

of one case where one of my clients in this case was living in a house one time that had no indoor plumbing. In other instances, I know members of the band who were living in backs of automobiles. Now, almost without exception, they live in houses. Some of them live in the finest sections of Palm Springs. Virtually all of them have a substantial income, and this all in 10 years.

The program itself is not perfect. I don't think anybody connected with that will claim that it's perfect. It certainly has produced, as Mr. Kettmann said, a miraculous change in the conditions of the tribe, and I say you gentlemen are not here to argue personalities, and not necessarily to argue whether Mr. Cox was good, bad, or indifferent in his preparation and presentation of his report, but you are here to determine as best you can what recommendations to make to the full committee by future legislation.

However, in my opinion, this report of Mr. Cox's is one of the grossest distortions of facts that it has been my mispleasure to encounter in a governmental publication. In the interest and protection of the many people whose reputations have been vilified by it, I am going to be compelled to direct some remarks to it.

You asked, Mr. Edmondson, where the report was faulty. If you will turn to page 6, the last sentence, "Although petitions to appoint conservators have been filed almost routinely as minor wards have attained their majorities, the Department has in no case participated in such actions."

Now, if Mr. Cox means literally that the Department has not filed an appearance in that action, and literally that the Department has not specifically requested the appointment of a conservator or a guardian, then that literal interpretation is accurate. The implication, however, is that the Bureau has not participated in any way, and in virtually every instance, the Bureau has been aware of the filing of the petition, has been aware of the person who has been required to have been appointed, and has been notified in advance of the request, and has, at most times, conferred with the petitioner. Therefore, their participation has, at least, been unofficial.

The second place in which the report is false, in my opinion is—

Mr. EDMONDSON. Let's get that one in focus before we go on to the next one.

Mr. CLEARY. All right; OK.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You say this is false, and yet you say it is literally true. Do I follow you right on that?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, sir; literally, they have not filed an active—no; literally, it is false, because they have participated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Had they appeared in court?

Mr. CLEARY. No, sir; they have not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Have they filed any pleading?

Mr. CLEARY. No, sir, they have not; but one does not have to file a petition to participate in the filing of a petition, at least, as far as I know.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The statement that "* * * the Department has in no case participated in such actions" refers back to petitions to appoint conservators.

Mr. CLEARY. Then, let me say, sir, with that clarification I present this question. If the Bureau knows about the filing of the petition,