five years and pick it up afterwards. Or if you say, "We're going to do it. We're going to do it from now on unless it's proven to be definitely of no value." So I think when you say criticism there is some criticism you could apply to all administrations. That goes for local ones too.

HACKMAN: Could you talk about your membership on the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations? How you got in it and exactly how this group worked?

TUCKER: Well, of course, they have a staff set up with a director. They are appointed: some appointed by the president, some appointed by the Senate, some appointed by the House. And they have representatives of the governors, the citizens, the mayors, and various legislative representatives, as well as Cabinet members. Subjects are discussed as they are proposed by the various members as a topic for discussion, and a memorandum will be prepared, in all probability by the staff, as to what can be done. Then as this subject is being discussed and as various phases and elements of it are completed, the report is written. It is brought back; it's reviewed. And there again, as I said earlier, it's edited and refined, words may be deleted, and intent is clarified. And it gradually becomes a portion of the final report. And then that is circulated to the various people who are interested in it.

I personally believed that they have done an outstanding job. I noticed recently they've been doing a lot of work on local governments and its structure and the possibility of, I would say, a general council form of government in metropolitan areas to handle problems which are of a regional character. They've gone into the question of fiscal policies. They've gone into the question of taxes, and the overlapping of taxes and matters which I think are of very, very direct value to the governmental units that are lower on the totem pole. I mean from the local community to county and on up. If

nothing else, they have at least afforded stimulation of discussion and also they offer, as a rule, a mode of behavior which might be worthwhile in solving your problems.

HACKMAN: Do you recall if there was anything that you were specifically involved in, in depth, in instigating on your own?

TUCKER: No. No. Because we would.... Then again, see, I was a representative there; to a great extent representing certain organizations. And they had presented their views for problems, so I was not a lone wolf on this thing. But I represented a unit. And the committee, as a rule, worked as a unit. And they either got consensus on a subject or they permitted the minority to file the minority reports.

HACKMAN: While we are talking about this question of governmental relations, what type of problems did you specifically encounter in relation to the state government at that time--when Governor Dalton [John M. Dalton] was governor?

TUCKER: Well, the thing that I find very, very frustrating about the relationship of the local community with the state government is the fact that they will not give you the authority that is necessary to solve your problems. Of course, it's a hangover from the old feudal days in England when the kings granted charters and grants and he dictated the appointees. In fact, he established the rules and the regulations. And the courts have picked that up. And their interpretation has always been this, that if the state does not specifically grant you this authority then you cannot have it, whereas, in the federal constitution it is written in the most general terms. It allows itself a very, very liberal interpretation. And because of that, it has existed over the period of time that it has. And it has done a beautiful job. So, if the states would grant to the local communities all authority which is not specifically denied them, I think it would be a great step forward.

Then they preempt certain forms of taxation on you. Like in Missouri, they have preempted the income tax; they have preempted the sales tax; they have even gone to the extent of placing the gasoline tax in the constitution. So if you want to raise the gasoline tax you have to amend the constitution of the state. And I would say that if they take off the ceiling on taxation, why, it would be helpful too.

Then again, I think they frustrate the local communities in the fact that they require a two-thirds vote for the passage of bonds, whereas the president of the United States carries the states which elect him by a majority vote. It doesn't require a two-thirds. And I would say the majority of the electors would make him a president. The governors are elected by a majority vote. In fact, I don't know of anything--all you laws, with very few exceptions, are passed by a majority vote. But, presumably, when you get to the question of bonded indebtedness, why, a very, very active minority can frustrate the wishes of the majority. And this idea that you destroy your credit, I don't buy because these bond houses are not foolish. And unless your credit is good, they wouldn't buy the bonds. So you could pass them till you're blue in the face and if you couldn't pay for them, they wouldn't buy them.

HACKMAN: Did you feel that much was accomplished in alleviating any of these problems, let's say in '60 to '64, when Governor Dalton was governor?

TUCKER: Not materially. Not materially. In fact, I think the funniest thing of all, to show you how the state can operate: They passed a law in the state legislature permitting all cities of seven hundred thousand population or less to use the revenue from parking meters to retire revenue bonds for off street parking. There is only one city with over seven hundred thousand, St. Louis. So they wouldn't let us use the money for that purpose. They let us build garages but they wouldn't let us operate them.

