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| 1 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 1 | for again, please? |
| 2 | BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: | 2 | A. Statement on auditing standards. |
| 3 | Q. Mr. Pallais, you testified that you have not reviewed any | 3 | Q. Now, SAS standards apply to audits, correct? |
| 4 | government records underlying the IIM accounts, correct? | 4 | A. Correct. |
| 00:03:11 5 | A. Correct. | 00:05:44 5 | Q. And more specifically SAS 31 applies to audits, correct? |
| 6 | Q. And you also testified, did you not, that you have not | 6 | A. It did apply to audits, yes. |
| 7 | reviewed any government records underlying Interior's historical | 7 | Q. And again, what is G-A-A-S, GAAS? |
| 8 | accounting effort, correct? | 8 | A. That's generally accepted auditing standards. |
| 9 | A. Correct. | 9 | Q. And that applies to audits, does it not? |
| 00:03:21 10 | Q. Now, regarding what you call external corroborating | 00:06:02 10 | A. Primarily, yes. |
| 11 | evidence, you wouldn't consider a check to be inherently | 11 | Q. And what is G-A-A-P, GAAP? |
| 12 | unreliable, would you? | 12 | A. It's generally accepted accounting principles. |
| 13 | A. No. | 13 | Q. And that likewise applies to audits, right? |
| 14 | Q. Likewise, you wouldn't consider information in an oil and | 14 | A. Generally accepted accounting principles applies to a lot |
| 00:03:40 15 | gas lease to be inherently unreliable, would you? | 00:06:16 15 | more than audits. Audits may use generally accepted accounting |
| 16 | A. No. | 16 | principles, but its application is far broader than audits. |
| 17 | Q. How about information in a farming lease? Inherently | 17 | Q. Far broader. You did say in your report, though, did you |
| 18 | unreliable? | 18 | not, that GAAP principles do not apply to the summarization of |
| 19 | A. Probably not. | 19 | transactions reported in the HSAs. Correct? |
| 00:03:51 20 | Q. Likewise, a grazing lease, inherently unreliable? | 00:06:36 20 | A. That's correct. They are intended to be reported under |
| 21 | A. Information is a broad concept. Certainly the provisions | 21 | another basis of accounting. |
| 22 | in it would not be inherently unreliable. | 22 | Q. Now, an audit is not identical to an attestation |
| 23 | Q. Keeping within the context of this external corroborating | 23 | engagement, is it? |
| 24 | evidence, would you consider information in a timber contract | 24 | A. No. |
| 00:04:12 25 | inherently unreliable? | 00:06:48 25 | Q. Likewise, an audit is not identical to a consulting |
|  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |
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| 1 | A. Probably not. | 1 | engagement, correct? |
| 2 | Q. What about information in a court order? Would you | 2 | A. Correct. |
| 3 | consider that inherently unreliable? | 3 | Q. You testified, Mr. Pallais, that you base your opinions on |
| 4 | A. Again, probably not. | 4 | the assumption that internal documents were unreliable based on |
| 00:04:29 5 | Q. You testified, did you not, that reconciliations are not a | 00:07:09 5 | the history of independent audits, correct? |
| 6 | standard accounting service. | 6 | A. I think that's generally what $I$ said. |
| 7 | A. Yes, I did. | 7 | Q. Now, it's true, isn't it, that one basis for qualified |
| 8 | Q. Now, your resume reflects no engagements by government | 8 | audit opinions is what's called a contingent liability, correct? |
| 9 | agencies; is that correct? | 9 | A. It can be. Typically, we don't qualify for contingent |
| 00:04:41 10 | A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that question. | 00:07:39 10 | liabilities since SAS 58 came out in the 1980s. |
| 11 | Q. Your resume indicates that you have not been hired by any | 11 | Q. Contingent liabilities could include such things as pending |
| 12 | government agencies; is that correct? | 12 | litigation. Is that not true? |
| 13 | A. You mean I have not been employed by a government agency? | 13 | A. Yes. That's true. |
| 14 | Q. No, contracted. | 14 | Q. I want to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding |
| 00:04:55 15 | A. I have done consulting for a government agency, but my | 00:07:57 15 | completeness, Mr. Pallais. You believe that reporting on |
| 16 | resume doesn't list all of my clients. | 16 | recorded amounts without regard to whether there are other items |
| 17 | Q. Your resume does not indicate any testimony on behalf of | 17 | that should have been included is insufficient, correct? |
| 18 | government clients, does it? | 18 | A. Correct. |
| 19 | A. It doesn't, no. It doesn't mean $I$ haven't done it; it just | 19 | Q. In other words, in your opinion, if a beneficiary's account |
| 00:05:15 20 | means it's not on my resume. | 00:08:18 20 | was mismanaged, you believe that the reporting on the recorded |
| 21 | Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you recall testifying, do you not, that | 21 | amounts should consider that mismanagement, correct? |
| 22 | if this were an audit -- do you remember using those words? | 22 | A. I'm sorry. You lost me with the word "consider." |
| 23 | A. I don't, but I will trust that I used those words. | 23 | Q. I'm sorry. If a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, you |
| 24 | Q. I'm going to talk to you a little bit about some of the | 24 | believe that any reporting on that beneficiary's account should |
| 00:05:32 25 | terminology in your report. S-A-S, SAS, what does that stand | 00:08:41 25 | take into consideration that mismanagement, correct? |
|  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |  | Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR |
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A. "Take into consideration" was not a lot better than "consider." I'm not sure whether you're saying the reported amount should consist of what actually happened in the account, what should have happened in the account, or whether the report to the recipient should say your account has been mismanaged. I'm not sure -- or perhaps a fourth alternative. I'm not sure which one you're asking.
Q. I think it was your second alternative. You would argue, would you not, Mr. Pallais, that any accounting statement should consider whether the information was -- whether the actual account amount was properly recorded, correct?

THE COURT: Can you give the witness a verb different from "consider"?

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: I'll try, Your Honor.
THE COURT: "Report"? "Reflect"?
MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: How about "reflect," Your Honor? THE COURT: All right. How about "reflect"?

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Mr. Pallais, would you agree that in your opinion if a beneficiary's account was mismanaged, any accounting statement provided to the beneficiary should reflect such mismanagement?

MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I think
this is beyond the scope of direct. I didn't ask him anything about mismanagement of accounts. It's beyond the scope of what this hearing is about.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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THE COURT: Well, management and mismanagement has
become -- or people think it's become kind of a term of art in
this court. I'm not sure that it is, and I'll let the witness
answer the question if he can. Overruled.
BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Do you believe, Mr. Pallais, that any -- well, let's say an

HSA to a particular beneficiary should reflect any mismanagement found by the accountants?
A. I haven't spent a lot of time thinking about what should be reflected in the HSA. My focus has been on whether the amounts are supported. So it could be acceptable, I suppose, for an HSA to be misstated and for the accountant to say the HSA is misstated. I'm really having trouble answering the question as you posed it.
Q. Well, let me move on to a related portion of your expert report. Do you recall saying that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect fraudulent financial reporting?
A. No. I believe that's what the accounting standards manual said. And what my report says is that it provides no guidance about how the order should do that.
Q. Do you remember stating in your report that Interior's reconciliation process should include provisions to detect misappropriations?
A. No. I don't recall saying that in my report at all.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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Q. All right. In the documents you have reviewed,

Mr. Pallais, have you seen any direct evidence of fraudulent
financial reporting?
A. No.
Q. Likewise, have you seen any direct evidence of misappropriation?
A. No.
Q. Now, in assessing the 2007 Plan, Mr. Pallais, one must consider the nature of the procedures called for in the plan, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's also true, is it not, that in assessing the plan
one must consider the government's proposed sampling approach, correct?
A. I believe so. That wasn't part of my engagement, but I expect that is a true statement.
Q. And in fact, not being part of your engagement, you did not actually analyze the government's sampling approach, correct?

## A. That's correct.

Q. You mentioned the various accounting firms that have worked
for Interior on this project. Is it your testimony,
Mr. Pallais, that all five of those accounting firms contracted
by Interior have not applied sound professional judgment?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Pallais, you're not familiar with the requirements of
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1 the 1994 Trust Reform Act, are you?
A. No.
A. I don't believe so.

6 Q. You have not interviewed those actually doing the
7 accounting work, have you?
8 A. I may have to change the answer to the question $I$ just
9 answered previously. I may have read court opinions on that. I don't recall them, but in the name of fair play, I may have read
11 those.
Q. Thank you for that clarification.
A. Sorry. Go ahead and ask your other question again.
Q. My next question, Mr. Pallais, was you haven't interviewed

15 any Interior accountants working on the project, have you?
16 A. No.
Q. You haven't interviewed any Interior contractors working on the project, have you?
19 A. No.
20 Q. You haven't interviewed those with supervisory
21 responsibility for the project, have you?
22 A. No.
23 Q. The only documents you have reviewed are those provided to
24 you by Plaintiffs' counsel, correct?
00:14:32 25 A. Yes.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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1 Q. You have not reviewed any congressional appropriations 2 documents, have you?

## A. No.

4 Q. You have not reviewed any Interior budget requests, have
you?
6 A. No.
7 Q. In formulating your opinion, you did not estimate the cost
8 of adopting your approach, did you?
9 A. No.
Q. You haven't reviewed Dr. Angel's report on records, have 11 you?
12 A. No.
13 Q. Likewise, you've not had a chance to read a transcript of 14 his testimony, correct?
15 A. I have not read it. I'm not sure whether it's accurate to
Q. You've not been to OHTA, have you?

21 A. No.
Q. Understood. Yes, sir. You have not been to Lenexa, have you?
A. No.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Pallais, I think that completes your testimony. You may step down, sir. Thank you.
(The witness steps down.) Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we had two brief matters to raise before we call the next witness, if we might.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. DORRIS: Yesterday I failed to move in the
exhibits for Mr. Homan's report, which was Plaintiffs' 4210, and the Arthur Andersen audit that we reviewed with Mr. Homan yesterday, and it's been referred to again today, which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 575, and I would move for those to be admitted.

THE COURT: 4210 and 575 are received.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, may we address that briefly?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Mr. Homan's report has attached to it both his previous report and I believe his seven days of testimony. Government has no objection to the admission of his 2007 report, but we would object to including the seven days of prior testimony and his earlier report.

THE COURT: Fair enough.
MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would suggest on his earlier report, which is attached to it, it is a report he prepared. I don't oppose any motion to not include the prior testimony.

THE COURT: He's talking about his testimony.
MR. DORRIS: But the prior report is incorporated into Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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THE COURT: Well, to what end? The proffer has been -- the proffer is just that. It's a proffer of what the testimony of Representative Klinger would be. I said I won't hear him, so the proffer is really the record that the Plaintiffs are making that I should hear him. What do you want to add to it?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Well, I was not clear -- and that's
fine if that's the status of it. I was not clear from our final pretrial conference whether you would then view that in reaching a determination on whether to grant the motion in limine or permit the testimony. If a decision was going to be coming in that vein, then I would like to address it. If it's only a proffer as to what would have been heard, then that's certainly fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I need to go back and review the bidding. You don't have to respond to it now. We may take it up at a later time.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Harper.
MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
MR. HARPER: I would like to call as our next witness
Mr. Richard Fitzgerald.
(The witness takes the stand.)
MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Mr. Fitzgerald. Would Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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you state your full name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Richard v. Fitzgerald.
F-I-T-Z-G-E-R-A-L-D.
MR. HARPER: Your Honor, briefly, the proffer for this
witness is that he is an expert witness. We filed an expert
report, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285. And he's an expert, among other things, on operations of trusts, standards of government trusts and the systems necessary to manage and administer trust assets. He's been previously designated and has been approved as a witness in the trial 1.5 in this proceeding.

THE COURT: All right.
RICHARD FITZGERALD, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, I would like to go over briefly with the Court some of your background. Could you tell me -- you started at the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at some point. Can you tell me what your first position there was?
A. Yes. In 1963, after graduating from law school, $I$ joined the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency as a trust examiner at the entry level, and $I$ was engaged for the next year and $a$ half or so in the examination of the trust departments of various banks, national banks, here, in what was -- here in the Washington, D.C., area, in what was then known as the fifth

$$
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national bank region.
That region was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia, and covered the states from Delaware down to North Carolina, Georgia. I was involved in the on-site exams of those banks. Do you want to know how those exams went at all? Q. Yes. A. They were surprise exams back at that time. We would get orders on a Friday night to be someplace on a Monday morning. We would go to the bank before it opened, introduce ourselves as federal bank examiners. We would go in and seal the records, both the vault and the individual account records in the trust department.

We would then, among other things -- many of these things went on simultaneously, particularly in the larger institutions. We would look at the records of the bank and then go into the records of the individual accounts to see that the two records of securities agreed one with another. That included, $I$ remember this distinctly, having to spend many hours in vaults counting securities, bonds, for instance.

We then go into the records of the individual accounts. We would review the governing document, whether it was a will or a trust agreement or what have you. We would then go and we would review the administration by that institution of those accounts to see to it that the administration of those accounts agreed with and were consistent with the governing documents and state Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
law, if that was applicable, and certainly the principles that govern trusts in general.

A report was then written, and that report was several pages depending on -- and many, many pages in the larger banks like Riggs and First National Bank of Maryland and those sorts of places. That report would have basically a balance sheet on the front, indicating how big the department was. A second page would list any violations of law and any violations of fiduciary principles. The rest of the report would then highlight those problems with reference to the individual accounts, where those problems had been discovered.

That report was then forwarded to the regional office. It was signed by the representative in trust, who is the person in charge of the examination. That report would then be filed with the -- forwarded to the Richmond office, where it would be reviewed by more senior and more experienced trust people, and by the people who are in charge of the commercial side of the bank, because the theory was that if there was a major default in a trust account or in a trust department, that the reparations for that would have to come out of the capital of the bank, which would then threaten the solvency of the larger bank. That's why that -- why we did trust exams.

And the reason that, back in the Kennedy administration, why lawyers were doing this -- prior to that it was commercial people who were doing it. But the reason that lawyers were

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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doing this was that Comptroller Saxon felt that it was the
threat from the violations of the law rather than just the commercial practices that was the real threat.
Q. If I can turn your attention to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285.

Mr. Fitzgerald, do you recognize this document?
A. Yes.
Q. Or this page, I guess?
A. That's the cover of my report.
Q. And if I can turn to page 13 of this document, which is the first exhibit, Exhibit 1 to your report. Is this essentially a synopsis of your work history?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you just described, your first position was with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. In very brief form, what are the responsibilities of the OCC?
A. The OCC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of National Banks, which is its full title, charter national banks and thereafter regulate those banks back at that time through, primarily through on-site examinations.

The office was engaged in seeing to it that the banks remained solvent, and when they were deemed to be insolvent they closed the bank and, with the assistance of the FDIC, in most cases were able to sell those insolvent banks to other banks.

We were also engaged -- the office itself was engaged -- am I going too far or -- the office itself was engaged --

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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THE COURT: Was that question addressed to me? (Laughter)

It is a bit of a narrative. You can kind of bite off your answers and make him ask you another question.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, it mentions here that in 1965 you were commissioned as a representative of trust. And briefly, what is a representative of trust?
A. The representative in trust was the -- bank examination is an apprentice process, and there were three levels, and if $I$ remember correctly there was an assistant in trust, which is what I was originally, then an associate, and then a representative. And the representatives were the most senior, most experienced field examiners.

I became a representative in trust when $I$ became the principal assistant to the deputy comptroller of the currency for trusts, who oversaw the whole trust examination process.
Q. In that position, what were some of your responsibilities?

THE COURT: Mr. Harper, I'm not sure we need all of that. I've just reviewed his resume and I see that he was in the Office of Special Trustee from 1996 until 2004.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
THE COURT: Although I think the bank examiner part -bank trust examiner part of this is interesting, it's not nearly
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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so close to this case as his more recent experience. So I
wonder if you could kind of sneak up on that.
MR. HARPER: Fair enough, Your Honor.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. If we could turn down to the bottom of this page.

Mr. Fitzgerald, this talks about when you joined the Department of Interior, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. And you were in the Office of Special Trustee, and your first position it says was a trust and policy officer. What were your responsibilities in that office?
A. I was called down there to join that office because of my background in trusts, and $I$ reported to the deputy special trustee for policy, and the primary focus of my responsibility, what I was supposed to do, which flow out of the Trust Reform Act, was to see to it and to help the Department to have written and consistent policies, procedures, regulations, for the administration of their trust responsibilities department-wide.

In doing that, one of the first things I did was to put together a small group of people -- 10, 12 people, maybe -- from different parts of the Department to review what policies and principles then existed. What we found was, if you're interested in what we found, was that OTFM had pretty good policies and procedures, and they were continuing to develop those. But in many of the other departments, there were few, if Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. Have you been qualified as an expert -- to testify as an expert in prior proceedings other than in the Cobell litigation? Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
any, and many of them were local in nature in that they were not integrated or comprehensive.
Q. And then you became in 2004 the director of the Office of Trust Regulations Policies and Procedures?
A. Yes. That was several years later, because the review that we were doing was really a failure. I had to write a memo to one of the people there and said we need to do this differently, because it was sort of like pushing a string.

But anyway, in ' 04 I guess it was, I was, apropos of the reorganization that the Department did of the -- of both the BIA and the special trustee's office, I became the director of the Office of Trust Regulations Policies and Procedures, which was a new office but which was an office that was grafted onto an office that had existed for about 10 years.
Q. And very quickly, what was your principal duty as head of that office?
A. We were supposed to assist and ensure that the various offices within the Department that had anything to do with trusts, with Indian trusts, had, as the act requires, written, consistent, integrated policies and procedures.
Q. And when you say "the act," what act are you referring to?
A. I'm referring to the '94 act, the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act. I hope I got that right.
A. Yes. I've testified in depositions any number of times while I was in private practice, in commercial banking lawsuits, and $I$ then -- which $I$ think is in my resume. I also testified before the legislative -- I think it was the legislative committee of the Rhode Island legislature, about the failure of some small state-chartered depository institutions.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, at this time Plaintiffs would
like to move that Mr. Fitzgerald be qualified as an expert on
trust standards, policies, procedures, and principles generally, and the Department of the Interior's policies, procedures and principles.

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: No objection.
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, during your tenure at the OCC when you were reviewing bank trust departments, did you have occasion to review accountings?
A. Yes.
Q. So are you familiar, then, with what is required in an accounting?
A. Yes.
Q. In very general terms, could you give the Court a sense of what is normally required in a fiduciary accounting?
A. What is normally required, expected in a fiduciary accounting is a statement given to the beneficiary which lists Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
and identifies all of the assets that are held in trust for that particular beneficiary. That would include the money that's in the account at that particular time, the securities or other assets that produce those funds, and also any property that is held in trust that doesn't produce income.

It was not uncommon, for instance -- it wasn't very common but you often saw a trust would hold a valuable painting, for instance. So you would see -- you would expect to see that that was listed on the accounting that was given to the beneficiaries.

The best place I think to look for what I did was the accountings that had to be done for the common trust funds, which were relatively new back then. And those common trust funds by regulation were required to give a report listing all of those things to all of the participants in the common trust fund on a quarterly basis.
Q. If we can turn back to your expert report, Plaintiff's Exhibit 4285, page -- second page of that. Near the final line at the bottom -- this section is called "Question One, what is a fiduciary accounting?" Your second exhibit is what you call the internal general guidance. That's the title. Could you tell me what that document, why you prepared that document?
A. Yes. In OTP, which is what we called the office that I became the director of, what we were supposed to be doing was reviewing the regulations, policies, procedures, that the
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program people would put together, and they would then ship it to, send it to OTP. We would then review it for compliance with fiduciary principles, with the statutes that govern this particular, and the regulations that govern this particular trust.

And if we found that those things passed muster, we were then able to assure the special trustee that these things that were coming forward were fiduciarily appropriate and that they were to be -- able to work together as the statute required us. And the staff down there, the staff was located in Albuquerque and had been inherited from the prior office, which was OTFM-centered really.

There were maybe 12 people on that staff when I got there. I don't think there was anybody on that staff who had tenure with the Department of over a year. So it was those people who came to me and said how are we supposed to review these things? And I said, all right, I will put together the internal general guidelines so that they could refer to those things as they were reviewing the documents that were to come to me. That's how that --
Q. And at the time you were the principal policies and procedures person at the Office of Special Trustee, correct?
A. I was, at that particular time, I was no longer the trust policy officer. That title and office had been eliminated in the organization. I was now the director of the Office of Trust Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

Regulations, Policies and Procedures, which I think the function was somewhat different.
Q. If I could turn to this internal guidance, I just have a
brief question about it. That's your Exhibit 2 referred to, and you prepared this document?
A. Yes.
Q. For the reasons you just stated?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was -- it was intended to aid in the operation of the Indian trust. Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. If we can turn to the sixth page of this document. And I just have one question about No. 6 here. "Keep the Beneficiary Informed." If you could just read that to yourself. I just have one question on this point in your document.
A. Yes. I'm familiar with it.
Q. What is meant there by the fact that the records are trust assets?
A. It is a standard principle of the operation of any trust that the trustee must keep the beneficiaries informed, and the reason that you keep a beneficiary informed is so that the beneficiary is aware of the management of his property interests that are held in trust, so that he feels or she or it feels that the management is proper. And if you don't feel that it is proper, you can then take whatever action is appropriate to see Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
$\qquad$ certainly ask, if you're smart enough, to say, okay, what did you do for the $\$ \mathbf{3 0 0}$ ? What did you fix? What kind of parts did you add? So that if any of these things go wrong, you can go back and see to it that they are fixed without paying for them twice.

So in that sense, that information is valuable to the
beneficiary, and since it is of value it is an asset and should be kept secure, like all other assets.
Q. If I can turn your attention back to your expert report on the second page -- actually the third page. We're still on this first question in your report, what is a fiduciary accounting. And you discussed that briefly. Let me ask you, what is required to be produced to the beneficiary in fiduciary accounting?

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection. Calls for a legal
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conclusion.
THE COURT: Calls for a what? MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Legal conclusion. THE COURT: What in his experience? Go ahead.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. In your experience, Mr. Fitzgerald.
A. Repeat the question.
Q. What is required in the fiduciary accounting in your experience?
A. To be included in --
Q. Precisely.
A. -- in the information that is given to the beneficiary. I
thought we --
THE COURT: So far you've told us about listing and identifying assets held in trust, including money, securities, and property.

