

And I'd like to point out that the notice of dated April 10, 1969 does not contain a minimum price.

And further that the unmistakable text of these 7 letters and instruments is to the effect that the Department of Welfare leaves the decision in these matters up to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And it was the action of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that directly led to the discontinuance of Mr. O'Fields public assistance. It's my intention to proceed now without having the testimony and the records of the bureau to show that the policy and procedures of the Bureau in matters of this sort is irrational and unreasonable and toward that end when it becomes time for our proof to be offered I intend to call witnesses to show that circumstances

The record states without the abilities to compell attendance here as witness, Bureau of Indian Affairs that its impossible to obtain a fair hearing. We'll attempt to proceed without it, but in order to discover whether or not their actions have been as required by law in the best interest of Mr. O'Field they should be. What we have received from them are those papers; yes, I think I read them into the record on the 2nd of July that for it to be an appraisal of Mr. O'Field's property, but they are not, they refer to some 13 sites inspected and that those 13 were suppose to be comparable to Mr. O'Fields' property but instead of setting out the facts on those 13 sites, they set out the facts on 3. I say facts and have reason to doubt that they are facts. Its difficult to say because that reported appraisal is undated. It possibly was made in 1967. The appraisals of the 3 sales that are set out, the sole date and that's on the sale of Wallace Stone, A. J. Pear is July 9, 1966 and the date on the sale number 3 is August 16, 1966 and on the sale number 1 there isn't any date and the indication is that that transaction is in the process of closing. So insofar as we know, from the 3 transactions set out the latest one is in August of 1966 and sales in 1966 are not sales in 1969, property values in 1966 at least may not be the sort of prices that the same properties would bring in 1969. There is an error on the 1st page of the reported 3 pages of appraisal that the property was in on March 21, 1967 and re-certified on October 17, 1968, but that's not the same as setting out property; comparable property and its sale in 1967. In other words what we have are sales or possible sales in 1966 being used as a basis for the value of property in 1969.

In addition, perhaps we can come to some stipulation here; we have inspected records in the courthouse, the county recorder's office; county clerk's office, sale # 1 which sets out the grantor as A. J. Pear and the grantee as A. Vaughn. This is not a record in the courthouse.

Referee: That's Delaware County Courthouse?

Mr. T.: Yes. Can we work out some stipulation or shall we bring up the clerk to testify as to that?

Referee: I think that would be acceptable to the committee on the basis of what you've stated.

Mr. T.: I myself didn't inspect the records Mr. (name not audible) did.

Referee: I think if they feel it should be investigated any further they will make inquiries.

Mr. T.: Further, the reported appraisal, these three sheets received from the Bureau, not at any point state the value of Mr. O'Field's property. The word, none of which I believe is used or comparable in some effects and less desirable in others, the incoherent feature of the statement following each sale; proposed sale is taking the statement made the property of Mr. O'Field would be valued at \$125