

~~SECRET~~

. . . . The 55th meeting of the CIA Career Council convened at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, 5 February 1959, in the DCI Conference Room. The following were present:

- 25X1A9A Gordon M. Stewart, Chairman
- Robert Amory, Jr., Member
- [redacted] Member
- Richard Helms, Member
- 25X1A9A Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Member
- [redacted]
- 25X1A9A Lawrence K. White, Member
- [redacted] Executive Secretary
- [redacted] Recorder
- Guests: Lawrence R. Houston
- 25X1A9A [redacted]

MR. STEWART: The meeting will come to order.

The minutes of the last meeting are the first item of business.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'd like to have paragraph 5 modified to read: "The Inspector General nonconcurred."

MR. AMORY: Nonconcurred in what?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your Career Service for the Photographic Intelligence Center. This was a matter of principle we discussed at the last meeting.

MR. STEWART: Yes, and you certainly made it clear that you nonconcurred.

COLONEL WHITE: Gordon, may I make one comment--which doesn't involve these minutes particularly, but the principle. I wonder if the minutes of the Career Council shouldn't habitually be submitted to the Director for either approval or notation, because at this point in time, at least, it seems to me we have arrived at trying to face up to several problems upon which we all don't really agree.

25X1A9A [redacted] The minutes always go to General Cabell for his information. He always initials them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to urge that you also include Mr. Dulles--at least see if he won't look at them--because he's going to have to make some pretty major policy decisions one of these days.

COLONEL WHITE: That is right, and as we discuss such things as early retirement, and that sort of thing - after all, he is the fellow who is going to

~~SECRET~~

have to stand up and carry the ball on this if we ever get into retirement legislation, so I think it would be well to make sure, if we can, that these minutes go to him so that he is aware of all of this. It's obvious from some of the questions he asks now and then that he really isn't.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Red, would you raise this tomorrow at the Deputies' meeting? Or I will.

COLONEL WHITE: I'd be glad to.

MR. AMORY: It's only one a month, isn't it?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not even that--they run less than that, even.

COLONEL WHITE: I'll be glad to raise the point with him.

MR. STEWART: Good.

If there are no other comments on the minutes of the last meeting may I propose that we move to the first item for today, which is: Training Evaluation Reports. In the memorandum from Colonel Baird--on page 2, paragraph 5-- he asks four questions which he wishes to have answered. The first question is: Should there be a differentiation in reporting made in terms of GS level, age of student, and length of time in the Agency?

MR. HELMS: May I ask, in connection with this information, if Mr.

25X1A9A [] would be good enough to explain to me how this whole issue has come up in the first place?--I mean, the nature of it, the criticisms or the complaints, the extent of them, etc.

25X1A9A [] I can explain in a general sort of way why Matt was impelled to suggest this some time back. For a long time there has been a body of complaint--which could never be attributed to any particular source, but just sort of gets around--that people damn well don't like to be evaluated, they resent having to go through certain courses and subjected to the scrutiny of people who are going to be measuring not only their performance but the way they behave and that sort of thing. It's not a terribly specific thing but it's a constantly nagging factor, and we felt maybe it was worth bringing up here for some guidance, not necessarily as an earth-shaking issue or one that required complete and definitive adjudication but it has been the source of enough complaints and difficulty to warrant consideration. Now, this has pertained more to the operations courses than anything else, but it comes up occasionally on just about every form

~~SECRET~~

of training in which we have an evaluation procedure, including basic orientation. It seems to depend upon who is talking and from what point of view; supervisors, generally, like evaluations - they like to receive them, but people who are in training don't like evaluations.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Dick, what is your general philosophy on training evaluations as an aid to management?

MR. HELMS: I think they should be had, and I don't know why there should be any exception to it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree they should be had - I don't think we are going to be in conflict on the desirability of them, and the more the better, but I think there must be a cut-off point somewhere up and down the line.

MR. HELMS: Well, I had always thought that this matter was one that came in that category where good judgment had to prevail. I don't think that
25X1A9A Colonel Baird or or anybody else, would necessarily want to have some kid 25 years old writing an assessment report on Tracy Barnes, or something of a nature which was going to be derogatory or silly, or something of that kind. But it doesn't seem to me that is something you legislate in or out of existence--that you allow good judgment to obtain in matters of this kind, and that if a real "crasher" comes up in which there is an obvious difficulty or obvious conflict, there are plenty of senior men around here to adjudicate or discuss it, or what have you. So it seems to me rather than backing up on this and saying, "No - let's cut it off at grade 14" - or something of that kind, that the rule of good judgment ought to prevail on these matters.

MR. AMORY: I think also there is another application of the rule of good judgment, and that is not to apply it to people who have only gone to two weeks' familiarization or an orientation course. Just be careful that you don't run it into the ground.