THE WITNESS: Right.
THE COURT: What else?
THE WITNESS: The other thing that goes into there are the transactions that the trustee has engaged in and the proceeds, if any, or the losses that have resulted from those transactions. And the amount of time that that accounting should cover is from the date of the last accounting. So it is with respect to the funds, I suppose, it would be the nature and amount of the funds, the status of the funds, which means to me Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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where do those funds come from.
And that's why you have to identify the underlying trust
asset, the property that's held in trust in which the
beneficiary has an equitable interest.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Ordinarily, what kind of records would a trustee have to provide in the accounting?
A. The records that they would need -- the record that they would need to provide would be a statement, a written statement, very much like we would get, any of us get from our stock brokers, very much like what the banks are required to produce on a quarterly basis for their common trust funds.

That information is based on the data, the information that the trustee keeps internally of the details of the management of
those trust assets.
Q. Is there any verification process that's generally needed
in your experience?
A. Verification process?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, of course the accounting is part of the verification process, the statement that goes out to the beneficiaries. So the beneficiary can say, yeah, that sounds right, or no, it doesn't. So that is part of the verification process. There are internal audits that go on all the time in institutions that are trustees, and there should be audits that go on all the time Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
among lawyers who are trustees, that there is a verification process that the records that are being kept are accurate and up-to-date and complete.
Q. In your experience, have you ever seen an accounting where the source of the funds, the trust funds, has not been identified?
A. No. I don't think I have.
Q. And in your experience where there is a fiduciary accounting, if there is a lack of documentation, what is the result of a lack of documentation?
A. The lack of documentation?
Q. The lack of documentation to support a particular transaction.
A. You know, in my experience in banking, I really never saw that. Running a trust is really not rocket science. It's really a pretty reasonable and obvious type of thing to do as far as the records are concerned.

As I understand it, the scholarship says that where there are doubts about what the record -- lack of records or what the records mean, the doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary. And the reason for that is that the trustee is expected to know everything about the trust and its operation. They're the only ones who are required to keep records.
Q. I'd like to turn to your -- we've been talking about this notion of what is a fiduciary accounting. I'd like to turn to Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
your concluding paragraph on that and just have you read that to yourself. The paragraph beginning "Therefore in my opinion."
(Witness reviewing document.)
Maybe you can just explain what you mean there.
A. Well, I think that's really what we were just talking about. The trustee is the legal owner of the property that is held in trust. He holds that or the trustee holds that for the benefit of the beneficiary. So the beneficiary does not have any responsibility for the maintenance of the property or the maintenance of the records that relate to the property, but it does have the benefit of the use of all of that property.

So the -- and the beneficiary is entitled to all the information, complete and accurate information, about the running of the trust. And if he doesn't, or the beneficiary doesn't get that, then whatever he is given is not really a fiduciary accounting.
Q. If we can then turn to question two here. And it talks about whether or not the Secretary of Interior follows traditional trust principles. If you can just sort of synopsize your answer to that question.

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object to bringing up common law principles, since common law claims in this case have been dismissed by the Court.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, the precedents in this case, common law standards fill out the interstices of the duties Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
applicable --
THE COURT: We're going to worry a lot about the law later on, but let me hear the witness's answer to the question.

THE WITNESS: Would you restate the question?
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Your second question here is about whether or not the

Secretary of Interior follows common law and traditional trust
principles to account to the individual Indian trust
beneficiaries, and I just wanted you to give a synopsis of your answer.
A. When I was there at the Interior Department, I had the opportunity to read a whole bunch of Indian trust cases, and all of those cases looked for guidance, let's say, to the restatement and to the other treatises on trust, Bogart and Scott.

The Department under Secretary Babbitt put out an order which cited to a letter that the Department had produced when Solicitor Krulitz was there, which cited to a whole lot of those cases, and indeed, that particular solicitor's opinion said, if I remember the verbiage correctly, was this was a trust, this Indian relationship was a trust, and that it was appropriate for the operation of that trust to be guided to some extent by those things -- by those principles that guide private trustees.

I found, however, that while there was some implication that the Department does follow those principles, I came to Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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realize that they don't. Indeed, we were told quite
specifically by a relatively senior BIA person in reviewing some stuff that we were putting out, that reference to the restatement and to Scott and Bogart was inconsistent with the position that they were presenting in this particular case.
Q. And that senior official, could you identify that senior official?
8 A. Nancy Jemison.
9 Q. If I can turn to Exhibit 6 of the expert report. Is this
the e-mail you were referring to?
11 A. Yes, it is.
Q. And you were a recipient of this e-mail?
A. Yes. There under the cc.
Q. What was your reaction to this e-mail?
A. I wrote a memo to my immediate supervisor, the deputy special trustee for policy, John Miller, and said that I didn't see that that was a particularly good way to go, that the litigation has to do with what had gone on before, and that I think the position is inconsistent with what $I$ understood the case law to be with respect to Indian trusts.
Q. Do you believe that --
A. However, we did stop making reference to the restatement, but we did continue to reference the general principles as $I$ understood them.
Q. Did this position have any implications for decisions
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regarding the historical accounting and how to perform it?
A. I don't know that directly, except that I have now come to understand that the position is -- and $I$ understand this back in ' 03 when the first historical plan was presented to the Court, that what the Department wished to do was to report essentially on the monies, the funds, if you will, that had actually been posted to the various accounts.

That became even more clear to me after Mr. Swimmer became
the special trustee, because he said on at least one occasion that the prior judge in this particular case had turned the case from a funds case to an asset case. And we said it always was.

At another time in February out in Albuquerque, he restated that and said we only have to report on funds because that's what the statute says and -- meaning the '94 Act -- and we don't have to do anything about non-income-producing assets. Both I and Donna Erwin, who was the head of OTFM, disagreed with him.

And if I remember correctly -- yeah, if I remember correctly, Donna Erwin actually asked me back in '03 to review what the Department was going to put together, and I verbally said to her, as acting special trustee, don't sign on to this, because if you do you will be trapped into saying, okay --

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection on basis of hearsay,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sustain the objection not because it's hearsay but because basically what the witness
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is now recounting is internal disputes and debates within the
Department of the Interior which -- I'm more interested in the
outcome than I am the arguments that were used back and forth
within the Department of the Interior. I don't have any sense that there was anything but good-faith discussion and debate going on. So, people don't make admissions if they make arguments within the hallowed halls of the Department of the Interior.

Let's get on to what they did, what they decided, and what this witness believes that it complies with or doesn't comply with. But the hallway conversations, meetings, conferences that led up to this policy, I think are not probative of anything that I'm going to rule on.

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, have you reviewed the Government's 2007
accounting plan?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think that, if implemented fully, it would discharge their duty to account?
A. No.
Q. If we can turn to Question Three on your expert report, page 5 at the bottom, this is in essence what this part of your report evaluates?
A. Yes.
Q. If we can turn to the next page, page 6. The heading Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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A. Yeah. I guess it is the accounts, right, because -- yeah.
Q. If we can turn your attention, Mr. Fitzgerald, to the 6 section entitled "Direct pay." Do you know what direct pay is?
7 A. Yes. I think I do. That is a situation where a lessee or 8 a buyer or purchaser of trust assets has undertaken to pay 9 either the rent or the cost of the asset being acquired directly to the beneficiary.
11 Q. If I can turn your attention to the following page of this

23 A. Yes. I'd heard when I was over there that some people felt
24 that the funds, because they never came into the hands of the
"Exclusions of beneficiaries and accounts." You talk about the accounts that are closed prior to 1994.
A. That I think was probably inarticulately put, because going back and looking at that, it wasn't those closed prior to '94, Re Reform Act didn't create the trust obligations. Those were already there.
Q. If we go down further to the next section here, it's called "Direct pay."

THE COURT: Before you leave that, Mr. Harper, let's straighten out with the witness and with me whether he meant accounts closed before October 25, 1994, or transactions. I think accounts is what he did mean, and I think that's what I understand it to be.

MR. HARPER: That's my understanding, Your Honor, as well.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Is it accounts prior to 1994 or transactions, do you understand?
but I think it was the transactions that took place before ' 94.
I think that's what that was. failure to account for direct pay funds is inconsistent with the Department's trust obligations to complete accounting of all funds."

And then second highlighted area, it says "These funds derive the trust character not because they are deposited in a special deposit but because they are proceeds from the trustees" -- excuse me, "a specific account," I misread that -"but because they are proceeds from the trustee's management of Indian trust assets." This second, could you explain a little bit the second highlighted part there? trustee, were therefore not trust funds. But of course, the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
assets that produce those funds are trust funds, and therefore these proceeds are also trust funds. And I feel that way because the trustee has an obligation to see to it, for instance, that the lease, if that's what's producing the funds, is properly operating.

So these to me are trust funds, and I believe the government has usually considered that they were trust funds for which the government was responsible. Therefore, they should be accounted for.
Q. In your experience with respect to other trusts, are there times when beneficiaries receive proceeds directly from a source other than the trustee?
A. Yes. Oh, yes. It is not, $I$ suspect, uncommon for businesses, for instance, that are run within a trust, to produce funds for the beneficiary. As a matter of fact, I remember one that -- I was over here at Riggs, and a fellow up on Georgia Avenue died. The major business, his family business was a liquor store. And I was over at Riggs and I said well, how do you run that? Do you send one of your vice presidents in there to run the liquor store?

He said of course not. We go over there and we see to it that the business is being run properly, that the place is being stocked and that there's no fraud going on and all that sort of stuff. But those funds went directly to the family. It didn't go through Riggs, because it was a family business. But because Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
the business was held in trust, it was up to Riggs as the trustee to see to it that it was run properly and that the proceeds were proper proceeds, reasonable proceeds.
Q. So would Riggs still have in that instance an accounting duty to those beneficiaries?
A. I believe they would, yes.
Q. If we can turn down to the next section. Do you understand whether or not the -- will the government pursuant to their 2007 Plan provide an accounting for deceased beneficiaries?
A. I understand they do not intend to do that.
Q. And do you think that's appropriate in your experience?
A. I think that's inappropriate. That's not the way I understand a trustee would act anyplace else.
Q. In some circumstances, through the probate process in the private sector, are there accountings provided to the beneficiary?
A. Oh, yes. If an estate goes before a probate court or official, and part of the estate consists of a trust, it is usual, normal for the trustee to produce an accounting to the probate official, so that the probate official can review the administration of the trust and so that the heirs, if there are any that have an interest in the property that is coming out of that trust, can also look at that.

That again is the function of an accounting, as far as I'm concerned. It's what you would say, a review, calling people to Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

22 A. I would not consider that an accounting, because it does
23 not put any beneficiary in the position to raise questions about
account, a second-guessing if you will.
Q. Do you understand in the Indian probate process, do they perform that type of an accounting?

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection. Lack of foundation.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Do you have an understanding, Mr. Fitzgerald, of how the Indian probate process works?
A. A general understanding, because that was one of the things that we were trying to address in the Office of the Special Trustee.
Q. Based on your understanding, is there any accounting provided to the beneficiaries during that process?
A. As I understand it, BIA will provide information about the trust to the probate officials. And as I understand it, the probate officials will accept that information without question. It's also interesting to me that both the trustee and the probate people are within the body that is the trustee, so it is one part of the trustee reporting to another part of the trustee. So it's the trustee reporting to itself.
Q. Do you understand that there is or is not an accounting provided? the administration of the trust.
Q. So that would be a distinction with how probates sometimes Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
work in the private sector when accountings are provided.
A. That's right.

3 Q. If we can turn to the next section on the next page.
4 Accounts Opened Prior to 1938.
A. Yes.
Q. And this deals with the fact that the transactions are not
being accounted for?
8 A. Yes. This is what I was getting mixed up with with the
it's not the account, it's the transactions.
11 Q. So your understanding of the 2007 Plan is that they are not
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accounting.
Q. And where there's never been an accounting provided, what is the -- when does the accounting begin?
A. Usually go back to the date when the trustee had
responsibility for the trust property, back to the beginning.
Q. If we can go down to the next heading, which is Compacting and Contracting Tribes, will the 2007 Plan as you understand it from your review provide accounting for assets and funds held in trust by the United States but managed through compacts or contracts by tribes?
A. As I understand it, there is to be no accounting for those funds.
Q. And in your view, in your experience, can you provide a
fiduciary accounting without accounting for those assets and funds?
A. You can't, it seems to me, because those assets that are being managed or administered, whatever word you want to use, by an agent or a contractor, which these compacting and contracting tribes are, are acting on behalf of the trustee. And the trustee cannot escape its responsibility for the actions of their agents, essentially.

And we recite to the Leshy memo in there that -- well, let me see. Yeah. The Leshy memo to Ken Rossman, "The fact that a tribe takes over federal duties by entering into one or more contracts or compacts does not extinguish the federal trust Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
responsibility." I was pleased to see that, because that's my understanding of what general trust practices would require.
Q. In the private sector, are there times when there is an agent or a contractor of a trustee that manages the trust assets?
A. I wouldn't call it managing the trust assets, but there are -- because the management of the trust assets always remains -- or the responsibility for the management of the trust assets always remains with the trustee.

There are innumerable instances, and you see them almost every place in the wider trust world, where a trustee will hire outside people to keep the records, to execute securities transactions, to collect the funds and pay the funds out, all of that sort of thing. But everybody understands that those are still the responsibility of the trustee for which the trustee is responsible and liable if they go wrong.
Q. Would it be consistent, then, with general trust principles to exclude the transactions that were administered by compacting and contracting tribes?
A. Not in my view, no.
Q. If we can turn our attention to the following page, page 9 of your expert report. And there's a section called Additional Exclusions, and I think you talked briefly about a number of other parts of the 2007 Plan. One of those, in the top -second sentence, says -- talking about the plan, "It limits its Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
accounting only to monies actually collected and recorded in the individual accounts." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your understanding?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And is that appropriate if one wants to complete a
fiduciary accounting?
A. No. Again, where records are kept accurately and completely and up-to-date, you would see very, very few monies that were collected but not recorded. Here that is not the case. When I first got there, there was -- I can't remember how many millions it was, but it was quite large. I understand they're working that number down. But there's still, as $I$ understand it, a large amount of money that the trustee does not really know where that money is to go, and needs to do a great deal of research to see to it that it gets to where it's supposed to go, to the proper account, to the proper beneficiary.

So here you've got assets, funds, that have been collected but haven't been attributed to the right account. They should be accounted for, I believe. It'd be interesting to see how you would do that, however. It might be with an asterisk at the bottom of the statement, at the bottom of the beneficiary statement, which says we've got $X$ number of funds, some of which you may be entitled to, but I don't think I've ever seen that
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## anyplace.

Q. Generally speaking, would in your experience a trustee have to account for monies owed to beneficiaries?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And what about monies -- so monies owed but also monies actually collected.
7 A. Oh, yes. Right. Here they just don't know to whom it's 8 owed, and they should.
9 Q. During your review of the systems at the Department of the system?
A. As I understand it, they do not. I asked that question when I was back there, and there is no accounts receivable.
Q. And you were there till 2005 ; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would be the problem with not having that kind of a system in place?
A. As I understand it, there is no general record of the things that are owed to the accounts. There is no accounts receivable. So except going to the individual accounts, you don't know when the money is owed, as I understand it, and you're largely, therefore, dependent on the honor of the lessee, if you will, to pay the money in, and you're also relying on the accuracy of the local records, the individual records.
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do you know what a -- what's commonly referred to as a Youpee interest?
A. Yes. I learned about those when I was at Interior. As I understand it, and I don't know the year, but Congress passed a law apropos of I guess the -- correct me here, the Youpee Indians or was Youpee the plaintiff?
Q. I believe he was an individual plaintiff, for the record.
A. An individual plaintiff. I don't remember the tribe. The upshot of the statute was that there was a large amount of land which was not producing very much money, if any, and Congress said, well, let's escheat that land to the tribe, whatever tribe it was.

Youpee said -- the plaintiffs said you've taken my land unconstitutionally. And the Supreme Court agreed with that. So there was then a project, I guess, going on about how do you get that land into its proper hands.
Q. Do you understand that the 2007 Plan will or will not account for funds generated from Youpee interests?
A. That's as I understand it, yes.
Q. Excuse me, what is your understanding?
A. That they will not account for those funds.
Q. And do you think that's appropriate in light of --
A. No.
Q. In your experience, is it appropriate -- does a fiduciary accounting, does it require the identification of the assets, of Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

## the nonfund assets of the trust?

A. The nonfund assets of the trust?
Q. The nonmonetary assets of the trust.
A. Yes. Again, it is a basic principle that when a trustee receives something in trust, whether it is income-producing or not, that the records identify that asset. I used to talk about if you're holding a valuable painting in trust and it's hanging over at the National Gallery, what the accounting should show each time is that that is an asset of the trust.

Why is that? It is easy, particularly in an institutional situation, for the records to become incomplete, which then means that the memory of the trustee becomes incomplete, and the information being sent to the beneficiary becomes incomplete. And that can happen in a trust that goes over many, many generations.

So it is important for those assets, the
non-income-producing ones, to be listed all the time, to inform the beneficiary that they hold it in trust, and to really remind the trustee that that's what they have in trust. As a banker, we used to say if it doesn't exist in the records, it doesn't exist.
Q. Looking at your concluding paragraph to this section, it
says -- well, it's up on the screen. I won't read it, but you
can see that there. Two questions on this. First, do you
believe in light of these exclusions the 2007 Plan, if fully
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
implemented, will constitute a fiduciary accounting?

## A. No, because it doesn't give all of the information to which

 the beneficiary is entitled.Q. And second, given your experience at the Department of the

Interior and in light of what you know about the state of the
policies and procedures and records, do you believe that the
Department of the Interior can perform a fiduciary accounting?
A. I don't think so. We know that the records are incomplete
to some extent. What $I$ understand is that as time has gone on,
the records are becoming more complete, but they're still incomplete to some extent. And the fact that the Department has put forward this idea that their only responsibility is for the
funds actually collected, suggests to me that what they want to
do is what they think they can do, as opposed to what they should do.
Q. I'd like to turn your attention for a moment to Exhibit 19 of your expert report.
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. And who is Mr. Thomas Slonaker?
A. He was the special trustee in July of ' 02 .
Q. Did Mr. Slonaker ever deliver this testimony?
A. I don't think he did.
Q. Do you know why not?
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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## A. He was advised --

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: What's your basis of -- how do you know
what he was advised of?
THE WITNESS: He told me what he was advised of.
THE COURT: And who is -- where is Thomas Slonaker
now?
MR. HARPER: He was on our witness list, Your Honor,
but I think he's in India.
THE COURT: I think I'll sustain the hearsay
objection.
BY MR. HARPER:
Q. If we could turn back to the front of your expert report to
page 10. And Question Four is "Is it justified and" -- "Is it
unjustified and inconsistent with fiduciary principles for the
government to bear the costs of the accounting for the IIM
trust?" And you say the answer to this question is no. And why do you say that?
A. I believe that the government as a trustee, as a fiduciary, owes the beneficiaries a complete and accurate accounting statement.

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Your Honor, I'm going to object on the basis of relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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## Q. Well, that historical perspective is nice, but

fundamentally what was the problem with a bank going under?
A. If a --
Q. The depositors wouldn't get their money, correct?
A. Yes --

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I have no further questions
for this witness. Thank you, Mr. Fitzgerald, for your testimony.

THE COURT: Cross-examine?
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Fitzgerald.
A. Good afternoon. Nice to see you again.
Q. Nice to see you too. Deja vu all over again. Just a
couple of questions about your period of time at the OCC.
A. Yes.
Q. You mentioned your concern there was about the
administration of a trust through the trust department having the potential to bring down the bank.
A. That's right.
Q. And why was that an issue?
A. Why was it an issue?
Q. Right.
A. The comptroller was concerned as a policy matter that the office be fully aware of all of the risks that might affect the
solvency of a particular institution. Prior to Mr. Saxon being there, the examination of the trust departments was conducted by examiners who were experienced in the commercial side of the bank and really didn't have any knowledge or experience with trusts or trust principles or trust law.
MR. HARPER: Objection, Your Honor. Could he let the witness finish his answer.

THE COURT: If he thinks it's a nonresponsive
question, he can -- I think he appropriately interrupted. I'll
overrule the objection. Ask your question again,
Mr. Stemplewicz.
BY MR. STEMPLEWICZ:
Q. The problem with the bank going under essentially is that the depositors would lose their money, correct?
A. The depositors would lose their money. That was the first thing and most important thing, but the failure of banks, particularly large banks, impacts the whole system. And we were concerned about that.
Q. If the trustee in the kinds of trusts you were looking at back then were to lose all the money of the beneficiary, where did the beneficiary have to look for recourse?
A. To the trustee.
Q. The trustee's insolvent.
A. Yes, that's exactly true, and they would probably lose all

25 of their money because the FDIC didn't insure any of that.
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21 Q. And Mr. Gingold was there at the time? remember?
A. I think it was a hundred thousand dollars per account.
Q. In the ' 80 s ?
A. Savings account.
Q. In the '80s?
A. What did I say, a hundred thousand dollars?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I didn't mean a hundred thousand dollars. Thank you for correcting me. A thousand dollars.
Q. Now, also, while you were at the OCC, were you an associate of Mr. Homan's, who was here before?
A. Mr. Homan, I met Mr. Homan when Mr. Homan came to Washington. I think I preceded him in the Washington office,
Q. What was the extent of fDIC insurance at that time, do you
Official Court Reporter
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17 A. I didn't understand the very beginning of your question.

23 Q. I mean, they couldn't be retroactively instituted. They
24 did what they did, correct?
accounting, providing information currently or to the historical accounting?
A. As I remember it, there was -- and I can't remember the year, but it was relatively early on. The Department wanted to put out -- and I think it eventually did -- put out a Federal Register notice to basically Indian country, about what do you want in an accounting. And there were meetings about what that accounting should look like.

