Ry. 12, Freddrick, Md. 21701

Nr. Jim McKinley 7309 NN Maple Lane, Kansas City, No. 64151

Dear Jim,

21

.

ź

33

In answering your recent letter I did not address an apprehension because it really was up to Jim Lesar. I gave him copies of your letter and mine. We were together yesterday and thas I write.

While there is nothing wrong with bis being paid for the time he gave Playboy cha your story, he is at maid that with us it will be disinterpreted and perhaps misused. It is not that he doean't need the money. We has no real income and has given up practically all other practice or the prospect of it. But I agree with him and I believe I discussed this with you long ago. What is normal for all others becomes very woring for us.

However, many other unpaid services have been rendered and there is no reason of which I can think that the payment can't be for the time and services not on the Ray story.

I, for example, would like to be able to pay him for some of the FOIA work he has done for me, but I can't. He needs the payment for the work he's done.

But there might be some trouble for him if others could misuse and misinterpret payment for what is not improper.

The solution, it seems to me, is to pay for what has no connection with Ray.

I can think of some of these things if they do not occur to you.

I don't take time now because I've been away, had little sleep, have to clean up an accumulation so I can return to work on Post Mortem.

Best regards,