25X1A9A Our practice is reflected in these examples (appended to the agenda). We have tried to distinguish between those reportable facts on accomplishments in training, and those impressions gained in the Staff, and treat the latter as an assessment report, not a part of the permanent record at all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, a training evaluation, as I understand it, Bob--

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

at the present time the practice is to make it only on the courses taken for record, is that correct? Not an audit--I mean, students who are auditing the courses--

25X1A9A [] There are very few auditors.

MR. AMORY: If you go to the two weeks' communism course, for example, there is no point in having an evaluation on that.

25X1A9A [] Except for the fact that on the substantive matter there is a test.

MR. AMORY: Except to say "this guy is industrious and lucid in expression" etc.

MR. STEWART: I think we ought to clean up our language. I think if we call test scores "test scores" - and they measure comprehension or skill, or something like that - that is a "test score." And "evaluation" is a term that we generally use for the evaluation of a personality. A&E has that as their job.

25X1A9A [] So one is a performance report and the other is an evaluation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And we have a third thing to be considered here and that is assessments. We are not talking about assessments in this paper.

One thing, Gordon, before you get to the questions Baird asked, that I do want to raise is where are we keeping personnel records in the Agency?-- because these are, in effect, personnel records. And I've just listed at the top of the page here: Office of Personnel, Security Staff, Medical Staff, individual component, and the Office of Training.

25X1A9A [] We just have them on this one angle--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How about Fitness Reports?

COLONEL WHITE: They [Training] only had those for the period when they were studying the Fitness Report.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But they are not kept there on file in the Office of Training?

MR. STEWART: They do now - they go to A&E.

COLONEL WHITE: I thought that had been terminated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it ought to be terminated. For test periods,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

yes, but on a regular basis, no. The reason I caught this, I made out a Fitness Report the other day and just out of curiosity I asked how many copies - and one for OTR came up.

COLONEL WHITE: I quite agree. I thought that had been terminated.

25X1A9A [redacted] It was extended at [redacted] request. 25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPAATRICK: One last question on this, Gordon. At one of our previous meetings--and I couldn't be accurate as to how long ago--we discussed at some length and I think we all concurred in the development of biographic profiles on personnel for the use of supervisors. How do the training evaluations fit into the biographic profiles, in your opinion? In other words, do we give a supervisor a biographic profile or do we give him the whole shooting match, including all the training evaluations?

25X1A9A [redacted] The only part of the evaluations included in the profiles are simply those results recorded in Part I in these examples--a person took a certain course - he did a "satisfactory" job, or he got an "excellent"--

25X1A9A [redacted] That does not show on the profile--just the course he took. There is no evaluation or test score or anything.

25X1A9A [redacted] That is a good change. But you did it at the outset--
No, I don't think it was ever included.
Then it's only a record of the training accomplished.

. . . . Mr. Houston joined the meeting

25X1A9A [redacted] I keep them all in training files separate from personnel files, and when we come up with competitive evaluation lists they're brought out and are a factor in rating our people. And they all see them before they go into their training file.

MR. STEWART: I think training material is very valuable - there isn't any question about it.

MR. HELMS: I just think if we let down the bars on this we will end up with a lot of people goofing in these courses. To be a little bit subjective about this, I do remember being sent to a Naval indoctrination school and doing very badly, and all of these bright kids just out of school were knocking the socks off the thing,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

and I would have been delighted to have said - "Oh just give me a passing mark" - but my feet were kept to the fire by the fact that they were grading all these things. So it has a certain disciplinary effect. And if they're serious about the course they ought to "put out," and this is a device for seeing that they do put out.

MR. STEWART: I think the philosophy of doing this is right, but I do believe that the A&E people themselves are a little bit overwhelmed with enthusiasm, and that they talk up evaluation and its importance to the point that it scares the dickens out of people. If they could take a somewhat more measured view of what their function is, and not have the evaluation tail wagging the training dog, I think we would be better off. I think there is a certain amount of resistance built up just because of their propaganda.

25X1A9A [redacted] You mean students get the impression they are under constant surveillance.

MR. STEWART: It is carried just a bit too far. And there is enough nervousness in this Agency without causing any more.

COLONEL WHITE: That is perfectly true.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Matt's statement in paragraph 3 [reading]: "I keep hearing of attempts to avoid training courses because the training evaluation report becomes a matter of record" - is misdirected. I think the comments--at least the comments I pick up--are more directed at the assessments than at the training records.

I think Dick's point is very valid--we can't have training courses and not mark the students, because any clown can then come in and get credit for it and still not do anything.

25X1A9A [redacted] It is my impression that these training evaluations such
25X1A9A as you [indicating [redacted]] submitted as samples, go into the personnel records.

25X1A9A [redacted]: The first part, yes, but the second part do not--the assessment aspects do not. A great many people wish to have these things keep coming. Supervisors tell us they find them useful.

MR. STEWART: Of course they are.

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

Now, do you [indicating [redacted]] have enough to go on?

[redacted]

I think we have enough to go on.

25X1A9A

MR. HELMS: So do I.

