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Location: Office of Ray Simon, Chicago, IL.
Present: Ray Simon, Dr. David W. Veenstra, and Jason Marcus Waak

Jason Marcus Waak: The date is 30 June, 2010. We’re sitting with Ray Simon. Mr. Simon, if you could, just state your name for the record. Then talk a little bit about your background, your birth place, where you were raised, your education, etc.

Ray Simon: Yes, Jason. My name is Raymond Simon. I was born in Chicago in 1932. I lived in back of the stockyards, as we called it, although it really wasn’t. I grew up on Lowe Avenue. It’s a street that you probably know because it’s the street that Mayor Daley lived on. I attended Catholic grade school and I attended Jesuit High School and college. I went to St. Ignatius College Preparatory School. I went to Loyola University as an undergraduate and I got my law degree from Loyola University as well.

JMW: Then, upon graduation from law school, did you immediately go into law?

RS: In law school, I clerked for the corporation counsel. It was the summer before my last year and passed the bar exam. Everyone has a friend as well as a mentor. The mayor was sort of a mentor to me. But a friend was Judge Power. Judge Power knew my father, who was a member of the organization in the Eleventh Ward. He judged a court argument at Loyola, which our team was successful at. And he said, “Have you considered working in government, Ray?” And I said, “Listen, I’d love it" (RS laughs). He said, “Well, let me make a date with you for lunch. Then we can talk to the mayor.” So that was the beginning of the career. I was hired as a corporation counsel right after I was admitted to practice law. That would have been in 1956.

JMW: Good. That was my next question. What were you doing in assisting corporation counsel?
RS: I worked in the appeals division. The appeals division wrote legal opinions and they wrote briefs for the appellate court. Those cases, then, were tried in the general counsel division and then appealed. So I was a law clerk to the corporation counsel, whose name was John Melaniphy. He was a wonderful, old crusty guy. John was very good to me. I worked for him for about a year to a year and a half. He asked me to come in and work as an administrative assistant. Then I did that with a multiplicity of jobs, which included dealing with the general assembly and with the Congress, although the general assembly was a pretty active assignment with a lot of legislation there in dealing with the leadership. They became my closest friends.

George Dunne, John Touhy, and Art McGloon were the leaders in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Then in Washington, D.C., when we had a question there, we didn’t go and deal with the members of Congress so much as we dealt with what was the leadership of our delegation. During those years, it was Dan Rostenkowski, whom I formed a very significant relationship with. I’ve always felt that Danny was one of the real miscarriages of justice, as far as my opinion of the incident that led to his imprisonment.

JMW: I do want to talk about your legislative activity with Springfield, Washington, D.C., and Dan Rostenkowski. But what about that first meeting, when Judge Powell brought you up to meet the mayor? (DWV and JMW laugh) That must have been quite shocking like, “Hey, I'm going to meet the mayor.” Would that have been the first time?

RS: No, not at all. My father used to bring me to meetings of the ward organization. The mayor commented on the fact that my father was always very helpful in carrying the precinct where he was involved and working with the organization. The mayor oftentimes referred to me as homegrown. He’d say, “He’s our homegrown legal genius,” or something like that (RS laughs). Homegrown didn’t mean a Chicago law school. It meant that I grew up on Lowe Avenue (RS laughs).

JMW: So you grew up on Lowe Avenue and what?
RS: It was at Lowe Avenue and Thirty First. It was 3119 Lowe Avenue.

JMW: Okay. So what kind of legislation still sits in your mind, as far as Springfield? What sticks out, as far as trying to get stuff done in Springfield and Washington, D.C.?

RS: Well, there were many years. So there were lots of pieces of legislation, both affirmative and defensive. On the defensive side, there was the civic federation and the organizations that represented big business like the chamber of commerce and the civic federation. They always wanted to put a rate limitation on the city’s power to raise taxes. They wanted to say that we couldn’t go above a certain rate. And we always would resist that.

The argument was always that the city council of Chicago and the mayor of Chicago knew better what Chicago needed than representatives that came from Decatur, Springfield, Winnebago County, and that kind of stuff. So that was a tug of war. We dealt with the leadership in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. We were always successful in stopping it. But that was always a perennial piece of legislation. That was legislation that dealt with elections and that kind of stuff.

But then, on the affirmative side, one of the significant contests occurred when the mayor hired O.W. Wilson to be the superintendent of police. O.W. Wilson wanted to change a lot of the things that went on in the police department. He wanted a separate review board rather than the civil service commission with a whole array of reform legislation. That was very significant. I remember going over to present it at a patrolman association meeting. And I got thrown out on my fanny, unceremoniously (RS laughs).

JMW: Both Dan Rostenkowski and Michael Madigan have talked about when the mayor would host the Illinois delegation. It may have been on Fridays. I'm not sure. And then, in Madigan’s case, I'm assuming also the Chicago area state representatives. It was not necessarily marching orders.

RS: It was reviewing pending legislation.
JMW: Yes.

RS: Sure. I did that. But at the time, John Touhy was the leader. Touhy was the Speaker of the House of Representatives. But he preceded Michael Madigan by many years. Michael Madigan also worked for me in the corporation counsel’s office in those days (RS and JMW laugh).

JMW: Okay. Go ahead (speaking to DWV).

Dr. David W. Veenstra: I want to go back to the legislation with Illinois. There was something that was in the works before Richard J. Daley was the mayor. And it was always finding ways to keep money in Chicago. New York City eventually went bankrupt in the seventies because they were paying for seventeen different hospitals, I believe. In Cook County, the county was paying for the hospital. The county was paying for different things. Was there any legislation that you dealt with to try to get other people to pick up the bill for Chicago?

RS: Well, I think it worked a little bit in reverse. Chicago is what we call a home ruled city. It’s the only city in Illinois that has a population in excess of five hundred thousand. So we would pass legislation, uniformly, to all cities over five hundred thousand. There is still no city, other than Chicago, that has over five hundred thousand. So the mayor wanted to keep Chicago’s taxing authority and Chicago’s ability to regulate independent of the General Assembly. So rather than trying to pass off responsibility to suburban communities or to county government, he wanted to centralize control in the city of Chicago.

So I don’t see it the way your question poses it. We could have had regional incineration plants, rather than our own in the city. There was a strong movement for regional government and so on. He didn’t want the CTA to be taken over. He didn’t want municipal functions to be broadened out into the region or the county. He wasn’t trying to save taxpayers money by diverting responsibilities for the various city functions to the
broader governmental agencies. He wanted the control left in Chicago. That’s the way I saw his government.

JMW: I guess you went from administrative assistant to….

