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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:44, 198 Pm 1 | Q. Okay. Let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, which is | 01:49248PM 1 | Q. The slight adjustment for what? |
| 01:44238. 2 | Attachment C, individual Indian trust disbursement calculation. | 01:499288M 2 | A. For the fact that not all the checks that were issued were |
| 55:10PM 3 | Dr. Cornell, do you recognize this document? | 01:99308PM 3 | cashed |
| 15:12PM 4 | A. It likes like a black screen to me. I recognize this from | 01:49:317PM 4 | Q. So what did you specifically include then in that total |
| 8PM 5 | my home computer. There we go. | 01:49.388M 5 | th regard -- |
| 16:00M 6 | Q. Do you recognize this document, Dr. Cornell? | 01199.388M 6 | A. Well, as I recall -- |
| ${ }^{01.46: 1728 M} 7$ | A. Yes. This is a document 1 prepared summarizing materials | (499417 | Q. Let's go back to Attachment C. That's Plaintiffs' 56. |
| М 8 | sent to the plaintiffs by officials at the Department of | 01:199.48PM 8 | A. I included the CPNR disbursements adjusted, which is Column |
| M 9 | Treasury. | 01:499.51PM 9 |  |
| M 10 | Q. Did you review the data yourself? | 0:499.51PM 10 | Q. What does Column C, corrected revenues, mean? |
| M 11 | A. Yes. | 01:49.99PM 11 | A. Column C is just directly off of my schedule. That's |
| м 12 | Q. Under Column A, what is Column A? | 01.50.5sPM 12 | Column E from Attachment A, the corrected revenues. |
| mi 13 | A. Those are the number of checks issued out of AALC account | :10pm 13 | Q. And under Column D, checks paid, that is what you just |
| ¢р 14 | number 4844, which in the cover letter from the Treasury was | 01.50:189M 14 | described as you took only the data from the checks that were |
| pM 15 | explained to be the individual Indians monies account. | 01.50:99PM 15 | identified as paid or negotiated? |
| 01:44.5.58M 16 | MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify an | 01.50.21PM 16 | A. Correct. Not all the checks issued were paid. Some were |
| -17 | exhibit admitted in trial 1.5, which is DX 272. DX 272 is a | 01.5024PM 17 | never cashed. |
| 18 | letter from Charles Schwann, who is document production | 0.50.2889 18 | Q. I'd like to go back to DX 272 for a moment, please. |
| - 19 | coordinator, Department of the Treasury, Financial Management | 0.50.377M 19 | THE COURT: On this percentage of checks paid and |
| 20 | Service, to Bert Edwards, executive director, Office of his | \&0Р 20 | cashed -- |
| ¢ 21 | Historical Accounting, Office of the U.S. Interior, dated | 21 | MR. GINGOLD: Back to Attachment C, your Honor. |
| ззрм 22 | November 4, 2003. | 01.50:48PM 22 | THE COURT: Well, whatever attachment you were just |
| spm 23 | BY MR. GINGOLD: | 0.150.499 23 | on, if hypothetically there were $\$ 200$ million worth of |
| - 24 | Q. Is this the letter you're referring to? | 01.50.568M 24 | disbursement checks cut and let's say two hundred thousand |
| 01:477.889 25 | A. Yes. | 01.51:088 25 | checks and ten percent of those checks were not cashed, what did |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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| IPM 1 | Q. I'd like you to turn to page two of this document, which | 015:514PM | you do? Did you discount the total payment by ten percent? |
| з3PM 2 | identified as Bates 272-00032, and at the top of the page, the | 00.551:77PM 2 |  |
| gmm 3 | first sentence states, Exhibit B provides the number and amount | ${ }^{015512029 M} 3$ | can in Column E you see the percentage of checks paid as a |
| PM 4 | of checks issued under symbol 4844 and captured in CPNR since | 0.151248 PM | fraction of the percentage of checks issued. |
| трм 5 | the implementation of CPNR on November 6, 1986. Is that your | ${ }^{0151512868} 5$ | THE COURT: What do you do with the likelihood -- I'm |
| 18:13PM 6 | understanding? | ${ }^{\text {01:512:29PM }} 6$ | assuming it's a likelihood that most of the checks not cashed |
| 01:188:49PM 7 | A. Yes, it is. | 01:513.32PM 7 | are the checks for twenty-five cents or a dollar-and-a-quarter |
| 01.48.15PM 8 | Q. I'd like to turn to page eighteen of this document, which | 01515:3898 8 | or two-dollars-and-a-half, that kind that aren't worth cashing. |
| 01:18:199\% 9 | is at Bates 48. It's identified as Exhibit B, and it's | 01.55: 408PM <br> 0151:43PM <br> 10 | THE WITNESS: I did not make an adjustment for check |
| 01:4887PM 10 | identified as CPNR information for symbol 4844 by calendar year. |  | size. It's just prorated. |
| 01:48.35sm 11 | Do you recognize this information, Dr. Cornell? | 01.51:43PM <br> 00.51:4PPM <br> 11 | THE COURT: All right. |
| трм 12 | A. Yes. That's the same information you'll find in my | 0.51:478PM 12 | MR. GINGOLD: |
| орм 13 | Attachment C. | 0.1514.47PM 13 | Q. Did you make any determination as to whether or not that |
| ¢ 14 | Q. Okay. Under "number of records," what does that mean? | 0.151:4989 14 | was a characteristic typically of checks that were not paid or |
| А8,ззм 15 | A. Number of checks issued. | 01:51:54PM 15 | was a characteristic typically of checks that were not paid or cashed? |
| 45PM 16 | Q. Under "dollar amount," what does that mean? | ${ }^{0.1515 .54 P M} 16$ | cashed? <br> A. No. There was no data on that. This is the complete data |
| 01:488.88PM 17 | A. The aggregate amount for all those checks. | 01.51:57PM 17 | from the Treasury. |
| 01.488.50PM 18 | Q. And what did you take from this information, including | $\text { O.:5:5:58M } 18$ | from the Treasury. <br> Q. Now, if the checks weren't paid or cashed, do you know |
| 01:48.549M 19 | Attachment A? | 01.52.28PM 19 | Q. Now, if the checks weren't paid or cashed, do you know where the money remained? |
| 01.48.55PM 20 | A. Well, 1987 turned out to be a partial year, so I excluded | 01.52.:5PM 20 | A. Well, presumably it would remain in the Treasury account, |
| 01:49901PM 21 | it and then I took the rest of the information. |  | because it wasn't drawn down from it. |
| 01:490:389 22 | Q. So is that the reason you have the highlighted disbursement | 00.52:12PM 22 | Q. And the CPNR data, was that summary-level data? |
| 01:49:128M 23 | numbers in under Column $F$ of Attachment $A$ on page four? <br> A. They're drawn directly from that schedule with a slight | 01.55:168M 23 | A. Yes. |
| 01:49:168M 24 |  |  | Q. So there was no checks that were provided to you that |
| 01:498:23PM 25 | A. They're drawn directly from that schedule with a slight adjustment. |  | supported the check disbursements, was there? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{01} 5158498 \mathrm{M}$ M 1 | I'll explain that too. | 0202:17PM 1 | Indian money would be the last money you'd credit? |
| ${ }^{01} 15.58 .51 \mathrm{PM} 2$ | Q. Page one, please. | 02022:21PM 2 | THE WITNESS: Well, I'm treating it as the mariginal |
| ${ }^{01} 505.568 \mathrm{M} \quad 3$ | A. What the government did not provide Osage data explicitly | ${ }^{02} 0.02 .25 \mathrm{PM} 3$ | money, that everything else is held the same and the government |
| 01.59.01PM | that I could then take out, so what I did was I noted in all the | ${ }^{02002288 \mathrm{PM}} 4$ | either has or does not have the Indian monies. |
| 0159.055M 5 | years where there was data, 1909 to the present, the Osage | ${ }^{02020238 \mathrm{PM}} 5$ | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 01:59.922PM 6 | government was 41.4 percent $I$ think it is of the Osage | 0202238PM 6 | MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, plaintiffs would like to |
| 01.59:188M 7 | corrected, so I plugged in 41.4 percent of the corrected as an | 02022.35M 7 | identify Exhibit 59. It's identified as Treasury Debt, |
| ${ }^{01.559248 \mathrm{M}} \mathrm{C}$ | estimate of the Osage government and then did the same | 8 | Historical Debt Outstanding Annual, 2000 to 2007. |
| ${ }^{01559928 \mathrm{Mm}} 9$ | technique, took it out and replaced it. | 1248PM 9 | THE COURT: That's too depressing. I don't want to |
| 01:593.17PM 10 | Q. So you didn't double count the revenue, correct? | 0202:50PM 10 | see that exhibit. |
| 01:59.338M 11 | A. I did not double count the Osage. | 02:20:59PM 11 | THE WITNESS: It's more depressing when you divide by |
| 01.59.968M 12 | Q. Is that a reasonable approach to take when you have data | 02:02.568M 12 | the working population. |
| ${ }_{01599411 \mathrm{PM}} 13$ | that is missing, to be able to plug in the number based on the | 02:03:01PM 13 | MR. GINGOLD: We won't ask any questions about that, |
| 01.59.45PM 14 | percentage that you observed for the other information? | 02.03.38PM 14 | your Honor. |
| 01:59.488M 15 | A. Yes, $I$ think that is. | 02.03:09PM 15 | Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification |
| 01.59:4989 16 | Q. With respect to Attachment A, you identified a column under | s. 16 | Exhibit 58. Exhibit 58 is entitled IIM Banking Policy, prepared |
| 02:00.088M 17 | G that's labeled nominal benefit to the government. What does | 02.032389 17 | by Terence Kehoe, Morgan, Angel \& Associates. This too was |
| 02:00:419PM 18 | that mean? | 02.332989 18 | produced in trial 1.5 by the government. |
| 02:00:419 19 | A. That's just that year's revenues minus disbursements so | 02.03:29PM 19 | (Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 58 was marked for |
| 02:00:1989 20 | that you can see it and don't have to calculate it. | 02.03:29PM 20 | identification at about 2:03 p.m.) |
| 02:0022PM 21 | Q. Does that include interest? | 02.03:29PM 21 | BY MR. GINGOLD: |
| 02:00238M 22 | A. No. | з2PM 22 | Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to the second page of |
| 02:0024PM 23 | Q. And with regard to Column I, which is identified as accrued | sspm 23 | this excerpted exhibit, which is Bates number it looks like |
| ${ }^{02} 20.032 \mathrm{Pm} 24$ | benefit annual, what does that mean? | 24 | D1100034. The Court had asked you questions at the beginning of |
| 02:00.369 25 | A. That is the interest earned on the balance at the beginning | ${ }_{0} 0203.54 \mathrm{P}$ P 25 | your testimony about funds held on deposit in banks. Do you |
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| 02:00:40PM 1 | of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the | 0203:588M 1 | recall that? |
| 02:00.44PM 2 | interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at | 02033.59PM 2 | A. It think so. |
| 02:00:488M 3 | the government bond rate for that year. | 02040:01PM 3 | Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? |
| 02:00:9989 4 | Q. And Column J, what is Column J? | 020.0.058M 4 | A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. |
| ${ }^{02} 20.0 .55 \mathrm{Pm} 5$ | A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit | 02:04411PM 5 | Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still |
| 02:0:10.03M 6 | for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated | 02:04.15PM 6 | a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in |
| 0200:10PM 7 | benefits from previous years. | 0204.499M 7 | commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it |
| 02:0:1711 18 | Q. If you can turn to page five, please. | 020:424PM 8 | your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? |
| ${ }^{02001: 1989} 9$ | THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the | 020.4.389 9 | MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's |
| 02:0.1217 10 | government was not a net borrower? | 020:4.388M 10 | testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and |
| 02:012 24 PM 11 | THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was | 02004.388M 11 | money held in banks. |
| 02:012 27 PM 12 | in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they | 02:04400PM 12 | MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? |
| 02:01:308M 13 | were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net | 020:4.438M 13 | THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll |
| 02:0.1.389 14 | borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and | 02:044.689 14 | hear his answer. |
| 02001:483PM 15 | not many, but there are a few. | 02:04.488. 15 | BY MR. GINGOLD: |
| 02:01:4889 16 | THE COURT: And should we be including interest for | 02:04.488. 16 | Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial |
| 02.0.1458M 17 | those years? | 020:4.52PM 17 | benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in |
| 0200:4.45PM 18 | THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government -- in | 020:4.59PM 18 | commercial banks? |
| 02:01:788M 19 | order to not include the interest saved, the government would | 02:04.55PM 19 | A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is |
| 02:0.5.51PM 20 | have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my | 020:4.599m 20 | not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the |
| 02:0.156m 21 | mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could save | 02.05.38PM 21 | monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed |
| 02020.017M 22 | interest if someone gave me some money and I could use it in | 02.05.688M 22 | entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit |
| 0200:2.5sM 23 | lieu of borrowing by paying down that borrowing further. | 02.05.999 23 | conferred on the government. If they were held there and |
| 0202:0989 24 | THE COURT: But by your theory, unless the national | 02.05.12PM 24 | allowed to accumulate and eventually used for some government- |
| 02:02:14PM 25 | debt got down below the accumulated amount, in other words, the | ${ }_{\text {02:55.6PM }} 25$ | related expenditure or returned to the Treasury, there would be |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before?
A. Yes.
Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were
disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit
conferred analysis, correct?
MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading.
THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be