25X1

[redacted]

That was Matt's primary purpose - to bring it to this level, because it has never been considered as a potential problem.

MR. STEWART: Now we will skip to item 4, which is "Overtime Compensation Policies." I believe, Dick, that you have a paper on this, in addition to the papers that have been attached to the agenda--do you not?

MR. HELMS: That is right. I believe everybody has a copy--don't they?

And this paper, I want to state at this point, we simply offer as a conceivable alternative to the other paper. We are not aggressively pushing it forward, we simply ask that it be looked at. I'm sure we're not trying to make a horse race out of this--we're trying to find the best means of solving what becomes an increasingly insolvable problem.

MR. AMORY: I'd like to say two things, at quite different levels. One is addressed to the whole problem, and it amounts to a strong plea that any drastic action--and I consider that what we propose here is in the way of a drastic action - it affects a substantial number of individuals to the tune of several hundred dollars per annum--be deferred until we have something to show on the plus side of Career Service. I note my own ears and eyes around this place, but I was also interested in your [indicating Mr. Kirkpatrick] spot reports of FDD, and various other places, where people commented to you that Career Service was increasingly becoming a joke. And I think we could do a great deal of harm-- I speak for all our AD's - we had a lunch last Friday--if we go out and slap down something like this, and "Boy! You're all in the Career Service - it's a great privilege - you can work like holy hell - you work for nothing - compared to your brethren over in this, that and the other agency." Now if we could, at the same time we establish this, not necessarily get it all the way through Congress but have a real forward move toward accelerated retirement, or something like that, and say, "Boys - you're not going to get those kind of benefits without some sacrifices, and here is the sacrifice" - I don't think they would mind having the sacrifice effective on 1 July even though the other thing might not be effective until the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

next session of Congress. I think it's ill-advised in its timing, as far as the overall morale of the Agency is concerned.

Now, if I lose on that I will come back to some specific points with respect to what we do.

COLONEL WHITE: Well, this paper was drafted in the hope that we could meet all the problems which Ting raised the last time, in that you have these people who have to work more than five days a week, etc., and that this would authorize compensation for that category of personnel. I don't think we are trying to deprive any of that category of people from getting paid - if they really fall into that category; and we are not trying to deprive people whose work can be measured in terms of hours from anything they might deserve--

MR. AMORY: This goes a long way to meet these--

COLONEL WHITE (Continuing): --but what we need, and I think we need badly, is an Agency overtime policy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you recall, Red, I went on record on this just about a year ago urging that we get a standard overtime policy, so that those of us who are complete so and so's and won't allow overtime, are not generally put in a bad light with those who do allow it.

I don't know whether Sheldon reported to you [indicating Mr. Amory] his tactics last time. It was quite amazing - because every time we got to a telling point Sheldon got called out of the meeting! [Laughter] And this went on many times. But in between he was quite eloquent.

25X1A9A

MR. AMORY: I think [] has put it very well, that with respect to a lot of people in Sheldon's shop they are not laborers, etc., in the sense that you can run it on a piece basis or per hour or anything like that, but at the same time they definitely have no legitimate or realistic ambition to be big wheels in the Agency, Chiefs of Station or otherwise--they are what I call "intellectual laborers," and they are damned skilled laborers, and they are a very valuable part of the Agency. But when you've got the [] and the satellite division over there, and you're in your late 30's and you have a boss who is in his early 40's, and he has a boss in his late 40's whose boss is in his early 50's - it's a pretty dismal prospect to get out of that GS-13 slot. And

25X1A6A

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

if there comes a crisis in Yugoslavia, and you're following a mass of proceedings of their Party yea thick [indicating]--I don't think it's too much to ask the taxpayer to compensate for that.

Now, I'm all for certain of the mathematics in this, if we do decide to go ahead with it now. I'm a great believer that there ought not be overtime between 5:00 and 6:00 o'clock around here. People all have a pleasant enough and intriguing enough existence in their intellectual semi-drudgery so

25X1A6A that they shouldn't be time clock punchers. I was interested in the fact that the [redacted] punch time clocks--which we've never had our people do here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Could I ask a question here, Gordon? What do some of our associate agencies do where they have people doing a similar type of work to Bob's? Do they pay people?

COLONEL WHITE: I think generally speaking the State Department does not pay overtime. Generally speaking, I think they just say they do not have money for overtime. They do have some exceptions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What does the Bureau of the Budget say about overtime? They are against it?

COLONEL WHITE: Yes, they are after us every year on overtime. I don't go all the way with the Bureau of the Budget--I mean, they say, "You can check our records over here, and we work nights and we don't pay any overtime, period." But I don't think we can run our Agency like the Bureau of the Budget does. Yet I do

25X1A9A think in some parts of the Agency--particularly, [redacted] good example - where he has discontinued any scheduled overtime - and once it was done I don't

25X1A9A think you [indicating [redacted]] suffered any morale problem--and it's been done in a lot of other places. Both FE and WE, for example, in the DDP, have made tremendous strides.