The special trustee, and I was part of that, said that the accounting, to be an accounting that we felt was fiduciarily appropriate, would have to go back to the very beginning, or else an accounting couldn't be done as fiduciary people understand it.
Q. Now, obviously, instituting policies and procedures in the

1990s could not be retroactively applied to the early part of
the century, the middle or any time prior to that, correct?
Q. Right. If you were trying to develop policies and procedures in 1996 or ' 97 or that era, obviously they wouldn't pertain to the policies and practices that the BIA followed in administering the IIM accounts in the past.
A. I'm not sure I understand that.
A. They did what they did, but in order to have a current
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have been done, and therefore, if they weren't done, you should
do them now.
Q. Okay. Over the course of many years, the administration of
the individual Indian monies accounts, day to day, year to year,
administration of the accounts was conducted at the agency
level, correct?
A. That's as I understand it, yes.
Q. Did you, in forming your opinions or instituting your policies, did you go back to the field agencies and talk with any of the employees about their work?
A. I did not personally, no.
Q. So you weren't familiar with the kind of knowledge that BIA on-the-ground employees doing this work had with the accounts, with their constituents, the kind of familiarity they had with the problems of the account holders and that sort of thing?
A. As I was there, I became more aware of what was going on in the different offices, and what struck me was that there was very little understanding about what a trust really was and what sort of principles would apply to it. I did know that in many cases the people in those regional offices knew the beneficiaries quite well, but that's a different question from about whether they appropriately managed the assets that they Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
accounting, you need to have confidence that the starting balance of whatever current accounts are there are appropriate and are accurate, and that relies on the accountings that should have been done, and therefore, if they weren't done, you should do them now.
the individual Indian monies accounts, day to day, year to year, administration of the accounts was conducted at the agency level, correct?
were supposed to manage.
Q. Did you actually interview BIA employees who were doing this work?
A. I did indirectly through the training courses that we had put together. Not indirectly, but I did interview and have interaction with a number of those people in the training course situation.
Q. Did you interview IIM account holders about their
satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with how their accounts were being administered?
A. Many of those people who work at Interior are IIM account holders, and of course as you know, we also had an advisory board, and those people were IIM account holders outside of DOI. So yeah.
Q. And Ms. Cobell was on that board?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. How many account documents, documents used in the
administration of the IIM accounts did you review in determining the state of the documentation to do the historical accounting?
A. I don't think I personally reviewed any of those. I relied on the information that was coming to us from other sources about the collection of and the -- well, the availability and the collection of and the condition of the records at that particular time.
Q. Now, on the subject of trust documents, would
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Q. You testified and your report I think indicates that no deceased beneficiaries will receive an accounting. Were you 5 intending to include beneficiaries who died after October 25, 6 1994?
7 A. Yeah. Yes, I suppose so. I haven't really considered that

16 A. I would conclude that if the Department is giving an in the 2007 Plan included estate accounts that were open as of
21 October 25, 1994?
22 A. I hope I understand what you're asking me. This would be
23 for accounts for estates?
24 Q. Yeah. A deceased account holder, the funds from the IIM
THE COURT: Sustained.
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still open as of October 25, 1994.
A. And in probate I take it?

3 Q. Yes.
4 A. And the Department will do an accounting for those?
Q. Assume that's the case.
A. Assuming that's the case, that is consistent with, as I

7 understand it, fiduciary principles.
8 Q. You indicated that BIA does present trust asset information
9 to the probate official?
A. That's as I understand it, yes.

11 Q. But that the information does not constitute in your

23 A. It would seem to me that that would be something that the
24 trustee should inform the beneficiary of, that he does have the opinion an accounting.
A. As I understand it, yes, because no questions are asked about it; as I understand it, it is accepted by the probate
people on its face.
Q. Well, what about the beneficiary? Does the beneficiary have an opportunity then to make the common law on-request right for an accounting?
A. Perhaps if they know they have that right, but --
Q. How does any beneficiary know? If it's an on-request right, how does any beneficiary know they have a right to an accounting or ever get an accounting? right to an accounting and has a right to raise questions about Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
the accounting. That falls under the rubric of keeping the beneficiary informed.
Q. Turning to the issue of compacting and contracting tribes,
is it your understanding that these tribes that do the
compacting and contracting are considered to be sovereign nations?
A. Yes. I assume they are sovereign nations. They are considered to be -- recognized tribes are considered to be sovereign nations.
Q. And is it also your understanding that the compacting and contracting is part of the U.S. policy to promote self-governance by the tribes?
A. I understand that also. Indeed, I think there's a letter from John Miller to Mr. Sinclair on this very point in my exhibits, and that letter, if $I$ remember correctly, recites to those.
Q. In your experience in the private sector, does that situation have any analogue in the private sector, where a trustee delegates to a sovereign nation pursuant to a national policy?
A. In the trust area, not that I am aware of. However, in the commercial banking area, there are similar sorts of situations.
When I was back at the Comptroller of the Currency, for instance, there was a situation where some foreign nationals who were part of the royal family of some sovereign nation wanted a
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bank charter, and they wouldn't give us all of the information that we requested, standing behind their sovereign status. And I can't remember whether we got that information or whether the application was withdrawn.

But here the trust information is -- are trustee information documents which have been given to a sovereign nation as an agent of the trustee.
Q. In regard to missing documents, could you explain again this idea of -- you think the concept applies to the government like it does in the private sector, that if you can't prove the transaction, then the trustee is liable?
A. You need to explain that to me a little bit better than that.
Q. What was exactly your testimony in regard to the inability to prove up a transaction in the private sector on the part of a trustee due to lack of documentation?
A. If there's a lack of documentation, and this again is the general trust principle, and there are any doubts raised about not only the lack of documentation but documentation that is not clear, that any doubts are resolved in favor of the beneficiary.

And that's standard trust principles.
Q. And the whole discussion of that issue as I understand it
is to enlighten the Court about what happens in the private
sector, but not necessarily to say that's what would happen
here.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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21 A. As I understand it, the United States has been held liable trustee, and I rely to a certain extent on that of what Mitchell said and particularly what the dissenting judges in Mitchell said, which was very, very interesting, it seemed to me.

So this is a fiduciary obligation. I believe that the congress knew exactly what it was doing. The government knew exactly what it was doing when these trusts were set up. In prior generations I believe there was a good deal better knowledge about what a trust is and what it involves than today.
Q. Well, wouldn't that concept of having to pay if you've lost the documents through negligence be a form of absolute liability?
A. It would seem to me that it could be, but what I would rather characterize it as, the admonition to keep good records so that you don't lose them.
Q. Right. But in your analysis have you considered the concept of absolute liability as applied to the United States?
for mismanagement of the trust in other cases.
Q. On a showing of liability, correct, not on an absolute liability theory?
A. On a showing of liability, I suppose. I'm not sure --
A. No. I don't agree with that. As I understand it, the government is a trustee. The courts have said the government is a trustee. That the principles that apply to private trustees can be the guidance for the actions of the government as Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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Q. You haven't currently looked at Supreme Court cases like

2 the Dalehite case that talks about absolute liability?
3 A. No, I have not.
Q. Now, you indicated that it's your belief that the

Department of Interior cannot produce an accounting to the IIM trust beneficiaries, correct?

7 A. I think my testimony --
8 Q. It's just impossible.
9 A. Excuse me?
Q. I'm sorry. It's just impossible in your view?

11 A. I don't know that particularly. What my opinion goes to is

24 Q. Mr. Fitzgerald, you testified on cross regarding whether or that what the Department is now proposing is not an accounting. If they are able to discover all the records that they need to discover, if they actually exist, then yes, $I$ suppose you could do an accounting.
Q. One last point. Have you been to Lenexa, to the AIRR, the American Indian Records Repository?
A. No. I've seen pictures of it.

MR. STEMPLEWICZ: Thank you. No further questions.
MR. HARPER: I have a couple questions on redirect. THE COURT: Okay.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. HARPER:
not a beneficiary must request an accounting. Do you recall
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
that --
A. That's right.
Q. -- those questions? Without a request for an accounting,
does the trustee have to provide an accounting at regular
intervals?
A. I would say that a trustee needs to and is expected to provide an accounting on regular intervals, if that's yearly or whatever. As I understand the scholarship --

THE COURT: You've answered the question. What's the next question?

BY MR. HARPER:
Q. Are the trust assets of individuals Indians, are they commingled?
A. I understand some of them are through fractionization.
Q. What about the fund assets, are they commingled?
A. They are commingled at OTFM. As the money comes in, those things are invested in a commingled fashion.
Q. The defense counsel asked you about whether or not a single beneficiary has the right to seek an accounting of the entire IIM trust. Since the funds, as you've just testified, are commingled, how can a beneficiary receive a full accounting without an accounting of the entire trust?
A. They can, and that accounting would look very much like what commercial banks do in the -- with common trust funds.
Q. Do you recall counsel asking you about compacting and
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contracting tribes?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the self-determination statute that provides for the ability to compact and contract?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything in that statute regarding whether or not it diminishes trust responsibility?
A. Indeed those statutes, as I understand them, go exactly the opposite direction, that compacting and contracting does not diminish the fiduciary responsibility. And that was cited to in Mr. Miller's letter to Mr. Sinclair.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'd like to move in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4285, Mr. Fitzgerald's report. And I have no further questions.

THE COURT: 4285 is received. We'll be in recess for
15 minutes max. When we get back I want to talk a little bit
about where we're going from here. I want to set up a schedule for talking about this proffer. And maybe it's time we should talk a little bit about Lenexa.
(Plaintiff Exhibit No. 4285
received into evidence.)
(Recess from 3:35 p.m. to 3:51 p.m.)
MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we expect to have three more
witnesses. This afternoon Mr. Jeff Zippin from OST, OTFM, and
then tomorrow we expect to have Sally Willett, who has been an
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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administrative law judge in probate for the Department. And then completing with Joe Christie, who, we think both witnesses we should be able to complete first thing in the morning.

I will go ahead and tell the Court both of those witnesses, whom we don't have control over, live in the West and both are traveling to Washington, D.C. today. So they will be available first thing in the morning. But upon the completion of those three witnesses, we plan to rest our case.

THE COURT: All right. Then there will be some rebuttal witnesses from the government, right?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Caren Dunne will be available to testify tomorrow. And as necessary, Dr. Hinkins from NORC will also be available. At this point, it appears that Plaintiffs will not be presenting Robert Vaughn, correct?

MR. DORRIS: We do not plan to present Mr. Vaughn.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Because of that, Your Honor, we propose -- we had previously designated the prior testimony of Professor Langbein. He wrote a subsequent report in 2007 to address Mr. Vaughn's. We proposed that his designated testimony be offered to the Court because it is relevant to the testimony you just heard from Mr. Fitzgerald, but there's no reason to bring him in to add anything new regarding Mr. Vaughn obviously, who's now not being presented, which is one reason we suggested he be treated as a responsive witness, so that we won't have to take the time to present testimony before Mr. Vaughn actually Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
appeared.

So, again, we will be presenting Ms. Dunne and Dr. Hinkins, and we have designated previously Professor Langbein's 2003 testimony. We request that that be admitted.

THE COURT: Mr. Harper.
MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I can just speak to the point of the designation of Professor Langbein's testimony. As I understand it, that's principally regarding the consideration of the cost of the accounting. When we were exploring that area with Mr. Fitzgerald, Defendants' counsel objected, and as I understood it, the Court sustained that objection. So I don't see how that could possibly rebut testimony that we didn't get into with Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Professor Langbein's prior testimony addressed the trust standards, similar to what Mr. Fitzgerald just discussed. He might address cost, but it's related to the applicable trust standards that are justified in this case. Certainly his -- well, his report and subsequently his testimony do not relate solely to cost.

MR. HARPER: Your Honor, our objection it to the cost issues. So if the Defendants want to state which aspects of the designated testimony, we can review that and then make the determination at that point.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: We would submit his testimony as a Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
whole.

THE COURT: In the ordinary course of things, we don't receive expert testimony just designated in written form, but if there's no objection to it, I guess I'll let it be part of the record as long as it doesn't cover the cost issue. I guess that's where we are on that.

Let's proceed with the witness you have yet this afternoon.
MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. The Plaintiffs call Mr. Jeff Zippin.
(The witness takes the stand.)
MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, if you would state your name and spell your last name, please.

THE COURT: Robertson. James Robertson. R-O-B --

## (Laughter)

MR. DORRIS: Sorry, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: My name is Jeffrey Zippin. Z-I-P-P-I-N.
MR. DORRIS: And Your Honor, to tell you the areas we plan to cover, I cannot tell you what Mr. Zippin is going to say. I've never met him, and he obviously works for the government. But want to go through with his involvement in the 2003 and 2007 Plan, including especially the assembly of the administrative record here, and some of the documents there that are in that record; in addition want to then address with him questions regarding how the government is treating the calculation of interest with respect to the 2007 Plan.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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## THE COURT: All right, sir.

Q. Mr. Zippin, I'm Bill Dorris, one of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs. And we've never met, but I do have a number of questions for you today.
8 A. Okay.
9 Q. What is your present position?
A. I'm the deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust

11 Accounting.
Q. And how long have you been with OHTA?
A. I was with the Office of Special Trustee starting in April

16 2001, until the creation of OHTA.
17
Q. Prior to April of 2001, were you with the Department of Interior in any capacity?
19 A. Yes, I was.
02:25:31 20
20 Q. And what were you doing then?
21 A. Prior to that, I was the GPRA program manager for the
22 Department, sort of like the strategic planner for the
23
24
25

Department.
Q. As part of that, did you have any involvement in the individual Indian trust issues?
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21 Q. And when you say oversee that work, what work are you
A. Only to the extent that those issues were reported on as part of accountability reports that the government filed.
Q. Was that a significant part of the work you did prior to going to the OST's office?
A. No, sir.
Q. Now, did your responsibilities and role change when you moved from the OST's office to OHTA?
A. Not terribly. A little bit.
Q. Okay. Would you tell us what your present responsibilities have been since you became deputy director of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?
A. Well, our office began with just two people, executive director Bert Edwards and myself, and we had a summer intern. So the first step was to build an office. By design, the office has a small number of federal employees but a large number of expert contractors who work for us.

And so part of the task that I undertook was engaging experts and contractors to do this work. I would just generally state that my duties now are to carry out the mission program of the office and oversee that work.
talking about, sir?
A. The historical accounting for IIM trust, special deposit cleanup, as we refer to it, and tribal trust accounting.
Q. And when you say your responsibility is to oversee that

Official Court Reporter
Q. How many employees of the Office of Historical Accounting are there that are involved with this process?
A. It varies, obviously, but about 35 employees and about 400 contractors.
Q. Okay. The employees, do they report directly to you?
A. We've moved to a bureaucratic hierarchy, so we have division chiefs now below me, who are now the direct report -most of that, a lot of the staff are direct reports of those people, but then they report through me.
Q. And with whom else in terms of in other offices are your primary contacts or that you have the most interface with with respect to the effort to provide an accounting to the individual Indian beneficiaries?
A. Primarily with the Office of the Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
Q. And the Office of Special Trustee, who from the Office of Special Trustee do you primarily deal with?

21 A. Quite a number of people. The special -- Ross Swimmer, the 22 special trustee, some of his Washington staff, particularly with Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Erwin and her deputies and her staff.
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A. No. We have, our staff are the contracting officer's representatives. They oversee the contract work and make sure the contractors are doing the work that we've assigned. Our office works in many ways, rather than a typical contractor relationship, we view these people sort of as -- we use them almost as staff in effect, and so the day-to-day reporting relationships are varied.
Q. Who from the office of the Secretary do you deal with, if anyone?
A. Principally, two people. Dr. Abe Haspel and Jim Cason.
Q. Okay. Now, who was the person -- we will look at it in a minute, that you signed, I think it's called a certification Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. And what about at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is there a specific contact that is your primary contact there?
A. Well, we were working with a fellow -- we work with a number of people, but one of the principal ones was Arch Wells, who recently retired. We now work with Ms. Vicki Forrest. But we work through all the people that we need to deal with. Mike Jones is a person we deal with who deals with realty issues. We just deal with a variety of people as the need arises.

We also deal directly with the regional offices and any of their suboffices as -- the agency offices, as we need to, to get information.
Q. Are you the primary person that the various contractors that are hired by OHTA report to?
regarding the administrative record. Who was primarily responsible for putting together the administrative record that's being referred to in this hearing?
A. There was a process that we undertook. We had some meetings with our solicitor's office and also with representatives of the Department of Justice to talk about what the scope of that needed to be. We then tasked people within Office of Historical Trust Accounting. We have a records manager who is responsible for maintaining our records and files. We also have a chief of staff who was tasked with working on this.

At various times I became involved as necessary. And ultimately the administrative record was compiled. There were memos that were sent out from -- I'm not sure if it was a memo or an e-mail, from the deputy solicitor's office, requesting that people provide to us any documents they have which would reflect decisions being made in the administrative record, and also directing our employees to provide information as well.
Q. That e-mail or memo that you're talking about, was that sent to people outside of the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?
A. It went to other levels in the Department. I don't recall the full extent of that, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, it sounds like you were involved to some extent with the assembly of the administrative record. Is that fair to Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
say?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And were you the one principally responsible for ensuring that the administrative record was complete?
A. I guess that's a fair statement.
Q. And did you review the administrative record when it was assembled?
A. I reviewed a lot of the index of it and talked about it with our staff who were working on it, to -- asking about where they looked, what they went through of my records, did they get things from other people, just making sure that the documents that we considered were included therein.
Q. Okay. Other than the one memo that you mentioned that I think you said came from the solicitor's office, what steps were implemented to ensure that all the documents that were considered in making the 2003 and 2007 Plans were included in the administrative record?
A. Looking it over and doing a review of that index, there were a number of documents that I knew to be important, certainly the NORC reports, which were provided in their entirety. We had accounting conferences that helped formulate our approach. Those conferences took place in 2002 and 2003. We wanted to make sure those were in there.

So I looked for particular kinds of documents that I knew were important, as well as going through my own notes. And I Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
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1 also know that our executive director, Bert Edwards, went
2 through his notes and any relevant material -- well, not notes,
Q. We've seen a few examples when Mr. Cason -- were you here when Mr. Cason testified?
A. Yes, I was.

7 Q. We've seen some examples when he was testifying of typed

11 A. Some of the notes were typed by one of the people in the

17 Q. And were all of the notes of Mr. Edwards that he had also

19 A. I don't think Mr. Edwards is a note-taker, sir.

24 Q. Now, in the administrative record, we've looked at during
notes that indicated they were transcriptions of your notes.
Did you have your notes then typed and included in the administrative record?
office, and I reviewed them then to make corrections. And then there was another group of my notes that I typed myself.
Q. Okay. And were those all of your notes that you had taken in connection with the development of the 2003 and 2007 Plans?
A. Yes, sir.
included in the administrative record?

20 Q. So I take that to the extent that you're saying we don't see notes from Mr. Edwards in the administrative record, you think that's because he did not have notes. Is that fair?
A. That's correct. the course of this hearing and there are others, documents that Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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are stamped draft in the administrative record. You're aware of that, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Some of those are documents that it's hard to tell who prepared them. Others it indicates, for example, some of the Morgan Angel reports, are stamped draft. Or do you recall that?
A. Not with any specificity, but I believe that that's
correct.
Q. But all of the documents that were included were documents that were maintained by and in the custody of the Department of the Interior. Is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So that if it's a draft report from Morgan Angel, it is a
report that Morgan Angel had actually furnished to the
Department if it's included in the administrative record.
A. That would be correct.
Q. And the other documents that do not show who prepared them, is there any way to determine who the preparer of the document was?
A. Some of them I might be able to recall or recollect who
did, but I wouldn't say that that's true for all of them.
Q. Okay. Now, we'll look at some of those. Was there an administrative record coordinator appointed for purposes of this administrative record assembly?
A. Yes.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. And who was that?

2 A. That was our chief of staff, Steve Alcorn.
3 Q. And can you spell his last name, please?
4 A. A-L-C-O-R-N.
Q. Okay. And does he report to you?
A. Yes, he does.
Q. And did you and Mr. Alcorn attempt to follow the

Departmental manuals and directives for the assembly of the administrative record?
A. We actually talked through with our solicitor's office, we had a copy of those requirements. We reviewed them with them and in discussions, and were using that as a guide, yes, sir.
Q. When you say you're using that as a guide, did you follow that guide in each instance?
15 A. I believe we did, sir.
16
Q. Now, let's look if we can at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4504.

That should come up on your screen there. If you'll blow up the middle. This is then where there's a notice of filing by the Interior defendants of a certification of administrative record, and if you would scroll down I think it'll show us the date of September 19, 2007. And if you would look, would be the fourth page of this exhibit, please. And this is a declaration. And if we can look at the next page and confirm that this is the document you signed.
A. Yes, sir, it is.

02:41:53 20
21
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1 declaration we included the documents that supported these
2 plans. And I'm trying to find out if there were documents that that were not included in the administrative record.
A. Sir, my understanding of the term "supportive" is in a

7 general way. I believe it should be documents that we
8 considered, and $I$ do believe there are documents in the record
9 that present alternative approaches to what we're doing and alternative thoughts on the matter, including some of the
11 limitations that have been discussed here.
12 Q. I follow that. I understand that answer. My question's a 13 little different. Are there documents that you're aware of that 14 the Department maintains or any office of the Department
15 maintains that have not been included in the administrative
16 record that do not support these plans?
17 A. I have no way of knowing what other offices in the
18 Department of Interior may have to that regard.
19 Q. Does the Office of Historical Trust Accounting maintain any

22 A. Sir, I believe that my answer is that we included documents
23 of that nature in the administrative record. documents that would be contrary to or not supportive of these plans that have not been included in the administrative record?

THE COURT: The question is whether you included all of them. the Department of Interior has that don't support the plans, in other words, would impeach the plans or be contrary to them,
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THE WITNESS: I believe we included all of them, Your Honor.

MR. DORRIS: Okay.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Good. But there may be some in other offices that you
don't know of whether they were included or not. Let me
restate. You look puzzled so I better ask that one again. You
do not know if other offices in the Department of Interior
maintain documents that do not support these plans that have not
been included in the administrative record?
MR. QUINN: Objection, Your Honor. Asked and answered.

THE COURT: I'm not sure it's been answered.
THE WITNESS: I don't know of other documents that
other offices may have.
BY MR. DORRIS:
Q. Can you state in court here today and to Judge Robertson that a thorough effort was undertaken to locate all such documents at other offices of the Department of Interior and include them in the administrative record or not?

MR. QUINN: Objection. Vague, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, may I see counsel at the bench on this one.
(Bench conference off the record.)
BY MR. DORRIS:
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
Q. Looking at the screen, at the last bullet that is there,
that indicates that "The documents reflected by the index are
those considered by the Department of the Interior in
formulating the plans identified above," do you see that?
A. Yes, sir, I do.
Q. It goes on, it says, "As well as documents that demonstrate implementation of the plans or provide explanatory or background material." Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So all of the documents that were considered by the Department of Interior in formulating the plans have been included?
A. To the best of $\mathbf{m y}$ knowledge, that's correct.
Q. And some of the documents that are in the administrative record were not those considered by the Department but were included to demonstrate implementation of the plans or to provide background material?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, let me ask you, we did not see in the administrative record a document that -- Mr. Cason is the one that signed the 2007 Plan, correct?
A. Yes. It's on the front page of that document, sir.
Q. Correct. And we did not see any decisional documents that he executed leading up to that plan. Are you aware of any in the administrative record?