## "hearsay."

MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay.
THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky.

MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence.

THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on.

BY MR. GINGOLD:
Q. Your Attachment $A$ is your best approach to providing an 21 approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't

22 it?
23 A. I want to say two things in that regard with respect to
24 Attachment A because it really has two aspects. One is it's a
25 financial economic model, and two is it relies on specific
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inputs. As a financial economist I believe that the methodology used in Attachment $A$ is the correct approach for computing benefits conferred on the government. As to the precise numbers to input into it, I 've used the best approximation that I could come up with having worked on this matter for a couple of months, but I was also told that much of the input would come from the government's efforts to, for example, prove disbursements, and I indicated that if the inputs were improved, then I could input that into the model and get an improved estimate of the bottom line.
Q. But in your model, as you stated based on CPNR data, you used the seventy percent disbursement for the years that were actually provided in summary form in the CPNR database, correct?
A. Well, in the years where the CPNR data were provided I used that actual data, and in all the other years I used seventy percent, which was the average disbursement rate from the CPNR data.
Q. So just as the disbursements can, the percentage of disbursements could increase with the additional data that's considered a benefit, it is also possible that the seventy
percent number could decrease if, for example, checks were not identified to support a percentage?
A. That would be possibility.
Q. But we don't know, do we?
A. I don't know.
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Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the $\$ 734.33$ million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct?
A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the
assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred.
Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the
$\$ 734.33$ million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct?
A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line.

MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:

Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John

Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon.

