

**CONFIDENTIAL**

01826R-21

COPY 1 OF 2 COPIES

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

21st Meeting

Thursday, 29 March 1956

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS.   
 DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S @ 204  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: MR TO-2  
DATE: 2/06/81 REVIEWER: 018995

**CONFIDENTIAL**

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

21st Meeting

Thursday, 29 March 1956

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick  
IG, Acting Chairman

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
COP-DD/P, Alternate for DD/P, Member

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
D/CO, Member

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
SA/DD/I, Alternate for DD/I, Member

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
DD/TR, Alternate for DTR, Member

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
DD/Pers, Alternate for D/Pers, Member

Lawrence K. White  
DD/S, Member

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
Executive Secretary

[REDACTED] 25X1A  
Reporter

Guests

25X1A [REDACTED] Executive Officer, Office of Personnel  
Lawrence R. Houston, General Counsel

25X1A [REDACTED] Deputy General Counsel  
Norman Paul, Legislative Counsel

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

I-N-D-E-X

---

Agenda Item No.	Subject	Page
1	"Opposing Views on Accelerated Retirement," dated 27 March 1956 . . . . .	1 thru 7
2	"A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949" . . . . .	7 thru 15
	Agenda items for future meetings. . . . .	15 & 16
	Adjournment . . . . .	16

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

. . . . The 21st meeting of the CIA Career Council convened at 4:05 p.m., Thursday, 29 March 1956, in Room 154, Administration Building, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Shall we come to order?

25X1A9a

There is only one item, accelerated retirement. [REDACTED]

do you want to speak first?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: As long as you invite me to start off, there is a question I'd like to ask about the No. 1 item on our agenda here; in other words, the paper under Tab 1. I didn't quite understand about these percentages. There is something about it that eludes me, what relationship there is to what goes on above. Would somebody who is a mathematician explain this?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I scratched this together. Did you look at this other sheet that we have here for you, giving specific examples of what we like and what the Budget Bureau would like, and what we now have.

What were your immediate questions?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Oh, I see. You shift it from overseas credits to the amount of money you are going to get when you retire.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: This shows what these percentages would amount to in a particular instance.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: But up here we are talking about the amount of overseas requirement you have to have to reduce the length of time you have to stay in the Government, and here is the amount of money you get after you retire.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's sort it out, one item at a time. What Dick is saying is that our proposal is to let employees retire earlier. Now isn't it, in effect, what the Bureau of the Budget is saying is that you can't do that?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Kirk, maybe it would help if we explained the Agency's proposal as outlined here, because it combines two things: it not only reduces the age limit but it also increases the amount of the annuity. The first point here is that in granting  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years credit for each year of overseas service is increasing the factor of  $1\frac{1}{2}\%$  by 50%; in other words, it becomes  $2\frac{1}{4}\%$ .

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I knew I would be lost. I give up. I'll just assume

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

the figures are right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Don't give up.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years credit is the same as increasing the  $1\frac{1}{2}\%$  to  $2\frac{1}{4}\%$ . It's the same thing. If you give  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years credit for overseas service you are then giving  $2\frac{1}{4}\%$  as the rate by which the annuity is computed.

MR. HOUSTON: For every year of service abroad.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Now the Bureau of the Budget proposal is that you can't go above  $2\%$ . Therefore they say instead of giving  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years credit, give  $1\frac{1}{3}$  years.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Why can't you go over  $2\%$ ?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is simply their idea.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] There is no law about this, John?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No.

MR. PAUL: According to them, if we give our people  $2\frac{1}{4}\%$  our people will be getting a better break than anybody else gets for comparable service.

COLONEL WHITE: The roadblock we can't cross is that if they, representing the President, don't allow us to put this into Congress, we won't get anywhere.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Does anybody get  $2\%$  now?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The Foreign Service and Federal Investigative Service.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The Foreign Service officer gets  $2\%$  on his total service, whether it be spent in overseas areas or in headquarters. The investigator of the FBI gets  $2\%$  regardless of where he spent it so long as he is on investigative-type work.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, they are getting better than we would get.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We attempted to point out we were only asking for the advantage for the man in an overseas area.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we ought to go back and fight for that one, then.

