

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I say, in all fairness to Mr. Hollowell over here who, a minute ago, was testifying from memory about the conservators several times of several tracts. If a careful search of his records discloses that there was only one tract, and not two, then a letter on that subject would be welcomed by the committee. We're interested in getting the truth on it, and if you have that inaccurate a memory, we don't want to see people penalized by testimony from memory.

Mr. CLEARY. Going back a moment to page 25 where Mr. Levy said he felt some shock when Homer Jenkins of the Palm Springs office advised him on or about March 23, that the Bureau had appraised the land at \$1,500 per acre and that if the court approved the sale at this price there would be no objection to the sale from the Bureau, and that Levy would, in effect, be committed to make the purchase. If such a statement were made to Mr. Levy, I'm sure that he would be shocked, because up to the time of that conversation, Mr. Levy had signed no contract to purchase a piece of property and to have somebody tell him that if the court approved the purchase that that was tantamount to a contract to buy, or a contract to sell. The information is certainly misleading. Had that information been related to me, and were I in Mr. Levy's shoes, I, too, would have been shocked.

On exhibit 23 and 24, again Mr. Hollowell I don't believe, made his point correctly. Exhibit 24 is an accounting for the year 1963, something that did not—this is on page 28, the first paragraph.

Mr. TUNNEY. Page 28?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, 28. The part that did not appear as part of exhibit 24 was the letter to the court which is in the court's files indicating that Mr. Hollowell's fees were charged to the estate on an hourly basis. Mr. Hollowell has introduced into evidence as one of those documents the accountings for the years 1964 and 1966. The accusation has the years 1963, 1964, and 1966, that Mr. Hollowell duplicated his charges. The alleged proof of that is exhibit 23 wherein Mr. Fey indicates that he paid money to Mr. Hollowell during those years. From the fact that Mr. Fey paid Mr. Hollowell during the years involved, the task force concludes that Mr. Hollowell double charged. The task force did not, but should have, referred and included as part of exhibit 24, the accountings filed for the years 1964 and 1966 which accountings specifically spell out that Mr. Hollowell did some work for Mr. Fey, was paid by Mr. Fey, and is not charging the estate for that same work. The task force, even though they had these files for 155 days, neglected to read these accountings or advise anybody who was reading this report that those accountings were in existence. That he spelled out to the court he wasn't charging and why. Now, I feel that those two accountings for 1964 and 1966 should be made part of the record.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that we make part of our file those accountings which the witness has just referred to.

Mr. CLEARY. You have them.

Mr. TUNNEY. Are they part of our files, or a part of Mr. Hollowell's?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, Mr. Hollowell's.