You've testified a number of times before, correct.
A. Yes.
Q. So you know how the process works. If I ask you anything and you'd like it clarified or rephrased, please let me know.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:1:3171PM 1 | I'll be happy to work with you, okay? | 02:14.12PM 1 | where you may have gotten information for your analysis. |
| ${ }^{02011.328 \mathrm{M}} 2$ | A. Okay. | 02:14.168M 2 | A. Well, two sources. To some extent the plaintiffs' |
| 02:11.32PM | Q. All right. I want to follow-up on the last exchange that | 02:1422PM 3 | attorneys directly, but primarily via my staff who corresponded |
| 02:11.35PM | you just had with Mr. Gingold. You were talking about the | 02:14.2889 4 | extensively with plaintiffs' attorneys and documents float back |
| 02:1:400PM 5 | methodology in your model which you've represented is the proper | 02:14.317PM 5 | and forth, but most of those documents were sent to CRA opened |
| 44PM 6 | methodology, but you're also talking about making some | 02:14.35PM 6 | and examined by the staff and then presented to me. |
| 02:1:1788M 7 | adjustments based on government data? | 02:14.3889 7 | Q. Did you personally ask to speak with anyone besides |
| 5som 8 | A. Correct. | 02:14.44PM 8 | Plaintiffs' counsel, for example? |
| ${ }^{022.15: 1919} 9$ | Q. So to be sure we understand what you're testifying to | ${ }^{02} \mathbf{2 1 4 . 4 5 8 \mathrm { SPM }} 9$ | A. I spoke with some of the other experts who have testified |
| 02:11.5spm 10 | today, it's your opinion that the methodology is correct, right? | 02:14.51PM 10 | today, Mr. Miller, Dr. Miller, Mr. Laykoc. That's about all I |
| 02:12.017 11 | A. Yes. | 02:15.02PM 11 | recall. |
| 02:1202PM 12 | Q. But you're not here today to tell the judge that this is | 02:15.02PM 12 | Q. Professor Cornell, what document did you review in the |
| ${ }^{02: 2120689} 13$ | actually the precise measure of the government's benefit from | 02:15.05PM 13 | context in preparing your opinion? |
| 02:12:10PM 14 | the government's alleged use of funds that couldn't be explained | 02:15.07pM 14 | A. Well, a lot. They were accumulated into more than a dozen |
| 02:2:1:159m 15 | from the accounting? | 02:15:15PM 15 | large binders. They were primarily historical documents, |
| 02:2:1:189M 16 | A. Well, I think that requires work further than I've done. | ${ }^{02} 1.1523 \mathrm{PM} 16$ | reports, government documents, things of the nature that have |
| 02:12:289M 17 | For example, one of the first things I asked was to hear the | 02:152889 17 | been introduced as exhibits to Attachment A. |
| ${ }^{02122298 \mathrm{~m}} 18$ | government's evidence regarding disbursements, and to the extent | 0215.322PM 18 | Q. And how did you obtain these documents? |
| ${ }^{02121238 \mathrm{Pm}} 19$ | that I hear that and it influences decisions about what | 02:15349PM 19 | A. Well, I obtained them from Mr. Herschlifer who is working |
| spm 20 | disbursements number to put into that spreadsheet, it's going to | 02:15.3989 20 | with me, but I imagine Mr. Herschlifer obtained them from the |
| 02:2:2438M 21 | change the bottom line. | 02:15,428M 21 | Plaintiffs' attorneys. |
| 02:12.44PM 22 | Q. Professor Cornell, do you prefer "professor" or "doctor"? | 0215:438M 22 | Q. Aside from documents that you believe Mr. Herschlifer |
| 02:12:509m 23 | A. I think "professor." "Doctor" sounds too medical to me. | ${ }_{0}^{02155.508 M} 23$ | obtained from Plaintiffs' counsel, do you know if you or any of |
| şр 24 | Q. All right. Professor Cornell, when were you first hired to | 02:15.538M 24 | your associates obtained documents from any other source? |
| ${ }^{0212.586 \mathrm{Pm}} 25$ | work on the Cobell case? | ${ }_{0}^{02151588 \mathrm{PM}} \mathbf{2 5}$ | A. Well, some of the information we, "we" being CRA, obtained |
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| 02:12:57PM | A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months | 02:16.038M 1 | because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- |
| \% 2 | ago. | 02:16.09PM 2 | time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from |
| ${ }^{02}$ 0213.393M 3 | Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you | Spm 3 | Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were |
| ${ }^{02213.077 \mathrm{PM}} 4$ | have any background or experience working with the individual | ${ }^{02} 16.2$ 23PM 4 | any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. |
| 02:13:10PM 5 | Indian trust system? | 02:16.300PM 5 | We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. |
| ${ }^{02}$ 02:3127PM 6 | A. No. | 02:16.338M 6 | Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, |
| 02:13:38PM 7 | Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing | ${ }^{0216,3.37 \mathrm{PM}} \mathbf{7}$ | the Treasury direct website shot? |
| ${ }^{02} \mathbf{0 2 3 1 3 1 8 8 \mathrm { PM }} 8$ | materials in connection with your engagement on this case? | ${ }^{02} \mathbf{0 2 6 , 4 . 4 1 \mathrm { PM }} \mathbf{8}$ | A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I |
| ${ }^{02: 13221 \mathrm{PM}} 9$ | A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a | 02:16:44PM 9 | couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained |
| 02:132889 10 | hundred. | 02:16.49PM 10 | directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather |
| ${ }^{02} 213288 \mathrm{~m} \frac{11}{}$ | Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were | 02:16.538M 11 | than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the |
| ${ }^{02} \mathbf{2 1 3 , 3 4 8 \mathrm { PM }} 12$ | assisted by staff? | 02:16.588M 12 | time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a |
| ${ }^{02} \mathbf{2 1 3 , 3 4 9 \mathrm { PM }} 13$ | A. Yes. | 02:17:01PM 13 | document in the case. |
| 02:13.34PM 14 | Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? | 02:17:02PM 14 | Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of |
| ${ }^{02}$ 02:3,359m 15 | A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on | 02:17:08PM 15 | documents that you reviewed were the historical materials |
| 02:13.427M 16 | this project from CRA International. | 02:17.09PM 16 | provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? |
| 02:13.45PM 17 | Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company | 02:77:11PM 17 | A. I think that's correct. |
| 02:13.509m 18 | you're associated with? | 02:17:138M 18 | Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, |
| 02:3.351PM 19 | A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. | 02:17:188M 19 | Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in |
| 02:13:35PM 20 | Q. That's Charles River? | 02:77:21PM 20 | connection with your analysis, correct? |
| 02:13.54PM 21 | A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA | 02:17228M 21 | A. Yes. |
| 02:14.00PM 22 | International. | 02:1722PM 22 | Q. Did you review any documents such as journal vouchers? |
| 02:14.00PM 23 | Q. Who's spoken to you in connection with your engagement on | 02:17:7889 23 | A. I may have, but I'm not sure. I don't recall specifically. |
| 02:14.068M 24 | this case? In other words, what I'm trying to learn is, since | 02:177389 24 | Q. In forming your opinions is it fair to say you've assumed |
|  | we haven't met before, I'm trying to get an understanding as to | 02.17.388M 25 | that money has been wrongfully withheld from the IIM trust |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02:174.42PM 1 | accounts? | ${ }^{02} 20.288 \mathrm{M}$ M | A, but would you please describe the process that went into |
| 02:174.2PM 2 | A. Well, I didn't make that assumption, per se. I eventually | 31PM 2 | preparing Attachment A? In other words, what was your role and |
| 02:17.49PM 3 | made the assumptions that went into Attachment $A$, but I did say | ${ }^{02} 20.3$ apm 3 | how did you all decide to undertake this approach? |
| 02:77.57PM 4 | to counsel in this matter that I was not a historian and had not | 0220.39PM 4 | A. Well, the first thing I did was have extensive conversation |
| ${ }^{02}$ 02:18.02PM 5 | been working on this matter long enough to have delved into the | 0220:45PM 5 | with Plaintiffs' counsel to understand the legal framework in |
| ${ }^{0218: 8.08 P M} 6$ | nature of each number, so to some extent I would be operating at | ${ }^{\text {0220.50PM }} 6$ | which a calculation would be done. And this would be somewhat |
| 02:18:100m 7 | a high level that may have to be refined. | ${ }^{\text {0220.56PM }} 7$ | analogous to the damages versus restitution discussion that I |
| ${ }^{\text {02:18:3PM }} 8$ | Q. Now, I know you were sitting in court part of yesterday and | 8 | started with and Professor Laycok talked about in detail, and I |
| ${ }^{\text {02:18:17PM }} 9$ | this morning when Dr. Miller was testifying so you heard some | 9 | learned what they were looking for was a model that would |
| 02:1821Pm 10 | testimony about the Treasury general account. Prior to your | ¢pm 10 | reflect benefits to the government, which I explained would be |
| ${ }^{02188286 \mathrm{~m}} 11$ | coming to court this week had you heard about the Treasury | ІРल 11 | damages to, let's say, a class of I ndians, so once I understood |
| ${ }^{021818288 \mathrm{~m}} 12$ | general account? | 0221:208m 12 | that, I said the benefits to the government, I pretty much then |
|  | A. Yes. | 02:2724PM 13 | knew what to do. The financial economics of Attachment $A$ are |
| ${ }^{02} \mathbf{2 1 8 2 9 8 9} 14$ | Q. And is that something you have a fair amount of familiarity | з1pm 14 | things that I've done in the past that I knew how to do and so I |
| ${ }_{\text {02:1832Pm }} 15$ | with from your work? | 022:17.58m 15 | basically developed the template for it and said that we're |
| 02:18349m 16 | A. Well, there's a great amount to know about Treasury | ¢ 16 | going to have to do a lot of work to find the right numbers to |
| 02:18:3889 17 | finance, but I worked on the Treasury bidding scandal for Warren | 21:438M 17 | go in there. |
| 02:18:4389 18 | Buffett back in 1986, so as part of that assignment I spent some | 4PPM 18 | Q. So was it you that decided, and I'm going to have to ask if |
| 02:184787 19 | time learning about government debt financing and the operation | я9р 19 | we could have Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41 put up. We can just go to |
| 02:18.509m 20 | of the Treasury, but it's been a while. | 555M 20 | the first page. Were you the person who actually made the |
| 02:18.52Pm 21 | Q. Okay. And aside from what you've heard this week, for | озPм 21 | decision to have the various columns in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41? |
| ${ }^{0218: 5.57 \mathrm{Pm}} 22$ | example, did you have a sense as to how much money typically was | о6PM 22 | A. Well, some, but not -- some I had to learn facts from |
| 02:9:01PM 23 | in the Treasury general account? | 22:10PM 23 | others. For example, I had no idea about this Osage calculated |
| 02:19.02PM 24 | A. I didn't -- that $\$ 5$ billion number that I saw in a | 168M 24 | or Osage corrected, but it was my view that the critical columns |
| ${ }^{\text {02:97.08PM }} 25$ | document, that was the first time I saw that as working balance. | ${ }^{02} 222$ 238M 25 | would be you need a measure of revenues and you need a measure |
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| 02:19:119M | I didn't know that prior. | ${ }^{02} 22.28 \mathrm{PM} 1$ | of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include |
| 02:99:12PM 2 | Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed | M 2 | things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the |
|  | yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? | 3 | government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to |
| 19PM 4 | A. I think that was it, yes. | 4 | themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a |
| 1989 5 | Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? | PPM | damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so |
| ${ }^{\text {02:1922PM }} 6$ | A. Yes. | 0222.50PM 6 | disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did |
| 02:19238M 7 | Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any | ${ }^{\text {0222:55PM }} 7$ | not benefit the government. |
| ${ }^{\text {02:19288m }} 8$ | research studies related to the Treasury general account; is | ${ }^{0222.568 \mathrm{M}} \mathrm{8}$ | Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud |
| ${ }^{02} \mathbf{2} 1933 \mathrm{Pm} 9$ | that correct? | ${ }^{\text {0223.00pm }} 9$ | when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? |
| 02:99388m 10 | A. Not specifically, no. | 0223:38PM 10 | A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with |
| 02:97349m 11 | Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to -- you've | 0223.07p 11 | a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I |
| 02:99:408 12 | referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use | 02.23.117PM 12 | would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. |
| 02:19:4PM 13 | those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working | 223:18PM 13 | Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? |
| 02:99:99Pm 14 | with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief | 02233:6PM 14 | A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. |
| 02:99.58PM 15 | filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that | 0223:9PM 15 | Q. Okay. |
| 02:19.55Pm 16 | document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? | 0223:19PM 16 | A. At any rate -- |
| 02:9957PM 17 | A. I think so, yes. | 0223208M 17 | Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you |
| 02:19.59Pm 18 | Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some | ${ }^{\text {0223228m }} 18$ | reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? |
| 0220.03PM 19 | numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only | 0223288m 19 | A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, |
| 0220.0.88 20 | difference? | 0223328PM 20 | it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see |
| ${ }^{\text {0220.06PM }} 21$ | A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment $A$. |  | evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic |
| ${ }^{0220: 11 p m} 22$ | For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, | (2383PM 22 | payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified |
| 0220:159M 23 | so that's changed. You'd have to show me which particular | ${ }^{02} 233477 \mathrm{PM} 23$ | before, pretty scattered data as far as I've seen to this point. |
| 0220:19PM 24 | version you have before I could tell you for sure. | 0223.5.5PM 24 | Q. Did that surprise you looking back at a history of over a |
| ${ }^{0220228 P M} 25$ | Q. Well, if that's necessary we'll get to the old Attachment | ${ }^{02} 23.547 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | hundred years? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {023:21PPM }} 1$ | A. Yes. | 0234.099PM 1 | Q. All right. Now, let's go ahead and look at -- why don't |