25X1A9A [redacted] We don't have any scheduled overtime. But this was a very difficult thing to put over in the Signal Center, which has to run 24 hours a day, seven days a week. So we went to shifts, and certain people get Mondays and Tuesdays off, and other people get Saturdays and Sundays off.

MR. AMORY: But they only work a total of 40 hours.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]

40 hours - unless there is a situation comparable

to what you were talking about with respect to the

[REDACTED]

25X1A6A

25X1A6A

[REDACTED]--and then we pay overtime. But it's not scheduled--they can't count on it to buy an automobile or anything like that.

COLONEL WHITE: I feel myself that we have a lot of places in the Agency where people have come to expect overtime as a part of the deal.

25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: [REDACTED] recently put part of the Director's Office on

an 8:30 to 5:00 basis, which knocked out overtime for several people, and I heard

later that one of the individuals in that particular component was counting on

that overtime to pay for his new car. Which leads me to the kind of impertinent

question, Bob: don't you feel in OCI some of these people are perfectly spoiled by some of these practices?

MR. AMORY: Oh yes--and I'm perfectly prepared to have a band of time between 40 hours and when overtime takes place. I'm with the paper on that. I think the band is set too wide--and I will argue about that before I get through, but I would like some reaction to my suggestion that we hold up on this business until we have something to announce to people about an Agency retirement plan - as something on the plus side of Career Service. I mean, these people have really come to look at this as a big fraud, that this is the way in which the Bureau of the Budget and the tough guys at the top of the Agency are grinding them down rather than building them up.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: One of the things that a lot of people on that level still don't know is the amount of hours that went into it at this level working out a good hospitalization and insurance program and the other imponderable factors in the Career Service, which to my mind aren't recognized because we have never really properly advertised.

I think you have a point, that when you club somebody you should let them see a sunny day coming up--but I'm afraid somebody is going to club us first.

COLONEL WHITE: I'd like to respond to Bob's question here, in that we don't mislead anybody, that Gordon and Rud, and the other people, have been really digging into this early retirement matter. We had a session with the actuaries

~~SECRET~~

this week. While I still think that we will have something some day, the formula which we decided here we want to go for would appear to cost about 12 million dollars a year more than our present retirement system under Civil Service. We aren't finished with this yet, but obviously this is something you are not going to get through Congress in a breeze. As a matter of fact, I'll be perfectly honest and say that I doubt very seriously if we have any hopes of getting it in this session. This is not the annual remark that we make on that-- because I think Gordon has made a great deal of progress in getting it down to what we want, what it's going to cost, etc., so that we will have something to present--but I just don't see getting a program through the Congress this session that is going to cost 12 million dollars a year. So I think we have to consider this problem, if we are to consider it at all, without considering the two together.

25X1A9A [] There is another point, Mr. Amory. The retirement formula we discussed at the Council table and that we have been working on--as you know, has never shown any very substantial benefit for the DDI - because of the overseas aspect of it. I think it's only fair to point out that everything we have tried for has not been of major benefit to the DDI side of the house - because we have never been able to figure out how to do it.

MR. AMORY: And I have never felt that it should for a person that worked 30 years in the DDI side. But there are a lot of them--I was just talking
25X1A9A to [], who is coming back in July, after seven solid years in [] 25X1A6A -
he would get the same benefits as an FI officer. There are enough people in our shop who do get overseas service, so that it will have more than a negligible effect.

MR. STEWART: I honestly feel that as far as Career Service is concerned I know of no more cookies in the cupboard. I mean, we are not going to produce benefits that are going to compensate for any move that we would make in the direction of sound management in this field. And I do feel, Bob, that any Agency policy would have to be something that could be reasonably sold to your people, just the same as it would have to be something that could reasonably be sold to the DDP and the DDS people.

Now, in this formula we have certainly included [] 25X1A9A

~~SECRET~~

people as designated people. I mean, you designate them and they draw every cent of overtime that they earn.

MR. AMORY: Where is that on this paper?

MR. STEWART: It's in paragraph 2.c.(1) [reading]:

"Production positions, the productivity of which is predominantly measurable in units of production or hours of duty performed, may be designated as such by Operating Officials, with the concurrence of the Director of Personnel, and the incumbent will receive compensation or compensatory time off for directed overtime performed."

MR. AMORY: I'm sorry--our people didn't interpret it that way at all. They thought that meant the people in OCR who were grinding out prints of photos, or something like that.

25X1A9A [redacted] No. These are the analysts in OCR.

MR. STEWART: That at least is what we had in mind when we put this out. We did have your Lundahl people, and others, in mind, too. We feel there are certain people who are clearly called upon, month in and month out, to put in a lot of overtime, and who occupy grade 12 and 13 positions, and whose prospects of promotion are not very good. [redacted] went over this with us.