RS: Then I became the deputy mayor for a period of time.

JMW: Okay. That was from 1966 to 1969?

RS: Yes.

JMW: Kind of working backwards, can you talk about the bond issue from 1960 at all?

RS: Well, I'm not sure about 1960. But one of the bond issues that was significant was the revenue bond issue. I don’t think I need to develop legal differences between a general obligation and a revenue bond issue. But simply put, a general obligation gives the purchasers of the bonds a tax base authority to raise money through taxes, whereas a revenue bond only pledges a revenue through a facility that is developed with those bonds. One of the most significant bond issues that happened early on, and it may have been in 1960, was the sale of revenue bonds to build O’Hare Airport.

O’Hare Airport was built without costing the taxpayers a penny. We acquired the land. We built the facilities. And it was all done with the leases with the airlines that were using the airport. They paid for their leases. All of the revenues and concessions went into a pot for parking, food sales, and all of that. If there was less revenue than the cost of the airport, it was what they called a landing fee. That was based upon the amount of usage from the various airlines. It was a very equitable way of doing it. United Airlines probably used it more than Southern Airlines. So they paid on that basis. So that was a very significant development in municipal government that we got one of the world’s greatest airports. And the taxpayers didn’t pay a penny for it.

JMW: Yes. That is quite remarkable.
RS: Well, we had bond issues for alley lighting and other things.

JMW: There was a bond issue for the construction of the UIC Campus in 1958. It got voted down. So I’m referring to the 1960 bond issue. The slogan was, “Don’t cheat our kids out of education.” It was supposed to be this bipartisan support. It was fifty million dollars. There was fifty million to build this campus, twenty five million for SIU Edwardsville, and then the rest of the money was for the rest of the state schools.

RS: That was in the General Assembly. That would be nothing that the City of Chicago could do that affected it.

DWV and JMW: Right. It was the General Assembly.

RS: Well, it’s been common that the General Assembly has a group from downstate that begrudged Chicago anything, whether Democrats or Republicans. It’s good for their campaign to be against Chicago. So that’s why we wouldn’t get much help from them on something like that. But the University of Illinois is a great topic if you discuss Richard J. Daley. That’s because I think, in his mind, it was something that would be a lasting legacy for him. It would educate the people in the city that didn’t have a lot of money. If you know the history of the mayor, you know that he grew up in that kind of a family.

He had a very good education. He was not only a lawyer. But he was an accountant, a CPA as well, which a lot of people don’t know. That’s why he was so good at understanding the city budgets and so on. But I think the mayor felt that if we could get a four year branch of the University of Illinois here, there would be tens of thousands of Chicagoans who would get a good education that didn’t have a lot of money to pay for a college education. So that was very significant.

But it was a fight. It was a struggle. It was one of the first times when we got direct action. Theretofore, if you didn’t like what was happening, you’d grumble about it and maybe talk to your alderman about it. But over on the west side, what where we are with this item now, the university, Florence Scala organized a group. She later became a
friend of mine. But in those years, she was really an outspoken woman. Her father had a
tailor shop over here. It later became a restaurant that Florence had.

Florence would come down with a group. They would go into the conference
room and wouldn’t leave. They had their loaves of bread and they would be there. We’d
go home at six o’clock at night and they would be in there. They weren’t going to leave.
So we had the sit ins, the demonstrations, and active participation, which was a direct
action to protest what you didn’t think was right. And to some extent, a lot of what she
was saying was perfectly valid. That’s what you learn in government. And that is you
have to see both sides of it.

We saw a great university that was going to educate a lot of young kids that
otherwise wouldn’t be able to go forward in education. The neighborhood there saw
people that lived in what was originally a two flat that was maybe converted into four
apartments. The owner lived in one unit and rented out the other three units. When we’d
go out and get appraisals for the acquisitions, we’d come back with an appraisal that
might be fifteen or twenty thousand dollars. In those years, that was significant money.

But the guy that owned it would say, “I'm collecting rent from three units here.
That’s what I live on. I’m getting my own income. What am I going to do with the
income from twenty thousand dollars? It will only be a thousand dollars or something.
I’m collecting four times that and getting my own living for free. How can you do to
me?” It was like the devil’s evil. We didn’t want to hurt him. We wanted to build a great
university. But all that they saw was the individual impact. So Florence was one of the
first to lead the opposition to that.

Then, with the elected leaders, John D’Arco was the alderman in the city council.
He’d come in to see the mayor. He’d say, “Dick, my people are against that.” And the
mayor would say, “Your people? (RS laughs) The fact is that this is too big to shut down.
It’s only a matter that’s affecting a half a block. This is a great university for Chicago.”
So we had our struggles during those years. But it was a great thing that the mayor did. It
has expanded and has been recognized as one of his stellar achievements as the mayor.

JMW: Once the trustees agreed to build the campus, there was always this sort of
resistance, this kind of manifest destiny, if you let a Chicago campus grow. They wanted
to put it out in Maywood. From our research, the mayor was always committed to a near Loop or a downtown location that would be accessible to Chicago students.

RS: Right. And he felt that with the public transportation, this was accessible to everybody. And with a few that were coming further away, there was the expressway system. It fitted perfectly. He was very determined that it would be in Chicago. It was not, “Well, wherever it is, we’ll be happy to have it.” He wanted it here.

DWV: Yes. This neighborhood gave him tremendous support in the elections. I believe that it was second or third in loyalty to the mayor.

RS: It’s one of those things we talked a lot about. You’d get John D’Arco’s ward and Bernie Neistein’s ward. And in some of those wards, he’d win twenty to one. But you’d get five thousand to eight hundred, where someone would come in from the Fiftieth Ward. And they’d say, “Well, in John’s ward, he ended up getting four thousand at the rally. I cast twenty four thousand to twelve thousand. You’ve got twelve thousand at the rally in my ward. Why do you always look at those wards as being enormously important to you?” So it was one of those things. They did have a lot of people that paid attention to politics in the wards.

I don’t mean to depart from what we’re saying. When were visiting earlier, you mentioned the idea that you were talking to one of those who was a colleague of mine about the idea of patronage. And the reason that the turnouts in these wards was always so very strong was attributed to patronage. You had a lot of people that had a job in city government or were close to people and had some influence. Today, that patronage has developed a very negative kind of context. It’s pejorative when you use the word. I really think that today we’re missing something.

In those years, the political system probably had to do with the New Deal, FDR, immigration into the country, and so on. It’s probably true with Hispanic and Asian immigrants. But their connection to the city was through patronage. The precinct captain wanted their support. So he would help them get situated. He’d help them get a job. He’d
help their kids get a summer job. If they were in trouble, he’d front for them and see if he could help. He might know a lawyer who would represent them without charging them.