| ${ }^{\text {O2:3121PM }} \mathbf{2}$ | Q. Okay. Does Attachment A represent a regression, the | ${ }^{02344} 17 \mathrm{TPM} 2$ | you go back to the first page of Plaintiffs' 41. As I |
| ${ }^{\text {02331288M }}$, 3 | product of a regression analysis? | ${ }^{023} 34228 \mathrm{PM}$ | understand it, when you take your seventy percent, you look at |
| ${ }^{\text {023:128PM }} \mathbf{4}$ | A. I did regressions to, quote, fill in the blanks, but 1 in | 02.34277PM 4 | your total revenues for a particular year, like year, let's go |
| ${ }^{\text {023:133PM }} 5$ | fact didn't use them. I just used a simple linear | 0234.358M 5 | to the bottom, 1915, Column E; is that correct? |
| ${ }^{\text {о2:313989 }} 6$ | interpolation. | 0234441PM 6 | A. Yes. |
| о2:31.398 7 | Q. Are there other ways to fill in missing data becides a | 0234442PM 7 | Q. And that's the one that you multiply times .7? |
| 023:14389 8 | linear interpolation? | ${ }^{\text {023 4,45PM }} \mathbf{8}$ | A. Correct. |
| ${ }^{023} 17468 \mathrm{~m} 9$ | A. Yes. I looked at four or five, and there's probably many | ${ }^{0234477 \mathrm{M}} \mathrm{P}$ | Q. To get disbursements of 5.7? |
| о2:314.989 10 | more than the ones that I looked at, but I looked at some of the | 0234,509M 10 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }_{\text {o23:151PM }} 11$ | standard techniques. | 0234.517PM 11 | Q. And then what happens to the remain -- the difference |
| ${ }_{\text {O23:152PM }} 12$ | Q. What are some of those standard techniques? | ${ }_{0} 0234.55 \mathrm{Pm} 12$ | between the 5.7? What is that, 2.46; is that right? What |
| ${ }_{\text {o23:154PM }} 13$ | A. Well, you can use a regression model, a standard linear | 0235.038M 13 | happens to the difference? |
| о2z2:00pm 14 | regression model. You could use a logrythmic aggression, you | ${ }^{\text {0235.03PM }} 14$ | A. It's assumed that that -- the model effectively assumes |
| ог232.49¢ 15 | could use an exponential smoothing model. Ifound that as long | 0235.77pM 15 | that that difference is available to the government for use. |
| ог:32.09p 16 | as I focused on the 1887-to-1972 period the bottom line was not | ${ }^{02355.117 \mathrm{M}} 16$ | Q. Didn't get -- |
| 0232:168M 17 | very sensitive to how I filled in the blanks. | 02.35.13PM 17 | A. Except to the extent that it built up an external account. |
| ${ }_{\text {o2azispm }} 18$ | Q. Have you ever, and I'm sure you have, but I have to ask it | ${ }_{0}^{0235: 188 \mathrm{M}} 18$ | Q. I'm sorry, except to the extent? |
| о2322449 19 | this way anyway, have you ever heard the term multi-variate | ${ }_{\text {023520PM }} 19$ | A. Except to the extent that it builds up in an external |
| о23222989 20 | model? | 02355238M 20 | account. |
| о232229PM 21 | A. Multi-variate regression. | ${ }_{0} 0235238 \mathrm{PM} 21$ | Q. What does that mean? |
| ${ }_{\text {o2323:3PM }} 22$ | Q. I'll take that one. | 0235.24PM 22 | A. Well, if you go to the very end, and I talked about this in |
| ${ }_{\text {o2a3232PM }} 23$ | A. Yes. | ${ }_{0} 0235289 \mathrm{PM} 23$ | my direct, but go to the last page, you have a balance of 423 |
| ${ }_{\text {0232328M }} 24$ | Q. What is a multi-variate regression? |  | million. If all of those funds, all of those two-point whatever |
| ${ }_{\text {02323689 }} 25$ | A. It's where you try to explain a variable, like, let's say, | ${ }_{0} 0235480 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | you said it was, 2.4. |
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| ${ }^{\text {0232241PM }} 1$ | sales of iphones by a number of other variables such as GNP or | ${ }_{0} 02355428 \mathrm{M} \quad 1$ | Q. 2.46 ? |
| ${ }^{\text {o232253PM }} 2$ | sales of other Apple products where you don't just use one | 02.35.4PPM 2 | A. 2.46, if all of those had simply been dumped into another |
| ${ }^{02325588 \mathrm{M}}$ M | explanatory variable. You have several. | ${ }^{02354.48 P M} 3$ | account and not touched and just built up for a hundred years, |
| ${ }^{\text {02325.59PM }} 4$ | Q. Are there any advantages to using more than one variable? | ${ }^{02355.53 \mathrm{PM}} 4$ | hundred plus years, I presume you'd have a number pretty close |
| ${ }^{\text {0233,04PM }} 5$ | A. As long as you have a reasonable basis for so doing, and | ${ }^{02355.58 \mathrm{PM}} 5$ | to $\$ 58$ billion. That obviously did not happen because we don't |
| о2з3,.99PM 6 | it's not data-fishing, there would be, yes. | ${ }^{0236.01 P M} 6$ | have that sort of money, so I don't know what happened to it, |
| ${ }^{\text {0233:12PM }} 7$ | Q. And what are those advantages? | ${ }^{0236.658 M} 7$ | but it is an assumption of the model that it was available for |
| ${ }^{\text {0233:49PM }} 8$ | A. Well, you typically increase the explanatory power by using | ${ }^{02366.088 M} \mathbf{8}$ | use by the United States government. |
| ${ }_{\text {0223200PM }} 9$ | more variables. | ${ }^{02366.109} 9$ | Q. It's an assumption, is it not, that that thirty percent is |
| ${ }_{\text {о2З3322PM }} 10$ | Q. Okay. In the case of Attachment A how many variables did | 0236.49PM 10 | never disbursed to the plaintiffs? |
| о23327PM 11 | you use? | 0236:188M 11 | A. Except to the extent that it builds up -- |
| ${ }_{\text {0233288M }} 12$ | A. I just used the actual data itself, though I suspect if I | ${ }_{0}$ 023628PM $^{12}$ | Q. Well -- |
| ${ }_{\text {о2З33389 }} 13$ | had done a multi-variate model it would not have much impact | ${ }_{0} 0236823 \mathrm{PM} 13$ | A. -- so that is available for disbursement. |
| огз3ззтм $14^{14}$ | either. | ${ }^{02366.55 \mathrm{PM}} 14$ | Q. Well, let's look then -- oh, we can probably do it with |
| огзз3зтм 15 | Q. Now, I want to get to this 69.82 percent disbursement rate | 0236.309\% 15 | this one here. Let me do my calculation real quick. |
| 0233:458M 16 | that you utilized. | 0236.358M 16 | THE COURT: 58 million isn't money the government |
| 0233447PM 17 | And you have to bear with me, your Honor. You stole | 0236.377M 17 | spent, it's money the government didn't have to spend, isn't it? |
| ${ }_{\text {023352PM }} 18$ | some of my cross-examination so I'll try not to be duplicative | 0236:41PM 18 | It's basically the opportunity cost? I mean, it's interest that |
| ${ }^{02333.5689} 19$ | on some of these points. | 0236477PM 19 | did not have to be paid because the money did not have to be |
| ${ }^{\text {0233:57pM }} 20$ | THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Warshawsky. | 0236.50PM 20 | borrowed. |
| 0234.00pM 21 | MR. WARSHAWSKY: I wasn't, nor are my co-counsel. | ${ }_{0} 0236.51 \mathrm{PM} 21$ | THE WITNESS: Correct. But the point I was making is, |
| ${ }^{\text {0234.049 }} 22$ | BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: | ${ }_{0} 0236.53 \mathrm{PM} 22$ | we can't ignore that some of the money, \$423 million, it hasn't |
| ${ }_{\text {0234.04PM }} 23$ | Q. I'll just refer as a seventy percent disbursement rate, if | ${ }^{02377.089} 23$ | been used by the government, it is in the account, and it could |
| 0234.07PM 24 | that's okay. | 0237.088 24 | be disbursed tomorrow presumably to individual Indians. |
| ${ }_{\text {0234.0.7PM }} 25$ | A. That's fine. | 02377.07PM 25 | BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {0237707PM }} 1$ | Q. We can keep it on this page here. | 02:40:19PM 1 | revenue number was disbursed. |
| O2, 37,99PM 2 | We're on the last page of DX Exhibit 41. I'm looking, | 02:40:238M 2 | Q. I beg your pardon? |
| ${ }^{\text {02377.13PM }} 3$ | for example, at 2003, fiscal year 2003, and we take your | 3 | A. It's showing that thirty cents of every corrected revenue |
| ${ }^{\text {0237:17PM }} 4$ | corrected revenues of roughly 180 million, multiply it times 70 | пгр 4 | dollar was disbursed. |
| ${ }^{\text {023722PM }} 5$ | percent, and we get the disbursements of about 126 million, | 02:40:2989 5 | Q. Okay. It's showing that that's how you've calculated it on |
| ${ }^{023} \mathbf{3 7 2 8 8 P M} 6$ | right? | 02:40.338M 6 | Attachment C? |
| ${ }^{\text {0237288PM }} 7$ | A. Yes. | 02:40:34PM 7 | A. That's correct. |
| ${ }_{\text {0237272PM }} 8$ | Q. And then the thirty percent goes off somewhere. The next | 02:40.35PM 8 | Q. When I say Plaintiff', I forget what, 56 ? |
| ${ }^{02} 2373.32 \mathrm{M} ~ 9$ | year, 2004, you do the same thing again, right, we take 195 -- | 02:40:3989 9 | A. That's correct. |
| ${ }^{\text {02373.38m }} 10$ | A. Yes. | 02:403989 10 | Q. So this is Plaintiffs' 56 is the sole basis for your |
| 02377378M 11 | Q. -- times .7, and we get the 136? | 44PM 11 | conclusion that in a given year in every year thirty cents out |
| ог:377.42PM 12 | A. Yes. | орм 12 | of every dollar collected for beneficiaries disappears somewhere |
| ${ }^{\text {02377.3PM }} 13$ | Q. Isn't it correct, then, that implicit in your model that is | 02:40.55PM 13 | and never gets distributed to beneficiaries? |
| 023774889 14 | that thirty percent that's collected in a given year is never | 02:40:58PM 14 | A. That's correct. |
| ${ }^{\text {0237544PM }} 15$ | disbursed for over a hundred years? | 02:40:59PM 15 | Q. Now, Judge Robertson asked some questions which I had in my |
| 0237.75PM 16 | A. Well, you can't say that any particular amount -- I think | 02:4,1:089 16 | outline, but you are aware that the number in the pre-1972 |
| 02.38.338M 17 | Dr. Miller talked about this -- wasn't disbursed, because when | 02:41:15PM 17 | years, you had actual data for disbursements. Judge Robertson |
| 0238.688. 18 | you disburse monies in 2004, are those new or are those for | ярм 18 | pointed out one for you, I believe, for 1926? |
| 02:38:3PM 19 | prior years, but you are saying that thirty percent of the | 22PM 19 | A. There were mentions of disbursements in some of the |
| 02:38:77pM 20 | money, except to the extent that it goes and builds up in the | ¢рм 20 | documents I reviewed, yes. |
| pm 21 | account with a 423, disappears into the coffers of the Treasury | трм 21 | Q. Okay. Can you pull up Attachment B, please? I misplaced |
| 2грм 22 | and goes who knows where to the benefit of the government. | 441:488M 22 | my version but it doesn't matter. All right. We're back at |
| ог:383.32PM 23 | Q. Well, you're saying that this is money, thirty percent of | (241549PM 23 | Plaintiffs' Exhibit 55. Can you tell from reviewing Plaintiffs' |
| 02.38.359M 24 | revenues collected for the beneficiaries each year never get | Sspm 24 | Exhibit 55 how many years outside the 1988 to 2002 period, how |
| ${ }_{0} 02384.4 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | disbursed to the beneficiaries? | 02.42.:5sm 25 | many years you had actual disbursement data that failed to use |
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| ${ }^{02} 238.45 \mathrm{~m}$ M 1 | A. Net of the 423, that's correct. | 02:24.08PM 1 | it? |
| ${ }_{0} 238847 \mathrm{PM} \mathrm{C}$ | Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty | 02:42:09PM 2 | A. No. |
| ${ }^{02388.517 M} 3$ | percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus | ${ }^{024242177 \times M} 3$ | Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? |
| ${ }^{\text {0223857PM }} 4$ | billion dollars, we're going to get -- we'll get the | M 4 | A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The |
| ${ }^{\text {0239.07PM }} 5$ | disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're | ¢ 5 | individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I |
| 0239:11pm 6 | going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal | 02:22383PM 6 | brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said |
| 02:39:168 7 | benefit to the government? | 02:42378M 7 | there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use |
| ${ }_{\text {02399.17PM }} 8$ | A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks | 02:24:428PM 8 | as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that |
| ${ }^{02399208 \mathrm{M}} 9$ | out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust | 02:24.488M 9 | disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. |
| 0239238. 10 | and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small | 02:42:589M 10 | Pallais -- do I have the name right? |
| 0239277m 11 | fraction of the total potential benefit. | 02:425:77M 11 | Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. |
| 02393030M 12 | Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual | 02:43:00PM 12 | A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable |
| ${ }^{02} 399.55 \mathrm{M} 13$ | basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out | 02:47.389M 13 | data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I |
| 02:394.2PM 14 | of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the | 02:47:388M 14 | won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward |
| 02399458M 15 | government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? | 02:37:49PM 15 | from the CPNR. |
| о2399488. 16 | A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. | 02:43:49PM 16 | Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. |
| 0239952PM 17 | Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? | 02:3, 168 PM 17 | Pallais believed that data was unreliable? |
| 0239955PM 18 | A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct | 02:432089 18 | A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a |
| 02399.88PM 19 | evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. | 02:43:323M 19 | detailed and complex analysis. |
| 02400.02PM 20 | Q. And how -- | 02:432727M 20 | Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a |
| 02:40:33PM 21 | A. That's what that indicates. | 02:43.317M 21 | disbursement figure that you could have used instead of your |
| ${ }_{\text {02400.08PM }} 22$ | Q. The CPNR dated indicated -- you're not saying it indicated | 02:43.388P 22 | seventy percent imputed value, that disbursement figure was |
| 02:40:11pm 23 | that thirty cents out of every dollar failed to get disbursed to | 02:43:41PM 23 | actually larger? |
| 02:40:19PM 24 | plaintiffs, are you? | 02743:41PM 24 | A. Several of them were right around seventy percent and |
| 02:40.19PM 25 | A. Well, it's showing that only seventy cents of the corrected | ${ }_{0} 02 \times 3 / 4.4 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | several others were substantially larger, and one was less than |
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Q. Okay. So sitting here today you don't know how, for example, your model would have been impacted had you used all of the available disbursement data rather than simply plugging in the seventy percent calculation?
A. No. I'd have to go back and carefully get that data and substitute it.
Q. Did you ever review any audited figures related to the individual Indian money accounts?
A. When you say "audited," I mean, they aren't a private 11 company so I don't really quite know what you mean by "audited."