25X1A9A

My personal opinion is there would be no objection at all to designating people as being in production jobs. Maybe the term doesn't sound quite right, but we can clean that up. The principle there is that they would earn it.

25X1A6A

MR. AMORY: How is that going to apply to a reports officer in [redacted] Base.

MR. STEWART: If he is designated to get it, he would get it. This is Agency policy.

MR. AMORY: That leaves it up to the--

COLONEL WHITE: The Chief of Base.

MR. HELMS: You see, what we were advocating, Bob, in this alternative plan we want considered--rather than getting into a formula for the administration of this thing in the sense of trying to decide whether people should get paid who work from 5:00 to 6:00, and all the rest of it, was to administer it by putting a ceiling on the money to be used in various units for this purpose, thereby obviating what is the worst feature of the overtime thing at the moment, and that is that

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

depending upon the way you apply for it, and you maneuver, etc., you can have rather stark and dramatic differences. For example, when I was looking over the list of the people in the Clandestine Services in Washington who were paid overtime in the calendar year 1958, the thing that I was thunderstruck by was the great difference in the amount of money given to certain individuals, when to the best of my own personal knowledge the amount of actual time worked overtime by two of these individuals, for example, was not very different. So when I inquired into this I discovered that you could mount this up very fast if you did have this 5:00 to 6:00 business and you came in a little bit early on Saturday and ran it to 1:00 o'clock. It's that type of hokery-pokery that is hard to beat--unless the supervisor spends most of his time fiddling with overtime statistics. So it seems to me part of this problem could be taken care of if you had a ceiling--for example, FE Division: "You just don't get more than a certain amount for overtime. Administer it the way you like, divide the work up the way you like, but nobody is going to get their hands in this cookie jar."

COLONEL WHITE: That would be a way to do it. With this formula, with the exception for these designated positions--where they're not paid overtime unless they've worked 48-52 hours--would cut all those people off anyway. A guy who stays an hour after work or comes in on a Saturday morning, he is not going to qualify, because he has to put in a substantial amount of overtime - 52 hours--he has to work a day and a half overtime to qualify.

25X1A9A

In each 80 hour period.

COLONEL WHITE: So those people would be excluded, and in my judgment they are the people who should be excluded.

MR. HELMS: Is this procedure legal, Dr. Houston?

MR. HOUSTON: An excellent question! I'm glad you asked it. [Laughter]

We can find no legal objection to putting such a system in, but if someone at some time were to come in and claim overtime on the basis that he worked it, and had to work it, there is absolutely no indication what a court would do with it. The Comptroller General and his General Counsel agree with that--they say they can't guess it - but they have no objection. Incidentally, they consider it rather liberal, from their point of view. They don't object to it on

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

that ground, but they say it's somewhat liberal. So the best answer I can give is there is no reason we shouldn't try it.

MR. STEWART: I have the feeling--to get back to the position I took with Dan when I called him about his paper--that the basic Agency policy could be published, and then if you in DD/P, or Bob [Amory], wanted to set up allotments and control it financially, that would be a good thing. Actually, the first statement in Dan's paper is not a statement of policy, it's a statement of fact. It says we don't have to do this, or, if you want to phrase it differently: we don't want to give you the dough. But we were called upon to produce a policy--and that is what I think we should have, to start with--that is, how do you administer overtime - for the person who has to make the decision: Can I or can I not pay this? Let's assume in FE you have the money--he has to have certain standards, and he should pay it to certain people under certain circumstances. If he designates certain people as production people, he pays them; and other people who work over 52 hours overtime, surely they can collect it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What do we budget for overtime, Red? Doesn't each Office--

COLONEL WHITE: We budget for them on the basis of prior experience.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually, it would be a part of OCI's budget that they get. They are allocated a certain amount of funds per quarter.

COLONEL WHITE: Including their overtime--that is right. Of course, you can always hold that out, if you want to.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Perhaps a way out for OCI is to wean them--progressively drop it, with the warning that this is going to take place--because I'm reasonably certain in my mind that there are people around here who have prepared their personal budgets on the basis of the fact they're getting so much overtime as an augmentation of salary, in effect.

MR. AMORY: But they work for it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm not saying they don't.

COLONEL WHITE: I would like to plead that I think we do need an Agency overtime policy, and I believe that this formula which Gordon has put forth here is one that will work. Now we may want to debate whether 52 is too much or not,

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

but I think this principle will work. I certainly think if DDP or anyone else wants to, within this framework, further control it by allocation of funds, I don't see any objection to that. I think it would probably be unnecessary - the result would probably be the same, but I can't see any objection to that. But I do plead that we try to set up an Agency policy and at least experiment with it. Maybe we will find after a year that it isn't right, but almost any policy along this line would be better than what we have now - which is about a minimum of 25 different policies being administered by every component and Chief of Station and Base all over the world.