COLONEL WHITE: The question, as I see this - it's pretty simple. I think the Bureau of the Budget's proposal I would certainly find unacceptable. Now the question is whether or not we want to fight it out. And the

thought that occurred to me was that if we fight it out our whole legislative package will be delayed for I don't know how long but possibly too late to get much consideration during this session of Congress. And I don't see any compelling reason why this has to be fought out this year. After all, the retirement benefits aren't going to accrue to many of us for several years to come. I don't see anything magic about this year. Certainly we don't want to accept the Bureau of the Budget's proposal. Now the question is whether you want to run the risk of getting everything tied up to where we won't get anything through Congress by fighting about it, or saying, "Let's withdraw the whole thing and talk about it next year."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would recommend that we agree here that we follow the following procedure: That we go back to them with a rejoinder as to what we find in their proposals that we don't like, with the negotiating committee armed with the views of this Council as to what should be fought for and what shouldn't be fought for; and then, depending on what results we get, then we either accede to what they propose or try on a slightly higher level, with the Director discussing it with Mr. Brundage, and possibly even with Governor Adams - because I for one, having watched this governmental process for a long time, am damned if I don't think the Bureau of the Budget can be arbitrary as hell sometimes. But I think what we can accomplish this afternoon - I think there is no argument in the Council--and if there is, please speak out loud and clear--that we want to get this Bill up on the Hill this year, if for no other purposes than morale purposes, because we have been working at it now for three years - actually three years ago this summer.

COLONEL WHITE: It came up last year and we decided to do nothing about it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Our Legislative Task Force went to work three years ago this summer, so the Agency has made noises in that direction. So I guess we're all in agreement we want to get it up there this year. And then I think the details of what of this we go along with the Bureau of the Budget on - wouldn't it be best if you were armed with the knowledge of how the Council feels about these various aspects in your discussions?

COLONEL WHITE: I think it would be fine, but I'd like to see

CONFIDENTIAL

what John or Charlie or Norm thinks. My impression from talking with them is that the only thing we have a very good chance of getting them to back down on is this involuntary separation, and if there is any further fighting to be done it probably would have to be done by the Director with the Director of the Budget. I don't think there is much more to be done on my level.

MR. PAUL: I don't either.

COLONEL WHITE: And therein lies your delay. If you're going to take it to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Sherman Adams - there is going to be your delay.

25X1A9a

██████████ The argument is fairly much over in the lower levels of the Bureau of the Budget.

MR. PAUL: I don't see any point in going back to Macy's level and talking about it, and I think we have got to let them know what our position is and be sure the Director stands behind it, and then tell them whether we would like to discuss it with the Bureau of the Budget or not.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How much delay do you feel there would be if we precipitated it to the Director's level?

MR. PAUL: I think that is hard to tell, Kirk. First of all, our Director doesn't get back until Monday, and this can't be brought to his attention earlier than Monday--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Tuesday. He won't be available for anything Monday.

MR. PAUL: That's right, I forgot about that. Then you have to allow the boys over there to brief Brundage. If we have certain points where we have a negotiating position, it is conceivable that some of these things could come a little bit closer to what we want.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We have a 10-day congressional recess starting today. If we got it up by the time the recess ended, is that fast enough or do you think we should get it up during the recess?

MR. PAUL: Get the Bill up? Oh, no. I think if we get it up the first week after the recess we will be doing damn well.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does that give us time then to take it to the Director?

MR. HOUSTON: Kirk, couldn't the sense of the Council be that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Colonel White would inform the Bureau of the Budget people he has been negotiating with, that their proposal is unacceptable, and that we still feel our proposal is what the Agency needs--and we could expect a stone wall at that point--and Colonel White would have to be prepared to recede at that point unless the Director wanted to pick it up next week and go on from there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the Council wants to give Colonel White as free a hand in proceeding as he pleases from here on in. But what I am trying to find out, and I don't think I have yet found out, is whether you people that are negotiating with the Bureau of the Budget feel that it should be precipitated to the Directorate level or not, or whether you would like to concede on this level.

25X1A9a

██████████: May I say something on that, Kirk, just to help you make up your mind? There were two points that we brought up specifically in reference first to this 10 years that they insist would have to be spent in overseas service, with a possible compromise at 9. I personally made a strong objection to it on the basis that it would be almost impossible of administration in many cases where a man or woman would have to be pulled back before their completion of a tour, or they might possibly not be able ever to be sent back again, for good reasons, either the safety of the individual or the safety of an operation. They might have spent five, six or seven years, but there were good reasons never to send the person out of the country. They wouldn't buy that as any justification for backing away from the 10 year limitation. I pressed the point as to whether or not there was an area of compromise here so as to leave us free to even give a person credit for three years, if that is all they could make in an overseas area, and possibly put a 30-year limitation of service--that you would have to have 30 years service--but the people with whom we were dealing indicated that they absolutely could see no compromise on that score.