12 Q. I'm actually referring to the audit of the IIM system. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:

19 Q. Professor Cornell, I've placed before you what we've had document like this before?
Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
Official Court Reporter don't you blow up --
A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom?
Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen.

02:46:17PM 7 A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it.
02:46:19Pm 8 Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund
02:46:22PM 9 balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And
02:46:30Pm 10 as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the
02:46:33Pм 11 individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir?
${ }^{\text {ог243388 }} \mathbf{1 2}$ A. Yes.
02:46:37PM 13 Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under
02:46:43PM 14 Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for
02:46:48PM 15 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that?
${ }_{024.45 \text { sem }} 16$ A. Yes.
02:46:56PM 17 Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in
02:47:00PM 18 Attachment A?
02:47:01PM 19 A. Well, we'd have to go back and look.
02:47:04PM 20 Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment $A$, the last page, and
02:47:09PM 21 you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for
02:47:28PM 222006 your disbursements figure was how much?
02:47.31PM 23 A. 271.1 million.
02:47:37PM 24 Q. And what was it in the audited report?
02:47:42PM 25 A. It appears to be the $\mathbf{3 7 4 . 5}$ million.
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Q. So it was a hundred million dollars more, roughly; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then 2005, since you have the numbers right in front of you, what's the difference there?
A. We're comparing 202.7 with $\mathbf{2 7 8 . 4}$.
Q. So again, about 75 million?
A. Yes.
Q. In retrospect, do you think it would have been more reasonable to use audited disbursement figures in your analysis than the seventy percent that you imputed for those two years?
A. I don't think even in retrospect that as a financial economist I' $m$ in the position to do the detailed trust accounting. I can develop a model, which I have done, but I'm going to need help from the Court and from both parties to make sure that the most accurate figures go in there.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me ask you another question. Why don't we go, we're looking again at Attachment A , and you can go to the first page if you'd like so we don't have all these footnotes in front of us. Now, again, assume, remember we talked earlier about Osage and I asked you to assume that payments were made directly from -- well, strike that. Your total revenues figure?
A. Corrected revenue is actually the word I use.
Q. I'm sorry, yes. Right. Your corrected revenue figures, Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter
does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under
your model?
A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the --I've testified
before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding
I think that it would.
Q. Okay. Let me see something here.

So bear with me, your Honor.
I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we -- now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is?
A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury.
Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your

Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had
your footnote two -- I'm sorry. Attachment A, Column E, so is
it fair to say that to the extent disbursements were made to
headright owners, that would -- you're assuming it's encompassed Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter

|  | 348 | 350 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02-52:15PM 1 | within the CPNR data, correct? | ${ }^{02} 5.5 .317 \mathrm{PM} 1$ | Professor Cornell, you recall we were reviewing a number of |
| ${ }^{02} 25.2$ 278PM 2 | A. Yes. | 02:55.388M 2 | these commissioner Indian affairs reports earlier today, |
| ${ }^{02} 252 \cdot 188 \mathrm{M} M$ | Q. Okay. | 02:55.42PM 3 | specifically Plaintiffs' Exhibit 45 to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50 |
| 02:52:19PM 4 | A. I'm assuming that the Osage money went into the general IIM | ${ }^{02} 2.5545 \mathrm{SPM} 4$ | related to the years 1915 to 1920? |
| ${ }^{02} 25.2$ 25M 5 | account and then would be paid out, so it would be included in | 02.55.49PM 5 | A. Yes, 1 remember that. |
| 0252:288M 6 | both the revenues and the disbursements. | ${ }^{02} 255.50 \mathrm{PM} 6$ | Q. And if you recall talking about how you utilized the total |
| 02:52:3089 7 | Q. Are you familiar with, have you ever heard about something | 02:55.54PM 7 | income figures on the right-hand side? |
| 02-52.338M 8 | like something called Treasury disbursing symbol 4844? | ${ }^{02} 5.55 .77 \mathrm{PM} 8$ | A. Correct. |
| ${ }^{025252388 \mathrm{P}} \mathrm{P}$ | A. Yes. | ${ }^{02} 5.55 .57 \mathrm{PM} 9$ | Q. And I'm sorry, I should have actually -- we're going to |
| 02.52.389 10 | Q. And what is your understanding of what that is? | 02.56.01PM 10 | have to bring it down a little bit so you can see the years, and |
| 02-52:417PM 11 | A. That that's an account number related to the individual | 02.56.65PM 11 | you can see over on the left-hand side the first year is 1920 |
| 02.52.4.58M 12 | Indian trust. | 02.56.999M 12 | and then there's 1919, 1918 on down like that. Do you see that? |
| 02-52.488M 13 | Q. Okay. And the CPNR data that is utilized, was that simply | 02.56.12PM 13 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }^{025252549 \mathrm{~m}} 14$ | for 4844? | 02:56.13PM 14 | Q. Now, let's go back to where I was before under the last |
| ${ }^{02} 2.52 .55 \mathrm{Sm}$ 15 | A. That's my understanding, yes. | 02.56:77PM 15 | caption. Do you see there are two categories, allotted and |
| 02:52.57PM 16 | Q. So if in fact the payments made to headright owners go | 02:56.389 16 | unallotted? |
| 0253.0.08M 17 | through a different Treasury disbursing symbol, your | 02:56.23PM 17 | A. Yes. |
| 02:53:10pm 18 | disbursements data wouldn't capture that; is that correct? | 02:56.889 18 | Q. Do you have an understanding as to the distinction between |
| 02-53:38PM 19 | A. I believe that's correct. | 02:56.30PM 19 | those two categories? |
| 02:53:49PM 20 | Q. Are you familiar with the terms, and they both refer to | 02:56.30p 20 | A. I think I did when we originally went through this. I |
| 02:53208M 21 | basically the same thing, ACH, EFT, the acronyms? | 02.56.359M 21 | don't recall it now. |
| ${ }_{\text {02-53288M }} 22$ | A. Electronic funds transfer. | 02.56.35PM 22 | Q. Let me see. Would it refresh your recollection if I were |
| ${ }_{02253329 \mathrm{M}} 23$ | Q. Exactly, or ACH, automated clearing house? | 02.56.38PM 23 | to suggest that the unallotted referred to tribal trust as |
| 02:58.339 24 | A. Yes, I'm familiar with those. | ${ }_{02,56.51 P M} 24$ | opposed to individual trust, individual Indian trust, does that |
| ${ }_{02583} 0.34 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | Q. Okay. And are you a -- have you been made aware whether | ${ }_{0} 2.56 .54 \mathrm{PM} 25$ | sound familiar? |
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| 02-53,3989 1 | any disbursements from the Indian -- to the individual Indian | ${ }^{02.56 .555 M} 1$ | A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. |
| ${ }^{02} 0253.45 \mathrm{Sm} \mathrm{M}$ | beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, | ${ }^{02} 5.56 .57 \mathrm{PM} \quad 2$ | Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if |
| 02-53,49PM 3 | being made by checks? | 02:57.02PM 3 | in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as |
| ${ }^{02535.50 P M} 4$ | A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, | ${ }^{02577.088 \mathrm{M}} \mathrm{4}$ | income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it |
| ${ }^{02535.568 M} 5$ | quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the | ${ }^{02,57.4 P \mathrm{PM}} 5$ | fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to |
| 02:53:59PM 6 | way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details | ${ }^{02,57.18 P M} 6$ | the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? |
| 0254.0.03PM 7 | of how these are distributed. | 02:57.23PM 7 | A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. |
| 0254.0.08M 8 | Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments | ${ }^{02557.288 \mathrm{PM}} \mathbf{8}$ | I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual |
| ${ }^{\text {0254:12PM }} 9$ | made by EFT or ACH? | ${ }^{02575729 \mathrm{M}} \mathrm{M}$ | I ndian trust, and if there is a number that was included in |
| 02:54.177M 10 | A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if | 02.57.3PM 10 | that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be |
| ${ }_{0} 0254238 \mathrm{PM} 11$ | some of those were electronic I would think it would include the | 02.57.35PM 11 | overstated. |
| 02:542889 12 | electronic. That would have been my interpretation. | 02:57.368M 12 | Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? |
| ${ }^{02545430 \mathrm{PM}} 13$ | Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with | 02574.2PM 13 | A. Yes. |
| 0254.3.39M 14 | respect -- not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic | 02.57:42PM 14 | Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred |
| 0254.3.389 15 | payments? | 02:57:488 15 | to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can |
| 02:54.3989 16 | A. No. | 02:57.59PM 16 | refresh your recollection. |
| 025.4.40PM 17 | Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic | 02:57.59PM 17 | A. I'm trying to remember, yes. |
| 0254.477M 18 | transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me | 02.58.1PM 18 | Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently -- would you |
| 0254.508M 19 | that your disbursement rate is artificially low? | 02.58.48PM 19 | pull up Cobell 20 , please? |
| 0254.538M 20 | A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to | 02.58.068M 20 | This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of |
| ${ }^{0254.588 \mathrm{P}} \mathbf{2 1}$ | draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and | 02.58:38PM 21 | this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is |
| ${ }^{0255,502 P M} 22$ | understood it, but I couldn't rule out that possibility. | 02.58:77PM 22 | 532 F Supp 2d at page 84. So go to the 41st page of this |
| ${ }^{02555.07 P M} 23$ | Q. I'd like to refer to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50. If you could | 02.58.388M 23 | document. |
| ${ }^{02555: 49 \mathrm{PM}} 24$ | pull that up, please. And I'll tell you what. I'm going to try | ${ }_{02} 2.58 .38 \mathrm{PM} 24$ | And would you blow up the yellow section here? Blow |
| 02:5522PM 25 | to make this easier. If I can step over here and show -- | ${ }^{025884.40 \mathrm{M}} \mathbf{2 5}$ | it up a little bit more. It's been a long day. Okay. |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0258.48PM 1 | Can you see the highlighted section where Judge | 0302: 16 PM 1 | Q. Have you become aware of instances -- strike that actually. |
| 02.584989 2 | Robertson was discussing tribal IIM accounts and tribal IIM | 03.022489 2 | Are you aware that some of the amounts collected |
| ${ }^{02585.49 \mathrm{PM}} 3$ | money, and he states, Tribes utilized IIM accounts as | ${ }^{03} \mathbf{0 . 0 2 8 8 8 \mathrm { m }}$ 3 | thin the IIM system represented deposits made by unsuccessful |
| ${ }^{\text {02590.1PM }} \mathbf{4}$ | convenience as a realitively easy way to obtain checks from the | 03.02:37PM 4 | bidders? |
| 0259.0.08M 5 | IIM system. Such accounts oxymoronically are referred to as | 0300238PM 5 | A. Yes. |
| 59:11PM 6 | tribal IIM accounts containing tribal IIM money, and citing to | 03:02:39PM 6 | Q. Okay. And for example, why don't we go ahead and -- let's |
| 02599:17PM 7 | Kathy Ramirez's testimony. Does that refresh your recollection | 03.02.45PM 7 | go to Defendants' Exhibit 33. This is actually, I believe this |
| ${ }^{02595988 \mathrm{P}} \mathrm{8}$ | as to what tribal IIM money is? | 03.02.55PM 8 | is actually -- I believe this is from one of the same reports |
| ${ }^{02599288 \mathrm{PM}} 9$ | A. I think so, and if I read above it, it refreshes me better | 03.30.01PM 9 | you looked at earlier with Mr. Gingold, but why don't we go to |
| - 10 | that tribal IIM money is money owned by or the tribal unit has | 03.30.999\% 10 | ge two, and if you look in the upper right-hand corner you see |
| 0259.483 11 | the right to that gets deposited into the IIM account. | 03.03:168M 11 | there's under disbursement amounts returned to unsuccessful |
| 02.59.6.6PM 12 | Q. How does Attachment A treat tribal IIM money? | 03.032.17PM 12 | dders, do you see that? |
| 02.59.51Pm 13 | A. It doesn't break it out. | 03.032383M 13 | A. Yes. |
| 02599.57PM 14 | Q. And so for example, to the extent you've included | 03:33:38. 14 | Q. And that represented in that particular year about a third |
| 03.00.09PM 15 | collections within your collections figure tribal IIM money, | 03003288¢ 15 | of the disbursements? |
| 03.00:077 16 | that overstates revenues; is that correct? | 03.03322PM 16 | A. Yes. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { оз.0.0.9ем } 17 \\ & \text { оз:0.:99м } 18 \end{aligned}$ | A. That sounds correct, but again, sitting here under oath I | оэ:03.33РМ 17 | Q. That's very rough, but 2.7 million out of $7.6,7.7$ million, |
|  | wouldn't want to say for sure | 03.03.399\% 18 | right? |
| 03:00208P 19 | Q. Okay. Did you ever become aware of circumstances where | оз:93.399\% 19 | A. Yes. |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 03:00288PM } & 20 \\ 01\end{array}$ | revenues into the IIM system include amounts that subsequently | ¢03.398 20 | Q. And how does your model treat disbursements and collections |
| 03.00.30Р 21 | were transferred to the tribal trust? | 03:303:689 21 | related to unsuccessful bids? |
| 03.00.368M 2 | A. I became aware of instances of that, yes. | sapm 22 | A. Unsuccessful bids, because it would not -- if they were |
|  | Q. And how did those -- how were those transfers accomplished? | 03.035.4PM 23 | earnedd it would not accrew as a benefit to the government and |
|  | I mean, in other words, mechanically? Was a journal entry | 24 | should be debunked out. |
| 03.00:989 2 | prepared? | 03:04.00p 25 | Q. That's happened in your days? |
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| 03:00:49PM 1 | A. I don't know. | 030.4.038M 1 | A. Well, it's hard to say, because with just applying the |
| 03.00.51PM 2 | Q. Well, let's take a look at, I had this marked as | 03.04.088M 2 | ity, it isn't clear exactly what's in that thirty percent. |
| ${ }^{03.00 .55 P M}$ | Defendants' Exhibit 480. This is actually a much larger | Pm 3 | Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and |
| 03,00:00PM <br>  <br>  | exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, | ${ }_{03} 03.421 \mathrm{PM} 4$ | arlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to |
| 03:010:03PM | you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And | ${ }_{03} 03.4255 \mathrm{PM} 5$ | e government. In connection with that, there is discussion -- |
| 03001:17PM 6 | why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a | 03.04328M 6 | THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last |
| 03:01:258M 7 | document like this before? | 03.04.359M 7 | oint. I thought the question was does the thirty percent |
| 03.012.26M 8 | A. No, I don't believe so. | 03.044.41PM 8 | mber of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned |
| 03.012:29PM | Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to | 03.04477PM 9 | to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't |
| 03.0.1.3PM 10 | 14X63039? | 0304.45PM 10 | know. Why is it you don't know? |
| 03:01:35PM 11 | A. Yes. | 03.04.568M 11 | THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of |
| оз:1:3789 12 | Q. Do you know what that is? | 03.04.488M 12 | hat the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to |
| 03:01:3789 13 | A. No. | 03.05.049 13 | operate at a very high level without understanding the micro- |
| 03:01:388. 1 | Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't | 03:05:10PM 14 | data. |
| 03:01728PM 15 | know what the $14 \times 7433$ and on down is? | 03:05:10pm 15 | BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: |
| 03.00:4.48PM 16 | A. No, I don't believe so. | 03.05:12PM 16 | Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent |
| 03:01:77PM 1 | Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being | 03.05:75PM 17 | disbursement does not include money that was returned to |
| 03.0.:51PM 18 | transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? | 03.05271PM 18 | unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? |
| 03.0.154PM 19 | A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. | 03.05288¢ 19 | A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders. |
| 03.0.157PM 20 | Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your | 03.05:40pM 20 | THE COURT: If it were a third, as in this case, it |
| 03.020.17PM 21 | disbursement calculation wouldn't have captured such a transfer | 030.5.42PM 21 | would wipe out the delta. |
| 03.202.08PM 22 | because this wouldn't have been something included in the CPNR | 03.05.4PM 22 | THE WITNESS: Well, that's a third of the |
| 03.22.09PM 23 | data? | 03.054.45M 23 | disbursements, not a third of the revenues, but it would take a |
|  | A. I believe that's correct, but I 'd have to understand it more fully to be sure. | 03.05.50PM 24 | big chunk out of it, yes. |
|  |  | 03.05.59PM 25 | THE COURT: Okay. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03.05.55M 1 | BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: | 03:09327M 1 | should be considered disbursements and they would be -- how they |