There were services that were given by the political organization to people that caused them to be loyal to the political organization. So it gave them a connection to the government. They were not powerless. They had some friends that were important. A lot of that is gone. And a lot of it is gone because the people who work for the government don’t feel much loyalty to the people in charge of the government. They say, “Oh, I was here before them. I’ll be here after them. I do my job. Don’t anybody in the neighborhood come and ask me if I can help them with anything because that’s not my job.”

So we lost a lot. I mean, there were abuses to patronage. And I knew them probably better than most people. Just read the newspapers. That was bad. But during the mayor’s administration, he would never try to do things that were underhanded, undercover, or try to front for people who were doing criminal kinds of activities. There’s a big difference between doing a favor for someone and doing something that’s illegal. He would never condone fixing a case in court. He would certainly condone someone coming in saying, “Dick, our neighborhood isn’t getting any services out there. They’re not collecting the garbage. There are potholes in the street. We’re not getting any services.”

And he paid attention to them. He got the Commissioner of Sanitation down and say, “You know this. Where are your inspectors?” This is not any deal. There’s a big difference in giving services and helping people and doing things on the periphery that have kind of a criminal overtone to them, like the kinds of things we’ve seen go on in the courts. There’s an awful lot of difference in those two things. Anyway, I didn’t mean to get you off track with that.

DWV and JMW: Oh no.

JMW: I was just thinking back to the university. It’s interesting. It’s nice to know that you had a friendship with Florence (RS and JMW laugh). It’s kind of come full circle. Well certainly, if you weren’t displaced in the neighborhood, you made out like crazy.
Try to rent an apartment now and look at the prices. I mean, even Florence made money off of the university. She opened the restaurant.

RS: Right. That wasn’t what she wanted.

JMW: No. It wasn’t.

RS: You know, there’s a lot to talk about in terms of the way the mayor ran his administration and the way he ran his cabinet.

DWV: You mean his style.

RS: Yes.

JMW: Well, let’s talk about that then.

RS: One of the things that was always a thorn in my side was that the mayor would always have a cabinet meeting on Monday morning at eight thirty (RS laughs). I told my friends that if I wanted to go to eight thirty meetings, I would have been an engineer instead of a lawyer (RS, DWV, and JMW laugh). That’s because the courts start at ten o’clock. But he got us all down there. And he would go over his agenda. You know, the mayor was there for a long time. And many times, the problems we discussed were problems we discussed in the previous administration.

But he kept the opinion that we could make it better. And we just had to keep pounding away at it, whether it was the building department inspections, getting bogged down in court, and so on. He did a lot of things that were innovative at the time. He’d say, “Well, let’s put together a team.” So then, you’d have a building inspector, an electrical inspector, a housing inspector, and a lawyer who was a prosecutor. They’d go out and do a comprehensive inspection of the building, instead of having it be fragmented. So when they came before the court, they’d show the judge a good picture of the whole building and so on.
So he’d keep pounding away at whatever the problems were and trying to bring in new ideas. He was susceptible to new ideas, if they were good ideas, no matter who gave them to him, even if it was the guy who was the starter to the elevators down on the main floor of the hall, or one of his cabinet people, or if it was a social acquaintance of his. He really was open. He also had a kind of common touch. I remember him saying, and this was addressed to the cabinet members, “Now, I know you work hard. You carry home a briefcase full of things that read at night after dinner and this kind of stuff. But who is at the front desk in your department? Do you know who that is? Is it a person who has a good attitude that says, ‘Good morning. How can I help you?’ Or is it a guy that has a drinking problem that can’t get along with his wife and is angry with the whole world? When somebody comes in, he says, ‘What do you want? Give me that. Sit down and wait.’”

His whole attitude was, “You know, we’re here to serve the public. But they don’t know what we’re doing in these cabinet meetings. They know what’s going on when they come to the city clerk’s office when they come to get a vehicle license sticker. Or if they come to the Water Department for a permit, or whatever it is. Are your people out front and aware that you talk to them? Do you make them aware of the fact that this is what the public sees?”

One of my close friends who has been dead for a number of years and was a close friend for all of his life. His name is George Dunne. In his younger days, he worked for the Chicago Park District. He was an assistant to the General Superintendent. He would go out every Sunday. He would go to visit the toilet facilities along the lake front. They each had a person in charge, so that they smelled clean, they were fresh, they had toilet paper, soap, and so on. He’d go along and it wouldn’t be there. He’d get the guy in and raise hell with him.

He’d say to the guy, “Look. If this is beneath your dignity, apply for a different job and we’ll put somebody else here. What we’re doing in the administration building, no one knows. There will be two hundred thousand people in the Chicago Park District this Saturday and Sunday. And they’re going to judge us by whether when they go to the bathroom if it’s fresh and clean, the windows are open, if it smells fresh, if there’s toilet paper, if there’s paper towels after you wash your hands with soap and water, and so on.”
That was an aspect that was never missed by the old pros. They understood dealing with people. Today, I think we get so far away from it that we’re losing focus on something that’s very important. But Richard J. Daley had a good common grasp of where the voters were, where the citizens were, where the people receiving city services came in contact with city government, and who was in contact with them, who really was representing him. But that was an interesting aspect of him.

DWV: You said that he was open to new ideas. It seems to me, looking at his cabinets, he had a lot of young people on his cabinets.

RS: He called us the kiddie cabinet (RS laughs). I was thirty five years old when I was on the corporation counsel in Chicago, or something like that. There were a lot of young fellows, like Jim McDonough. He is one of the terrific engineers. He runs a really great engineering and architecture firm in Chicago. There was Jim Fitzpatrick. There was Lou Hill, who was a young guy in those years. There was Milton Pikarsky. Jerry Butler was the city architect.

These were all very well educated and very idealistic people. They hadn’t been spoiled by being around a long time to get cynical and say, “Well, you know, we understand you have to say that. But underneath it, no one cares.” I mean, they believed that people cared. They came in with a lot of fresh ideas and a lot of idealism, which is probably an ingredient that is as important as anything else.

JMW: My question was going to be along those lines. Other than the joint teams, such as the electricians and lawyers that you were talking about earlier, what other innovations can you remember about the mayor?

RS: Well, what I remember is that he was always open to new ideas. We were talking about the outer drive as it gets around Forty Seventh Street or Fifty Forth Street going south. There’s a very bad turn there. There was a bottleneck and a lot of accidents occurring. So the planners and the engineers decided that they were going to straighten it out. They were going to cut down all of the trees and give it a straight line. And again,
Jim Clements’ wife was down there and chained herself to a tree. Direct action got to be common place in those years. You didn’t think you counted unless you had people walking up and down in front of your house (DWV laughs).