25X1A9a

██████████ Who are these people?

25X1A9a

██████████ They are technicians that are responsible for the line-by-line review of this thing, and for expressing what they believe to be the opinion of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why should they limit us? From what you describe on how they would limit us, that would seem to be much more restrictive than for the Foreign Service.

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why would they limit us when our work is much more demanding?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] They indicated that 20 years total service would be acceptable as a minimum, with 10 years spent overseas. And I told them that that just wasn't realistic, that there were many people in the Agency here who would have an opportunity to serve one and possibly two terms overseas, but that the possibilities, as they stood now, of their getting their 10 years service just didn't seem to be on the horizon, and to penalize those people didn't seem reasonable to us.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: A very small number of people would qualify under this proposal.

COLONEL WHITE: These technicians are also Phil Young's people, with their White House hats on, pitching in with them. It's really Perry, Macy and Hamilton, and they haven't got as strong a voice as those other people have.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's discuss for a minute the proposal which you whizzed by pretty fast, that we send the Bill up with the Bureau of the Budget's proposals in it, and then go after reconsideration either later or try to get the Bill--should it happen to pass--amended next year.

COLONEL WHITE: That is not what I said. I wouldn't want it to go up with the Bureau of the Budget's proposal because I think that proposal is unacceptable. I would delete the whole retirement provision. Either you delete the whole retirement provision or else you go fight about it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Is this the only provision at issue or are there other nit-picks?

COLONEL WHITE: The territories and possessions thing--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does the rest of the Bill have enough in it so that we want it badly enough to shoot it ahead without this? Because this, to my mind, is one of the most important benefits which we are fighting for.

COLONEL WHITE: Yes, there is. We ask for a substantial improvement in medical benefits, which I think is acceptable, and taking care of our dependents, and it's consistent with what they have agreed to with the Foreign Service, exactly, and I think that is important to us.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The right to accrue home leave is in there.

CONFIDENTIAL

COLONEL WHITE: There are several things in there.

25X1A9a

██████████ And there are some other things that we particularly wanted to talk to the Council about - just a few things.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Before we do that I want to get the strategy figured out, after which we can take these six points. But your strategy, Red, then would be that rather than accept the Bureau of the Budget's retirement proposals we delete that entire section and send it along without that? The Bill could then go without it, is that right?

COLONEL WHITE: Well, there is the territories and possessions problem, which we have already yielded on.

MR. HOUSTON: Except we have some questions.

COLONEL WHITE: My reasoning, Kirk, was that if we should get retirement legislation of any kind this year, then it would seem to me your chances of getting that amended anytime in the next four or five years are pretty remote. So if you don't have in the legislation what you want, it would seem better strategy to me to try again next year to get what you want rather than to accept something which you would almost be stuck with for several years before you would have justification for going back and having it changed.

25X1A9a

██████████ It is important to remember, and I don't know whether the Council is completely aware of this, that the way we have written this it would have retroactive effect, so that we wouldn't be any worse off, except for a few people who might have retired within the year--

25X1A9a

██████████ I'd be inclined to recommend that we send the Bill up this year without the retirement provision. I think there is probably enough in it to suit the morale purpose which you mentioned [indicating Mr. Kirkpatrick], and with which I heartily concur, and we would have a Bill there which shows we are really acting on Career Service. I have an idea this retirement provision is nutzy enough--but I think we ought to fight until the last dog is hung, even for two years. The Bureau of the Budget's proposal is not only unrealistic but it's totally unacceptable to this service. I'd rather live under our present provisions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The Bureau of the Budget's attitude burns the hell out of me. Well, let's go on and discuss these six points then.

25X1A9a

Minimum time overseas. I think, ██████████, we all

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

agree with you on this. What it does is cut the DD/I completely out of the picture, because very few of those people will ever serve 10 years.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think it definitely would penalize Dick's people.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] If you have a guy who has had two tours and he has some physical disability so he can't serve overseas again - he's had it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: You would never get anybody to return from overseas if you had this in.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The second question on point one: Is there a minimum we would accept or do we want all service overseas - if it counts?

MR. HOUSTON: I don't see any sense for a minimum--

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I would much rather see no minimum in there.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: PCS duty. We're not talking about temporary duty.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further argument on Point 1?