7 Q. And the thought underlying that was because there was, at
8 least at that time, there was a thought or concern that each
9 region and each agency may be different from another one. Is

## 10 that right?

11 A. That was a possibility to consider.
12 Q. In other words, that was part of what was driving what
13 became the decision to make sure that there were samples coming
14 from each agency, correct?
02:53:30
15 A. At the time.
16 Q. All right. Has that now changed?
17 A. It has changed in the 2007 Plan.
18 Q. And was there at some point a study or determination made
19 that in fact there were not differences between the agencies
02:53:48 20 that would necessitate having each agency stand on its own?
21 A. In fact, what we relied on, the study was in fact the
22 litigation support accounting, which was undertaken initially as
23 a separate component apart from what we had had in the 2003 Plan
Q. And why was that?
A. Initially we wanted to provide coverage for a statistical

1952
1 of what the judge had ordered, and so the litigation support
2 accounting was, as it states, it was intended to provide
3 information that could support settlement discussions that were
4 being undertaken under the auspices of Congress.
5 Q. Okay. In light of what you've just said, is it correct
6 that the decision to move from making sure that each agency
7 could stand on its own and ensuring a certain number of samples
8 came from each agency, to what we now see in the 2007 Plan, was
9 the result of the LSA or information gained from the LSA?
A. That's a fair statement.

11 Q. But the LSA -- was the LSA -- were there samples in the LSA

16 Q. Okay. But you do not know whether -- you do know, don't
17 you, that there were some agencies where there were no samples
18 taken, correct?
19 A. The only one I know of for sure is the Horton Agency, sir.
02:55:35
20 Q. And we know of that because that's where the
21 land-to-dollars test was done, and that was one of the reasons
22 they went to the Horton Agency, was because they figured they
23 weren't tired of providing information at that point, right?
24 A. That was one of the criteria for selecting Horton Agency.
25 Q. Now, let me ask you to look at the same document -- no,
excuse me. It would be document 63-11-5. And if we come to the top of this, this is then a meeting with Mr. Cason on November 10, 2003 that Mr. Cason, Mr. Haspel, Bert -- that would be Bert Edwards?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Yourself and Alyce. Who was Alyce?
A. Alyce Schiess. Alyce Schiess is an employee in the office.

S-C-H-I-E-S-S.
Q. Look down about halfway down the page where it talks about third-party records. Let me give you a moment to review that.
A. Could you go back to the top again, sir?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Okay.
Q. Can you read it at that size?
A. Starting with "for third-party records"?
Q. Yes.
(Witness reviewing document.)
A. Okay.
Q. What's your recollection of what was being discussed here?
A. My recollection was one of the breaches that had been --
that the Court had noted in an earlier ruling dealing with
third-party records, and this was a discussion of third-party records.
Q. And what ended up being decided regarding obtaining third-party records?
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## A. Well, I don't know specifically coming out of this. The Department has a departmental manual release; our office actually undertook to go out and survey some third-party records and ultimately in the historical accounting, under LSA we use third-party records to reconcile transactions. <br> Q. And what third-party records were used to reconcile transactions in the LSA? <br> A. I'm aware of two. One involved a right-of-way payment in Arizona. We couldn't verify the payment amount without going to an attorney who represented an allottee in negotiations with the state of Arizona. And the second one we couldn't verify an electronic funds disbursement in Alaska, and we ended up calling the bank which had succeeded the previous bank, and they were able to look in their records and confirm that the payment was made. <br> Q. But those are the only two instances in the LSA <br> reconciliation project that you're aware of where third-party <br> records were obtained in order to try to support one of the reconciliations?

A. Those are the ones that I readily recall. I think there may have been some others.
Q. But you don't recall them here. Now, look at this same document, Bates page 8, which appears to be a meeting on December 15, 2003, and you see the people that were in attendance there. So this is document No. 63-11-8 that we're Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

1 looking at. You see where it says "Dollars in and dollars out, 2 preferred reporting, 13 billion in"? Do you see that?

3 A. Yes, sir.
4 Q. And what was the discussion as to why it was preferred to

6 A. What we refer to as the blue document, the report to
7 Congress, that first surfaced and had a table referencing the $\mathbf{1 3}$
billion -- actually referred to that as throughput. Throughput in the parlance that we use means you're counting the money as
12 Your Honor, as collections is just the money coming in, and so
13 it's -- the preferred reporting should have been and going
14 forward should be $\mathbf{1 3}$ billion in collections, using the data that
03:00:40

15 we had at that time.
16 Q. Okay. So that was what, the best you recall as to why that's preferred reporting, is to make it clear that that's the money coming in, at least as far as the Department saw.

19 A. Yes, sir.
Q. Let me ask you to look -- let's start in this same

21 document, Bates page 10. And look up at the date of the
22 meeting, and it appears to be a meeting from June 17, 2004, that
23 you had with Mr. Cason. Do you see that?
24
25
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And could you just scroll down the page so he can get the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
A. Yes, sir, I have.
Q. And are any of those included in the administrative record?
A. My understanding, they were presented as an exhibit.
Q. Okay. But were they prepared after the administrative record?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But none were prepared as of the time you put together this administrative record?
A. I don't believe they were, sir.
Q. Other than those that had been presented as an exhibit, are you aware of any draft historical statements of account for land-based account holders?
A. No.
Q. All right. And are you aware of even the ones that were presented as an exhibit that contained a statement from the paper record with an opening balance that cannot be verified?
A. I don't recall what that refers to.
Q. The note here in this meeting, you don't recall what that's referring to?
A. No, sir.
Q. Is it expected that there will be land-based accounts that go back into the paper record era where the Department will not be able to verify the opening balance?
A. I believe that if we have an account that goes back to 1938, and if we follow what the courts have said about using the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

1 context of this meeting. And then if we'll look at the next
2 page, if we may.
3 A. Okay.
4 Q. And so we're now at document Bates page 63-11-11. Do you see where this is a continuation of that same meeting, correct?
A. I believe so.

7 Q. Okay. And you see where it's talking about example
8 statements 3 to 4? Would you look at that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. It says "sample of a statement from paper record with opening balance we cannot verify." Do you see that?
12 A. Yes, sir.
13 Q. Was a statement, a draft statement of historical accounting 14 such as that ever prepared?
15 A. I don't think at this date we had produced any statements.
16 I know later on when we were beginning to talk about historical
17 statements of account we pulled together just an example of all
time we did not have anything like that, $I$ believe.
Q. Okay. The 2007 Plan talks about there being statements of historical accounts sent out to a variety of different beneficiaries, some of whom have land-based accounts, correct? And my question just goes to the land-based accounts. Have you seen draft statements of historical accounts for land-based beneficiaries?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
act of June 24, 1938, as the limit of the accounting, then that's as far back as we would go.
Q. Okay. Now, let's look over at the next page. And this is a meeting of July 2, 2004, where there's a briefing for Mr. Cason on LSA results, and you see the attendees at that meeting, and I assume you were also there, correct?
A. Yes. It says so.
Q. And would you -- let's look -- do you see where it says "draft by July 9 " toward the bottom of the page?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see just above there where it says "we assume no connotation on missing information"?
A. I see that.
Q. Do you know what that's referring to?
A. In light of what we ended up producing, no, sir, I don't, because we ended up -- if we couldn't reconcile the transaction because of missing information, we assumed it was an error.
Q. Okay. So to the extent that this is an indication that the LSA results had made no connotation on missing information, that ultimately did not end up being the decision as to how the reconciliation would be done?
A. At this time, this part of the LSA was only partially completed in 2004, and I believe we included an interim report by NORC about it. So this is while it was ongoing. And ultimately it's the final report on LSA that contains the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
conclusions that were made and describes the process.
2 Q. So this was at some point while LSA had not yet been completed; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, let me ask you to look at one -- it'll be the last note that we'll look at -- is going to be Bates page from the administrative record 63-13-2. And this is a July 21, 2006, document that indicates it's a contemporaneous note of yours, 9 and the subject is "Paper era accounts." And it appears that it was a meeting just between you and Mr. Cason. Do you see that?

11 A. Mm-hmm.
12 Q. It says under "Notes," "Paper era accounts needed. If 200 records tail and a paper records antecedent. yields 75 , is that enough?" What was being discussed, if you recall?
A. My recollection of this is that we did not at this time have a good number for how many of the accounts in the historical accounting population went back into the paper records era. I think that's been referred to both as a paper
Q. I don't think they said antecedent the way you said --
A. I think they said antisedent. That was new to me too.

But I think at this time what we were looking at was if we were to draw a certain sample, how many would likely be in the population. And we didn't do it at that time because we didn't have enough information.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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1 Q. Okay. So the 200, would that be -- if 200,000 accounts
2 ends up there being 75,000 accounts that have a paper record 3 tail?

4 A. Actually, I think it might have just been 200 and 75. I don't know -- I don't recall more than that.

6 Q. That's fair. Look at the first subparagraph there. It
7 says find best of remaining accounts and do minimis. What do
8 you remember was being discussed about doing minimis?
9 A. I don't recall how that applies.
Q. But this is a note that you made in a meeting between you

11 and Mr. Cason in July of 2006, correct?
12 A. That's correct.
13 Q. Let me ask you to look at Bates document 57-30-1. And if

16 know where this document came from?
17 A. Is there anything further down below, sir?
18 Q. Yes. We can --
19 A. I think -- my guess is this would probably be from one of
03:10:06 20 the accounting conferences.
21 Q. Okay. We don't really work with guesses here very well.
22 A. In that case I don't who the author is.
23 Q. Okay. But you do know this was a document that was
24 maintained by the Department of Interior and was considered in
connection with the development of the plans.
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
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A. Yes. And I do believe, although I don't have a specific recollection of who prepared this, $I$ do believe this came from one of our accounting conferences.
Q. So you do not even know if this document was prepared by
somebody within the Department of Interior or a contractor. Is that right?
A. I think it would have been by a contractor, but I can't be certain.
Q. And likewise, in light of what you said, you wouldn't know which contractor prepared it.
A. No, sir.
Q. And you do not know when it was prepared, do you?
A. Short of going back and looking through the accounting conference books and seeing if that copy exists in there, no, I would not.
Q. And did you make the decision to include this document in the administrative record?
A. I made the decision that we should include all of our accounting conference binders, because of material like this that was presented at those meetings, which -- recall that these were mostly held prior to even the first plan being developed. This is part of what $I$ would call the formative information that we considered in developing the plans.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you, in the administrative record there were a number of exhibits where there were, on the front it

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
would make it clear it was from an accounting conference. Okay?
And this, as you will see, is page 1 of this particular
document.
A. I'm sorry. This is page 1 of...
Q. If we look at the Bates number down at the bottom, and if you can blow that up at all, or at least where we can read it. You know how the administrative record is numbered and Bates numbered?
A. I know those numbers, but $I$ couldn't tell you what that is.
Q. Okay. But do you see that this is page 1 of the particular document?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Now, there's one particular statement I want to show you in here to see if that refreshes you as to who wrote this, or if you can give us a time frame that it came from, okay?
Look on Bates page 3, the paragraph just above the heading about
two-thirds of the way down the page. And we'll look at the highlighted language. Let me let you read the entire paragraph and then I'll ask you.
A. Well, could I see the entire page first before focusing on this?
Q. Yes, sir.
(Witness reviewing document.)
Are you able to see that, Mr. Zippin?
A. With glasses I can.

Official Court Reporter error in the account." Do you see that?

11 A. I do.
12 Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to the origin of
13 this document or the timing that this document was prepared?
14 A. I don't know exactly when it was prepared, but given what

## (Witness reviewing document.) Okay.

Q. The highlighted part says -- this is after talking about there being a small error rate on the disbursement side, it says "although there were problems in locating all the support documents," I want you to focus on this sentence that says "this
Official Court Reporter
part of our population are going to be recalculated using the interest factor that was applied either by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Office of Trust Funds Management, OST, to a particular transaction.
Q. Why is that going to be done? What's the thinking behind it?

7 A. We had concerns about whether in fact interest may have been calculated properly, and wanted to do a recomputation of that to report to people as part of the historical accounting.
Q. And why did you have concerns as to whether or not interest had been posted correctly to the accounts?
A. I think largely anecdotal, the kinds of things that had been raised from a variety of sources.
Q. And it was not based on any study that was undertaken to determine whether interest and earnings had been posted correctly to the accounts?
A. No. Other than the results that -- we began doing this with judgment and per capita accounts as a matter of course, and noted that sometimes there were interest differences calculated. So we decided to apply this to all historical statements of account that we would be sending out.
Q. Would it be fair to say, even though it was based on anecdotal evidence, that there was sufficient concern by the Department of Interior that the interest had not been correctly calculated and posted to the accounts, that it thought it
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5
statement of account as practicable, that we could do this.
Q. You said that you were going to use the stated interest
factors, or words to that effect. Did I get it right?
A. Yes.
Q. What interest factors, who states them, and what are those that are being used?
A. My understanding is that whenever there is an interest period, interest is moved into a special deposit account, interest that's been earned by the pooled funds, and that divided by the dollars that are being in the accounts to which this interest is applicable, generates a decimal fraction. That's the factor that is then applied to calculating interest in all accounts that are eligible to receive interest.
Q. And who is making that calculation?
A. That's the -- it's in the Office of the Special Trustee.

And prior to that it would have been the Bureau of Indian
Affairs.
Q. So that's a historical calculation that's been done?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So there has been a calculation done over the course of Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
time as to what -- an effort to determine what interest was actually being earned on the pooled investments; is that correct?
A. Well, it's not a report of the interest. The factor used is what is actually applied to the dollars that are in an account, in accordance with what the applicable interest payment rules were at the time.
Q. Okay. I got totally lost on that last part.
A. I apologize.
Q. No, I don't know that it's you. I don't understand what you just told me. Can you explain how -- what these interest factors are?
A. And I want to draw the distinction these are not interest factors. These are factors that were used -- the factor itself is not about interest earned; it's about the total amount that was available to be paid from the interest, and the factor is what they use to apply to the money in accounts.
Q. Okay. Let's try to do this quickly, but we need to break it down fairly simple for me if we can. Funds are in a pooled account; is that correct?
A. Yes. The IIM funds are pooled.