But the engineers were putting up sheets on the easel and showing Mayor Daley the routes, where they were going to correct it, and so on. They just felt that this was absolutely the way to do it. And they said, “Of course. And if you wanted to do this, you could do this.” Daley looked at them and said, “If I wanted to do that? Of course, I want to do that. I don’t want to knock down the trees. I want to correct the problem here.”

So then, all of a sudden, someone from nowhere gives him an idea of how you could do this. He wasn’t an engineer. But he didn’t have that much regard for engineers, lawyers, or anyone else. I mean, he wanted to solve problems. So he wasn’t like people that got invested with what they said yesterday. “It has to be that way and we’re going to bull our way through it.” If there was a better way of doing, he didn’t feel like he was losing face to say, “Maybe I didn’t have all of the facts that I have today when I made that decision yesterday.” And he would change. So he was very open to new ideas.

There was a certain paternal attitude that the mayor had as far as young people were concerned. For a period of time, being a politician in residence was a nice title for important politicians to go to different universities in the country and talk about what they were doing. The mayor went to about a dozen of them and I was with him for most of them. One that was very memorable was when the mayor spoke at Harvard. He was introduced by a man that was the head of the planning department. I think his name was Jim Long from Boston. He was highly regarded. He gave the mayor a very glowing introduction.

When the mayor went to the podium, the kids in the audience hissed (RS laughs). Daley walked up to the microphone and said, “You know, my beloved mother, Lord have mercy on her, used to say that was the sound of truth when it hit the fires of hell (RS, DWV, and JMW laugh). I wanted to come and talk to you young men and women because you’re among the best and brightest that we have in this country. And it’s going to be dependent on you as to what kind of leadership that we have in this country. So I wanted to spend this time with you. But before I begin, I want to tell that up until now, you’re not achievers. You’re just takers. You’re here because people are paying your
tuition. You’re here because of your parents or because of scholarships. So far, you haven’t done anything. So we ought to understand each other as we begin to talk. Now I know a lot about municipal government and politics. And that’s why I decided to come here.”

But I thought he shoved them back down in their seats (RS laughs). He gave a fine talk and ended up with a standing ovation. But it was kind of cute the way he dealt with them. He was in no way intimidated by being on the campus at Harvard. Those were kind of fun things.

There was another thing about the mayor that I don’t think people knew anything about. But we’d go on a trip someplace and be checking into a hotel at eight o’clock at night. He’d say, “Ray, find out what time the masses are at the closest parish in the neighborhood.” So we’d go to eight o’clock mass in the morning. There aren’t many people, when they’re out travelling, that won’t say, "Where is there a bar where there’s a little bit of life in this town?" He’d say, “We’ll go to mass in the morning and get an early night’s sleep.” He was a very decent man, a very good man, and a very moral man. Because he had a gruff exterior and had the Democratic machine in Chicago, people didn’t understand that dimension to the mayor. Maybe they did. But I don’t think it was generally talked about.

JMW: Well, we’ve heard a lot of the Council of U.S. Mayors stories. Tom Donovan tells some of them. All of those mayors gravitated to Mayor Richard J. Daley.

RS: They did. They all did. He was the mayor during his time, and because he worked at it. Mayor Lindsay in New York City was tall, thin, elegant, spoke with the refinement of the east coast, and so on. He had a deputy mayor for everything. I mean, if you had a problem, he’d give it to this deputy mayor over there. His desk was cleaner than this table is. If you had a problem, you’d get a federal grant, he’d give it to the gang members, and so they would calm down. And that wasn’t any problem for him.

Daley didn’t operate that way. I mean, Daley dealt with the city problems at his desk every day. And he wanted them on his desk. He’d say to us in the cabinet, “I don’t want to know about the problem after it’s in the front page of the Chicago Tribune. I want
to know about the problem when it’s incipient, and when we can do something about it. He was a real detail guy who worked on the problems of the city. And that’s why the mayors around the country were delighted to be in his company because he was kind of the dean of that group.

DWV: What about his relationships with John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson?

RS: Well, I can tell you an interesting anecdote. We were going down to Washington, D.C. to present the opening testimony on Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty legislation. We were met at the airport by Jack Valenti, who was Johnson’s Chief of Staff, or whatever they called them in those years. He said, “Dick, I don’t want you to stay at the White House. He sent me out to meet you.” The mayor said, “Well Jack, he’s a busy man. I don’t want to impose on him. Tell him we appreciate it.” He said, “Well, he’ll be disappointed if I come back without you.” The mayor said, “Oh, he’s very gracious and I appreciate that.” I don’t want to impose on him. We’ve got reservations at The Statler.” So Jack Valenti looked over at me and I had just been introduced to him as Mr. Simon. He said, “Mr. Simon, what do you think?” (RS laughs)

I said, “Mr. Mayor, I could get into The Statler on my own (RS laughs).” And he said, “That’s true, Ray. It’d be a good experience. Fine Jack, we’ll stay at the White House.” So we did. We stayed at the White House. In fact, I slept in the Lincoln Bedroom. In those days, we didn’t have any money. And in those years, no one was expected to make a contribution for that privilege. But in any event, we had a lovely dinner with Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson. Dan Rostenkowski and Richard M. Daley were at the dinner. When we were leaving, Lady Bird said, “Mr. Simon, if Mayor Daley would like a nightcap before he retires, there’s a bar set up just in back of where his room is. And if you need anything, just call the third floor kitchen.”

So anyway, the mayor and all of us met with the president. We discussed polls. He was running for re-election then. We talked about which group was ninety per cent for Johnson, eighty five per cent, and all of this kind of stuff. They were all very favorable. Then we retired. I said to the mayor what Lady Bird had said to me, that there was a bar
there if he’d like some. He said, “I’d like a beer, Ray.” So I went and rummaged around. There was every kind of liquor you’d want, but no beer.