25X1A9A

I found an interesting psychological reaction - when we said "no scheduled overtime" they cleaned up their outgoing cable traffic on Friday night - they got it out. But when you say "no scheduled overtime" then they can't count on it. This had a good reaction and it cushioned the thing - after they tried it out for a month or so.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I remember a guy wandering around the halls and talking to all his friends - who used to put in more damned overtime between 5:00 o'clock and 2:00 o'clock in the morning. And he's the type when you say no scheduled overtime he starts doing his work between 8:30 and 5:00 rather than 5:00 and 2:00.

COLONEL WHITE: As I say, Bob, this was primarily to take care of the problems Ting raised at the last meeting about his situation where something had to be covered every day of the week, and this was the change which we thought would meet all those problems and still cut out this fellow who chisels on the short periods after 5:00 o'clock and comes in a couple of hours on Saturday morning. But we ought to have some policy. I certainly think this is worth trying.

MR. AMORY: I then move on to the point that I think this 48-52 is unnecessarily complex and too long. I think it's bad business to encourage people to get the multiples of pay that they will get by stretching that time between 48 and 52 - if in the 49th hour they say, "I'm not getting anything, but if I stall around here, and nobody knows what I'm doing so I'll do two or three crossword puzzles, and I suddenly get overtime for four hours." And I think it would be a lot better and perfectly adequate to put it at 48, to say there would be no pay

~~SECRET~~

for overtime up to 48 - which is, roughly speaking, working until 6:00 five nights a week and coming in for three hours on Saturday. Anybody who does that in a week, has no legitimate equity or claim for compensation. That is a perfectly reasonable thing for a white-collared guy in an interesting job to do. But where it gets beyond that - right the minute he gets beyond that, he starts getting paid - without a complicated leverage factor. I am always for simplicity in this thing. I think this is an unnecessary complexity. And I do think that sort of 8 hours of donated time is enough to show the guy's heart is in the right place-- but from there on out -

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I simply comment there, Bob, that I feel rather numb as far as formulas are concerned, because I don't think any formula you adopt is going to be a substitute for the supervisor keeping his eyes open and watching for the ones that are idling and then putting on that last minute spurt to get the work out by 6:30. The only thing I'm pleading for is let's get a standard Agency over-time policy. I think it's long overdue.

MR. STEWART: I believe we need the formula, because one of the most noxious things is picking up the extra hour - charging the Government for the extra hour - and in our business I don't think that belongs. But I don't--unless, Emmett, you want to make a speech in favor of 52-48--I would settle for 48-48, or 48, period.

25X1A9A

Well, the 52-48 formula was really designed to keep the overtime chiselers out of the picture. A man can very easily knock off--by coming to work a little early or staying a bit late each night, by the end of his regular 5-day workweek he can have 8 hours' overtime quite easily. And then he comes in on Saturday morning and diddles around for four hours and collects 4 hours' overtime. But I figured with the 52 level as the qualifying level, and with the lower level at 48 or 45--but, again, formula can be very flexible--actually would eliminate the overtime chiseler from the picture. No man will willfully, regularly work 52 hours in order to collect 4 hours' overtime.

MR. AMORY: Nobody is going to work 49 hours, either, just to collect one hour overtime.

COLONEL WHITE: Well, I feel myself the 48-48 formula would be a big step forward. If we can agree on 48-48, I would certainly say let's try it.

~~SECRET~~

MR. AMORY: I would be willing to look at it a year from now--if you turn out to be right--but I think if, as Kirk said, we have this blanket formula and then reasonable management will catch the other guys. That would be 8:00 to 6:00--

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]

You have to put in a full hour before you count it. It has to be at least an hour before it counts.

MR. AMORY: How many people get in here at 7:30? The parking lots are pretty empty at 10 minutes of 8:00.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]

I think it might be easier to administer if we cut it off at 48 hours.

MR. STEWART: I'd settle for that.

MR. AMORY: I'd like the record to show I fought like hell for 45/45 but settled for 48. [Laughter]

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What does this do to your proposal [indicating Mr. Helms]?

MR. HELMS: Well, we can have ours over and above this.

MR. STEWART: I believe that is true. You can add anything you need to this. Do you feel that way, Dan?

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]

Let me say I have never been hostile to the program as proposed by your [indicating Mr. Stewart] Office. The factors that led me to take a new tack were these: As you know, the jobs in the Clandestine Services are not easily put into pretty definite categories. You have people that do a variety of things. I have run into a great deal of opposition from division chiefs or from staff chiefs in any procedure that requires that they designate individuals who will be in particular categories. They don't want to go through this prolonged exercise--I mean, the production worker, for example - they don't want to go through this.

MR. STEWART: I don't think you need to.

25X1A9A

[REDACTED]

Another thing they will say to you - it's very difficult if a Station Chief wants an important job undertaken by a certain number of people - they don't want to have any formula, they want to be able to direct the overtime and to pay for it, if that is justified. It's the usual opposition that

you run into - to good management, good supervision, but without account being taken that some people don't give it the good management or good supervision that is desired. That would be the ideal, of course. But what I was trying to do was to extract as much of the good as I could from this paper [indicating proposed

25X1

[redacted] --and it certainly contains much that is good--and then let your chiefs have broad responsibility and authority in the administration of overtime, within the funds you gave them, without giving them a rule of thumb - which they resent. That was my approach.