22 Q. And they are pooled and invested in some type of security
23 or bond that pays a dividend or interest, correct?
24 A. Yes.
03:19:47 25 Q. And so you have a pooled amount that has a certain amount
Q. And so you have a pooled amount that has a certain amount
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| 1894:25, 1895:7, <br> 1920:6, 1920:15, <br> 1920:20, 1920:23, <br> 1924:17, 1929:24 <br> commonly [1] - <br> 1909:1 <br> compact [1] - 1930:4 <br> Compacting [1] - <br> 1905:6 <br> compacting [7] - <br> 1905:18, 1906:18, <br> 1925:3, 1925:5, <br> 1925:10, 1929:25, <br> 1930:9 <br> compacts [2] - <br> 1905:9, 1905:25 <br> compare [1] - <br> 1919:12 <br> compiled [1] - <br> 1938:13 <br> complete [9] - <br> 1893:3, 1894:13, <br> 1900:14, 1907:6, <br> 1911:10, 1912:21, <br> 1931:3, 1939:4, <br> 1965:5 <br> completed [2] - <br> 1958:23, 1959:3 <br> completely [1] - <br> 1907:9 <br> completeness [1]- <br> 1870:15 <br> completes [1] - <br> 1875:23 <br> completing [2] - <br> 1931:2, 1943:5 <br> completion [1] - <br> 1931:7 <br> compliance [1] - <br> 1888:2 <br> complies [1] - <br> 1898:10 <br> comply [1] - 1898:10 <br> component [1] - <br> 1951:23 <br> composition [1] - <br> 1919:13 <br> comprehensive ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 1885:2 <br> comptroller [2] - <br> 1883:17, 1913:19 <br> Comptroller [6] - <br> 1879:18, 1879:21, <br> 1882:1, 1882:14, <br> 1882:16, 1925:23 <br> computer [1] - <br> 1864:25 <br> computer-aided [1] - <br> 1864:25 <br> concept [4] - | 1867:21, 1926:9, 1927:13, 1927:20 concern [3] 1913:12, 1951:8, 1964:23 <br> concerned [4] 1893:17, 1902:25, 1913:19, 1914:18 concerns [3] 1922:21, 1964:7, 1964:10 conclude [1] 1923:16 concludes [1] 1865:17 <br> concluding [2] 1894:1, 1910:22 conclusion [2] 1891:1, 1891:3 conclusions [1] 1959:1 <br> condition [1] 1918:23 <br> conducted [2] 1913:22, 1917:8 conf [1] - 1950:18 conference [6] 1878:9, 1945:24, 1949:25, 1961:14, 1961:19, 1962:1 conferences [5] 1898:11, 1939:21, 1939:22, 1960:20, 1961:3 <br> conferring [1] 1970:20 <br> confidence [1] 1917:1 <br> confirm [2] - <br> 1942:23, 1954:14 confused [1] 1970:16 <br> congress [1] 1927:9 <br> Congress [5] 1909:4, 1909:10, 1951:25, 1952:4, 1955:7 <br> congressional [2] 1875:1, 1936:23 congressman [1] 1877:14 <br> connection [3] 1877:15, 1940:15, 1960:25 <br> connotation [2] 1958:12, 1958:19 consider [13] 1867:11, 1867:14, 1867:24, 1868:3, |  |  | 1928:6, 1931:14, 1940:23, 1941:8, 1941:16, 1943:10, 1946:13, 1946:21, 1947:10, 1947:14, 1947:15, 1947:20, 1947:21, 1948:11, 1948:22, 1949:1, 1951:14, 1952:5, 1952:18, 1956:5, 1956:22, 1958:6, 1959:3, 1960:11, 1960:12, 1966:3, 1966:20, 1966:23, 1967:1, 1967:2, 1967:16, 1968:13, 1968:19, 1968:20, 1969:10, 1969:14, 1970:8, 1970:12, 1973:4 <br> correcting [1] 1915:10 corrections [1] 1940:12 correctly [8] 1883:12, 1895:20, 1897:17, 1897:18, 1925:15, 1964:11, 1964:16, 1964:24 correspondence [1] - 1919:1 corroborating [2] 1867:10, 1867:23 cost [7] - 1875:7, 1900:9, 1932:9, 1932:16, 1932:19, 1932:20, 1933:5 costs [1] - 1912:17 counsel [8] 1866:21, 1874:24, 1877:10, 1929:18, 1929:25, 1932:10, 1945:22, 1970:20 counting [3] 1880:19, 1955:9, 1955:10 country [1] - 1916:6 couple [3] - 1913:10, 1928:20, 1948:3 course [11] - <br> 1877:17, 1892:20, 1900:25, 1901:21, 1917:6, 1918:6, 1918:12, 1933:2, 1940:25, 1964:18, 1965:25 $\qquad$ Court [19]-1864:11, 1864:12, 1874:3, 1877:13, 1879:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```1886:22, 1894:23, 1897:4, 1909:14, 1922:7, 1926:23, 1928:1, 1931:4, 1931:20, 1932:11, 1951:24, 1953:21, 1963:23, 1973:3 court [5] - 1868:2, 1872:3, 1874:9, 1902:17, 1945:17 COURT [61] - 1864:1, 1865:2, 1866:8, 1866:12, 1866:25, 1871:12, 1871:15, 1871:17, 1872:1, 1875:23, 1876:3, 1876:10, 1876:13, 1876:19, 1876:24, 1877:3, 1877:17, 1877:21, 1878:1, 1878:15, 1878:19, 1878:21, 1879:12, 1883:1, 1883:20, 1883:24, 1886:13, 1891:2, 1891:4, 1891:14, 1891:18, 1895:2, 1897:24, 1899:16, 1900:2, 1912:4, 1912:7, 1912:11, 1912:25, 1913:4, 1914:8, 1921:11, 1921:18, 1921:25, 1923:1, 1928:21, 1929:9, 1930:15, 1931:9, 1932:5, 1932:24, 1933:2, 1933:13, 1934:1, 1944:24, 1945:13, 1945:22, 1969:25, 1970:22, 1970:24, 1971:2 Courthouse [1] - 1864:12 courts [2] - 1927:2, 1957:25 cover [4] - 1882:8, 1891:23, 1933:5, 1933:18 coverage [2] - 1951:2, 1952:13 covered [1] - 1880:3 covers [1] - 1921:1 create [1] - 1899:13 creation [1] - 1934:16 criteria [1] - 1952:24 CROSS [2] - 1867:1, 1913:5 cross [2] - 1928:24, 1971:1``` |  |  | ```1898:7, 1908:9, 1911:4, 1911:7, 1911:11, 1915:24, 1916:4, 1922:15, 1923:16, 1924:4, 1928:5, 1928:12, 1931:1, 1934:17, 1934:22, 1934:23, 1938:6, 1938:22, 1941:10, 1941:15, 1943:18, 1944:3, 1944:14, 1944:18, 1945:8, 1945:19, 1946:3, 1946:11, 1946:15, 1954:2, 1955:18, 1957:22, 1960:24, 1961:5, 1964:24, 1968:21 department [7] - 1880:12, 1881:7, 1881:19, 1884:18, 1913:13, 1915:19, 1915:20 Department's [2] - 1899:9, 1900:14 department-wide [1] - 1884:18 departmental [1] - 1954:2 Departmental [1] - 1942:8 departments [4] - 1879:23, 1884:25, 1886:16, 1913:22 dependent [1] - 1908:22 deposit [3] - 1900:18, 1935:23, 1965:13 deposited [1] - 1900:17 depositions [1] - 1886:1 depositors [3] - 1914:4, 1914:14, 1914:15 depository [1] - 1886:6 deputies [1] - 1936:25 deputy [7] - 1883:17, 1884:13, 1896:15, 1915:17, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1938:15 derive [1] - 1900:17 describe [1] - 1963:23 described [2] - 1882:13, 1920:14 describes [1] -``` | ```1959:1 design [1] - 1935:14 designated [6] - 1879:10, 1931:17, 1931:19, 1932:3, 1932:22, 1933:3 designation [1] - 1932:7 details [1] - 1892:14 detect [2] - 1872:17, 1872:23 determination [4] - 1878:10, 1930:3, 1932:23, 1951:18 determine [3] - 1941:18, 1964:15, 1966:1 determined [1] - 1967:6 determining [1] - 1918:18 develop [2] - 1884:24, 1916:18 developed [1] - 1961:21 developing [2] - 1943:16, 1961:23 development [2]- 1940:15, 1960:25 died [4]-1901:17, 1923:5, 1923:12, 1923:17 difference [3] - 1865:15, 1865:17 differences [3] - 1951:19, 1964:19, 1969:18 different [8] - 1871:12, 1884:21, 1889:2, 1917:20, 1917:24, 1944:13, 1951:9, 1956:21 differently [2] - 1885:7, 1922:11 diligence [1] - 1965:4 diminish [1] - 1930:10 diminishes [1] - 1930:7 Direct [6] - 1899:15, 1900:6, 1922:12, 1972:3, 1972:4, 1972:6 DIRECT [3] - 1865:5, 1879:14, 1934:3 direct [10] - 1871:23, 1873:2, 1873:5, 1900:6, 1900:13, 1922:12, 1922:15,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```1936:10, 1936:11, 1967:18 directing [1] - 1938:18 direction [2] - 1920:22, 1930:9 directives [1] - 1942:8 directly [6] - 1897:2, 1900:9, 1901:11, 1901:24, 1936:8, 1937:9 director [8] - 1885:3, 1885:11, 1887:24, 1888:25, 1934:10, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1940:1 DIRK [1] - 1864:6 disagree [1] - 1922:10 disagreed [1] - 1897:16 disbursement [2] - 1954:12, 1963:4 disbursements [1] - 1963:8 discharge [1] - 1898:18 discover [2] - 1928:13, 1928:14 discovered [1] - 1881:11 discussed [9] - 1877:12, 1890:22, 1932:16, 1944:11, 1949:23, 1950:8, 1953:19, 1959:13, 1960:8 discussion [6] - 1898:5, 1926:22, 1949:12, 1950:10, 1953:22, 1955:4 discussions [4] - 1942:12, 1947:24, 1952:3, 1967:20 dismissed [1] - 1894:23 dispute [1] - 1921:8 disputes [1] - 1898:1 dissenting [1] - 1927:6 distinct [1] - 1949:15 distinction [2] - 1903:25, 1966:13 distinctly [1] - 1880:18 DISTRICT [3] - 1864:1, 1864:1, 1864:10 divided [2] -``` | ```1965:15, 1967:10 dividend [2] - 1966:23, 1968:7 division [2] - 1936:10, 1967:12 Division [1] - 1864:8 document [42] - 1880:21, 1882:5, 1882:9, 1887:22, 1889:5, 1889:12, 1889:15, 1894:3, 1911:19, 1941:18, 1942:24, 1946:20, 1946:22, 1947:2, 1947:8, 1947:12, 1948:2, 1948:8, 1948:10, 1950:11, 1952:25, 1953:1, 1953:17, 1954:23, 1954:25, 1955:6, 1955:21, 1956:4, 1959:8, 1960:13, 1960:16, 1960:23, 1961:4, 1961:16, 1962:3, 1962:11, 1962:23, 1963:1, 1963:13, 1963:18 documentation [10] - 1893:9, 1893:10, 1893:11, 1893:12, 1918:19, 1926:16, 1926:17, 1926:19, 1963:9 documents [53] - 1870:4, 1873:1, 1874:23, 1875:2, 1880:25, 1888:19, 1918:17, 1918:25, 1919:3, 1919:5, 1926:6, 1926:8, 1927:14, 1933:22, 1938:16, 1939:11, 1939:15, 1939:19, 1939:24, 1940:25, 1941:4, 1941:9, 1941:17, 1943:4, 1943:12, 1943:13, 1943:15, 1943:17, 1943:22, 1944:1, 1944:2, 1944:7, 1944:8, 1944:13, 1944:20, 1944:22, 1945:9, 1945:14, 1945:19, 1946:2, 1946:6, 1946:10, 1946:14, 1946:23, 1947:5, 1947:11, 1947:13, 1948:10, 1960:14, 1963:6, 1968:10``` | ```DOI [1] - 1918:13 dollars [13]-1915:3, 1915:7, 1915:9, 1915:10, 1952:21, 1955:1, 1965:15, 1966:5, 1967:1, 1967:10, 1967:12, 1970:7, 1970:10 Dollars [1] - 1955:1 Donald [1] - 1972:3 done [16] - 1868:15, 1868:19, 1887:12, 1904:17, 1916:12, 1917:4, 1923:12, 1952:21, 1958:21, 1964:5, 1965:23, 1965:25, 1969:9, 1969:11, 1969:13 Donna [3]-1897:16, 1897:18, 1936:24 DORRIS [26] - 1864:16, 1865:3, 1865:6, 1866:5, 1866:9, 1871:22, 1876:1, 1876:4, 1876:20, 1876:25, 1877:4, 1930:23, 1931:15, 1933:8, 1933:11, 1933:15, 1933:17, 1934:4, 1945:3, 1945:4, 1945:16, 1945:25, 1950:5, 1970:3, 1970:19, 1970:21 Dorris [2] - 1865:2, 1934:5 doubts [4] - 1893:19, 1893:20, 1926:18, 1926:20 down [26] - 1875:24, 1875:25, 1880:3, 1884:5, 1884:12, 1888:10, 1890:9, 1899:14, 1902:7, 1905:6, 1907:13, 1913:14, 1922:19, 1922:22, 1942:20, 1950:16, 1953:9, 1955:25, 1960:17, 1962:5, 1962:17, 1963:18, 1966:19, 1971:3, 1971:4 Dr [5] - 1875:10, 1931:12, 1932:2, 1937:23, 1947:25 draft [7] - 1941:1, 1941:6, 1941:13, 1956:13, 1956:24, 1957:11, 1958:9 drafts [1] - 1969:6``` | ```draw [2]-1959:23, 1966:13 driving [1] - 1951:12 due [2]-1926:16, 1965:4 Dunne [6] - 1865:8, 1865:17, 1866:23, 1866:25, 1931:11, 1932:2 during [6] - 1866:15, 1886:15, 1903:12, 1940:24, 1967:7, 1968:8 During [1] - 1908:9 duties [3] - 1894:25, 1905:24, 1935:19 duty [3] - 1885:15, 1898:19, 1902:5``` ```e-mail [5] - 1896:10, 1896:12, 1896:14, 1938:15, 1938:19 e-mails [1] - 1940:3 early [2] - 1916:4, 1916:15 earn [1] - 1967:11 earned [11] - 1965:14, 1966:2, 1966:15, 1967:2, 1967:7, 1968:16, 1968:19, 1969:21, 1970:7, 1970:11, 1970:15 earning [1] - 1968:8 earnings [2] - 1964:15, 1968:7 easy [1] - 1910:10 Edwards [6] - 1935:13, 1940:1, 1940:17, 1940:19, 1940:21, 1953:4 effect [2] - 1937:19, 1965:8 effort [5] - 1867:8, 1936:15, 1945:18, 1950:21, 1966:1 either [2]-1900:9, 1964:2 electronic [1] - 1954:12 eligible [1] - 1965:18 eliminated [1] - 1888:24 ELLIOTT [1] - 1864:15 Elliott [1] - 1877:9 ELOUISE [1] - 1864:3``` | ```employed [1] - 1868:13 employee [1] - 1953:7 employees [8] - 1917:13, 1917:16, 1918:2, 1935:15, 1936:4, 1936:6, 1936:8, 1938:18 enable [1] - 1922:17 end [3] - 1878:1, 1958:20, 1970:5 ended [5] - 1952:13, 1953:24, 1954:12, 1958:15, 1958:16 ends [1] - 1960:2 engaged [6] - 1879:22, 1882:20, 1882:24, 1882:25, 1891:20 engagement [4] - 1869:23, 1870:1, 1873:15, 1873:17 engagements [1] - 1868:8 engaging \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1935:17 enlighten [1] - 1926:23 ensure [2]-1885:17, 1939:15 ensuring [2] - 1939:3, 1952:7 entering [1] - 1905:24 entire [4]-1929:19, 1929:22, 1962:18, 1962:20 entirety [1] - 1939:21 entitled [6] - 1894:12, 1900:6, 1907:25, 1911:3, 1967:11, 1973:5 entry [1] - 1879:22 equitable [1] - 1892:4 era [5] - 1916:19, 1957:22, 1959:9, 1959:12, 1959:18 error [4] - 1949:19, 1958:17, 1963:4, 1963:10 errors [4]-1949:9, 1949:13, 1969:16, 1969:17 Erwin [3] - 1897:16, 1897:18, 1936:25 escape [1] - 1905:20 escheat [1] - 1909:11``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| especially [1] - | 1879:22, 1883:24, | expected [4] - | 1966:14, 1966:16, | 1893:8, 1893:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1933:21 | 1883:25 | 1886:24, 1893:22, <br> 1929:6, 1957:21 | 1967:5, 1967:12, | 1894:16, 1899:9, <br> 1905:14, 1907:7 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { ESQUIRE [13]- } \\ \text { 1864:12, 1864:15, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { examiners [3] - } \\ \text { 1880:10, 1883:15 } \end{gathered}$ | 1929:6, 1957:21 | 1968:5 <br> factors [5] - 1965:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1905:14, 1907:7, } \\ & \text { 1909.24 } 1911 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1864:16, 1864:19, | 1913:23 | 1884:1, 1891:4, | 1965:10, 1966:12, | 1911:7, 1912:16, |
| 1864:19, 1864:23, | example [4] | 1891:6, 1891:9 | 1966:14 | 1912:20, 1916:12, |
| 1864:23, 1864:1, | 1941:5, 1947:16 | 1892:17, 1893:4 | led [1] - 1876:4 | 1923:18, 1924:7 |
| 1864:2, 1864:2, | 1956:7, 1956:17 | 1893:8, 1893:14 | failure [5]-1885:6, | 1927:8, 1930:10 |
| 1864:3, 1864:3, | xamples [2] | 1901:10, 1902:11, | 1886:5, 1900:13, | field [2] - 1883:15, |
| 1864:6 essence | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1940:4, } 1940: 7 \\ \text { exams }[4]-188 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1905:13, 1908:2, } \\ & \text { 10na:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1914:16, 1963:9 } \\ \text { fair }[9]-1874: 10, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1917:12 } \\ & \text { fifth [1] - 1879:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1898:22 | 1880:5, 1880:7, | 1913:24, 1925:1 | 1889:10, 1936:3, | figured [1] - 1952:22 |
| essentially [4] - | 1881:22 | experienced [3] - | 1938:25, 1939:5, | file [1] - 1877:18 |
| 1882:10, 1897:5, | except [3] - 1897:2, | 1881:16, 1883:15, | 1940:22, 1952:10, | filed [4]-1877:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1905:21, 1914:13 } \\ & \text { estate }[4]-1902: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1908:20, 1947:2 } \\ & \text { exclude [2] - 1899:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1913:23 } \\ & \text { expert }[16]-1872: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1960:6, 1964:22 } \\ & \text { Fair }_{[2]}-1876: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1879:6, 1881:14, } \\ & \text { 1935:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1902:18, 1923:20, | 1906:18 | 1879:6, 1879:7 | 1884:3 | files [2]-1919:7, |
| 1923:25 | xclusions [1] | 1885:24, 1885:25 | fairly [2] - 1865:21, | 1938:10 |
| estates [1] - 1923:23 | 1910:25 | 1886:8, 1887:17 | 1966:19 | filing [1] - 1942:18 |
| estimate [1] - 1875:7 | lusions [2] | 1890:19, 1896:9, | faith [1] - 1898:5 | fill [1] - 1894:25 |
| et [2]-1864:3, | 1899:1, 1906:23 | 1898:21, 1906:22, | falls [1] - 1925:1 | final [5] - 1865:7, |
| 1864:6 | xcuse [3]- | 1911:17, 1912:14 | familiar [4] - | 1878:8, 1887:18, |
| evaluates [1] - | 1909:20, 1928:9 | 1933:3, 1935:16 | 1873:25, 1886:19, | 1958:25, 1969:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1898:23 } \\ & \text { eventually } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1949:24 } \\ & \text { excuse [2] - 1900:19, } \end{aligned}$ | experts [1]-1935:18 explain [6] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1889:16, 1917:15 } \\ \text { familiarity }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { financial }[4]- \\ & \text { 1865:20, 1865:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1916:5 | 1953:1 | 1865:13, 1894:4 | 1917:17 | 1872:17, 1873:3 |
| evidenc | execute | 1900:21, 1926:8, | family [4]-1901:17, | fine [2] - 1878:8, |
| 1866:11, 1867:11 | 1906:12 | 1926:12, 1966:11 | 1901:24, 1901:25, | 1878:14 |
| 1867:24, 1873:2, | executed [1] | explanatory [1] - | 1925:25 | finish [1] - 1914:7 |
| 1873:5, 1877:8, | 1946:24 | 1946:7 | far [7] - 1869:16 | firms [2] - 1873:20, |
| 1930:21, 1964:23 | executive [2] | explicitly [1] | 1882:25, 1891:14, | 1873:22 |
| EVIDENTIARY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $1935: 12,1940: 1$ | 1865:24 | 1893:17, 1902:24, | First [2]-1881:5, |
| 1864:8 <br> evolved [1] - 1949:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exhibit }[7]-1877: 22 \text {, } \\ & \text { 1882:10, 1887:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exploring [1] - } \\ & \text { 1932:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1955:18, 1958:2 } \\ \text { Far }_{[1]}-1869: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 1910:24 |
| exactly [7] - 1914:24, | 1942:22, 1957:3 | extent [11] - 1895:22, | farming [1] - 1867:17 | 1882:10, 1882:13, |
| 1926:14, 1927:9, | 1957:10, 1957:15 | 1911:9, 1911:11, | fashion [1] - 1929:17 | 1884:10, 1884:19, |
| 1927:10, 1930:8, | Exhibit [18] - 1865:7, | 1915:1, 1927:5, | favor [2]-1893:20, | 1890:21, 1897:4, |
| 1963:14, 1969:11 | 1866:7, 1866:10, | 1935:1, 1938:23 | 1926:20 | 1900:12, 1907:11, |
| Examination [1] - | 1876:8, 1877:6, | 1938:24, 1940:20 | FDIC [3] - 1882:22, | 1914:15, 1931:3, |
| 1972:3 | 1879:7, 1882:4, | 1952:13, 1958:18 | 1914:25, 1915:1 | 1931:7, 1935:14, |
| EXAMINATION [6] - | 1882:10, 1887:18 | external [2] | February [1] - | 1943:3, 1955:7, |
| 1865:5, 1867:1, | 1889:4, 1896:9, | 1867:10, 1867:2 | 1897:12 | 1960:6, 1961:21, |
| 1879:14, 1913:5, | 1911:16, 1930:13 | extinguish [1] | federal [4] - 1880:10, | 1962:20 |
| 1928:22, 1934:3 | 1930:20, 1942:16, 1972:9. 1972:10. | 1905:25 | 1905:24, 1905:25, | Fitzgerald [21] 1878.23, 1878.25 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { examination [5] - } \\ \text { 1879:23, 1881:14, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1972:9, 1972:10, } \\ & \text { 1972:10 } \end{aligned}$ | extra [1] - 1971:5 <br> Extract [1] - 1921:11 | 1935:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1878:23, 1878:25, } \\ & \text { 1879:3, 1879:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1883:10, 1883:18, | exhibits [4] - 1876:5, |  | fellow [2] - 1901:16, | 1882:5, 1883:7, |
| 1913:22 | 1925:15, 1943:23, | F | 1937:3 | 1884:6, 1886:8, |
| Examination.... <br> [1]-1972.5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1961:25 } \\ \text { EXHIBI } \end{gathered}$ | F-I-T-Z-G-E-R-A-L- | felt [3] - 1882:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1886:15, 1891:6, } \\ & \text { 1898:15, 1900:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Examination. $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1972:8 } \\ \text { exist } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D}_{[1]}-1879: 4 \\ & \text { face }[1]-1924: 15 \end{aligned}$ | few [4] - 1884:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1903:6, 1913:2, } \\ & \text { 1913:7, 1928:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text {....... [2] - 1972:4, } \\ & \text { 1972:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 1910:21, 1928:14 | fact [12]-1873:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1907:9, 1940:4, } \\ & \text { 1948:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 1931:21, 1932:10, |
| Examination $\qquad$ | 1956:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1889:17, 1901:15, } \\ & \text { 1904:6, 1905:23, } \end{aligned}$ | fiduciarily [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1932:13, 1932:16, } \\ & \text { 1972:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| ........ [2] - 1972:4, 1972:5 | $\text { 1884:22, } 1885$ | 1911:11, 1921:10, | 1888:8, 1916:10 <br> fiduciary [24] - | FITZGERALD |
| examinations | exists [1] - 1961:14 | 1921:14, 1951:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { fiduciary [24] - } \\ \text { 1881:8, 1886:23, } \end{gathered}$ | 1879:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1882:19 } \\ & \text { examine [1] - 1913:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expect }[4]-1873: 16 \text {, } \\ & \text { 1887:8, 1930:23, } \\ & 1930: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1951:21, 1964:7 } \\ & \text { factor }[10]-1964: 2, \\ & \text { 1965:17, 1966:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1886:24, 1887:20, } \\ & \text { 1888:3, 1890:21, } \end{aligned}$ | Fitzgerald's [1] 1930:13 <br> five [1] - 1873:22 |