So I picked up the phone and I called the kitchen. I said, “I’m with the mayor of Chicago and that Lady Bird said that if we needed anything to call you. Do you have any beer?” And he said, “Oh goodness. No, we don’t have any beer.” He looked at his watch and said, “It’s past eleven o’clock. There are no liquor stores open. I’m sorry.” I said, “That’s all right.” So I reported that to the mayor. The mayor said, “When John Kennedy lived here, they had beer.” (RS, DWV, and JMW laugh) That was kind of cute. But it has nothing much to do with anything. He had an excellent relationship with both of them. Kennedy said to the mayor, when the mayor was visiting the White House, “Well Dick, the reason that I'm here is because of you.” He smiled and shrugged it off. Then he said, “He says that to everyone who comes here.” (RS and DWV laugh)

Lyndon Johnson was very helpful when we had riots in the city. Things were going very tough in the city. I remember, as corporation counsel, if we had a pornography case, that was high profile stuff. Then I remember when we had the riots in the city after Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated. The mayor said he talked to the president. But he said, “He’d like you to get General Mather,” who was here from Fort Hood, Texas. And he said, “Would you get President Johnson on the phone and advise him that we’ve had the police on twelve hour shifts. We’ve had the Illinois National Guard. And things are pretty dicey. We’d like him to nationalize the guard and send in federal troops.” So I did get President Johnson on the phone.

I thought to myself, “You know, the veneer of civilization is pretty thin.” We had all of what we had in Chicago to maintain law and order. The gangs on the southwest side out in Englewood hadn’t done a thing. The Blackstone Rangers were very quiet and didn’t cause any problems. You know, there were so many more places that could have erupted when the word about us had spread. But Lyndon Johnson said, “We’ll have anything you need, Mayor Daley. I’ll need to have your lawyer put General Mather on the phone. And I’ll tell him that I'm signing the order to nationalize the Illinois National Guard.

So we went through an awful lot of that stuff when we had the convention and demonstrations that were serious. When Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was killed, it was
very serious stuff. I remember being up in a helicopter flying over the city. The hoses out
in the west side were like spaghetti, trying to extinguish fires everywhere. One of the
things historically has been a thing with the liberals. Fortunately or unfortunately, I’ve
always considered myself one of them. There were the mayor’s comments during the
riots, when he issues that very harsh order when he was going to direct the police to shoot
to kill arsonists, and shoot to cripple and maim looters.

In the context in which it was stated, we had been through what I was describing,
when we had policemen on duty. They were getting exhausted working twelve hour
shifts. We had General Francis Kane, who was head of the Illinois National Guard at that
time. We had all of the guardsmen out. Then we had federal forces. The fire department
would be up on a ladder with their hoses, trying to extinguish a fire. And people would be
shooting at them. Television would show them throwing a brick through a window.
They’d be carrying out everything that was portable. And it was just getting too far out of
control.

It was sort if like with your children. You have to say, “There’s a limit beyond
which you can go. And now you’ve reached it. There’s going to be no more of this, with
firemen trying to save the property, save the people, and having someone shoot at them.”
They’d throw a Molotov cocktail into a building to start a fire. We’d send policemen out
to risk their lives. Then someone would think it was a joke to take potshots at them. It had
to stop. That’s when we said it, kind of crudely, but effectively. People don’t seem to
report that it stopped. It stopped. It quieted down. There was no more of it, throwing the
Molotov cocktails.

The firemen were not being put in great jeopardy because the people heard what
he was saying. “It’s enough! Stop it! This is too much! If it goes any further, the
consequences are going to be drastic.” So it was one of those things. The people of
Chicago loved him. They elected him in the next term with an overwhelming majority.
The people in the east, the liberal press, said, “How could you shoot to cripple people?”
Well, he didn’t want to cripple anyone. He was trying to give them a message. He said it
with harsh words and not the most refining words. If the mayor spoke with the eloquence
of John Lindsay, he probably would have been the president of the United States. I mean,
the mayor came up the hard way. I mean, he made himself understood. At times, he
would be eloquent. But when he was angry, he would say things that would come out sometimes as pretty harshly. And that was one of those quotations that people will never forget. But it wasn’t all that bad in terms of the effectiveness.

DWV: That’s very interesting. Yes. That’s never been reported, that it stopped. Did Lyndon Johnson ever say no?

RS: Well, I don’t know everything the mayor dealt with him about. I'm sure he would have said no to him if the mayor had asked him to make John D’Arco ambassador to the Vatican or something (RS laughs). No. He liked the mayor. He called the mayor for advice. The mayor would never ask for anything personal. He’d ask for things for the city. And I don’t think that if it was within his control and within his power to do it, I don’t think he’d ever say no to him. But the mayor was a wise and prudent person. He never wore out his welcome. It was part of the wisdom of it all, too.

DWV: What would Lyndon Johnson call for advice for?

RS: Well, he called about the legislation on the war on poverty and the Great Society legislation. I mean, these were proposals that had to do with job training and things that were trying to get people out of poverty. I mean, we’re not so far away from needing that kind of legislation today, with unemployment at such a drastic level. I mean, making work projects don’t sound so ridiculous today. Where my farm is, up towards South Beloit, with the closing of the plants in Rockford and in Janesville, unemployment was at sixteen and eighteen per cent in those areas. So, Lyndon Johnson would clearly want his advice and say, “What can we do to stimulate more employment? What can we do to keep our cities more vibrant?”

You know, the cities around America, during those years, were all going down the drain. They were looking more like Detroit, Michigan than they were looking like a brand, spanking new city. Mayor Richard J. Daley had a lot to do with the fact that Chicago didn’t go the way of other cities. And a big part of it was that he felt the center part of the city was important. And he would always encourage the business people to
develop there. He always had a very strong coterie of outstanding, public minded citizens who were Democrats and Republicans who he would call on for advice. And he would help.

A lot of people, like John D’Arco and Vito Marzullo, felt, “What the hell? Those people never helped you. They never rang a doorbell to help anyone. They never circulated anything.” Mayor Daley’s attitude was, “They are very important in Chicago. And the commerce of our city is most important.” So we were building high rise buildings. We were carving good areas out of slums. Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores on the south side were terrible slums that became beautiful high rise housing. With the Sandburg housing on the north side of the Loop, those were terrible slums. People were living in cold rooms and basements that existed there.

The slum clearance and the redevelopment programs did a lot for those areas, just as the University of Illinois program did a lot for the near west side. So he was building an area that made it comfortable to be in Chicago, to develop. In those years sixty to eighty million dollars was a lot of money to put up a high rise building. But you didn’t have the feeling that, “You know, things will get out of control in the city. People will be uncomfortable being there. We’d be better off building in the suburbs.” They didn’t have that feeling in Chicago. They felt that Chicago was going to be stable. The leadership listened to the business community. So there was that partnership, which was very unusual for the old time politicians. The Tammany Hall people didn’t give a damned about the affluent part of the business community. But Mayor Daley did. He did very much.

DWV: I have another question.

JMW: Go ahead.