Point 2: Minimum time in Government service.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I think on this, Kirk, that the 20 years is reasonable. It could be 30 or it could be 25. I think there is no problem there.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] What we want is 20, isn't it?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think so. The thing we mustn't lose sight of is that we are running more and more into the very real problem of some of the older operational people having to retire.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: This is a rigidity of formula and you already have enough rigidity of formula under the Civil Service Retirement Act, so why get another?

MR. PAUL: What are you doing? Turning down Point 2?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We agreed with 2.

Next, the bonus of 2%. I think we want to fight on this one.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] May I say a word on that? I asked this fellow who was giving us the Bureau's pitch if he wanted to comment on the passage of the Johnston Bill which is now before Congress, which would raise the rate for everybody from 1½ to 2% per year of service. Well, he gave me a rather stuffy answer to the effect that that does not represent the Administration's views. But I think the possibilities of that Bill passing are fairly good. And because we were attempting not to cover total service in

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA but only that part overseas, I think their objection to this is just a book objection and has no real basis, no real merit.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we really want to fight for this one, because this is where I think the Agency has got to stand up and be counted as being different from the rest of the Federal Government.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And fight for 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ % then.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] What you are really fighting for is time-and-a-half credit. The Johnston Bill is 2% and we would be fighting for 3%.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Anything more on 2%?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Can I go back to Point 2 for a moment? Does not 2 add to the present formula?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I am personally against it, but the Council voted for it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We may have noted in ignorance, [REDACTED] 25X1A9a  
What is the tricky formula? I can't follow your rapid mathematics.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We have a formula - so many years service at a certain age. This is a new stumbling block which would mean that someone coming to our shop at the age of 40 or 45 years scarcely has a chance to get credit for any of his overseas service if this 20-year requirement goes in.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Now you can retire in certain circumstances with 15 years service or involuntary circumstance or disability - you can retire with 10 years, but this is a brand new requirement which says you must have 20 before you get benefits.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then we want to reverse ourselves on Point 2.

Mr. Paul, you're looking fainter and fainter.

MR. PAUL: This looks fine as far as I am concerned.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, Point 3 we said we have to fight.

All right, Point 4. Now this to my mind is a complete subterfuge. All that is going to do is necessitate administrative agreements between employees--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It's dishonest, immoral and all wrong.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The only thing I can add to this is that this thought comes out of the report of the Kaplan Committee on the retirement systems in the Federal Government, and it is attempting, I think, to "guinea pig" us on this point. He is using this as one of the principles that the Kaplan

CONFIDENTIAL

Committee came up with on this matter of retirement, that where you have a selection out process then it is reasonable to have a lesser retirement age. But understand, now, the Kaplan Committee reports have not been accepted in toto; as a matter of fact, I doubt whether a lot of it will ever be accepted, but the principle is out of the Kaplan Committee. His first point was, "Well, perhaps this needs to be written into your legislation - that is, your basic organic act here that the Director separate people for this purpose." But then he said, "Well, of course, you have basic authority to separate anyhow, so just use that authority."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And these are the people we're debating with! This shows their level of understanding. You have to get fired before you get this!

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You can tell the fellows over there this may be the Agency of dirty tricks but we wouldn't stoop to anything like this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think there is much point in discussing Point 4. How about Point 5?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think that is wrong. I have a lot of boys who have had six or eight years of military service.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We sure went around on this before - internally.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: The way I see Point 5--and I've checked with Charlie-- a man can be hired by this Agency at age 58, work one day for us, and get credit for 20 years overseas service with the Department of Agriculture. And that is completely cockeyed as far as I am concerned. It's absolutely idiotic. But that is what this says.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Here again the Bureau is trying to apply the broad brush treatment to this legislation, the same as they try to apply it to all Government legislation. They point out that whenever you deal with the Retirement Act you are not dealing with a small group of people but with two million people. And I gave him quite a story about what our Career Staff concept was and that this was aimed at developing a career force, but I'm afraid it just went over his head.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I thought this was to encourage people overseas to stay overseas.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Also, I feel the Bureau would not hold fast on this, and, as Red says, I don't believe they would bleed and die on this point, but it was one they insisted we consider.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. KIRKPATRICK: From your description it sure sounds like you are dealing with great, open-minded people over there!