| ```fix [1] - 1890:12 fixed [1] - 1890:14 Floor [1] - 1864:13 flow [1] - 1884:15 focus [4]-1865:14, 1872:10, 1884:14, 1963:6 focusing [1] - 1962:20 follow [5] - 1895:25, 1942:7, 1942:13, 1944:12, 1957:25 followed [1] - 1916:20 following [2] - 1900:11, 1906:21 follows [2] - 1894:18, 1895:7 FOR[3] - 1864:1, 1879:13, 1934:2 foregoing [1] - 1973:4 foreign [1] - 1925:24 form [6] - 1882:14, 1920:20, 1927:14, 1933:3, 1948:14, 1969:7 formative [1] - 1961:22 former [1] - 1877:14 forming [1] - 1917:11 formulate [1] - 1939:21 formulated [1] - 1950:23 formulating [3] - 1875:7, 1946:4, 1946:11 Forrest [1] - 1937:5 forth [2] - 1898:3, 1919:2 forward [3] - 1888:8, 1911:12, 1955:14 forwarded [2] - 1881:12, 1881:15 foundation[2]- 1903:4, 1921:8 Four [1] - 1912:15 fourth [2] - 1871:6, 1942:21 Fourth [1] - 1864:24 fraction [1] - 1965:16 fractionization [1] - 1929:14 frame [1] - 1962:15 Franklin [1] - 1864:9 fraud [1] - 1901:23 fraudulent [2] - 1872:17, 1873:2``` | ```Friday [1] - 1880:8 front [4] - 1881:7, 1912:14, 1946:22, 1961:25 full [4]-1879:1, 1882:17, 1929:21, 1938:23 fully [3] - 1898:18, 1910:25, 1913:20 function [2]-1889:1, 1902:24 Fund [1] - 1885:23 fund [2]-1887:16, 1929:15 fundamentally [1] - 1914:2 Funds [2] - 1964:3, 1966:19 funds [47] - 1887:4, 1887:12, 1887:14, 1891:24, 1891:25, 1892:1, 1892:12, 1893:5, 1897:6, 1897:11, 1897:13, 1900:13, 1900:15, 1900:16, 1900:24, 1900:25, 1901:1, 1901:2, 1901:4, 1901:6, 1901:7, 1901:15, 1901:24, 1905:8, 1905:12, 1905:15, 1906:13, 1907:19, 1907:24, 1909:18, 1909:21, 1911:13, 1923:24, 1929:20, 1929:24, 1954:12, 1965:14, 1966:21, 1967:2, 1967:15, 1968:7, 1968:11, 1970:11 furnished [1] - 1941:14``` <br> G <br> GAAP [3] - 1869:11, <br> 1869:18 <br> GAAS [2] - 1869:7 <br> gained [1] - 1952:9 <br> Gallery [1] - 1910:8 <br> game [1] - 1971:5 <br> gas [1]-1867:15 <br> general [13]-1881:2, <br> 1886:22, 1887:21, <br> 1888:17, 1890:6, <br> 1896:23, 1903:8, <br> 1906:2, 1906:17, <br> 1908:18, 1920:10, <br> 1926:18, 1944:7 <br> generally [7] - | ```1869:8, 1869:12, 1869:15, 1870:6, 1886:9, 1892:16, 1935:18 Generally [2] - 1869:14, 1908:2 generated [2] - 1909:18, 1920:8 generates [1] - 1965:16 generations [2] - 1910:15, 1927:11 Georgia [3] - 1864:17, 1880:4, 1901:17 GINGOLD [2] - 1864:12, 1864:12 Gingold [1] - 1915:21 given [8] - 1886:25, 1887:9, 1891:12, 1894:15, 1911:4, 1926:6, 1950:9, 1963:14 glasses [1] - 1962:25 good-faith [1] - 1898:5 govern [3] - 1881:2, 1888:3, 1888:4 governance [1] - 1925:12 governing [2] - 1880:21, 1880:25 government [23] - 1867:4, 1867:7, 1868:8, 1868:12, 1868:13, 1868:15, 1868:18, 1879:8, 1901:7, 1901:8, 1902:8, 1912:17, 1912:20, 1926:9, 1927:2, 1927:4, 1927:9, 1931:10, 1933:20, 1933:24, 1935:2, 1970:23 Government [3] - 1876:16, 1877:15, 1877:16 Government's [1] - 1898:15 government's [2] - 1873:13, 1873:18 GPRA [1] - 1934:21 graduating [1] - 1879:20 grafted [1] - 1885:13 grant [1] - 1878:10 grazing [1] - 1867:20 great [1] - 1907:15 Griffin [1] - 1865:19``` | ```Griles [1] - 1948:24 ground [1] - 1917:16 group [2] - 1884:20, 1940:13 guess [10] - 1882:7, 1885:9, 1900:1, 1909:5, 1909:15, 1920:2, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1939:5, 1960:19 guesses [1] - 1960:21 guessing [1] - 1903:1 guidance [6] - 1872:20, 1887:21, 1889:3, 1895:13, 1915:23, 1927:4 guide [4] - 1895:23, 1942:12, 1942:13, 1942:14 guided [1] - 1895:22 guidelines [1] - 1888:18 GUILDER [1] - 1864:19 H half [1] - 1879:23 halfway [1] - 1953:9 hallowed [1] - 1898:7 halls [1] - 1898:7 hallway [1] - 1898:11 handled [2] - 1963:21, 1963:24 hands [2] - 1900:24, 1909:16 handwritten [2] - 1948:13, 1948:15 hanging [1] - 1910:7 hard [1] - 1941:4 Harper [4]-1878:19, 1883:20, 1899:16, 1932:5 HARPER [32] - 1864:19, 1878:20, 1878:22, 1878:25, 1879:5, 1879:15, 1883:6, 1884:3, 1884:4, 1886:7, 1886:14, 1891:5, 1892:5, 1894:24, 1895:5, 1898:14, 1899:21, 1899:23, 1900:4, 1903:5, 1912:9, 1912:13, 1913:1, 1914:6, 1921:7, 1922:24,``` | ```1928:20, 1928:23, 1929:11, 1930:12, 1932:6, 1932:20 Haspel [4]-1937:23, 1947:25, 1950:13, 1953:3 hate [1] - 1949:24 head [2] - 1885:15, 1897:16 heading [3] - 1898:25, 1905:6, 1962:16 headquartered [1] - 1880:2 hear [5] - 1878:4, 1878:5, 1895:3, 1921:3, 1921:4 heard [4] - 1878:13, 1900:23, 1908:25, 1931:21 hearing [4] - 1871:25, 1877:13, 1938:3, 1940:25 HEARING [1] - 1864:8 hearsay [3] - 1897:22, 1897:25, 1912:11 heirs [1] - 1902:21 held [11] - 1887:1, 1887:5, 1889:23, 1891:15, 1892:3, 1894:7, 1899:10, 1902:1, 1905:8, 1927:21, 1961:21 help [1] - 1884:16 helped [1] - 1939:21 hierarchy [1] - 1936:9 highlight [1] - 1881:9 highlighted [5] - 1900:12, 1900:16, 1900:22, 1962:18, 1963:3 Hinkins [2] - 1931:12, 1932:2 hire [1] - 1906:11 hired [2] - 1868:11, 1937:13 Historical [7] - 1934:10, 1935:11, 1936:2, 1936:4, 1938:8, 1938:20, 1944:19 historical [24] - 1867:7, 1897:1, 1897:4, 1914:1, 1916:1, 1918:19, 1921:2, 1923:10, 1935:23, 1943:5,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1954:4, 1956:13, | hours [1] - 1880:18 | Inappropriate [1] - | 1865:18, 1870:5 | inform [2]-1910:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1956:16, 1956:21, | HSA [4] - 1872:7, | 1922:6 | INDEX [1] - 1972:1 | 1924:24 |
| 1956:24, 1957:11, | 1872:10, 1872:11, | inappropriate [2] - | index [4]-1939:8, | information [37] - |
| 1959:17, 1964:9, | 1872:12 | 1902:12, 1922:5 | 1939:18, 1943:3, | 1867:14, 1867:17, |
| 1964:20, 1965:5, | HSAs [1] - 1869:19 | inartfully [1] - | 1946:2 | 1867:24, 1868:2, |
| 1965:23, 1968:25, | hundred [3] | 1904:17 | India [1] - 1912:10 | 1871:10, 1890:4, |
| 1969:2, 1970:6 | 1915:3, 1915:7, | inarticulately [1] - | Indian [26]-1885:19, | 1890:16, 1891:12, |
| history [2] - 1870:5 | 1915:9 | 1899:3 | 1885:22, 1889:10, | 1892:13, 1894:13, |
| 1882:11 | hundreds [3] 1919:17, 1919: | $\begin{gathered} \text { inasmuch [1] } \\ 1949 \cdot 3 \end{gathered}$ | $1895: 8,1895: 12$, $1895 \cdot 21,1896.20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1903:13, 1903:15, } \\ & \text { 1904:21, 1910:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| hold [3]-1887:7, | 1919:20 | incept | 1900:21, 1903:2, | 1911:2, 1916:1, |
| 1910:18, 1923:19 |  | 1934:13, 1948:16 | 1903:7, 1915:25, | 1918:21, 1924:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { holder [4]-1919:15, } \\ & \text { 1920:9, 1923:24 } \end{aligned}$ | I | ude [13] - | 1916:6, 1917:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1924:11, 1926:1, } \\ & \text { 1926:3, 1926:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| holders [6] - | idea [2] - 1911:12, | 1872:23, 1876:22, | 1919:21, 1920:1, | 1926:6, 1937:11, |
| 1917:18, 1918:8, 1918:12. 1918:13. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1926:9 } \\ & \text { identical [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 1887:2, 1923:5, $1923 \cdot 12 \quad 1923 \cdot 14$ | 1920:3, 1928:17, 1934:25. 1936:16. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1938:18, 1952:3, } \\ & \text { 1952:9. 1952:23. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1918:12, 1918:13, 1957:12, 1965:5 | 1869:22, 1869:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1923:12, 1923:14, } \\ & \text { 1943:13, 1945:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1934:25, 1936:16, } \\ & \text { 1936:18, 1937:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 1958:12, 1958:17, |
| holding [1] - 1910:7 | identification [1] - | 1951:4, 1961:16, | 1943:6, 1964:2, | 1958:19, 1959:25, |
| holds [2] - 1894:7 | 1909:25 | 1961:18 | 1965:21 | 1961:22, 1969:2, |
| Homan [4]-1876:6, | identified [3] | cluded [1] | Indians [2] - 1909:6, | 1969:3 |
| 1915:13 | 1865:15, 1893:6 | 1943:15 | 1929:12 | Information [1] - |
| Homan's [3] - | 1946:4 identifies [1] - | included [27] - | indicate [4] - <br> 1868:17 1943.2 | 1867:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1876:5, 1876:14, } \\ & 1915: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { identifies [1] - } \\ & \text { 1887:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1870:17, 1880:17, } \\ & \text { 1891:10, 1923:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1868:17, 1943:2, } \\ & \text { 1943:12, 1960:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Informed [1] - } \\ & \text { 1889:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Honor [54]-1865:3, | identify [4]-1892:2, | 1939:12, 1939:16, | indicated [4] - | informed [5] - |
| 1866:5, 1866:9, 1866:13, 1866.20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1896:6, 1910:6, } \\ & \text { 1922:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1940:9, 1940:18, } \\ & \text { 1941:9, 1941:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1915:23, 1924:8, } \\ & 1928: 4,1940: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1889:20, 1889:21, } \\ & \text { 1920:11, 1920:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 866:13, 1866:20, } \\ & \text { 1871:14, 1871:16, } \end{aligned}$ | identifying [1] | 1943:18, 1944: | indicates [6] | 1925:2 |
| 1871:22, 1875:22, | 1891:15 | 1944:5, 1944:15, | 1868:11, 1923:3, | inherently [6] - <br> $1867 \cdot 11,1867 \cdot 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1876:1, 1876:11, } \\ & \text { 1876:20, 1877:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IIM }[17]-1867: 4, \\ \text { 1912:17, 1916:21, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1944:21, 1944:22 } \\ & \text { 1944:24, 1945:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1941:5, 1946:2, } \\ & \text { 1948:21, 1959:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1867:11, 1867:15, } \\ & \text { 1867:20, 1867:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1877:5, 1877:9, | 1918:8, 1918:11, | 1945:6, 1945:10 | indicating [1] - | 1867:25, 1868:3 |
| 1877:24, 1878:14, | 1918:13, 1918:18 | 1946:12, 1946:16 | 1881:7 | Inherently [1] - |
| 1878:18, 1878:20, | 1919:2, 1919:24, | 1947:6, 1947:22, | indication [1] - | 1867:17 |
| 1879:5, 1883:5, | 1922:13, 1923:24 | 1957:2, 1958:23 | 1958:18 | inherited [1] |
| 1884:3, 1886:7, | 1923:25, 1928:5, | 1969: | ndications [2] - | 1888:11 |
| 1894:21, 1894:24, | 1929:20, 1935:23, | including [6] | 1968:11, 1969:12 | innings [1]-1971:5 |
| 1897:23, 1899:21, | 1966:21, 1967:16 | 1876:17, 1891:15 | indirectly [2] - | innumerable [1] - |
| 1912:2, 1912:9, | immediate [1] | 1933:21, 1944:10 | 1918:4, 1918:5 | 1906:10 |
| 1912:23, 1913:1, 1914:6, 1921:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1896:15 } \\ & \text { impacts [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 1950:24, 1952:13 | individual [27] 1880:11, 1880:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insolvent [3] - } \\ & \text { 1882:21, 1882:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1914:6, 1921:7, } \\ & \text { 1922:24, 1930:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { impacts [1] - } \\ & \text { 1914:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { income }[4]-1887: 5 \text {, } \\ & \text { 1897:15, 1910:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1880:11, 1880:16, } \\ & \text { 1880:20. 1881:10. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1882:21, 1882:23, } \\ & \text { 1914:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1930:23, 1931:11, | impeach [1] - 1944:4 | 1910:17 | 1895:8, 1907:2, | instance [9] - |
| 1931:16, 1932:6, | implementation [2] - | income-producing | 1908:20, 1908:24, | 1880:19, 1887:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1932:14, 1932:20, } \\ & \text { 1933:8, 1933:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 1946:7, 1946:16 implemented [3] | [1] - 1910:5 | 1909:7, 1909:8, 1917:7, 1919:9. | 1887:8, 1890:8, 1901:4, 1901:14. |
| 1933:15, 1933:17, | 1898:18, 1911:1, | 1910:11, 1910:12, | 1919:11, 1919:13, | 1902:4, 1925:24, |
| 1945:2, 1945:11, | 1939:15 | 1910:13, 1911:8, | 1919:21, 1920:1, | 1942:14 |
| 1945:21, 1949:24, | implication [1] - | 1911:11 | 1920:2, 1920:3, | instances [2] - |
| 1955:12, 1969:24 | 1895:24 | inconsistent | 1934:25, 1936:15, | 1906:10, 1954:16 |
| 1970:19, 1970:21, | implications [1] - | 1896:4, 1896:19, | 1943:5, 1967:11, | institute [1] - |
| 1971:1 <br> honor [1] - 1908:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1896:25 } \\ & \text { important }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | 1900:13, 1912:16 incorporated [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1967:16, 1967:24, } \\ & \text { 1968:13, 1969:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1922:16 } \\ & \text { instituted }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| HONORABLE [1] - | 1910:16, 1914:16, | 1876:25 | 1969:22 | 1916:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1864:9 } \\ & \text { hope [2] - 1885:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 1939:19, 1939:25 impossible [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { indeed }{ }^{[2]} \text { - 1895:19, } \\ & \text { 1920:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { individual's [2] - } \\ \text { 1970:8, 1970:15 } \end{gathered}$ | instituting [2] - 1916:14, 1917:1 |
| 1923:22 | $\text { 1928:8, } 1928: 10$ | Indeed [3] - 1896:1, | individuals [3] - | institution [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Horton [3]-1952:19, } \\ & \text { 1952:22, 1952:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inability [1] - } \\ & \text { 1926:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1925:13, 1930:8 } \\ & \text { independent }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1866:20, 1919:16, } \\ & \text { 1929:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1880:23, 1913:21 } \\ \text { institutional [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |


| 1910:10 <br> institutions [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1874:15, 1874:17, } \\ & \text { 1875:4, 1884:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { involves [1] - } \\ & \text { 1927:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1864:7, 1866:21, } \\ & 1938: 6 \end{aligned}$ | L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1880:14, 1886:6, | 1894:18, 1895:7 | sland [1] - 1886:5 | ustified [2] - | L.L.P [3] - 1864:16, |
| 1892:24 | 1895:11, 1898:2 | issue [8] - 1866:3, | 1912:15, 1932:17 | 1864:20, 1864:2 |
| instrument [1] - | 1898:4, 1898:8, | 1913:16, 1913:17 | JUSTIN [1] - 1864:19 | lack [9] - 1893:9, |
| 1920:21 | 1908:10, 1909:3, | 1925:3, 1926:22, |  | 1893:10, 1893:11, |
| instruments [1] - | 1911:5, 1911:7, | 1933:5, 1949:22, | K | 1893:12, 1893:19, |
| 1968:3 | 1915:24, 1918:11, | 1963:21 |  | 1918:9, 1926:16, |
| insufficient ${ }^{11}$ - | 1922:16, 1928:5, | issues [5] - 1932:21, | keep [6] - 1889:20, | 1926:17, 1926:19 |
| 1870:17 | 1934:18, 1941:11, | 1934:25, 1935:1 | 1889:21, 1893:23, | Lack [1] - 1903:4 |
| uran | 1942:19, 1943:18, | 1937:7, 1947:3 | 1906:12, 1920:10, | land [10] - 1909:9, |
| 1915:1 | 1944:3, 1944:18, | It'd [1] - 1907:21 | 1927:17 | 1909:11, 1909:13, |
| insure [1] - 1914:25 | 1945:8, 1945:19, | it'll [2] - 1942:20, | Keep [1] - 1889:13 | 1909:16, 1952:21, |
| integrated [2] - | 1946:3, 1946:11, | 1959:5 | keeping [1] - 1925:1 | 1956:22, 1956:23, |
| 1885:2, 1885:20 | 1960:24, 1961:5, | item [1] - 1908:25 | Keeping [1] - | 1956:24, 1957:12, |
| intend [2]-1902:10, | 1964:24 Interior's [4] - | items [4]-1870:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1867:23 } \\ & \text { keeps [2] - 1892:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 1957:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1968:24 } \\ & \text { intended } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Interior's [4] - } \\ \text { 1867:7, 1872:16 } \end{gathered}$ | 1936:23, 1948:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { keeps [2] - 1892:14, } \\ & \text { 1950:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { land-based [5] - } \\ \text { 1956:22, 1956:23, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1869:20, 1889:9, | 1872:22, 1886:10 | 1882:25, 1903:19, | KEITH [1] - 1864:19 | 1956:24, 1957:12, |
| 1952:2 | ```intern [1] - 1935:13 internal [9]-``` | 1920:21, 1966:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KEMPTHORNE } \\ & \text { 1864: }- \end{aligned}$ | 1957:21 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1904:12, } 1923: 5 \\ \text { interaction }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1865:23, 1866:1, } \\ & \text { 1870:4, 1887:21, } \end{aligned}$ | J | Ken [1] - 1905:23 Kennedy [1] - | 1952:21 <br> Langbein [1] - |
| 1918:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1888:17, 1889:3, } \\ & \text { 1892:24, 1898:1, } \end{aligned}$ | JAMES [1] - 1864:9 James [1] - 1933:13 | 1881:23 | 1931:18 |
| interest [47] - 1892:4, 1902:22 | 1915:23 | January [1] - 1943:7 | 1893:2, 1907:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Langbein's }[3] \\ \text { 1932:3, 1932:7, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1909:2, 1919:25, | internally [1] - | Jeff [2] - 1930:24, | key [1] - 1865:15 | 1932:14 |
| 1920:13, 1933:25, | 1892:14 | 1933:9 | KILPATRICK [3] - | language [1] - |
| 1963:21, 1963:23, | interrupt [1] | Jeffrey [2] - 1933:16, | 1864:16, 1864:20, | 1962:18 |
| 1963:25, 1964:2, | 1949:25 | 1972:6 | 1864:24 | large [7] - 1907:12, |
| 1964:7, 1964:10, | interrupted [1] - | JEFFREY [1] | kind [8]-1872:2, | 1907:14, 1909:9, |
| 1964:15, 1964:19, 1964:24, 1965:1, | 1914:9 <br> interstices [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1934:2 } \\ & \text { Jemison [1] - 1896:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1883:3, 1884:2, } \\ & \text { 1890:12, 1892:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1914:17, 1935:15, } \\ & \text { 1951:5, 1968:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1964:24, 1965:1, <br> 1965:7, 1965:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interstices [1] - } \\ & \text { 1894:25 } \end{aligned}$ | Jemison [1] - 1896:8 <br> Jensen [1] - 1948:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1890:12, 1892:6, } \\ & \text { 1908:16, 1917:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 1951:5, 1968:12 <br> largely [2]-1908:22, |
| 1965:12, 1965:13, | intervals [2] - | Jim [1] - 1937:23 | 1917:17 | 1964:12 |
| 1965:14, 1965:16, | 1929:5, 1929:7 | job [1] - 1920:17 | kinds [3] - 1914:19, | larger [3] - 1880:14, |
| 1965:17, 1965:18, | interview [3] | Joe [1] - 1931:2 | 1939:24, 1964:12 | 1881:4, 1881:21 |
| 1966:1, 1966:4, | 1918:2, 1918:5, | JOHN [3] - 1864:2 | KIRSCHMAN [11] | last [12] - 1879:1, |
| 1966:6, 1966:11, | 1918:8 | 1864:3, 1864:6 | 1864:1, 1876:11, | 1891:23, 1904:25, |
| 1966:13, 1966:15, | interviewed [4] - | John [2] - 1896:16, | 1876:14, 1877:5, | 1928:16, 1933:12, |
| 1966:16, 1966:23, | 1874:6, 1874:14, | 1925:14 | 1877:24, 1878:7, | 1942:3, 1946:1, |
| 1967:4, 1967:5, | 1874:17, 1874:20 | [1] - 1884:12 | 1878:18, 1931:11, | 1947:5, 1947:13, |
| 1967:7, 1967:8, | introduce [3] | joined [2] - 1879:20, | 1931:16, 1932:14, | 1949:8, 1959:5, |
| 1967:11, 1967:21, | 1866:20, 1877:12, | 1884:6 | 1932:25 | 1966:8 |
| 1968:6, 1968:16, | 1880:9 | Jones [1] - 1937:7 | Klinger [2] - | Laughter [2] - |
| 1969:8, 1969:19, | invested [5] - 1929:17 1966.22 | JR [2] - 1864:23, | 1877:14, 1878:3 | 1883:2, 1933:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1969:21, 1970:5, } \\ & 1970: 7,1970: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1929:17, 1966:22, } \\ & \text { 1967:15, 1968:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 1864:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { knowing [1] - } \\ & \text { 1944:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { LAW }_{[1]}-1864: 12$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1970:7, 1970:14 } \\ \text { interested [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1967:15, 1968:2, } \\ & \text { 1968:3 } \end{aligned}$ | Judge [1] - 1945:17 <br> JUDGE [1] - 1864:10 | 1944:17 knowledge [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { law [22]-1879:20, } \\ & \text { 1881:1, 1881:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1884:23, 1898:2 | investment [2] - 1968:12, 1970:11 | judge [3] - 1897:10, | 1913:24, 1917:15, 1922:12 1927:12 | 1882:2, 1894:22, |
| interesting [4] - 1883:25, 1903:16, | 1968:12, 1970:11 investments [4] | 1931:1, 1952:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1922:12, 1927:12, } \\ & \text { 1946:13, 1967:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1894:25, 1895:2, } \\ & \text { 1895:7, 1896:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1907:21, 1927:7 | 1966:2, 1967:3, | judgment [2] - | known [1] - 1879:25 | 1909:5, 1913:25, |
| interests [2] - 1889.22 1909-18 | 1967:23, 1967:25 | 1873:23, 1964:18 | knows [1] - 1921:25 | 1915:19, 1915:20, <br> 1920:6, 1920:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1889:22, 1909:18 } \\ \text { interface [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { involved [6] - } \\ \text { 1880:4, 1936:5, } \end{gathered}$ | July [5] - 1911:22, | KOHN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1864:3 <br> KPMG [1] - 1865:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1920:6, 1920:15, } \\ & \text { 1920:20, 1920:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1936:14 | 1938:12, 1938:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1958:4, 1958:S } \\ & \text { 1959:7, 1960: } \end{aligned}$ | KRESSE [1] - 1864:3 | 1924:17, 1931:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { interim [1] - 1958:23 } \\ & \text { Interior [34] - 1864:6, } \\ & \text { 1873:21, 1873:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1954:8, 1963:20 } \\ \text { involvement }[2]- \\ \text { 1933:20, 1934:24 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June [2] - 1955:22, } \\ & \text { 1958:1 } \end{aligned}$ | Krulitz [1] - 1895:18 | ```lawsuits [1] - 1886:2 lawyers [3] - 1881:24, 1881:25,``` |