DWV: Why have journalists and historians been so hard on the mayor? I’ve never asked that before.
RS: Earl Bush was Richard J. Daley’s press agent. Earl Bush was a friend of mine. There was a coterie of us that were all Catholic around the mayor. Bush was Jewish. Earl felt that was not quite on the inside of the group. He’d complain to me and we’d talk to each other. And I liked Earl very much. He understood politics very clearly. I remember him coming in to complain. A guy from Life Magazine, I forget his name, did a story about Mayor Daley and it came out. And Earl said, “Ray, I just left the mayor. He reamed me out because I recommended that he give this guy an interview. The guy wrote a story in Life Magazine. It’s ninety eight per cent pro-Daley and two per cent negative. All he wanted to talk to me about was the two per cent negative. You know, he’s not paid to do P.R. for Mayor Daley. He’s got to write a story.” And Bush was complaining because Mayor Daley was only looking at that negative two per cent.

When you talk about what’s been written about Richard J. Daley, it wasn’t all negative. There was an awful lot of positive press. As he got older and was around longer, I think they didn’t seem to try to play up man ship with him. “I know more about him than you do.” That’s because as he was there longer, he knew more about government than anyone else. So you didn’t have Jay McMullen, or Ed Schreiber at the Chicago Tribune or those fellows. They were there to learn what he was telling them about and what was going on. So the local press, I don’t think, was hostile to Mayor Daley.

The national press was hostile to Mayor Daley. And they were hostile because there was a Republican bias in a lot of them. They went along with the idea that the election for John F. Kennedy was stolen in Chicago. That election was investigated by every investigation agency known in America. There was none of that. But because the returns were turned in slowly in some areas, they figured that they were being tampered with. There was no evidence like that was being done. But they thought that the eastern press felt that Mayor Daley was an old fashioned, machine politician. So they couldn’t say nice things about him. It just went against the grain with them.

But I think that the local press was friendly. And I think with the books written about him, there have been some very hostile ones. There was one. I can’t think of the name of it. But it was reviewed in the forum years ago. But they recognized in Mayor Daley a talent for local government. Like any administration, there were things that
happened in the administration that you could pick up and criticize, like that two per cent. There was something towards one end. The policemen in Summerdale were involved as active participants with the burglaries that were going on. And it was Mayor Daley’s administration.

It was Tim O’Connor, his chief of police, even though Martin Kennelly was the one that hired Tim O’Connor. But Mayor Daley kept him on. Tim O’Connor was honest as the day is long. But this was a Summerdale police scandal. So naturally, Mayor Daley was criticized for it. “It was on your watch. You should be in control of what goes on in your city.” So he got his share of criticism for it. He deserved it and took it. Everyone felt that Mayor Daley was tough and had a shell like a turtle. And that was so entirely wrong.

Mayor Daley was as sensitive to criticism as anyone that you could imagine. I remember when I was in private practice. One of the editors at the Chicago Sun Times had written a story that was totally inaccurate. I said to the mayor, “I’m going to go over and I’m going to talk to him because this is just outrageous.” He said, “Ray, don’t bother with it. If you show that you’re upset, they’ll just needle you a little bit more. Just pretend you didn’t even read the story.” But Mayor Daley himself was always very sensitive to it.

DWV: That’s interesting.

JMW: Well, can we talk about 1968 and moving into the Democratic National Convention? We talked about the 1967 riots and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

RS: Sure. There’s a lot to be said about it. We talked earlier in this discussion about Florence Scala and the direct action, like the picketing, the sit-ins, and so on. When we’re talking about the convention, there was a group that came to Chicago. They were mobilized to disrupt the convention. Abbie Hoffman and all of the names don’t pop up in my head quickly.

But anyway, we had about six different groups. They would have demonstrations. They would walk out on the northwest side of the city and demonstrate. Then they’d call up the police department and say that they were going to demonstrate on the northwest side. And they’d show up on the southwest side, where the mayor had a lot of supporters.
They wanted to knock their block off for coming out and disrupting it. We had our police out there, making sure that the demonstrators were protected. They wanted to demonstrate and hold demonstrations at the site of the convention out at the stockyards. They insisted that that was where the action was. That’s where the whole world was watching. And that was where they wanted to go.

So I said to the mayor, “Why don’t we have a conference in which we tell them we’ll accommodate them with a place to assemble wherever they want to among these sites? We’ll give them a site in Lincoln Park and a site near the band shell on the south side. We’ll pick out these different areas where they can have press and television coverage. They can express all of their anti-war sentiment and so on.” No. They wanted to be at the convention. So we filed a suit in the district court. And we alleged just that, that our police department had its hands full and that we had to protect people. But we were being chomped by this group that said they would show up in one place but go to another place.

The police would be scurrying back and forth. They wanted places where they could hold rallies. They wanted to be at the convention. It’s just a physical fact that two people can’t stand on the same ground at the same time. So, while you have a right to free speech, you can’t say, “I’m going to be here at this time,” when we’re holding a national convention. So that was where we got with it. Then the courts directed them not to be at the convention. So they mobilized to do a rally at the Hilton Hotel.

JMW: Let me change the tape.

(end of video tape one)

JMW: Okay. So they wanted to go over by the Hilton Hotel.

RS: Well, that was when they made the demonstration that was given the most publicity. I was an alternate delegate at that convention. I was out at the stockyards. When I got home, my wife said, “My God. What was going on? The thing at the Hilton Hotel lasted
for hours and hours.” I said, “No. It lasted eighteen minutes. What are you talking about?” She said, “I’ve been watching it on television. Every two minutes it’s on television. You’ve got to be wrong.” Well, they kept saying it over and over again.

You would think it was going on for hours. But it wasn’t. There were people arrested. Nobody was badly injured and nobody certainly was killed. It was not that kind of terrible riot. You’ll hear things today where then people are killed and people shrug. So anyway, the mistake I think we made was chasing them out of Lincoln Park. That, I think, churned up an awful lot of antagonism towards the police department. You know, it’s all hindsight. I think we should have left them at Lincoln Park through the night.

One time, I was president of the Chicago Park District. We have curfew hours. You can’t be in the parks after eleven o’clock at night. And we thought, “If they’re in there at night, and some young woman gets raped or someone gets killed, they’re going to say, ‘What’s the matter? Are you afraid to enforce the laws? Is it this way for Chicagoans? But these people coming in to make trouble, you let them do what they want.’” Well, I don’t know if the motivation was not to let that happen or why the police chased them out.

I think it would have been better to leave them in there and patrol it with plain clothes undercover patrolmen. We had lots of them that looked like the demonstrators but were policemen. They could have probably prevented anything from going on. But when we chased them out and the police were taking off their badges and this stuff and whacking them around, they were fed up with this demonstration. It goes back to our discussion about the riots when Dr. King was assassinated.