25X1A9A

[redacted] Would it be practical to restrict the 48 formula to headquarters and the budgetary to the field?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No.

COLONEL WHITE: One of the places where it is needed most is in the field.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This would start to fragment the policy, which is something I have much objected to in the past.

. . . . Mr. Helms left the meeting

25X1A9A

[redacted] May I suggest we rewrite this notice according to the policy determined here, and then put this notice on the standard Council coordination procedures? That will get it done faster.

COLONEL WHITE: Yes.

MR. AMORY: And make it effective 1 April?

25X1A9A

[redacted] We were shooting for 1 July. In other words, put it out and then give a few months lead time.

COLONEL WHITE: You do need some lead time, especially in the field. My own thinking would be that we should say that it must be fully effective by 1 July, but not say it is effective 1 July - because you can start effecting it now, and it is effective in some of the offices--but it should be fully effective by 1 July. The field needs some time to adjust to it.

MR. STEWART: If that is agreed then let's go on to the notice on "Position Analysis as Related to Career Service Average Grade."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is this really necessary as a notice?

MR. STEWART: I believe it is. I think it's very desirable.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm not disputing the policy, I'm just questioning the notice.

MR. AMORY: Could I interrupt for a moment? I'm sorry I'm going to have to leave. I'd like to say that we could live with this [proposed], that we think this is acceptable. And I have no objections to items 7 or 8. 25X1

I'm sorry that I have to leave.

. . . . Mr. Amory left the meeting

COLONEL WHITE: I've been in the DDS Office now for seven years and I could count on one hand the number of times we have ever had a T/O request that involved a reduction in grade. There are bound to be justifications for reductions-- but we constantly push our average salary up. We are under pressure by the Budget and Congress to push our salary level down. And at our last Appropriations Committee hearing Mr. asked the Director for an explanation why our average salaries were as high as they were, and we never explained it - we got off on some other subject, but at the close of the hearing Mr. said, "When you come back next year be prepared to explain this." 25X1A9A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are we?

COLONEL WHITE: Not too well. At any rate, the idea behind this is to force people who are requesting T/O changes--and they invariably ask for increases, which raises the average salary of that component and, in turn, the average salary of the Agency--to make them re-examine their own component to see if there aren't corresponding reductions they can make somewhere to keep from raising the overall total.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: As I said, I wasn't disagreeing with the policy, I was just questioning the need for a notice.

MR. STEWART: It would make it a little easier for us to apply the policy if we have a piece of paper. In fact, we tried it without a piece of paper and said this was going to be miserable unless we have something we can show them. 25X1A9A

: My people were concerned only about one provision here, and that is you can rob one component and fatten another one. They are

worried about that. And I said, "Well, I have complete confidence in the DDS. He won't do a dirty trick like this"--if it is dirty--and it would all come out of the hide of the component, because there isn't a common average grade for the various components within any component. If we all started out with the same figures, it would be a little different. My people say, "We have radio operators and our pay will be lower anyway--"

COLONEL WHITE: Within the DDS area we have never submitted a T/O, in our history, that covered the DDS. They are all by individual components everywhere.

MR. STEWART: But I think you should be able to rob one component to fatten another, if there is good reason--because we do have shifts in emphasis. I think Mr. Amory has a clear-cut case of various offices there and some are more important than others, and there are very definite trends. This is just part of basic wage administration. What we want to do--and I've talked with Dan about this--we want to slow down promotions, too, in order to open up a little more money that we could possibly put around on these higher jobs.

25X1A9A [] I don't object to this, but this is the reaction my people will have when we publish this. I think it should be published anyway.

MR. STEWART: It would have to be done very judiciously, obviously.

Well, if that is acceptable we will go on to item 7, which is for your information. Item 8 is to get your approval of a notice which has already been discussed here and which has been passed around and has been approved by the working level people of all components--

25X1A9A [] And that is complete now. I said the coordination on the

25X1 [] notice was substantially complete - because I didn't have the DD/P concurrence, but I do have that now.

MR. STEWART: We have the concurrences at that level and all we need now is the concurrence here. And we would like to get it out immediately so that we can get on with the schedule.

25X1A9A [] This goes into effect in March, and we need the lead time.

COLONEL WHITE: Gordon, I wonder if this isn't so brief and simple that we can get concurrence right now to publish it, without letting it "lie on the table"

for a week. It's very simple. It's on one sheet of paper.

25X1A9A [] Dan, you had a couple of comments or suggestions in your concurrence; in other words, you concurred in it for the DD/P but you made a couple of suggestions.

25X1A9A [] Yes. they are. Would you explain them?--because you can do it better than I can.