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I think there is one other point. For six or eight months we around this table struggled with the problem of constructive credit for CIG, SSU and OSS, and I would hate to see that opened up again because we knocked ourselves out on it.

MR. PAUL: I have the impression they don't care about this, that this was thrown in to lessen the blow of some of these others.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They thought we would probably like it.

How about Point 6?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Of course, this is the major question that is addressed to the whole proposal.

COLONEL WHITE: Could I ask a question on 5 before we leave it? This doesn't preclude getting credit for Federal Service but he just doesn't get credit at the accelerated rate?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: That is right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: As long as you get credit for Federal service and you can't take that away from them--

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: And it is only civilian service that we are talking

25X1A9a about, as opposed to what you mentioned, [REDACTED] of a man in military service.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: It says "other agencies of U.S. Government."

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: Well, if he is counting military service in his total period of service, yes.

COLONEL WHITE: He gets credit for everything he would get credit for in another Government agency, but the accelerated or increased benefits only apply to CIA?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: That is all right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is not much point in discussing No. 6. It's tied to the whole territorial question, and that is one I think has too much political ooomph on the other side.

Are there any other comments on these six points?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I'd say the Bureau of the Budget had a fine day at bat!

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can tell the Bureau of the Budget that the CIA Career Council unanimously rejected all of their points, and leave out some of [REDACTED] adjectives!

COLONEL WHITE: I don't know that they will just exactly quiver about that!

MR. PAUL: It isn't going to strike terror into their hearts.

I would suggest that someone who understands the problem-- and who knows his mathematics--be deputized to go over and explain to them why this is unsatisfactory, either through going over and explaining this to them or writing them and telling them. But if we just say "this is unsatisfactory" - that is a weak position, it's not a strong position.

COLONEL WHITE: I think we ought to write them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we ought to write them. I'd like to go on record on this position. The thought occurs that should this point arise we might well be prepared to tell the President of the Board about it, because this is an important issue, and I think that is one place where they can help, particularly if we get somebody like Mr. Lovett taking an interest in personnel matters.

MR. PAUL: I think there is another argument in favor of not pursuing this too far in this year's legislation, and that is the Administration frankly doesn't know what it wants in the general field of retirement, at this point, and they don't have their counter Bill to the Johnston Bill as yet, as I understand it--well, they have a Bill but they are flirting around with all kinds of ideas--so maybe we would be better off taking a fresh look at it in a new Congress.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think too many personnel bills are going through this Congress. There is no political magic in Government personnel bills in an election year.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Aside from the morale factor, if the Bureau of the Budget and Congress are willing to make this retroactive to say 1947, very few would lose anything. It's only those who might retire between now and the potential date of the actual decision. Isn't that true?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further discussion on this?

Does the General Counsel want to bring up some additional points?

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. HOUSTON: We felt that particularly for the purpose of re-drafting for re-presentation to the Bureau, we would like some guidance on two points. One has to do with the death benefit, which has met opposition in the Bureau. Has that definitely been abandoned now as a proposal we are going to consider?

COLONEL WHITE: It was discussed at a Deputies' meeting and then brought before this Council. But it was my recommendation that we not fight about this one because at the time we put this in the Government did not have the insurance program, nor did we, and our arguments on this one are not anywhere near as valid as they were then, and it would, I think, be very difficult to support in the face of opposition.

MR. HOUSTON: So in drafting it we will leave that out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection?

25X1A9a

██████████ What was this?

COLONEL WHITE: Just an automatic \$1,000 death gratuity to the next of kin on the death of an employee. And, as I say, with the Eisenhower insurance that can be paid some other way now.

25X1A9a

██████████: The Council also, when it considered these seven points in the legislative program, agreed this would be the one from which we would retire first. The Council felt that a few years ago.

25X1A9a

██████████ I was going to say I don't have any objection to this but I understand now they will come back with a "not favorably considered" in the official communication back to this Agency. I am just wondering if that would be the better way to drop it, on the redraft, rather than to voluntarily drop it without their disapproval.

MR. HOUSTON: I thought they were going to act on the redraft.

MR. PAUL: This has been sort of left open. We have been pressing for a reply. We know the nature of the reply, at least in this section we certainly do, and what we told them the last time we met was that we would discuss with the Career Council the retirement business and after we got that one out of the way then we would get a letter from them giving their position, after which we would certainly clear a new Bill on its way to the Hill. I would just anticipate their turn-down of this and eliminate it from the draft.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is all right.

Do you have another point, Larry?