(there is a short pause in the interview)

JMW: Let’s see. We were talking about and finishing up with 1968.

DWV: It was the 1968 convention.
RS: Well, the point of it was that there was an insistence that they demonstrate at the convention. The motivation, obviously, was to disrupt the convention. And we didn’t let them do it. It resulted in the demonstration at the Hilton that gave Chicago a little bit of a black eye. And I suppose, in many respects, it affected the election. Hubert Humphrey was very unhappy with the way that we handled the activity in front of the Hilton. So that was one of the demonstrations where police training kind of let the mayor down. O.W. Wilson was a great superintendant of police. He was a teacher of criminology in California.

But he was there to train the police, especially with the use of the baton. He’d say, “Never raise it above the shoulder. If you would hit someone on the head or the shoulders with the baton, it’s brutal. The baton is a very good weapon for the police. Hit a person in the back of the leg. The pain is excruciating. But he jumps around in almost a comical look. And that doesn’t make the police look brutal.” Well, at the convention, the police had their batons up. They were whacking those kids and were throwing them into the paddy wagon. It was a bad scene. There was no question about it. And I think it hurt the candidacy of the Democrat.

DWV: I have one question here. I’ve heard that up until the convention, Lyndon Johnson was actually waiting to possibly enter the race at the 1968 convention. He was waiting on Daley to advise him. Do you know anything of it?

RS: I don’t know a thing about it. But I would say that’s an apocryphal story. I remember when the president made that speech. It was at a communications convention or something. It was at the broadcast communications convention where he announced that he wouldn’t be a candidate and he wouldn’t accept the draft. I think we were all astounded there. That came out of the blue, as far as my knowledge is concerned. If he talked to the mayor, the mayor would have encouraged him to run. He would have been strong in his advocacy if Lyndon had run. I think he felt that Lyndon would have been a much stronger candidate than anyone else, certainly stronger than Humphrey. Well, I don’t know. But my guess is that that’s not true, that he was toying with running. I think Lyndon had had his belly full. I think he was tired of the demonstrations. I think he was
tired of people saying, “LBJ, how many kids have you killed today?” So I think it just wore him out. It was no longer fun. He was getting older. He had done it all. He felt that it was for somebody else. There were no more mountains left to climb in his life.

JMW: What were the mayor’s thoughts, that you know of, in the aftermath of 1968?

RS: Well, it showed what kind of Democrat he was because, shortly afterwards, we had a rally over at State and Madison for George McGovern. He went over, gave a nice talk, and urged everyone to support McGovern. He was our candidate. “The Democratic Party supports the nominee so and so.” He was a true Democrat. He didn’t say, “My way or the highway.” His enthusiasm was dimmed. Of course, it was dimmed by a lot of things. One that we loved very much was Ted Kennedy. When we were getting tossed out of the convention, Ted Kennedy was out sailing. If Ted Kennedy had raised a finger, it would have changed their attitude and seated our delegation.

JMW: You’re talking about 1972, at this point.

RS: Right. I’m saying that not only was McGovern one of the sad episodes, but with Ted, whom he supported all of the time. He loved the Kennedy’s. There was a little bit of self interest on the part of Ted, in that regard. When you read his memoir, you can’t help but love the guy. His funeral was such a marvelous American tribute. But it was really one of those unfortunate things. Daley was a trooper, a soldier. He once said that. He said that he was against the war in Vietnam. But he said, “I’m sure the president has got better information than I have. He’s got more information from better sources and he knows what he’s doing.” He expected loyalty from his people and he was loyal to his leader.

JMW: Speaking of loyalty, it’s come up in interviews that when Nixon, during his last days came to Chicago, everyone had abandoned him, even his own party. Mayor Daley still went out to O’Hare and greeted him.
RS: That was typical of Mayor Daley. His father was a laborer. His father had campaigned against a Republican who was elected as the governor of Illinois. They were having a parade down State Street and he was standing there with his father. The governor was coming by and Daley started to boo. His father said, “Son, don’t do that. Take off your hat. That’s the governor of Illinois.” There was that respect for the office. As long as Nixon was the president of the United States, Mayor Daley wouldn’t denigrate that office at all. There was that respect for the office, no matter who held it. It was a high office and it should be respected. That was his attitude.

JMW: Since we’ve talked about John F. Kennedy and LBJ, can you shed any light on the relationship between Mayor Daley’s city hall and the Nixon administration?

RS: Well, there was nothing too close. I mean, there were people that we didn’t have too much regard for. [Richard] Kleindienst, for example, was the attorney general. If you wanted to get help because you had a problem, you had to virtually prostrate yourself saying, “Everything is ineffectual. We can’t do anything. Our city is going to ruins. Please send some people in here.” We met with them. Tommy Foran was one of my close friends, who was the U.S. Attorney at the time. He’d say, “How can we help you?” And I’d say, “Mr. Attorney General, you can help us by understanding what we need in an emergency, facilitating the help, and not acting like we’re the opposition that you’ve got to have us completing affidavits and all kinds of procedural requirements before you send us help. That’s not what we need.” He’d say, “Well, we’ll try to do better.” But that was the kind of stuff.

Mitchell was a mischievous guy. I mean, Mitchell was the kind that used the IRS to get tax information to try and hurt people who were Nixon’s enemies. It was a terrible kind of administration. I don’t think the mayor had any direct connections because that was the other side. We didn’t have any input there to speak of. But in terms of what they did, I think it was a terrible administration. We found out a lot with Haldeman, Erlichman, the plumbers, and all of that after the fact. But they were doing a lot of that early on.
JMW: What was life like with the corporation counsel? I spoke of this earlier. You saw times moving on. Patronage readily accepted became not so much anymore. I mean, with hiring and firing, open access, and sunshine laws, how did that affect the operations of city government? And how did the mayor deal with that, because obviously, times were changing?

RS: You know, lawyers are sort of in a different category, with the white collar workers who are in the offices and so on. The lawyers are professionals. Professionals aren’t cookie cutters. You can hire more because of their background, their talent, and their education. I don’t think that they were in the same type of straight jackets when it came to hiring professionals.

We had a very good office when I was in the corporation counsel. Tom Foran, who was later the U.S. Attorney, was the head of land acquisition. Earl Neal, who was a very prominent Chicago lawyer, worked in land acquisition. Dick Elrod, who became the sheriff and who is now a judge, was the head of ordinance enforcement. Marv Aspen, who was a distinguished federal judge, was the head of the appeals division. I mean, I could go on. In each of those departments, we had very talented people. It was a great law firm when I was there.

