

Bowdoin College

Bowdoin Digital Commons

Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and
Reconciliation Commission: Statements

Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth &
Reconciliation Commission Archive

7-10-2014

Statement by Jessie Briggs Gunther collected by Rachel George on July 10, 2014

Jessie Briggs Gunther

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/maine-wabanaki-trc-statements>

Recommended Citation

Gunther, Jessie Briggs, "Statement by Jessie Briggs Gunther collected by Rachel George on July 10, 2014" (2014). *Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Statements*. 45. <https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/maine-wabanaki-trc-statements/45>

This Statement is brought to you for free and open access by the Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth & Reconciliation Commission Archive at Bowdoin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Statements by an authorized administrator of Bowdoin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact mdoyle@bowdoin.edu.

General Information

Private or Public Statement? - Public

Statement Provider: Jessie Briggs Gunther

Date: July 10, 2014

Location: Bangor, Maine

Previous Statement? No

Statement Gatherer: Rachel George

Support Person: N/A

Additional Individuals Present: Gail Werrbach

Recording Format: Video

Length of Recording: 51:50

Recording

RG: Alright, my name is Rachel George. It is July 10, 2014. We are here in Bangor, Maine. Would you mind stating your name, please?

JG: I'm Jessie Gunther.

RG: Fantastic, and I'm also here with?

GW: Gail Werrbach.

RG: Thank you. The file number is ME-201407-00062. Jessie, have you been informed, understood, and signed the consent form?

JG: Yes.

RG: Fantastic. And I have to let you know that if at any point today you indicate that there is a child or an elder in need of protection or that there is imminent risk of serious bodily harm or

death to an identifiable person or group, including yourself, that that information may not be protected as confidential.

JG: Certainly.

RG: Fantastic. Um, is there anything you want to say starting off, or do you want me to just go into those questions?

JG: You can just go into the -- well, I will say something off-- starting off, which is that I understand we're dealing with Indian children at this point, but I personally consider the whole state-- the whole process of being removed from parents and put into state custody is a terrible tragedy for any tribe. And the group suffering is different for tribes than necessarily for your average family. But it's a horrible thing, however it happens. So.

RG: Yeah. Absolutely. Can you tell me about your past employment as a judge?

JG: I started as a judge up in Dover-Foxcroft, Lincoln, Millinocket in '76 District Court. Was there to '80. And that was when I did child protective cases, as well as custody, juvenile, whatever. '80 to '86 I was on Superior Court, which was not directly involved with child protective. We did do divorce and custody and some of that. Then '86 to '90 I was off being a mother. And then '90 to 2012 I was back on the District Court.

RG: How many child welfare cases did you work with as your time-- in your time as a judge?

JG: It's... I really-- that was on the list. I'm figuring it was probably some six, seven hundred.

RG: Wow. And when did you first learn about the Indian Child Welfare Act?

JG: I believe that we were notified in sort of a -- from the administrative people at the court when it passed. There was a conference up in Bethel, what I'm guessing was either May or October of '79 that DH-- all of the case workers-- not all of them, but a lot of case workers, the AG's office, the defenders and the judges came in. But I think it was a combined -- that's on the question later -- ASFA and ICWA was just part of our whole conference. I did look up online when ICWA passed, which was '78. And that's why I'm thinking it was May or October of '79, but it might have been '80. But we did have this giant conference and they also had continuing ed after the first, and I have no idea when this was, but the feds did a survey of how well we were doing it and it wasn't so hot. And we had another conference after that.

GW: In that early time period?

JG: No, this was much late-- see what happened, I think, was that we all got advised about ICWA. But at least the judges didn't figure this was anything we had to do much about. But if ICWA applied, one of these other players was gonna tell us about it. You know, either the defense-- the parents' lawyers, or the state. And so, you know, we didn't ask and actually they never told. And everybody just kind of went on our merry way. And ah, you know, we were



conceptually aware that there was ICWA, but unless somebody brought it-- somebody else brought it up in the situation of the particular tribe, or if it was obvious. That means some of the names: Sapiel, Socabasin, you might get a glimmer. But if it wasn't a, a tribal name, or if it wasn't anything else that really brought it up, we didn't-- we weren't proactive. And so, after we got the Federal compliance, I guess, review, we had another conference that basically said, you gotta be proactive, you judges, you have to ask this question in every case, don't just wait for people to tell you or not.

GW: Do you remember about the time when that...

JG: I do not, but I would guess... I would think within the last decade.

GW: Ok.

JG: Oh-- decade before I quit, which was 2012. But, I, I don't know. But I, that I think... somebody should have, well...

GW: There was a big review at the end of the 90's, that's wh—so, is that what you--

JG: That, that was probably--yeah that was probably it.

RG: Can you describe your experiences in working within the child welfare-- Indian Child Welfare Act, any challenges that you found in determining jurisdiction or residence of Native American children, if that came up?

JG: Well, th-- the... where the issues came up that created problems were ones where we weren't sure where the mother usually would think that she was connected to some tribe, and generally, not a Maine tribe. And you'd have to send out to the Cherokees, or whoever, to see if, what the connection might be. The... DHS, generally speaking, was responsible for trying to track that stuff down. We didn't-- the court system itself didn't. What basically-- cases would get put on hold while people tried to track down the tribal issues. Um, sometimes people were eligible to be tribal members but aren't on the tribal list, for one reason or another, and that -- that... there was no problem that I'm aware of in letting them go get listed and then come back as a... qualified as a member, I don't know. And there's always the dad problem. If, you know, she's not telling us the right name, and we don't know that it's dad. And then there's the dad problem of people, and it's not a problem actually, it's kind of nice when they, um, they've been off doing their drug-drinking thing and then suddenly want to be responsible and come in late in the case. Or we only find them late in the case.