I personally believe, too, that the whole state government should be restructured. By that I mean that certain functions which the local communities perform now are the result of lack of communication and inability to get to the court house, to conduct your business, and back. Consequently, the local communities set up certain facilities. That is no longer necessary. I illustrate it by the fact that I cannot see why the state won't take over the operation of all penal institutions. That is, at the state level. Then you would have a uniform policy of operation; you could devise a rehabilitation program that could be effective throughout the state; and there would be no necessity of having a workhouse here, one in the county, a jail in the county, a jail down here, and no doubt the county having different policies than we have in the city and the city the same way as far as the county. Now, when you think we have a hundred and fourteen jails, one in every county throughout the state, that's ludicrous. We just don't need that many. So they ought to pick some of those things up. And if they did that, then they'd relieve the stress on the local governments.

HACKMAN: Did President Kennedy ever show any personal interest in the workings of this Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations?

TUCKER: Oh, yes. Sure. He appointed it. I mean personally, I don't think the president has time to show a personal interest by, I mean, attending. But he had his people there. And he always made his appointments rather competent, and reappointments.

HACKMAN: Do you feel at all that the fact that Symington was a candidate in 1960 and that on the roll call, when Kennedy won on the first ballot, that Missouri stuck with Symington had any effect on your ability to get the programs desired from the federal government in the period? Was this ever a factor, politically?

TUCKER: Oh, no. Well, perhaps, maybe I'm naïve. But I considered President Kennedy to be a man of great intelligence, great ability, and far above the precinct type of politician, and ward politician. He might have to descend to it at one time or another, but I mean as far as appointments and things like that are concerned, I don't think he had ever tried to do that. I think he was too great a man, too

big a man. Some may do it, but you don't expect that from the presidency. I mean, I don't.

HACKMAN: You were recounting earlier this anecdote about your speaking at the American Municipal Association when Senator Kennedy was there. Do you want to talk about that and how that happened?

TUCKER: Oh, that was out in Denver. I was chairman of the inter-luncheon committee. And the senator was going to be the principal speaker. It was in the summer months, in early spring, and in introducing the senator, I wound up my introductory remarks by stating that now is the time for the senators to leave the halls of the legislature and go out into the hustings and proceed to drum up some support for their future ambitions. And I said, "Senator Symington in Missouri was doing it. And I notice that Senator Kennedy is now around here." The senator got up and facetiously made the remark that he knew where the chairman stood as far as his candidate is concerned. And later on, my wife came up and I introduced him. And she told him, she said, "Well now, senator, don't pay any attention to what Ray said because I'm for you."

HACKMAN: Do you have anything else along that line that you remember as far as Kennedy's trips to the state, during the convention maybe, or crowd reaction, or anything like this?

TUCKER: No. I mean those details, of course, were covered in the press. I would say usually the mayor of the city, when the president comes to town, is a pretty busy man, has considerable responsibility. And it's pretty tense because you don't like to have anything to happen even though you are not responsible for it. So I think you take yourself pretty seriously during those periods of time. And you lose your sense of humor then.

HACKMAN: Never any real problems cam up, though, on his visits in?

TUCKER: No. None at all. The only problem, as I say, when he came out was the difficulty of keeping the crowd from getting to him.

HACKMAN: I think I remember reading about one time when he flew into Lambert Field, and the reception committee couldn't hardly get to him because the crowd was so great.

TUCKER: I was right in that. And then when they did get to him, he broke through the circle to shake hands with people.

HACKMAN: That's actually about all I have unless you can think of something.

TUCKER: No. I don't have anything.

HACKMAN: Thank you very much.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

Name List

C

Celebrezze, Anthony J., 10
Chambers, Jordan W., 6

D

Dalton, John M., 12, 13
Dwyer, John J., 3, 6, 7

E

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 9

G

Galbraith, John Kenneth, 2

H

Hennings, Thomas Carey, Jr., 9
Humphrey, Hubert H., 6

J

Johnson, Lyndon B., 5, 6

N

Nitze, Paul H., 2

P

Pulitzer, Joseph, 7

S

Stevenson, Adlai E., 2
Symington, W. Stuart, 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14

T

Taylor, Frank, 7
Truman, Harry S., 1