| ```1893:1 leading [1] - 1946:24 learn [1] - 1963:17 learned [1] - 1909:3 lease [4] - 1867:15, 1867:17, 1867:20, 1901:4 least [4] - 1897:9, 1951:8, 1955:18, 1962:6 leave [1] - 1899:16 led [1] - 1898:12 legal [2] - 1890:25, 1894:6 Legal [1] - 1891:3 legislative [2] - 1886:4 legislature [1] - 1886:5 Lenexa [3] - 1875:17, 1928:16, 1930:19 Leshy [2] - 1905:22, 1905:23 less [3] - 1904:21, 1950:17, 1968:18 lessee [2] - 1900:7, 1908:22 letter [4] - 1895:17, 1925:13, 1925:15, 1930:11 level [4] - 1879:22, 1917:9, 1950:18, 1969:9 levels [2] - 1883:11, 1938:22 LEVITAS [3] - 1864:15, 1877:9, 1877:19 Levitas [1] - 1877:9 liabilities [2] - 1870:10, 1870:11 liability [7] - 1870:8, 1927:15, 1927:20, 1927:23, 1927:24, 1927:25, 1928:2 liable [3] - 1906:16, 1926:11, 1927:21 life [1] - 1890:7 light [6]-1909:22, 1910:25, 1911:5, 1952:5, 1958:15, 1961:9 likely [1] - 1959:23 likewise [2] - 1869:13, 1961:9 Likewise [5] - 1867:14, 1867:20, 1869:25, 1873:5, 1875:13``` | ```limbo [1] - 1951:25 limine [2] - 1877:15, 1878:10 limit [1] - 1958:1 limitations[3] - 1866:1, 1944:11, 1969:4 limits [1] - 1906:25 line [2] - 1887:18, 1949:7 lines [1] - 1949:8 liquidity [1] - 1968:1 liquor [2] - 1901:18, 1901:20 list [3] - 1868:16, 1881:8, 1912:9 listed [2] - 1887:9, 1910:17 listing[2] - 1887:14, 1891:14 lists [1] - 1886:25 Litigation [1] - 1864:8 litigation [5] - 1870:12, 1885:25, 1896:18, 1951:22, 1952:1 live [1] - 1931:5 local [2] - 1885:1, 1908:24 locate [1] - 1945:18 located [1] - 1888:10 locating [1] - 1963:5 longer-term [1] - 1968:3 look [38] - 1880:15, 1887:11, 1902:23, 1914:21, 1916:8, 1920:23, 1929:23, 1937:24, 1941:22, 1942:16, 1942:21, 1942:23, 1943:1, 1945:7, 1947:7, 1947:16, 1947:18, 1948:2, 1948:3, 1948:8, 1948:9, 1949:5, 1950:11, 1950:16, 1952:25, 1954:14, 1954:22, 1955:20, 1955:21, 1956:1, 1956:8, 1958:3, 1958:8, 1959:5, 1959:6, 1960:13, 1962:5, 1962:17 Look [3] - 1953:9, 1960:6, 1962:16 looked [6] - 1895:13, 1921:22, 1928:1, 1939:10, 1939:24,``` | ```1940:24 Looking[3] - 1910:22, 1939:18, 1946:1 looking [6] - 1899:4, 1914:19, 1951:4, 1955:1, 1959:22, 1961:13 lose [5]-1914:14, 1914:15, 1914:20, 1914:24, 1927:18 losses [1] - 1891:21 lost [3] - 1870:22, 1927:13, 1966:8 LSA [13] - 1952:9, 1952:11, 1954:4, 1954:7, 1954:16, 1958:5, 1958:19, 1958:22, 1958:25, 1959:2 \\ M \\ machine [1] - \\ 1864:25 \\ mail [5] - 1896:10, \\ 1896:12, 1896:14, \\ 1938:15, 1938:19 \\ mails [1] - 1940:3 \\ maintain [2]- \\ 1944:19, 1945:9 \\ maintained [4] - \\ 1941:10, 1943:17, \\ 1947:22, 1960:24 \\ maintaining [1] - \\ 1938:9 \\ maintains [2] - \\ 1944:14, 1944:15 \\ maintenance [2] - \\ 1894:9, 1894:10 \\ major [5] - 1865:15, \\ 1865:17, 1881:18, \\ 1901:17, 1969:18 \\ manage [2]-1879:9, \\ 1918:1 \\ managed [4] - \\ 1905:9, 1905:17, \\ 1917:25, 1968:3 \\ management [7] - \\ 1872:1, 1889:22, \\ 1889:24, 1892:14, \\ 1900:20, 1906:7, \\ 1906:8 \\ Management [2] - \\ 1885:23, 1964:3 \\ manager [2]- \\ 1934:21, 1938:9 \\ manages [1] - \\ 1906:4 \\ managing [1] -``` | ```1906:6 manual [2] - 1872:19, 1954:2 manuals [1] - 1942:8 marked [1] - 1877:22 Maryland [1] - 1881:5 material [4]-1940:2, 1946:8, 1946:17, 1961:19 materials [1] - 1940:3 mathematical [1] - 1969:17 matter [5] - 1901:15, 1913:19, 1944:10, 1964:18, 1973:5 matters [1]-1876:1 \(\max [1]\) - 1930:16 mean [8]-1868:13, 1868:19, 1893:20, 1894:4, 1899:19, 1915:9, 1916:23, 1919:13 meaning [1] - 1897:14 means [4]-1868:20, 1891:25, 1910:12, 1955:9 meant [2] - 1889:17, 1899:17 mechanic [1] - 1890:9 meeting [23] - 1948:11, 1948:19, 1949:2, 1949:6, 1949:16, 1949:22, 1949:23, 1950:1, 1950:7, 1950:13, 1953:2, 1954:23, 1955:22, 1956:1, 1956:5, 1957:18, 1958:4, 1958:6, 1959:10, 1960:10 meetings [5] - 1898:11, 1916:7, 1938:5, 1950:7, 1961:20 memo [7]-1885:6, 1896:15, 1905:22, 1905:23, 1938:14, 1938:19, 1939:13 memory [1] - 1910:12 memos [2] - 1919:1, 1938:14 mention [1] - 1921:3 mentioned [4]- 1873:20, 1913:12, 1915:17, 1939:13``` | ```mentions [1] - 1883:7 met [4] - 1915:13, 1915:15, 1933:19, 1934:6 meta [1] - 1866:16 meta-analysis [1] - 1866:16 method [2] - 1969:19, 1970:4 MICHAEL [1] - 1864:2 Michael [1] - 1970:23 middle [2]-1916:16, 1942:18 might [8]-1876:2, 1907:22, 1913:20, 1922:21, 1932:16, 1941:20, 1956:18, 1960:4 Mike [1] - 1937:6 Miller [3] - 1896:16, 1915:17, 1925:14 Miller's [1] - 1930:11 millions [1] - 1907:12 minimis [2] - 1960:7, 1960:8 minute [1] - 1937:25 minutes [1] - 1930:16 misappropriation [1] - 1873:6 misappropriations [1] - 1872:24 mismanaged [4] - 1870:20, 1870:23, 1871:5, 1871:20 mismanagement [7] - 1870:21, 1870:25, 1871:21, 1871:24, 1872:1, 1872:7, 1927:22 misread [1] - 1900:19 missing [8] - 1926:8, 1949:8, 1949:9, 1949:13, 1958:12, 1958:17, 1958:19, 1963:8 mission [1] - 1935:19 misstated [2] - 1872:12, 1872:13 Mitchell [2] - 1927:5, 1927:6 mixed [1] - 1904:8 moment [3] - 1911:16, 1953:10, 1970:19``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1903:5, 1912:2, } \\ & \text { 1912:9, 1912:13, } \\ & \text { 1912:23, 1913:1, } \\ & \text { 1913:6, 1914:6, } \\ & \text { 1914:12, 1921:7, } \\ & \text { 1921:10, 1921:13, } \\ & \text { 1922:3, 1922:24, } \\ & \text { 1923:2, 1928:19, } \\ & \text { 1928:20, 1928:23, } \\ & \text { 1929:11, 1930:12, } \\ & \text { 1930:23, 1931:11, } \\ & \text { 1931:1, 1931:16, } \\ & \text { 1932:6, 1932:14, } \\ & \text { 1932:20, 1932:25, } \\ & \text { 1933:8, 1933:11, } \\ & \text { 1933:15, 1933:17, } \\ & \text { 1934:4, 1945:3, } \\ & \text { 1945:4, 1945:11, } \\ & \text { 1945:16, 1945:21, } \\ & \text { 1945:25, 1949:24, } \\ & \text { 1950:5, 1969:23, } \\ & \text { 1970:3, 1970:19, } \\ & \text { 1970:21, 1970:23, } \\ & \text { 1970:25 } \\ & \text { must }[4] \text { - 1873:8, } \\ & \text { 1873:13, 1889:20, } \\ & \text { 1928:25 } \\ & \text { muster }[1888: 6 \end{aligned}$  | ```1879:9, 1931:12, 1938:12, 1965:1 necessitate [1] - 1951:20 need [14] - 1878:15, 1883:20, 1885:7, 1892:8, 1892:9, 1917:1, 1926:12, 1928:13, 1937:6, 1937:8, 1937:10, 1963:7, 1966:18, 1967:25 needed [3] - 1892:16, 1938:7, 1959:12 needs [2] - 1907:15, 1929:6 negligence [1] - 1927:14 negotiations [1] - 1954:10 never [5] - 1893:14, 1900:24, 1905:2, 1933:19, 1934:6 new [4] - 1885:13, 1887:13, 1931:22, 1959:21 next [17] - 1874:14, 1876:2, 1878:22, 1879:22, 1898:25, 1899:14, 1902:7, 1904:3, 1905:6, 1908:25, 1922:1, 1929:10, 1942:23, 1949:5, 1956:1, 1958:3 Nice [2] - 1913:8, 1913:9 nice [1] - 1914:1 night [1] - 1880:8 Ninth [1] - 1864:13 non [2]-1897:15, 1910:17 non-income- producing [2] - 1897:15, 1910:17 None [1] - 1947:18 none [3] - 1919:9, 1947:19, 1957:7 nonfund [2] - 1910:1, 1910:2 nonmonetary [1] - 1910:3 nonresponsive [1] - 1914:8 NORC [3] - 1931:13, 1939:20, 1958:24 normal [1] - 1902:19 normally [2] - 1886:23, 1886:24``` | ```Normally [1] - 1904:23 North [2] - 1864:25, 1880:3 Nos [2] - 1877:6, 1972:10 note [7]-1940:19, 1947:4, 1947:8, 1957:18, 1959:6, 1959:8, 1960:10 note-taker [1] - 1940:19 notebooks [1] - 1948:15 noted [2] - 1953:21, 1964:19 notes [21] - 1939:25, 1940:2, 1940:8, 1940:9, 1940:11, 1940:13, 1940:14, 1940:17, 1940:21, 1940:22, 1948:3, 1948:5, 1948:11, 1948:13, 1948:15, 1948:18, 1949:3, 1949:9 Notes [1] - 1959:12 nothing [2]-1969:7, 1970:21 notice [2] - 1916:6, 1942:18 notion [1] - 1893:25 November [2] - 1949:6, 1953:2 number [17] - 1886:1, 1906:23, 1907:13, 1907:24, 1918:6, 1934:6, 1935:15, 1936:21, 1937:4, 1939:19, 1947:17, 1950:25, 1952:7, 1959:16, 1961:25, 1962:5 numbered [3] - 1947:12, 1962:7, 1962:8 numbers [1] - 1962:9 NW[2] - 1864:13, 1864:13 1897:24, 1912:12,``` | ```1914:10, 1932:11, 1932:20, 1933:4 Objection [10] - 1890:25, 1897:22, 1903:4, 1912:2, 1914:6, 1921:7, 1922:24, 1945:11, 1945:21, 1969:23 objections [1] - 1866:15 obligation [3] - 1901:3, 1920:10, 1927:8 obligations [2] - 1899:13, 1900:14 obtained [1] - 1954:18 obtaining [1] - 1953:24 obvious [1] - 1893:16 obviously [7] - 1904:16, 1916:14, 1916:19, 1931:22, 1933:19, 1936:6, 1963:15 OCC [5] - 1882:15, 1882:16, 1886:15, 1913:10, 1915:11 occasion [2] - 1886:16, 1897:9 occurred [1] - 1968:15 October [7] - 1864:5, 1899:11, 1899:18, 1923:5, 1923:13, 1923:21, 1924:1 OF [3]-1864:1, 1864:8, 1864:12 of.. [1] - 1962:4 offered [1] - 1931:20 Office [24] - 1879:18, 1879:21, 1882:14, 1882:16, 1883:22, 1884:9, 1885:3, 1885:12, 1888:22, 1888:25, 1903:9, 1934:10, 1934:15, 1935:10, 1936:2, 1936:4, 1936:17, 1936:19, 1938:8, 1938:20, 1944:19, 1964:3, 1965:20 office [37] - 1881:12, 1881:15, 1882:20, 1882:24, 1882:25, 1884:11, 1884:12, 1885:11, 1885:13, 1885:14, 1885:16, 1887:23, 1888:11,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





| recounting [1] - | 1938:1, 1953:24 | 1916:3, 1925:15, | 1955:2, 1955:13, | 1884:11, 1884:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1898:1 recours | $\begin{aligned} & \text { region }[5]-1880: 1, \\ & \text { 1880:2, 1950:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1926:3, 1960:8 } \\ & \text { remind [1] - 1910:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 1955:17 <br> reports | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1899:9, 1935:6, } \\ & \text { 1935:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1914:21 | 1950:22, 1951:9 | rendere | 1865:24, 1866:16, | responsibility [12] - |
| Redirect [1] - 1972:5 | regional | 1865:1 | 1935:2, 1936:11, | 1874:21, 1884:14, |
| redirect [1] - 1928:20 | 1881:12, 1917:23 | rent [1] - 1900:9 | 1939:20, 1941:6 | 1894:9, 1905:5, |
| REDIRECT ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 1937:9 | reorganization [1] - | Repository [1] - | 1905:20, 1906:1, |
| 1928:22 | regions [1] - 1969:13 | 1885:10 | 1928:17 | 1906:8, 1906:15, |
| refer [5] - 1888:18, | Register [1] - 1916:6 | repaired [1] - 1890:8 | representative [6] - | 1911:12, 1930:7, |
| 1915:25, 1935:24, | regular [2] - 1929:4, | reparations | 1881:13, 1883:8, | 1930:10, 1935:25 |
| 1943:6, 1955:6 | 1929:7 | 1881:20 | 1883:9, 1883:10, 1883:14, 1883:16 | responsible [5] 1901•8, 1906:16 |
| reference | regulate [1] - | repeat [1] - 1950:3 | 1883:14, 1883:16 | 1901:8, 1906:16, |
| 1881:10, 1896:3, 1896:22, 1896:23 | 1882:18 | Repeat [1] - 1891:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Representative [1] - } \\ & \text { 1878:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1938:2, 1938:9, } \\ & \text { 1939:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1896:22, 1896:23 referencing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regulation [1] - } \\ & \text { 1887:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { report [67]-1865:8, } \\ & \text { 1865:11, 1865:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 1878:3 representatives [3] - | responsive [2]- |
| 1955:7 | regulations [3] - | 1866:6, 1866:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1883:14, 1937:15, } \\ & \text { 1938:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1865:8, 1931:24 } \\ \text { rest }[2]-1881: 9, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { referred }[9]-1876: 7, \\ & \text { 1877:1, 1889:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1884:17, 1887:25, } \\ & \text { 1888:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1868:25, 1869:17, } \\ & \text { 1871:4, 1872:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 1938:6 represented ${ }^{[2]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rest [2]-1881:9, } \\ & \text { 1931:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1909:1, 1938:3, | egulations [3] | 1872:20, 1872:22, | 1954:10, 1967:10 | restate [3]-1895:4, |
| 1955:8, 1955:11, | 1885:4, 1885:12, | 1872:25, 1875:10, | request [8] - 1920:9, | 1945:7, 1970:1 |
| 1959:18, 1967:9 | 1889:1 | 1876:5, 1876:14, | 1920:15, 1920:16, | restated [1] - |
| referring [9] | rejected | 1876:15, 1876:17, | 1924:17, 1924:20 | 1897:12 |
| 1885:21, 1885:22, | 1951:24 | 1876:18, 1876:21, | 1928:25, 1929:3, | restatement [3] - |
| 1896:10, 1920:19, | relate [2]-1894:10, | 1876:25, 1877:1, | 1932: | 1895:14, 1896:4, |
| 1921:23, 1947:9, | 1932:19 | 1879:7, 1881:3 | requested [1] - | 1896:22 |
| 1950:1, 1957:19, | lated [2] - 1872:15, | 1881:6, 1881:9 | 1926:2 | result [2]-1893:10, |
| 1958:14 1957:17 | 1932:17 [2] 1809:12 | 1881:12, 1881:14, | requesting ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 1952:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { refers }[1]-1957: 17 \\ & \text { Reflect }[1]-1871: 15 \end{aligned}$ | relates [2] - 1899:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1882:8, 1882:10, } \\ & \text { 1887:14, 1887:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 1938:15 request | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resulted [1] - } \\ & \text { 1891:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| reflect [8]-1871:16, | 1895:21, 1937:18 | 1890:19, 1890:21, | require [2]-1906:2, | results [4]-1958:5, |
| 1871:17, 1871:21, | relationships [1] - | 1896:9, 1897:5 | 1909:25 | 1958:19, 1964:17, |
| 1872:7, 1938:17, | 1937:20 | 1897:13, 1898:21, | required [9] | 1969:15 |
| 1947:24, 1969:20, | ative [1] - 1877:13 | 1898:23, 1906:22 | 1886:19, 1886:23 | sume [7] - 1868:8, |
| 1970:14 | relatively [3] | 1911:17, 1912:14 | 1886:24, 1887:14 | 1868:11, 1868:16, |
| reflected [4] - | 1887:13, 1896:2 | 1921:4, 1921:15, | 1888:9, 1890:23, | 1868:17, 1868:20, |
| 1872:10, 1946:2, | 1916:4 | 1921:20, 1922: | 1891:8, 1892:11, | 1883:21, 1886:3 |
| 1947:2, 1967:23 | release [1] - 1954:2 | 1923:3, 1930:13, | 1893:23 | sumes [1] - 1865:4 |
| reflecting [2] - | relevanc | 1931:18, 1932:18, | requirements [3] | retired [1]-1937:5 |
| 1947:23, 1970:5 | 1912:24 | 1936:8, 1936:10, | 1873:25, 1874:4, | retroactively [2] - |
| reflects [6]-1868:8, | relevant [3] - | 1936:12, 1937:13 | 1942:11 | 1916:15, 1916:23 |
| 1943:3, 1949:25, | 1931:20, 1940:2 | 1941:13, 1941:14 | requires [1] | review [19] |
| 1967:15, 1968:6, | 1940:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1942:5, 1955:5, } \\ & \text { 1955:6, 1958:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 1885:19 | 1865:11, 1878:15, |
| 1970:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relied }[2]-1918: 20, \\ & 1951 \cdot 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1955:6, 1958:23, } \\ & \text { 1958:25, 1964:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { research [1] - } \\ & \text { 1907:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1880:21, 1880:23, } \\ & \text { 1884:21, 1885:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1884:15, 1885:23, | 1951:21 <br> relies [1] - 1917: | 1966:4, 1968:24, | resolved [2] | 1886:17, 1888:2, |
| 1899:11, 1899:12 | [1] - 1927:5 | 1969: | 1893:20, 1926:20 | 1888:16, 1897:18, |
| refresh [1] - 1963:12 | ying [1] - 1908:23 | Report [1] - 1871:15 | resolves [1] - 1963:7 | 1902:20, 1902:25, |
| refreshes [1] - | remain [1] - 1920:11 | Report's [1] - 1877:3 | respect [8] - | 1905:8, 1908:9, |
| 1962:14 | remained [1] - | reported [6] 1864:25, 1869: | 1891:24, 1896:20, 1899:7, 1899:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1918:18, 1932:22, } \\ & \text { 1939:6, 1939:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { regard }[5]-1870: 16, \\ & \text { 1922:4, 1926:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 1882:21 | 1864:25, 1869: | $18$ | 1939:6, 1939:18, 1953:10 |
| 1926:14, 1944:18 | 1960: | 1884:13, 1935:1 | $1936: 15,1936: 23$ | reviewed [18] - |
| regarded [1] - | rema | Reporter [3] - | respond [2] | 1866:16, 1867:3, |
| 1866:16 | 1906:9 | 1864:11, 1864:12, | 1877:24, 1878:16 | 1867:7, 1873:1, |
| regarding [12] - | remember [16] - | 197 | responding [1] - | 1874:23, 1875:1, |
| 1867:10, 1870:14, | 1868:22, 1872:22, | reporting [11] - | 1866:22 | 1875:4, 1875:10, |
| 1897:1, 1915:24, $1921: 4,1928: 24$, | 1880:18, 1883:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1870:15, 1870:20, } \\ & \text { 1870:24, 1872:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { response [2] - } \\ & 1865 \cdot 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1876:6, 1881:16, } \\ & \text { 1883:21, 1898:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $1921: 4,1928: 24$, $1930: 6,1931: 22$, | 1895:20, 1897:17, | 1870:24, 1872:18, 1873:3, 1903:18, | 1865:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1883:21, 1898:15, } \\ & \text { 1918:20, 1930:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1932:8, 1933:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1901:16, 1907:11, } \\ & \text { 1909:8, 1915:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 1903:19, 1937:19, | 1882:15, 1883:19, | 1939:8, 1940:12, |