25X1A9A []: Well, this is really on the principle rather than a specific objection. I oppose whenever I can the issuance of notices. We just flood the command with notices. Whenever any step need be taken to include something that was put out in a notice, in the revision of some permanent issuance, I'm all for it. In this instance I say we prefer that [] be revised rather than publish a notice. There would be adequate time to prepare such a revision since the new competitive evaluation schedule does not become effective until 1 April. If perhaps other changes in [] were also in the offing this would not, in our view, argue effectively against revision now and further revision later when any such additional changes might have been decided upon. 25X1

25X1A9A []: We have gone into that and there is a massive re-write job in [] 25X1

25X1A9A [] That answers the question, then. But I do think this is a very sound principle.

COLONEL WHITE: I certainly subscribe to the principle.

Well, then let's put it out.

25X1A9A [] And I think at the earliest possible moment we should include the substance of the notice in a revision, and not let the notice expire.

25X1A9A [] We have as a priority the revision of [] and when that comes out it will rescind this notice. 25X1

MR. STEWART: Is there any further business?

25X1A9A []: Before we break up may I refer again to this matter of the State Department course--which was brought up but nothing was said definitively, and if we get an answer today we can fix up a reply accordingly--the proposition

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

being, in connection with our invitation to nominate a candidate for the 1959 course at the State Department the tuition was \$4,000 for this current year but it has been raised to \$6,000 for next year. The course has not changed substantially, but a number of field trips have been introduced.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Who pays for it?

COLONEL WHITE: Training.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why should we pay State to go to their courses?

25X1A9A

[] Since they asked for it in their budget for 1959 they feel obligated to carry the course. This is the only way in which they can do it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Has anybody done a balance sheet on how much we do for them and how much they do for us?

COLONEL WHITE: We're doing more for them - far more.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does anybody feel very strongly that we ought to send a man to this course?

25X1A9A

[] There's only the working relationship - the intangibles argue for it.

COLONEL WHITE: Well, don't you feel, Kirk, that the Director and General Cabell would both feel - even though they may feel that we shouldn't pay, I think they will probably feel that we should send somebody and it should be somebody from the Clandestine Services. I deplore giving them \$6,000, but I think there is something to be gained.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Can I start charging a honorarium when I go to lecture to their courses?--and maybe we can get this \$4,000 back.

COLONEL WHITE: We are probably contributing 15 or 20 percent to their total course of instruction.

25X1A9A

[] This will run our contribution for the year up to around \$65,000. At the moment we don't have the \$6,000 prospect in the Training budget, but we will have to find it by scrounging.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to see--before we make a commitment to pay this--at least a Dulles-Herter discussion.

COLONEL WHITE: I think we ought to send somebody to the course. I do

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

think we ought to raise this with the Director. I think it's wrong they stick us. They don't stick everybody--the Defense Department people don't pay anything. But we aren't going to get it changed until the Director speaks to Herter.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If they don't charge the Defense Department people that solidifies my feeling that we shouldn't have to pay either. We have the reputation of being an easy touch, and I think this is permeating the atmosphere at State, and I think we should disabuse them of this.

COLONEL WHITE: I think their argument is they send 15 people to the War College and they don't pay for that, and therefore they can't very well charge Defense Department; whereas they don't have any comparable group - or any group, really - from State Department attending our schools.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But they have a lot of CIA lecturers lecturing to their classes.

25X1A9A

They have 33 spaces in war colleges--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This is the State Department simply trying to get their National War College course going, and if there were an Inspector General of the Federal Government this is one of the things he would be looking at for duplication.

COLONEL WHITE: It's true, Kirk - all over - that you can almost say everything we get from the State Department we are paying pretty dearly for, whereas we get an awful lot from the Defense Department for which we're not paying.

25X1A9A

Mr. Rooney questioned this course very much last year--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That puts a little more cement in my position. What do we do when we get up before Mr. Rooney, and he will turn to his friend, Clarence Cannon, and say, "Cut them another \$50,000."

COLONEL WHITE: The Defense Department gets more money from transfers than they get by direct appropriation. That is the way they live. That is the way they survive.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with you, Red - I think the Director and General Cabell will probably want to send somebody, but I would recommend that it should go up to the Director with the Career Council's strong objection to paying

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

for it if strong negotiations at the summit level can avoid this.

25X1A9A [] I take it the minutes of the last meeting, then, will stand, in the event we do push our candidate--

COLONEL WHITE: The only other problem I assume there is any question about here is that they have also put out some new age limits, and none of the people we have are either old enough or young enough.

25X1A9A [] The age limits are 40 to 48, inclusive. [] is 37
25X1A9A and our first alternate will be 50 in a matter of weeks.

COLONEL WHITE: We of course assume that we can get them to take

25X1A9A [] For \$6,000 they ought--

MR. STEWART: I think that is what we should try for very hard.

Thank you all very much. The meeting is adjourned.

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~