JMW: Is there anything you can share about days of rage?

RS: Well, we’ve kind of talked about that, with David Dellinger, the National Mobilization Group, and so on. I wrote a report called, “The Strategy of Confrontation.” I don’t know if you’ve seen it. When people come here determined to disrupt things, it’s pretty hard to reason with them because their objective is to disrupt things. So your reasonableness is beside the point, as far as they’re concerned. So you have to deal with it from a law enforcement point of view. But then, the idea is not to let them outmaneuver you. That’s why we went into court. We offered them options. We made it clear that the trouble that was forthcoming was being caused by them and not by us. And we were doing what we had to do.
JMW: Okay.

DWV: Well, I was thinking about wrapping it up.

JMW: Sure. We’ve heard a lot of fishing stories (JMW laughs). Do you have any anecdotes about him fishing?

RS: Well, Mayor Daley was a fisherman. And he used to fish down in the Florida Keys. He liked to fish for bonefish. I learned from people where he used to rent accommodations that when he fished down there, Daley would cook the fish. He wouldn’t catch them, throw them on the shore, and let them spoil. He’d cook the fish. So he was a true fisherman. Bone fishing is a little bit like hunting. I don’t know if you’ve ever been bone fishing. You stand in the boat. They use these heavy boats that don’t rock very much.

You’ll have a guy in the platform above the motor that pulls you through the shallows. And he’ll see a school of these bonefish. And he’ll say, “Port thirty yards.” So you’ll turn to your port side and throw your line out a little ahead of him. And if it’s a school, they’ll hit it. With these bonefish, they’re not big. They’re maybe five or six pounds and maybe twenty four to thirty six inches long. But they fight like they are sailfish. I mean, they’re out of the water and you’re pulling them in. And then, they run into the boat and they get on the other side of you. Oftentimes, they’ll break your line. They’re a lot of fun to fish. Daley loved to go bone fishing. I did some of that.

My partner, Joe Spitali, retired at age fifty four. We had some luck with some class action cases. He said, “Ray, I’ve got enough money. I’m going to wake up some morning and find him dead. I’m going to go down and have some fun.” Joe has been retired since he was fifty four. And he bought a place in the Florida Keys. Ray fished with the mayor a lot of times. It’s a lot of fun to fish. I fished with my father in the little river up in Antioch, Illinois, where you can catch croppies, bluegills, and that kind of stuff. I’ve caught sailfish, marlins, and dorados. A dorado is a good fish to catch. Some call it a mahi mahi. Some call it a dorado. They get to be about sixty pounds when they’re big. But you usually catch them when they’re about thirty five to forty pounds. The male
is a gorgeous fish. It has a square head. They break the water, too. They dance on their tail when you’re trying to reel them in. It’s a lot of fun.

DWV: Is there any anecdote or anything that you want to add to the record of Mayor Richard J. Daley?

RS: No. I would say that in my mind, Mayor Daley was one of the great political leaders in American history. He was a thoroughly decent man. He was very talented. He was very loyal to his family. He said something that I thought was meaningful. He said, “A man ought to be able to make a living for family between nine in the morning and six at night.” He didn’t think people should be out working on Saturday and Sunday like some of my kids who are lawyers. They’re in big law firms. They pay them more money than they need. But they work them eighty hours a week. And they don’t have the time or a life with their families.

I thought that what he said was very prudential and very wise. And I think it would be better if our law firms would pay people less and let them have a life. It was one of the things that Mayor Daley always got home for supper. He’d have his main dinner with Sis. The kids would oftentimes go out at night. Sometimes it was to attend a funeral. Other times it was to attend a board meeting.

But he got home for dinner. He knew his kids. Today, they work hard and they’re conscientious. But all of a sudden, their kids are graduating from college. And they really spend very little time with them. They’ve never been fishing with them. They’ve never gone out and taught them how to hit a baseball, how to hold a bat, or how to throw a football. Those are the delightful things in life. Mayor Daley was a good father and a good human being.

JMW: You finished up in 1976?

RS: I think it was about then. Yes. It was 1969 to 1976 with the corporation counsel.

JMW: Then you went into private practice?
RS: I did.

JMW: If you could just leave us with the closing days upon Mayor Daley’s passing, what were the last days like? What was the fallout like and what was the Democratic Party like?

RS: Well, those were very sad days. When the mayor died, it was like the end of the world. It was like having your own father die. There was a scramble about who would be his successor. George Dunne, who was one of my close friends, was one that a lot of people thought would be his successor. George Dunne was the chairman of the party at the time. That was the natural succession. But George’s wife was ill. She had the early onset of Alzheimer’s Disease. George had his hands full and he didn’t want to take on anything like that. John Touhy was one of my close friends. He had been the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Illinois. Then he had been the Cook County Commissioner.

John was furious with George. He said to Him, “What the hell do you want to be the chairman of the party for? That’s nothing. That’s what leads you to become the mayor (RS laughs). The chairman of the party gets all of the aggravation.” But George was a wise man. I don’t know if it was a question of knowing your limitations at the time. But he didn’t want to make a fight for it. Mike Bilandic was chosen. Tom Donovan was very much involved, at the time, with Mike. And I think that the Daley's wanted Mike. I’ve never discussed it with Richard M., Bill, or Michael Daley. I saw Bill one weekend. Loyola had a founder’s dinner. Bill was there with his new wife, a beautiful woman.

But it was very sad. It was a transition that was downhill. It was downhill with Mike Bilandic. It was downhill with the successors, whether it was Harold Washington or Jane Byrne. And I think Richard M. Daley kind of recaptured it. He has brought it back and made the city as livable as could be. He’s done a wonderful job. He has problems, too. But every mayor has problems. You need revenue. So you privatize something. Then you have the fact that people are charging a lot of money to park your car. They get angry about it. But I think Richard M. Daley has the job of mayor as long as he wants it, even
though Maggie is not enjoying the best of health now. That’s a heavy thing for Richard M. Daley. He’s suffered a lot. He lost his son, as Bill did. No one goes through life without heartache. They’ve had their share.

But when Mayor Richard J. Daley died, it was the end of an era, literally. And even though I say that Richard M. Daley is doing a marvelous job, it’s a different era with him. It’s a different kind of mayoralty. It’s a different kind of administration. And he’s adapted to modernity beautifully. In his own way, he’s the equal of his father. He’s doing a wonderful job.

DWV and JMW: Thank you very much.

JMW: We’ll be in touch with your transcript.

********END OF INTERVIEW********