

I'm sure, as times goes on, his position in society will be increased as much as financial affluence can increase it.

In terms of economic cost to the Indian, I must respectfully disagree with the task force conclusion because they make a comparison of the cost to income. Certainly, income must be considered, and yet the idea of comparing cost to income at the beginning of a program gives no true picture any more than a comparison of how a candidate in one State getting 2 percent is going to end up getting elected to a particular job. The whole picture must be taken into account. To say this rounded out to 200,000, this is an overstatement, because the task force report indicates \$1.9 million has been paid, but actually, \$1.8 million has been paid, but the picture of costs includes several factors. One, what was the \$1.8 million paid for? Was it paid for ordinary services, or was it paid for total services? Now, it was, as a matter of fact, paid for total services. That includes—the letter of 1963 points out, it includes felony defenses, it includes matrimonial problems, it includes juvenile problems, it includes advising on how to buy an automobile, it includes building a building, it includes virtually every type of problem known to man because these people are just like everybody else and have the same kind of problems, and so these total charges go far—or, relate to services which go far beyond the normal services performed by a conservator of an estate. That's one point that Mr. Cox ignores.

Another point he wishes to make is that \$1.9 million bears a relationship to the income of 44 percent. Now, why he's making this charge I'm not sure; but I do know this, that the leases that produced the income are still producing the income. Many of them have about 60 more years to go and for him to say that the amount of 44 percent of the income is comparable to a situation where a prospective employee goes to an employment office and says, "How much will you charge when you get a job," and the employment office says, "Our charge is one month's rent." Well, if you analyze it—let's say he goes out and gets a job, and if you analyze the cost of getting the job with the income from the job at the end of the first month, you are going to find you have paid 100 percent income to get the job, and that's ridiculous; but if you wait until that job has been underway for about 5 years, you find that you're paying actually 1.66 percent so the comparison of costs to income would be a fair comparison, if the income has been allowed to season so you can see how much the work has produced; and I think Mr. Cox, at this time, is very premature in making that comparison, particularly since he claims that there has been \$4 million plus or minus income over the whole program, yet the fiscal year 1967 on June 30, the tribe was earning \$1,018,000.

Now, if that's true, by this year, the cost that had been paid out should be compared against \$5 million income; next year, they should be compared against \$6 million income, and the year after that it should go up, if nothing else is done.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Can you document, in support of your thesis, that the fees paid of all kinds are a diminishing percentage of total income for the tribe?

Mr. CLEARY. Well, I've given Mr. Sigler—

Mr. EDMONDSON. Because carrying your theory on to its logical conclusion, you should have a situation where your fees are a steadily