

December 1966

TO : Mr. Flores

FROM: Nancy Gratz

1. In order to submit accurate figures for the approved actuary study we must immediately establish some definite criteria for survivor payments in the event the principal dependent is terminated for cause.

2. I find it difficult to accept the inheritance formula that JMWAVE says has been SOP, i. e. when the first dependent is terminated the second dependent inherits the first dependent's share and so on down the line. In the first place, the Station hasn't been consistent in following this procedure and the fact it was originally established by AMBUD is no reason for us to continue it. Regardless of the background for this unrealistic procedure it seems that the whole matter is now at a point where policy governing future payments should be determined at the Headquarters level and the actuary study can't be started until we supply firm figures that are not subject to a variety of changes over the years. Furthermore, the Station views and clarification of the background leading to the present procedure, which was requested over a week ago, has not been forthcoming.

3. I think we can live with the following formula as it isn't too inconsistent with BEC survivorship provisions. I discussed the following with Mr. Millian who agreed the provisions seemed to be thoroughly practical and realistic if you concur.

OK *HH*
(a) In those cases where the parents are the sole beneficiaries, in the event one dies the survivor will be paid the larger of the two payments now received, which would be \$175 instead of the \$225 now received by both of them.

OK *HH*
(b) When a widow dies or remarries, her payment will be divided equally among the surviving minor children in lieu of the graduated payments they are now receiving. This may cost us a little more than just chopping off the widow's share and continuing the amounts presently paid to the children but we will minimize possible repercussions from the widow if she is still alive and remarried. It is also much more equitable to the children themselves to share and share alike in the event the mother dies. An additional provision should be that as each child reaches 21 or marries, his payment will be terminated, except in those cases where a child is physically or mentally incapacitated for life. In such cases the child will be paid for life.

In answer to any possible static over these provisions we can always fall back on the original cover story concerning availability of AMBUD funds.

4. May I have your opinion on the above proposal so that I can provide Mr. Evans with the statistics necessary to start the actuary study without further delay?

Nancy Gratz

SECRET

14 December 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes of the WUMUTUAL Investment Committee Meeting Held on 7 December 1966

REFERENCE: Agenda for the Subject Meeting

Minutes of meeting were satisfied 6 Jan 1967

1. The Subject meeting was held in the DD/S Conference Room at 10:30 a.m. on 7 December 1966. All members of the Committee were present. Also attending were the Chief, DO Division, the Committee Advisor, the WUMUTUAL Secretariat (Evans and Fielder), and Messrs. Kenneth William and Earl Williamson and Mrs. Nancy Graiz representing WH Division. The WH representatives were present in conjunction with Item 3 of the Agenda.
2. Mr. Houston chaired the meeting, and the first item of business discussed was Item 3 of the Agenda, i.e., WH Division's proposal of WUMUTUAL annuities for dependents of the Cuban Brigade. Mr. William gave a summary presentation on the Brigade matter. He stated that the payments to the dependents of the Cuban Brigade have been made since 1961 under Presidential order, which order in effect stated that the payments were to be made until rescinded by the President. Since that time, the Agency has spent approximately \$17,000,000 on the overall program, of which \$12,000,000 represents direct stipends to the beneficiaries. WH Division's FY 1967 budget for this matter is \$397,000, and currently 316 individuals are receiving payments, most of whom are dependents of the Brigade with the balance being dependents of the Heros and Martyrs Group and certain Garcia Line crewmen. The individuals are presently paid through a cover firm with no official Government attribution. It is WH Division's position that since this program must be continued until terminated by the President, it is a long range, overall Agency obligation which should not be budgeted for nor administered by WH Division. The Division would like to transfer total responsibility for the program to Project WUMUTUAL by a single premium purchase of annuities. If the single premium method is too costly, they would still like to have the responsibility transferred either by an installment purchase or by the funding method. Mr. Evans advised the Committee that he felt the matter should be brought to the attention of the Committee before WUMUTUAL secured actuarial calculations, since the fees for these calculations will be fairly expensive. After considerable discussion, the Committee concluded that while the

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

15 August 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Payments to Dependents of Brigade 2506

REFERENCE: Memorandum for General Counsel, OGC 66-1663
Dated 22 July 1966 with Attachment

1. On 11 August 1966, I met with Nancye Gratz and **Ken Millian** (WH/C) to explore further the proposal that payments to dependents of Brigade members be reduced.

2. I was told that WH is presently expending some \$255,000 per year for 144 cases of KIA's and MIA's, which figure includes the 16 still in prison on criminal charges that predate their membership in the Brigade. It was emphasized, however, that the proposed cut back would not include the 16. I also learned that the impulse for reopening this matter was a Wave dispatch (UFGA--25261, 3 June 1966). Among other things, this proposed that effective 30 June a new payment schedule be established, and that payments to trustees be discontinued entirely.

3. I told Gratz and **Millian** that while the reference sought our opinion regarding the proposed action, the matter of payments to dependents was political rather than legal. In this connection, I referred to such memoranda as Bissell's of 8 May 1961 and Helms' of 31 December 1962, which indicate that the White House had determined that these payments would be made. In response to the representation that the search of WH/C files failed to reflect any policy guidance subsequent to that set out in the DDP's memorandum of 31 December, I suggested that the Wave proposal be discussed with Mr. Sam Halpern, who had previously served as Executive Officer, TFW.

4. During the afternoon of 11 August, **Millian** and I met with Halpern. He stated that the White House was aware that payments to

*which was not used -
policy was not used -
was in the context of decision
to be made by CIA
to be made by CIA
to be made by CIA*

*to be made by CIA
to be made by CIA
to be made by CIA*