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MR. HOUSTON: On the territories and possessions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What page is this in the Bill, Larry?

MR. HOUSTON: The point they specifically struck at were the allowances on page 9, and the medical benefits on page 7, because it's not the travel it's the treatment. They took such a strong position it is my understanding that we were ready to retreat from trying to get those benefits for the territories and possessions. However, they did not specifically, as I understand it, rule out some of the travel authorities and authorities such as home leave for territories and possessions - they just didn't come to issue. And we were wondering if those which were not specifically objected to should not go into our draft, with authority to Colonel White to press for those which might be obtained, although, again, if you meet final objection, there again to drop them out of the remainder of the Bill. Again it reflects our drafting problem. We would draft it if you agree we should go ahead and make the attempt to get those travel and other authorities that have not been specifically objected to, we would draft those in for presentation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am certainly in favor of that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, they indicated agreement with the home leave benefit, as I recall it.

MR. HOUSTON: I wasn't there, but--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We don't remember that that was discussed specifically.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] They indicated, as I recall, that they saw no reason why our folks shouldn't have the same home leave benefit as does State.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This is in relation to the Foreign Service territories and possessions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, home leave from territories.

MR. HOUSTON: State doesn't have anyone assigned to territories.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It's home leave from foreign territories and home leave from territories and possessions as well. They indicated first a major objection to territories and possessions, but they at the same time indicated they saw no reason why our folks shouldn't be on a par with State insofar as home leave is concerned, so I interpret that to mean they saw no objection to our having home leave privileges, the same as State's, where they are in foreign areas.

CONFIDENTIAL

MR. HOUSTON: All right, in drafting we have changed the words in the allowances section, page 9, to read "abroad," which they understand to mean outside territories and possessions, and the same thing has been done to the medical benefits.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Our medical thing is now exactly the same as the Bureau of the Budget has accepted and has been introduced for the State Department.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: And you're eliminating the words "outside the continental United States"?

MR. HOUSTON: We're saying "abroad" for the allowances and medical benefits, but in drafting the other provisions we will continue to have it phrased so it would apply to territories and possessions, and we will see if we can argue some of them through.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'd certainly like to see it in there, because they could fast make a colonial power out of us.

MR. HOUSTON: That would give us such things as travel, storage, transportation of automobiles, transportation of deceased persons, and things like that, which would be very useful if we could get them. We will proceed and have this redrafted by tomorrow.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other points on the legislation?

Any new business?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: We agreed to drop some other things, which haven't been discussed.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The commuted per diem, but that is such a minor thing we just didn't bring it up.

COLONEL WHITE: I don't think you should ever have had it in there in the first place. That was a question of saying the per diem between here and London should be "x" number of dollars, no matter whether you sleigh ride, take a boat or paddle a canoe. That would mean more bookkeeping than it would be worth.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] On the 12th of April we plan to be able to distribute that revised paper on "Individual Career Planning." But I don't think we can do it before then.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I thought we were going to have it next week.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: It can't be done. We can't do it.

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: [REDACTED] says the schedule will be we will have "Individual Career Planning" at the meeting on 19 April, and at the meeting on 3 May the National Defense Executive Reserve and the Senior Civil Service. Are we going to get some interesting documents to read on that in advance?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Yes. We have stacks of pro's and con's.

COLONEL WHITE: This is the one Amory wants to have discussed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am very skeptical as to whether we can be a part of it. That will be on 3 May. Then on 17 May - "Competitive Promotion and Assignment."

I have only one thing I might point out on this career planning. Still experimenting, and with all humility because this IS just an "experiment," I carried the operation a step further with my Staff and took the career plans that the men had presented and went over them with them, and I am now forwarding them two places: to the Personnel Office to be entered in their Official Personnel Folders, and to their Career Service Boards, indicating all of their desires for their next assignments, even though there are no assignments coming up in 1956 - the next ones being in 1957.

I will be interested to see how this develops as far as career planning is concerned. I have talked to a couple of you about this, but this is trying to get this on an orderly basis.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I would like to comment on the National Defense Executive Reserve coming before the Council, and would like to ask that this date be tentative in order that we may have a position in DD/S with regard to the feasibility of it or in order that we might have specific proposals. I'm not certain that we can clear it by 3 May, and would like to have that as a DD/S matter before coming to the Council.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We will make those dates tentative, with the exception of the 19 April one.

Any other new business?

Thank you, gentlemen.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. . . .