| :02PM 2 | Q. By the way, Professor Cornell, and while we're having that | 03:099400M 2 | w I don't kn |
| PM 3 | exchange, which I recall in particular you did this afternoon | 3 | Do you know what years IIM monies were deposited in banks |
| 111PM 4 | talk to Mr. Gingold this afternoon about monies held in banks as | 03.09:999M | her than the Treasury? |
| g8m | opposed to held in the Treasury. Do you recall that? | 03.09:509PM | A. Well, there was a document put up this afternoon I believe |
| 12089 6 | A. Yes. | 03.09.54PM 6 | at continued up until the early 1930s. |
| 220PM 7 | Q. And so, for example, and this was even discussed I believe | 03:09.57PM | Q. So the basis for your understanding is the Terry Keyhoe |
| 4 PM M | during your direct, we looked again at this Defendants' Exhib | 03:30.038M 8 | document that Mr. Gringold showed you? |
| PM 9 | 33, total balance on hand June 30th, 1999, of 10.9 million out | 03:10.066M 9 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }^{\text {03006.39P }} 10$ | of about 959.6 million is reported being held in bonded banks to | 03:30:077 10 | Q. Now, let me ask you about the interest calculations. Why |
| 03006.468M 1 | credit individual Indians, right? | 03:10:177 11 | don't we go back to Column H? I think it's Column H. It was |
| 03:06:489M 12 | A. Yes. | 03:10.2289 12 | Column H of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41. Have you checked the |
| 03.06:49PM 13 | Q. How does your model -- strike that | 03:10.377M 13 | interest rates that were included in this column? |
| ${ }_{0}^{0300.5589} 1$ | Isn't it true that your model, however, treats those | 03:10.3989 14 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }^{03.06 .598 \mathrm{Pm}} 15$ | monies as though they were held in the Treasury? | 03:10.3989 15 | Q. Okay. And the reason I ask is the last two interest rates |
| 03077:72PM 16 | A. The government, like an individual, can have many different | 03:10:44PM 16 | or the ones I should say for 2000 -- let's go to 2005, 2006, and |
| 030077:16PM 17 | Treasury accounts. It could have been prior bank accounts. The | 03.10:4999 17 | 2007. They're all on the same page. Do you see 2005 is 4.22 |
| 03.072.21PM 1 | critical question is when money leaves the bank where does it | 03:11:03PM 18 | percent and 2006 went up a hundred basis points to 5.22 percent? |
| 0307.724PM 19 | go. | 03:311:08PM 19 | A. Yes. |
| 03:0724PM | Q. What's your understanding of the term there to credit | 20 | Q. And then to 6.22 percent in 2007? |
| 03:072989 | Indians. | 14 PM 21 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }_{030.733 \mathrm{~Pa} M}$ | A. I don't know exactly what that means. | 03:11:15PM 22 | Q. I'll tell you, I checked the Schiller Data on the website, |
| $\text { 00077.788 } 2 ;$ | Q. Implicit in your calculation, though, is an assumption that | 03:11:1889 23 | and we can pull that up if you want. Why don't we do that just |
| 03:077.39PM <br> 03.077:43PM | the government has free access to it, that the individual have | 03:112389 24 | to make sure we're comparing it to the right one? We saw a |
|  | no right to it? | 03:112:26m 25 | ghtly different interest rate and I want to make sure we're |
| Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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| ¢m 1 | A. No, I don't think so. | 03:1.1308M 1 | ing to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, |
| 03.07477PM | Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could | 03:11:486M 2 | that |
| 03.077.52PM | tap money into the Treasury? | 03:12.0.55M 3 | A. I don't think you want that page either |
| 03.07.54PM | A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be | 03:12.077M 4 | MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the |
| ${ }_{0}^{03.077 .589} 5$ | disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if | 03:12:098M 5 | witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? |
| 03080855m 6 | there's a deposit at a bank, and $I$ understand that the | 03:12:12729 6 | HE COURT: You may approach the witness, please |
|  | government would have the rights to recall those funds if it | 03:12.255M 7 | MR. WARSHAWSKY |
| 03.08:12PM 8 | chose to. | 03.12.25PM | Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. |
| 03.0822PM 9 | Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those | ${ }_{0}^{03.12 .289 \mathrm{Mm}} 9$ | There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see |
| 03.08277PM 10 | funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your | 03:12.358M 10 | there, that's good. |
| 03,083:309m 11 | model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that | 03:12.386M 11 | The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the |
| 03.083.39M 12 | correct? | 03:12:4009 12 | ars and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. |
| 03.083.3PM 13 | A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be | 03.12:43PM 13 | A. Yes, I see that. |
| 03:088.40PM 14 | saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that | 03:12:44PM 14 | Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76 ? |
| 03, 88:44PM 15 | went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. | 03.12:4989 15 | A. Yes. |
| 03:08.8889 16 | Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of | 03.12:4989 16 | Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in |
| 03.085.52 17 | the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or | 03.12.517m 17 | Attachment A? |
| 03.88:599\% 18 | pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the | 03.12.538m 18 | A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can |
| 03.090.389M 19 | alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition | 03:13.00PM 19 | check that during the break. |
| $\text { 03090.7קM } 20$ | would be a hundred percent. | 03:3.3027M 20 | Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate |
| 03.090.08P 21 | Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under | 03:13.068M 21 | was the appropriate way to gage interest here? |
| 03:09:12PM 22 | disbursements, the third line, checks drawn by Indians on bank | о3:3:309\% 22 | A. Well, I believe that the government borrowing rate was, and |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 00.39: 18 \mathrm{PM} \end{array} 23$ | accounts. Can you draw any inference from that as to who had | 03:31:12PM 23 | as I testified directly, I thought the average of the ten-year |
|  | the right to the funds in those bank accounts? | 03:13:177PM 24 | rate over the one-hundred-and-some-year period would be a good |
| ${ }_{03,0927 \mathrm{PM}} 25$ | A. If those funds were drawn by individual Indians, those <br> Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR <br> Official Court Reporter | ${ }_{\text {03:13200M }} 25$ |  |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03:13238PM 1 | Q. Now -- | 03:16.66PM 1 | A. No. I interpreted as the intermediate. There's '20s and |
| 03:13.24PM 2 | A. And it's also a number that you have available. For | 03:16.222PM 2 | '30s. |
| 03:13288M 3 | example, the government hasn't issued 30-year bonds throughout | 03:16:22PM 3 | Q. But you said that data wasn't available for the entire -- |
| 03:133289 4 | the time period. | ${ }^{03} 16.624 \mathrm{PM} 4$ | A. Not continuously. |
| оз:13:38>M 5 | Q. Are you familiar with the factors that a money manager | 03:16.25PM 5 | Q. Okay. But of the available data, the ten-year was on the |
| 03:13.3889 6 | would consider in making borrowing decisions? | 03:16.289PM 6 | high end, right? |
| 03:13:4009 7 | A. When you say a money manager, are you talking about a | 03:16.338M 7 | A. A little bit, but I felt the ten-year was a reasonable |
| 03:13:359m 8 | government money manager or just any money manager? | ${ }^{03,16.3 .389} \mathbf{8}$ | approximation of the government's borrowing costs. |
| 03:13.4.49PM 9 | Q. We can take any money manager first. | 03.16.388PM 9 | Q. Have you undertaken any efforts to become informed about |
| 03:31.51Pm 10 | A. Okay. Yes, I think I am. | 03:16:41pm 10 | how the government actually does make decisions as to how much |
| 03:17.53PM 11 | Q. And what are those factors? | 03, 16,44PM 11 | to borrow? |
| 03:13:568M 12 | A. Expected borrowing costs; risk. Those would be the two | 03:16.4.48M 12 | A. As to how much? |
| 03.14.04PM 13 | most important. | 03:16.488PM 13 | Q. Right. |
| 03:4.4.05M 14 | Q. Okay. You look at the time that you're going to need to | ¢¢ 14 | A. Other than the general point that I spoke of a moment ago, |
| 03, 14.09PM 15 | borrow; is that correct? | 03.16.51PM 15 | no. |
| 03:14:10PM 16 | A. If you're a very long-lived entity that just continually | 03.16:51PM 16 | Q. Well, and you were here this morning of course for Dr. |
| 03:14.13PM 17 | roles over that's less important. The U.S. government never | 03.16.65PM 17 | Miller's testimony. So let's try to go through it this way. In |
| 03:14:199\% 18 | really pays back its debt. In fact, it just gets bigger. | 03:17:01pm 18 | Attachment A, if you want to pull up Attachment A again, Exhibit |
| 03.14288. 19 | Q. We'll talk about that. Then let's talk about the people | 03.17:08PM 19 | 41, for 2007, I'm going to take your corrected -- well, nominal |
| 03:14.27PM 20 | that make borrowing decisions for the United States. What do | :17:20PM 20 | amount to the government. That's the net amount of revenue over |
| 32PM 21 | you know -- I'm sorry. Let me ask it differently. What's the | звр 21 | disbursements as you've calculated it, right? |
| 03:4,4.3PM 22 | basis for your understanding about how those decisions are made, | 03:77:317PM 22 | A. Yes. |
| 03:4,48889 23 | how much to borrow, say, at Treasury? | 03:77.3:17PM 23 | Q. And that's what you applied the interest rate to, correct? |
| IPM 24 | A. Are you talking about how much to borrow, or how to borrow | 03:17.7389 24 | A. Correct. |
| 03.14.45PM 25 | it? How to borrow, I mean what term of securities to issue. | 03.17.7.889 25 | Q. So 102 million, and we'll divide it by 52 weeks, it's about |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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| 03,14.49PM | Q. I'll take either one. I have a suspicion it's a more | 03:17:749PM 1 | roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is |
| 03:14.5.9PM 2 | complicated question than I understand. So why don't you | 03:17.7.5sM 2 | that correct? |
| 03:14.57PM 3 | answer? | 03:17.55PM 3 | A. Based on those numbers, yes. |
| 03.14.588M 4 | A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better | ${ }^{03.17 .588 \mathrm{P}} \mathrm{4}$ | Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't |
| ${ }^{03.15017 \mathrm{PM}} 5$ | witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow | 03.18.05PM 5 | have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that |
| 03:15.088m 6 | enough to meet the operations to which the United States | 03:18.098 6 | the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and |
| 03.15.088M 7 | government has committed itself, which includes all the | 03:18:479M 7 | makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. |
| 03:15:10PM 8 | programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the | 03:1821PM 8 | A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. |
| 03:15:689 9 | interest and the principal on the maturing debt. | 03:1824PM 9 | Q. So $\$ 2$ million, that is going to be material to a borrowing |
| 03:15.2089 10 | Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting | 03:18.317pm 10 | decision? |
| 03:152389 11 | together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try | 03.18322PM 11 | A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek |
| 03:15.288M 12 | to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or |  | mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say |
| 03.15.32PM 13 | weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular | ${ }_{0} 03.184 / 4 \mathrm{PM} 13$ | that you can't consider it that way. |
| 03:15.35PM 14 | debt instrument like the ten-year bond? | 03:18,428PM 14 | Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April |
| 03:15.377M 15 | A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a | 03:18.4889 15 | and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even |
| 03:15.408. 16 | hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration | 03.78.5.2PM 16 | than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't |
| 03:15.4.48PM 17 | to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a | 03.78.5.5sM 17 | affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and |
| 03:15.4.9PM 18 | marginal change. | 03.18.588PM 18 | I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It |
| 03:15.4.9PM 19 | Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times | 03:19.027M 19 | wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million |
| 03.15.53PM 20 | when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger | 03.19.088м 20 | people thought the same way it would affect the government in a |
| 03315.59Pm 21 | than short-term rates, right? | 03:19:10pm 21 | very real way so every little bit affects them. It's just that |
| 03:16:01PM 22 | A. Somewhat. That's a very hotly researched and disputed | 03:19:15PM 22 | when you look at any little bit in isolation it seems |
| 03:16.65PM 23 | issue, but typically that's been the case, yes. | 03:19:999\% 23 | unimportant, but to the extent that they don't have two million |
| 03:16.077M 24 | Q. Okay. But for purposes of your choices, the ten-year bond | 03:19:238M 24 | here they are going to have to get it elsewhere. |
| 03:16:117PM 25 | was the long-term rate, right? | 03:19.25PM 25 | Q. Well, that's the question I want to ask. Let's take that |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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two million. Assume further, though, that when the government makes the decision about how much to borrow, they don't borrow based on a projection of, well, we need an extra two million.
They say we're going to borrow, we're going to use a half billion dollars as the threshold. Say we calculate, we need 2.2 billion coming up, we're going to borrow two billion. If we need 2.8 billion we're going to borrow three billion. Are you with me?
A. Yes.