| 1942:11, 1947:13 | sample [5] - | 1906:22, 1910:22 | send [2] - 1888:2, | simple [1] - 1966:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reviewing [8] | 1950:17, 1950:24, | sector [8]-1902:15, | 1901: | simultaneously [1] - |
| 1886:16, 1887:25, | 1951:6, 1956:10, | 1904:1, 1906:3 | sending [1] | 1880:14 |
| 1888:19, 1894:3, | 1959:23 | 1925:17, 1925:18 | 1964:21 1881:16 | Sinclair [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1896:2, 1953:17, } \\ & \text { 1962:23, 1963:1 } \end{aligned}$ | samples [5] - <br> 1950:25, 1951:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1926:10, 1926:15 } \\ & \text { 1926:24 } \end{aligned}$ | senior [5] - 1881:16, <br> 1883:14 1896.2 | $1925: 14,1930: 11$ |
| 1962:23, 1963:1 rhetorical [1] - | 1950:25, 1951:13, 1952:7, 1952:11, | 1926:24 <br> secure [1] - 1890:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1883:14, 1896:2, } \\ & 1896: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { single [2]-1919:24, } \\ & \text { 1929:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1921:25 | 1952:17 | urities [5] | Senior [1]-1864:7 | [2] - 1880: |
| Rhode [1] - 1886:5 | sampling [5] | 1880:17, 1880:19, | sense [3]-1886:22, | 1882:1 |
| Richard | 1873:13, 1873:18 | 1887:3, 1891:15, | 1890:16, 1898:4 | sitting [1] - 1948:19 |
| 1878:23, 1879:3 | 1922:4, 1922:5 | 1906:12 | sent [4]-1910:13 | situation |
| 1972:4 | 1952:15 | security | 1938:14, 1938:20 | 1900:7, 1904:20 |
| RICHARD | SAS [5] - 1868:25, | 1966:22 | 1956:21 | 1910:11, 1918:7 |
| 1879:13 | 1869:3, 1869:5 | see [63] - 1865:9, | sentence [2] - | 1925:18, 1925:24 |
| Richm | 1870:10 | 1880:16, 1880:24 | 1906:25, 1963 | situations [1] |
| 1880:2, 1881:15 | atisfaction [2] | 1883:21, 1884:16 | separate [1] | 1925:22 |
| Riggs [6] - 1881:5, | 1918:9 | 1887:8, 1889:25, | 1951:23 | sixth [1] - 1889:12 |
| 1901:16, 1901:18, | Savings [1] - 1915:5 | 1890:2, 1890:10, | September [1] - | size [4]-1950:17 |
| 1901:25, 1902:1, | saw [3] - 1887:7 | 1890:14, 1896:17 | 1942:21 | 1950:24, 1951:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1902:4 } \\ & \text { right-0 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1893:14, 1955:18 } \\ \text { Saxon [2]-1882 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1901:3, 1901:21, } \\ & \text { 1902:2, 1905:23, } \end{aligned}$ | series [1] - 1948:15 | 1953:14 |
| 1954:8 | 1913:21 | 1906:1, 1906:10, | SESSION ${ }^{11]}$ - | 1911:21, 1911:2 |
| risks [1] - 1913:20 | schedule [1] | 1907:2, 1907:9, | 1864:7 | 1912:7 |
| road [1] - 1890:9 | 1930:17 |  | set [2] - 1927:10, | slow [2]-1922:19, |
| ROB [1] - 1933:13 | Schiess [2]-1953:7 | 1910:24, 1913:8, | 1930:17 | 1922:22 |
| Robert [1] - 1931:14 | scholarship [3] | 1913:9, 1919:22, | settlement [1] - | small [4] - 1884:20, |
| ROBERT [1] - 1864:1 | 1893:18, 1920:24 | 1921:2, 1921:3, 1922:22, 1932:12 | 1952:3 | 1886:6, 1935:15 |
| Robertson [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1929:8 } \\ & \text { school } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1922:22, 1932:12 } \\ & \text { 1940:21, 1943:7, } \end{aligned}$ | seven [2] - 1876:15, | 1963:4 |
| ROBERTSON ${ }_{[1]}$ | science [1] - 1893:15 | 1945:22, 1946:4, | several [2] - 1881:3, | SMITH [1] - 1864:23 |
| 1864:9 | scope [5] - 1871:23, | 1946:8, 1946:19, | 1885:5 | Smith [1] - 1877:13 |
| rocket [1] - 1893:15 | 1871:24, 1921:1 | 1946:23, 1947:8, | sheet [1] - 1881 | sneak [1] - 1884:2 |
| role [1] - 1935:6 | 1923:10, 1938:7 | 1947:17, 1949:6, | ship [1] - 1888:1 | solely [1] - 1932:19 |
| Room [1] - 1864:12 | Scott [3] - 1895:15, | 1950:14, 1950:19 | Short [1] - 1961:13 | Solicitor [1] - |
| Ross [1] - 1936:21 | 1896:4, 1920:24 | 1952:8, 1954:24, <br> 1955:1, 1955:2, | shorthand [2] - | 1895:18 |
| $\mathrm{Rossman}_{\text {[1] - }}^{\text {R }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { screen }[4]-1865: 8, \\ \text { 1910:23, 1942:17, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1955:1, 1955:2, } \\ & \text { 1955:23, 1956:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $1864: 25,1920: 14$ | solicitor's [5] - <br> 1895:19, 1938.5 |
| 1905:23 rounding | $\begin{aligned} & 1910: 2 \\ & 1946: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1956:7, 1956:11, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { show [5] - 1910:8, } \\ \text { 1941:17, 1942:20, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1895:19, 1938:5, } \\ & \text { 1938:15, 1939:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1969:16 | scroll [2]-1942:20, | 1958:5, 1958:8, | 1943:19, 1962:13 | 1942:10 |
| royal [1] - 1925:25 | 1955:25 180:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1958:11, 1958:13, } \\ & \text { 1959:10, 1962:2, } \end{aligned}$ | showing [2] - | solve [1] - 1968:22 |
| RPR [1] - 1864:11 | seal [1] - 1880:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1959:10, 1962:2, } \\ & \text { 1962:10, 1962:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 1927:23, 1927:25 | solvency [2] - |
| rubric [1] - 1925:1 | second [13]-1871:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1962:10, 1962:14, } \\ & \text { 1962:20, 1962:24, } \end{aligned}$ | SID [1] - 1949:7 | 1881:21, 1913:21 |
| rule [1] - 1898:13 | 1881:7, 1887:18, | 1963:10, 1969:16, | side [5] - 1881:17, | solvent [1] - 1882:21 |
| rules [1] - 1966:7 | 1887:20, 1890:20 | 1971:6 | 1913:23, 1915:16, | someone [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ruling }[1]-1953: 21 \\ & \text { run }[5]-1901: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1895:6, 1900:16, } \\ & \text { 1900:21, 1900:22 } \end{aligned}$ | See [1] - 1900:12 | 1963:4 <br> Siemietkowski | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1963:16 } \\ & \text { someplace [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1901:19, 1901:20, | 1903:1, 1906:25, | seeing [2]-1882:20, | 1866:12 | 1880:8 |
| 1901:22, 1902:2 | 1911:4, 1954:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1961:14 } \\ & \text { seek [1] - 1929:19 } \end{aligned}$ | SIEMIETKOWSKI [7] | sometimes [2] |
| Running [1] - | second-guessing | seem [2] - 1924:23, | - 1866:13, 1867:2, | 1903:25, 1964:19 |
| 1893:15 | [1] - 1903: | 1927:16 | 1871:14, 1871:1 | somewhat [1] - |
| running [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Secr } \\ \text { 1864: } \end{gathered}$ | selecting [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1871:18, 1872:5, } \\ & 1875: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 1889:2 |
| 1894:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 1864: \\ & \text { 1895: } \end{aligned}$ | 1952:24 | 1875:22 <br> sign [1] - 1897:20 | Sorry [3] - 1874:13, 1933:15, 1970:24 |
| S | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1937:21, 1948:22 } \\ \text { Section [2]-192 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { self [2] } \\ \text { 1930:3 } \end{gathered}$ | signed [5] - 1881:13, | sorry [8] - 1868:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S-C-H-I-E-S-S }[1]- \\ & \text { 1953:8 } \\ & \text { sake }[1]-1877: 1 \\ & \text { Salem }[1]-1864: 25 \\ & \text { Sally }[1]-1930: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1921:14 } \\ & \text { section }[8] \text { - } \\ & \text { 1887:19, 1899:14, } \\ & \text { 1900:6, 1900:12, } \\ & \text { 1902:7, 1904:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { self-determination } \\ & {[1]-1930: 3} \\ & \text { self-governance }[1] \\ & -1925: 12 \\ & \text { sell }_{[1]}-1882: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1946:20, 1947:19 } \\ & \text { significant }[1]- \\ & 1935: 3 \\ & \text { similar }[2]-1925: 22, \\ & 1932: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1928:10, 1950:3, } \\ & \text { 1962:4, 1970:2, } \\ & \text { 1970:16 } \\ & \text { sort }[12]-1885: 8, \\ & \text { 1890:6, 1894:19, } \end{aligned}$ |


| 1901:23, 1906:14, | 1868:25, 1878:24, | 1891:25, 1926:2 | 1960:6 | sustain [2] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1917:18, 1917:22, | 1933:10, 1950:19, | statute [6]-1888:9, | subsequent [1] - | 1897:24, 1912:11 |
| 1920:6, 1922:16, | 1950:22, 1951:20, | 1897:14, 1909:9 | 1931: | [1] |
| 1922:18, 1934:22, 1937:18 | 1952:7 | 1921:22, 1930:3 | subsequently [1] - | 1932: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1937:18 } \\ & \text { sorts }[3]-1881: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { standard }[3]- \\ \text { 1868:6, 1889:1] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1930:6 } \\ & \text { statute } \end{aligned}$ | 1932:18 | Sustained [3] - |
| 1890:7, 1925:22 | 1926:21 | 1930:8 | 1866:2 | Swimmer [2] |
| sound [1] - 1873:23 sounds [2] - | 1869:2, 1869:3 | Stemplewicz [3] 1914:11, 1922:2 | ${ }_{\text {succeeded }}{ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 1897:8, 1936:21 SWORN |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { sounds [2] - } \\ \text { 1892:22, } 1938 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1869:2, 1869:3, } \\ & \text { 1869:8, 1872:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1914:11, 1922:2, } \\ & \text { 1970:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 1954:13 | SWORN [2] - |
| source [2] - 1893:5, | 1879:8, 1886:9 | STEMPLEWICZ ${ }_{\text {[16] }}$ | 1964:23 | synopsis [2] - |
| 1901:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1894:25, 1932:15, } \\ & \text { 1932:17 } \end{aligned}$ | - 1864:6, 1886:12, 1890.25, 1891:3 | ${ }_{1876}$ suggest [1] | $1882: 11,1895: 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { sources [2] - } \\ \text { 1918:21, } 1964 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1932:17 } \\ \text { standin } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1890:25, 1891:3, } \\ & \text { 1894:21, 1897:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 1876:20 | synopsize [1] - <br> 1894:19 |
| sovereig | start [3]-1920:8, | 1903:4, 1912:2, | 1931:23 | system [3]-1908:11, |
| 1925:5, 1925:7 | 1920:9, 1955:20 | 1912:23, 1913:6 | suggestions [1] | 1908:17, 1914:17 |
| 1925:9, 1925:19, | started [1] - 1879:17 | 1914:12, 1921:10 | 1943:20 | systems [2]-1879:9, |
| 1925:25, 1926:2, | starting [2] - 1917:1, | 1921:13, 1922:3 | uggests [1] | 1908:9 |
| 1926:6 | 1934:15 | 1923:2, 1928:19 | 1911:13 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { speaking }[1] \text { - } \\ & 1908: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Starting [1] 1953:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { step }[3]-1875: 24, \\ 1935: 14,1971: 2 \end{gathered}$ | Suite [2] - 1864:17, | T |
| Special [9] | state [11] - 1879:1, | steps [3] - 1875:25, | $\text { sum }[3]-1967: 9$ | table [2]-1866:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1883:22, 1884:9, } \\ & \text { 1888:22, 1903:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 1880:25, 1886:6, | 1939:14, 1971:4 | 1967:23, 1968:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1955:7 } \\ & \text { tail [2] - 1959:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1934:15, 1936:17 | $\text { 1932:21, } 1933: 1$ | still [6] - 1890:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { summarization [1] - } \\ & \text { 1869:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 1960:3 |
| 1936:19, 1936:20, | 1935:19, 1945:17 | 1902:4, 1906:15, | summer [1] | taker [1] - 1940:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1965: 20 \\ & \text { special }{ }_{[14]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1954:11, 1968:5 } \\ & \text { state-chartered }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1907:13, 1911:10, } \\ & 1924 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1935:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { talks [6]-1865:16, } \\ & \text { 1884:6, 1894:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1884:13, 1885 | 1886: | ck [1] - 1892:10 | 1896:15 | 1928:2, 1953:9, |
| 1888:7, 1896:16, | statement [22] | stocked [1] | pervis | 1956:20 |
| 1897:9, 1897:20, | 1871:9, 1871:20 | 1901:23 | 1874:20 | task [1] - 1935:17 |
| 1900:18, 1911:22 | 1873:16, 1886:25 | STOCKTON ${ }^{\text {[3] }}$ | support [11] - | tasked [2]-1938:7, |
| 1915:18, 1916:9, | 1892:9, 1892:21 | 1864:16, 1864:20 | 1893:12, 1943:14 | 1938:10 |
| 1935:23, 1936:21 | 1907:23, 1907:24 | 1864:24 | 44:3, 1944:16 | TAYLOR [1] |
| 1936:22, 1965:13 | 1912:22, 1936:3, | stop [1] - 1896:22 | 1945:9, 1949:18 | 1864:23 |
| specific [4]- | 1939:5, 1952:10 | store [2]-1901:18, | 1951:22, 1952: | telephone [1] - |
| 1900:19, 1921:9, | 1956:10, 1956:13 | 1901:20 | 1952:3, 1954:18, | 1949:25 |
| 1937:2, 1961:1 <br> specifically [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1957:15, 1962:13 } \\ & \text { 1965:6, 1968:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { straighten }^{[1]} \\ \text { 1899:17 } \end{array}$ | 1963:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tenure [2]-1886:15, } \\ & \text { 1888:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $1869: 5,1896: 2,$ | 1969:3, 1970:6 | 1899:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { supported [2] } \\ \text { 1872:11, } 1944 \text { : } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { term }[3]-1872: 2$ |
| 1954:1 | Statement [1] | 1934:22 | supporting [3] | 1944:6, 1968:3 |
| 1941:7 |  | strategy [1] - 1963:7 <br> Street [5] - 1864:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1943:4, 1943:13 } \\ & \text { 1963:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { terminology [1] - } \\ & \text { 1868:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| speculation [2] | 1865:21, 1865:25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Street [5] - 1864:1 } \\ \text { 1864:17, 1864:20, } \end{gathered}$ | 1963:9 supp | terms [3] - 1886:22, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1912:3, 1922:25 } \\ \text { spell [3] - 1879: } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1956:8, 1956:15, } \\ & \text { 1956:17, 1956:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1864:24, } 1864: 4 \\ \text { string }[1]-1885 \end{gathered}$ | 1944:6, 1944:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1919:12, 1936:13 } \\ \text { terribly }[1]-1935: 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 1933:12, 1942:3 | 1956:24, 1957:11, | struck [1] - 1917:20 | 1872:11, 1891:2 | test [1] - 1952:21 |
| spend [1] - 1880:18 | 1964:20 | study [3]-1951:18, | 1923:7, 1927:25 | testified [12] - |
| spent [1] - 1872:9 | States [3] - 1905: | 1951:21, 1964:14 | 1928:14 | 1867:3, 1867:6, |
| spread [1] - 1968:17 <br> staff [13]-1888:10, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1927:20, 1927:21 } \\ \text { states [3] - } 1880 \end{array}$ | stuff [2] - 1896:3, | supposed [6] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1868:5, 1870:3, } \\ & 1886: 1.1886: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1888:13, 1888:14, | 1952:2, 1965:10 | $1901$ | 1884:15, 1885:17, | 386:1, 1886:3, 19:5, 1921:1 |
| 1936:11, 1936:22, | STATES [2] - 1864:1, | 1918:25, 1922: | $\text { 1907:17, } 1918:$ | 1923:3, 1928:24, |
| 1936:24, 1936:25, | 1864:10 | 1952:15, 1959:9 | Supreme [2] | 1929:20, 1940:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1937:14, 1937:19, } \\ & \text { 1938:10, 1939:9, } \end{aligned}$ | stating [1] - 1872:22 <br> Station [1] - 1864:9 | $\text { submit }[1]-1932: 25$ | $1909: 14,1928: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testify }{ }_{[2]}-1885: 24, \\ & \text { 1931:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1942:2 | statistical [4] - | 1947:2 | surprise [1] - 1880:7 | testifying [2] - |
| stamped [2] - | 1922:4, 1922:5 | suboffices [1] - | rvey [1] - 1954:3 | 1868:21, 1940:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1941:1, } 1941: 6 \\ & \text { stand }[8]-1865: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1949:19, 1951:2 } \\ & \text { status }[3]-1878: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 1937:10 | $\text { suspect }[1] \text { - }$ | testimony [30] 1868:17, 1870:14 |


| 1873.21, 187 |  | 238.2, 1956:17 | 194 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1875:24, 1876:16, | 1890:4, 1894:2 | 1957:7, 1970:1 | Trial [1] - 1864:7 | $0: 3,1910:$ |
| 1876:18, 1876:23, | 1901:8 | tomorrow [3] | tribal [3] - 1919:12, | 1910:7, 1910:9, |
| 1876:24, 1877:14, | herefore [4]- | 1930:25, 1931:12, | 1935:24, 1963:17 | 1910:14, 1910:18, |
| 1878:3, 1878:11, | 1900:25, 1901:1, | 1971:6 | tribe [4]-1905:24, | 1910:19, 1912:18, |
| 1911:23, 1913:3, | 1908:22, 1917:4 | took [4] - 1899:5, | 1909:8, 1909:11 | 1913:13, 1913:22, |
| 1921:3, 1921:4, | therein [1] - 1939:12 | 1939:22, 1948:11, | Tribes [1] - 1905:7 | 1913:25, 1915:16, |
| 1926:14, 1928:7, | thinking [2] - 1872:9, | 1948:18 | tribes [8] - 1905:10, | 1915:25, 1917:21, |
| 1931:17, 1931:19, | 1964:5 | top [5] - 1906:24, | 1905:19, 1906:19, | 1918:25, 1919:3, |
| 1931:20, 1931:25, | thinks [1] - 1914:8 | 1948:9, 1953:2, | 1925:3, 1925:4, | 1919:4, 1919:5, |
| 1932:4, 1932:7, | third [10]-1890:20, | 1953:11, 1960:14 | 1925:8, 1925:12, | 1919:11, 1919:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1932:12, 1932:15, } \\ & \text { 1932:19, 1932:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1953:10, 1953:15, } \\ & \text { 1953:22, 1953:25, } \end{aligned}$ | topic [2] - 1950:10 | 1930:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1919:13, 1919:14 } \\ & \text { 1919:15, 1919:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1932:25, 1933:3 | 1954:3, 1954:5, | 1967:15, 1967:23, | trouble [1] - 1872:13 | 1919:21, 1920:1, |
| testimony's [1] - | 1954:6, 1954:17 | 1968:12 | true [9]-1870:7, | 1920:21, 1924:8, |
| 1877:3 | third-party [9] - | totally [1] - 1966:8 | 1870:12, 1870:13, | 1925:21, 1926:5, |
| tests [1] - 1865:22 | 1953:10, 1953:15, | toward [2]-1950:16, | 1873:12, 1873:16, | 1926:18, 1926:21, |
| THE [77] - 1864:1, | 1953:22, 1953:25, | 1958:9 | 1914:24, 1915:22, | 1927:12, 1927:22, <br> 1928:6, 1929:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1864:9, 1865:2, } \\ & \text { 1866:8, 1866:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 1954:3, 1954:5, 1954:6, 1954:17 | towards [1] - 1969:6 | 1923:19, 1941:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1928:6, 1929:12, } \\ & \text { 1929:20, 1929:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1866:25, 1871:12, | thirds [1] - 1962:17 | 1894:19, 1895:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trust [132]-1868:23, } \\ & \text { 1879:9, 1879:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 1929:24, 1930:7, |
| 1871:15, 1871:17, $1872 \cdot 1,1875 \cdot 23$, | Thomas [2] - | training [2]-1918:4, | 1879:23, 1880:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1932:15, 1932:17, } \\ & \text { 1934:25, 1935:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1872:1, 1875:23, } \\ & \text { 1876:3, 1876:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 1911:21, 1912:7 | 1918:6 | 1880:22, 1881:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1934:25, 1935:23, } \\ & \text { 1935:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1876:13, 1876:19, | 1945:18 | ransaction [8] | 1881:22, 1883:8, | Trust [13] - 1874:1, |
| 1876:24, 1877:3, | thoughts [1] | 1893:13, 1926:11, | 1883:9, 1883:10, | 1884:15, 1885:4, |
| 1877:17, 1877:21, | 1944:10 | 1926:15, 1949:17, | 1883:12, 1883:16, | 1885:12, 1885:22, |
| 1878:1, 1878:15, | thousand [4] - | 1949:19, 1958:16, | 1883:18, 1883:25, | 1888:25, 1934:10, |
| $1878: 19,1878: 21$, $1879 \cdot 3,1879 \cdot 12$ | 1915:3, 1915:7, | 1964:4 | 1884:10, 1884:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1935:11, 1936:2, } \\ & \text { 1938:8, 1938:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1879:3, 1879:12, } \\ & \text { 1879:13, 1883:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 1915:9, 1915:10 | transaction-bytransaction [1] - | 1886:9, 1886:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1938:8, 1938:20, } \\ & \text { 1944:19, 1964:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1883:5, 1883:20, | 1919:17, 1919:18, | 1949:17 | 1887:7, 1887:12, | Trustee [9] - |
| 1883:23, 1883:24, | 1919:20 | transactions [17] | 1887:13, 1887:15, | 1883:22, 1884:9, |
| 1886:13, 1891:2, | threat [2] - 1882:2, | 1869:19, 1891:20, | 1888:5, 1888:23, | 1888:22, 1903:10, |
| 1891:4, 1891:14, | 1882:3 | 1891:22, 1899:5, | 1889:10, 1889:17, | 1934:15, 1936:17, |
| 1891:17, 1891:18, | threaten [1] | 1899:18, 1899:24, | 1889:19, 1889:23, | 1936:19, 1936:20, |
| 1891:19, 1895:2, | 1881:21 | 1904:6, 1904:10, | 1890:3, 1891:15, | 1965:20 |
| 1895:4, 1897:24, | three [3] - 1883:11, | 1904:12, 1904:17, | 1892:2, 1892:3, | trustee [60]- |
| 1899:16, 1900:2, | 1930:23, 1931:8 | 1906:13, 1906:18, | 1892:12, 1892:15, | 1884:14, 1888:7, |
| 1912:4, 1912:6, | Three [1] - 1898:21 | 1949:10, 1949:14 | 1893:5, 1893:15, | 1889:20, 1890:5, |
| 1912:7, 1912:11, | throughput ${ }^{11}$ | 1954:5, 1954:7, | 1893:22, 1894:7, | 1890:6, 1891:20, |
| 1912:25, 1913:4, | 1955:8 | 1956:18 | 1894:14, 1894:19, | 1892:6, 1892:14, |
| 1914:8, 1921:11, |  | transcript [3] - | 1895:7, 1895:8, | 1893:21, 1894:6, |
| 1921:18, 1921:21, | 1955:8 | 1864:25, 1875:13, | 1895:12, 1895:14, | 1894:7, 1896:16, |
| 1921:25, 1923:1, | tie [1] - 1963:18 | 1973:4 | 1895:20, 1895:21, | 1897:9, 1897:20, |
| 1928:21, 1929:9, |  | TRANSCRIPT [1] - | 1895:22, 1899:10, | 1900:25, 1901:3, |
| 1930:15, 1931:9, | timber [1] - 1867:24 | 1864:8 | 1899:13, 1900:8, | 1901:12, 1902:2, |
| 1932:5, 1932:24, | timing [2]-1963:13, | transcription [1] | 1900:14, 1900:17, | 1902:13, 1902:19, |
| 1933:2, 1933:13, | 1971:2 | 1864:25 | 1900:21, 1900:25, | 1903:16, 1903:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1933:16, 1934:1, } \\ & \text { 1934:2, 1944:24, } \end{aligned}$ | tired [1] - 1952:23 | transcriptions [1] - | 1901:1, 1901:2, | 1903:18, 1903:19, 1905:4, 1905:19 |
| 1945:1, 1945:13, | title [3]-1882:17, | 1940:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1901:6, 1901:7, } \\ & \text { 1901:14, 1902:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 1905:20, 1906:4, |
| 1945:14, 1945:22, | 1887:21, 1888:24 | pped [1] - 1897:21 | 1902:18, 1902:21, | 1906:9, 1906:11, |
| 1950:3, 1969:25, | today [6]-1876:7, |  | 1902:23, 1903:14, | 1906:15, 1907:14, |
| 1970:1, 1970:22, | $17 .$ |  | $1903: 24,1904: 22,$ | 1908:2, 1910:4, |
| 1970:24, 1971:2 | 1934:7, 1945:17 $1968: 21$ | 1949:19 | 1905:5, 1905:9, | 1910:12, 1910:19, |
| theory [2]-1881:18, 1927:24 | together [10] - | treating [1] - 1933:24 | 1905:25, 1906:2, | 1911:22, 1912:20, <br> 1914:19, 1914:22, |
| thereafter ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 1884:20, 1888:1, | ses [1] - | 6:8, | 1915:18, 1916:9, |
| 1882:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1888:9, 1888:17, } \\ & \text { 1897:19, 1918:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 1895:14 | 1906:11, 1906:17, | 1920:11, 1920:12, |



| $\begin{gathered} \text { yourself [2] - } \\ \text { 1889:14, 1894:2 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: |
| Z |
| Z-I-P-P-I-N $[1]-$ 1933:16 Zippin $[11]-$ 1930:24, 1933:9, 1933:16, 1933:18, 1934:5, 1943:25, 1962:24, 1963:20, 1970:18, 1971:3, 1972:6 ZIPPIN $[1]-1934: 2$ |