10 Q. If that's the actual -- and I'm sure I've oversimplified
11 it, but if that's basically the decision-making process that
12 goes on, isn't it true that that $\$ 2$ million isn't going to tip
13 the borrowing decision one way or the other?
14 A. I don't think that's correct logic because that could be 15 true of any $\mathbf{\$ 2}$ million receipt and yet in the aggregate they do.
16 So no, that's incorrect. \$2 million means $\$ 2$ million of added
17 borrowing. The way it flows through the actual decision making
18 may be complex but the only way to think about it is it would
19 increase the borrowing needs by $\$ 2$ million.
20 Q. And with whom are you going to aggregate the $\$ 2$ million of 21 income from the IIM trust here?
22 A. With all the other sources that the government has in 23 revenue. THE COURT: A short break? Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter

20
21

18 Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries
19 checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that
A. No.

MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much.

> Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Any redirect?

MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GINGOLD:
Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not?
A. I remember that line of questioning. any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals?
Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the Osage individuals was applied even though you didn't have a single shred of evidence that any money went to the Osage, correct?

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
Official Court Reporter
Q. In Attachment A in your model. the IIM trust for the benefit of individual I ndians, not for the particular account.

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter
Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM
trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model?

## A. I think so, but I 'd want to make sure I understand it a

 little further.THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a
little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA.

BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it?

THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD:
15 Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds 16 held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what 17 happens to the funds when a check is actually written?
18 A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared?
19 Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what
20 happens to the funds?
трм 21 A. No.
Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for

23 an individual Indian that comes out of the 14X6039 account, if
24 the funds are then immediately transferred to Treasury, general
25 account, and they stay in the general account until the checks Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter
are negotiated or paid, is it your understanding those funds are being held in the general account until such time, if my
wouldn't they too remain in the general Treasury until the

14 A. The way you've described it, yes, it sounds so.
15 Q. Now, if in fact all of the funds of the Osage that are held
16 in that account, or no, 98-and-a-half percent, assuming
17 98-and-a-half percent of the funds held in the Osage account are
18 soley the only rights to those funds are solely in the
19 individuals, would you assume that those funds are the
20 individuals' funds? If all rights to those funds are the
03.26:52PM 21 individuals' rights, would you assume those funds are the

23 A. Yes.
24 Q. If in fact the individuals paid taxes on those funds would you assume that they're the individuals' funds?
Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
Official Court Reporter

2 Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the receive whatever injuries they sustained they could also recover 24 in damages on that which remains if they chose to bring that 25 action in the proper court.

THE COURT: I didn't understand that. You're asking for a sum of money that is restitution.

BY MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.
THE COURT: You're asking for this restitutionary sum
of money to be given to a plaintiff class.
MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.
THE COURT: Are owners of Osage headrights members of the plaintiff class?

MR. GINGOLD: Yes, they are. They're individual
Indian trust beneficiaries in accordance with February 4th, 1998.

THE COURT: Okay. And is it your position that if this money, that this hypothetical award of restitution is made to the plaintiff class, that it will be distributed equally among all Native Americans?

BY MR. GINGOLD: What we've said in our briefs is this Court can make a determination on how the funds should be distributed. We believe, however, it's within the discretion of this Court, your Honor. We believe, however, because we're seeking benefit conferred, it is proper to distribute the funds on a per capita basis. To the extent that an individual --

THE COURT: Have you told the Osage about that?
MR. GRINGOLD: Yes, as a matter of fact we did. We went down to the Osage when we filed this action in 1996. We met with the Osage individuals in the Osage tribe and they
Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
Official Court Reporter

Yes, we did, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Proceed.
MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most
important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite
carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would
be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the
extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise
wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court
because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained.
BY MR. GINGOLD:
Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're dealing with a situation where we, Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to apply a seventy-percent rate across the board without regard to what tribe any individual is a member of?
A. Correct.
Q. And was there a reason Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to do that, do you know?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Was there any issue with respect to the reliability of the

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
Official Court Reporter


|  | 376 |  | 378 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03366.57PM 1 | methodology and the disbursement numbers he used were the | 03:40.038M 1 | With regard to the seventy percent disbursement |
| 03:377.00pm 2 | numbers you gave him. He's told us that the Osage should not -- | 03:30.0.8PM 2 | figure, did you testify that you assumed that all disbursements |
| 03.377.58M 3 | he's told us he isn't sure whether the Osage should be in there | 03:30:109\% 3 | by check are included in that figure? |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { оз:37:09Pм } \end{array}$ | or not. He's told us that he didn't use real disbursement | 03:30:128M 4 | A. Yes. I believe all disbursements by check are included in |
| ${ }_{\text {03:37:12PM }} 5$ | numbers. He told us there was no adjustment for the size of | 03:40:188M 5 | that figure. |
| ${ }_{\text {03, } 377 \text { :15PM }} 6$ | checks that were not cashed. He told us that, you know, if you | 03:30:99PM 6 | Q. So if a check was paid to an unsuccessful bidder, it would |
| ${ }_{0} 03.37228 \mathrm{P}$ 7 | want to get back to what he told us and do redirect on that, | ${ }^{03,40.238 \mathrm{P}} \mathrm{7}$ | be included in that figure? |
| 03:3727PM 8 | fine, but to bring back this whole litany of unreliable data to | 03, 30:249 8 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }_{\text {03:377389 }} 9$ | support the instructions you gave him, I don't buy it, so as far | ${ }_{0} 03.4024 \mathrm{PM} 9$ | Q. And if a check was paid to a tribe, it would be included in |
| 09373737. 10 | as I'm concerned -- | 03:402889 10 | that figure? |
| 03377388P 11 | MR. GINGOLD: I wasn't doing that | 03:40288PM 11 | A. That would be my understanding. |
| ${ }_{\text {03, } 37700 \mathrm{Pm}} 12$ | THE COURT: -- I can either tune out or you can move | ${ }_{\text {03, } 40.308 \mathrm{~m}} 12$ | Q. And even if a check was a fraudulent check, it would be |
| оз:37743>9 13 | on. | 03:40.389 13 | included in that figure, correct? |
| о9377.38PM 14 | MR. GINGOLD: I'm going to move on, your Honor, but | 03,40.34PM 14 | A. Yes. |
| ${ }_{\text {osar. } 7.5 \mathrm{sem}} 15$ | that wasn't the purpose of this being introduced. | 03:40.3.5PM 15 | Q. So did you assume that one hundred percent of the checks |
| 03.7.5.5PM 16 | BY MR. GINGOLD: | 03,40.3989 16 | were disbursed without regard to whether or not they were paid |
| 03:37.51PM 17 | Q. Do you recall Mr. Warshawsky asked you questions about | 03:30.44PM 17 | to the individual Indian trust beneficiaries? |
| 03.377.55M 18 | funds held outside the Treasury and in banks? | 03:30.4.48PM 18 | A. Yes. |
| 03:377.589 19 | A. Yes. | 03,40.477M 19 | Q. And that's the reason you excluded them from your |
| ${ }_{03,377.589} 20$ | Q. And whether or not they're considered in the decisions, | 03, 40.4.49PM 20 | calculation of benefits conferred, correct? |
| оэз3.38PM 21 | borrowing decisions of the Treasury, correct? | 03.40.51pm 21 | A. Yes. |
| озз3.05р 22 | A. Yes. | ${ }_{0}^{03.40 .517 P M} 22$ | Q. So there was no assumption that the funds were actually |
| 03:38.088 23 | Q. And whether or not they should be considered as funds held | 03:30.54PM 23 | paid to individuals, was there? |
| ${ }_{\text {03, } 3812 \mathrm{PM}} 24$ | by the Treasury anyway since they're outside the Treasury and | 03:40.568 24 | A. I couldn't prove that, no. |
| ${ }_{\text {03, 38:15PM }} 25$ | the banks, do you recall that? | 03:30.58PM 25 | Q. Well, no evidence has been presented to you in that regard, |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
|  | Official Court Reporter |  | Official Court Reporter |
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| 03:38:168M 1 | A. Yes. | 03, 41:04PM 1 | correct? |
| ${ }_{0}^{03,38.177 \times M} 2$ | Q. I'd like to identify a case, U.S. versus $\$ 277,000$ U.S. | 03, 41:04PM 2 | A. Correct. I just know they were paid out of that account. |
| ${ }_{\text {03,38830PM }} \mathbf{3}$ | currency, and you testified that you're not familiar with budget | ${ }^{\text {03,441:18PM }} \mathbf{3}$ | MR. GINGOLD: If I could have one minute, your Honor. |
| ${ }_{\text {03, } 3838 \mathrm{sPM}} 4$ | issues, did you not? | ${ }^{\text {03,41208PM }} 4$ | (There was a pause in the proceedings.) |
| ${ }_{\text {оз38399\% }} 5$ | A. Not in any real detail. | ${ }^{\text {03,41298PM }} 5$ | MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, we have no further |
| 0338842PM 6 | Q. I'd like to turn to page six of this decision. You did | 03:41:3089 6 | questions. |
| ${ }^{\text {03,38.5spm }} 7$ | listen to Dr. Miller's testimony, correct? | 03,4113089 7 | MR. WARSHAWSKY: Nothing further |
| 03.38.5889 8 | A. I did. | 03:41:317PM 8 | THE COURT: If there's nothing further for Professor |
| ${ }_{0}^{0338.588 P M} 9$ | Q. And your understanding of Dr. Miller's testimony is what? |  | Cornell, thank you, sir. That completes your testimony and |
| озз39.08р 10 | THE COURT: About everything? | 03,4.13779M 10 | you're excused. |
| озз39.08р 11 | MR. GINGOLD: No. With regard to the funds held in | 03:41:3889 11 | THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 03399100PM 12 | banks, not in the Treasury, their use by the Treasury with | 03:41:3989 12 | (Witness excused at about 3:42 p.m.) |
| 03.399:15PM 13 | respect to the borrowing decisions or the ability to have | 03, 414.42PM 13 | THE COURT: As I understand it, we're out of witnesses |
| 03399:88PM 14 | control over those funds. | 03, 4.1/4P9 14 | for today; is that correct? |
| 03.399:889 15 | BY MR. GINGOLD: | 03,414:458M 15 | MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. |
| оз392089 16 | Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? | 03:41477PM 16 | THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, |
| 03:392289 17 | A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the | 03, 41:500PM 17 | we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think |
| 03:392889 18 | fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available | 03.4.1.588M 18 | we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And |
| оз3922989 19 | to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether | 03:420.49PM 19 | then the witness will be who? |
| озЗ993289 20 | they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they | 03:420:88PM 20 | MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais. |
| озз993589 21 | were not, it's the same thing as well. | 03:32:10pm 21 | THE COURT: Mr. Pallais. All right. We're adjourned |
| 0339940PM 22 | Q. It's the same thing from the point of view of an economic | 03:42:138M 22 | for the day. Thank you very much, counsel. |
| 03:399438M 23 | impact, correct? | 03:42:177PM 23 | (Proceedings adjourned at about 3:42 p.m.) |
| 03:3994PM 24 | A. Correct. | 24 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {03,39968PM }} 25$ | Q. We don't need to go into that issue. | 25 |  |
|  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |  | Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR |
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