RG: Mmhmm. Ah, can you tell be about, or, can you further elaborate on your experiences and challenges that you might have come across in child custody hearings?

JG: If we're relating to ICWA, the... the situation actually -- once we got on track, and remember I -- okay, I'm going to back up and make a speech here, I guess. I-- I think there is a difference in dealing with the two tribes. And I think that historically, the Penobscot and the Bangor DHS have not been at loggerheads, the way-- at least from outside, from some observation. The caseworkers down in the Machias area have been at loggerheads. And some of this is personalities. Like, you've got Gail next door, salt of the earth and, you know, able to deal with and not-- and I think on the other side, you probably have tribal representatives who are willing to concede that maybe these people are just trying to do the job and do what they need to do. Somehow, whenever I was down in Washington County, it was the other way around. The workers were very hostile to start with, and the tribal people were very defensive.

And I don't want to overgeneralize either, but I think you... you have different dynamics based upon the people that are in the places. And somehow that changes the way that, I nev-- up here the, the handing off of jurisdiction seemed to go very well. When the tribes came in and said give us the case, I don't recall any situation where there was a problem. Actually I don't remember down in Machias either, but I wasn't down there very much.

And, but. When you-- the heart wrenching ones are where you have a child placed with-- a very needy child, and I'm thinking of a fetal alcohol baby, placed with a super-- as far as one can tell foster family that's not Native. But the relative in the tribe wants to give it a try. And we, I had one of the-- or, I did not -- I was peripheral on it. I had-- I floated in once and out. We usually tried to have one judge, one child, but if you've got vacations, then ok. And this child, I don't know if you'd consider it worked out or not, but in the end, the family in the tribe decided that it was more than -- and it was a single parent there, (*gesturing with the other hand*) it was a couple. So. But, there you are. Okay, you were asking about other, um -- I don't think that -- but you see, I'm one step removed. So by the time they get to me, there's several intermediaries, and I may not really see what's gone on.

RG: That's quite all right. Um, can you tell me a little bit about the requirement for the use of active remedial and rehabilitative efforts to prevent the breakup of Indian families before out-of-home placement is ordered?

JG: No. That really, that's an issue for the caseworkers, really. Now, well-- I can tell you this, is that, although it never came up with me. I think that you would not be able to prevent the state taking custody because of the failure of those preliminaries, because in an emergen-- I'm talking an emergency situation now-- if the child is in immediate risk of serious harm, then, you know, we-- we may want to vindicate the requirement. But you're not going to say, sorry kid, you know.

GW: So, the, the-- not to breach confidentiality with that case, but with the baby with the fetal alcohol syndrome (*sound of sirens*), so as the judge, the caseworker, the child's-- the GAL, and the parents, they-- so when, so at the point that they're coming to you in court, is that sort of something that's been decided?



JG: This case had-- the child had come into custody, and was being pl-- actually he came in at birth from the hospital. And, I do not-- I'm not guaranteeing -- I believe they decided it was fetal alcohol syndrome rather than fetal alcohol effect. But whatever it was. The mother hadn't gotten prenatal care to speak of. She drank through the pregnancy. So, it's Eastern Maine that the baby is born. The tribal connection is actually Passamaquoddy. And... the child had been placed with these folks for, it takes-- after the emergency hearing, your next hearing has to come within four months. I think they've changed the time limits around. But I think that was the four month-- so sometime between the time when the child goes into custody -- this child went into custody -- and the jeopardy hearing, which the, the department has to contact -- and this is actually true for, ah, it doesn't have to be a native child. You have to try to find family resources. Ok. This particular family resource was a little late in coming forward. But I think somewhat, and I'm just-- don't take this as gospel, but my sense is that the family, you know -- there were other members of the family like the grandparents who knew they couldn't do it because they were not in very good health themselves. And so they-- but were, they really did not want this child lost to them and the tribe. And they kind of went around trying to find someone who would be willing to volunteer as a parent. And then there's the aunt, and some-- I think it was the aunt. She volunteered and then she really became very committed to the child. It was very hard, I believe, for her to, in the end -- and this was not on my watch. My watch came some place in here. But I'm, it was in—it was, you know, I was aware of the case going forward because it did present such difficult, heart-rending issues. But I believe it was very difficult for the aunt, ultimately, to say, "Yeah, this is really more than I can handle." Plus, here I am in the poorest county in the state of Maine with the fewest services in the state of Maine. And I can't keep running back and forth to...

GW: Right, to Bangor.

JG: To Bangor.

GW: Do you remember the time frame? Just, do you have any general-- I mean, even the decade?

JG: Oh, well, it would have been some place between, I'm guessing, it was with the-- between '97 and 2003, but I could be --

GW: That's all right. I just... as we sort of keep talking to people, I'm trying to sort of piece together, in my own head, kind of understanding that whole history from, from '78 and how things changed and evolved.

JG: Oh this definitely was towards the end. As I said, the first ten, fifteen years that I was a judge, we were just sort of, yeah, it's there. Somebody will tell us if we need to pay attention to it. Which. But that was sort of, and I may be... but that was my sense.

RG: What do you consider good cause or good causes to deny transfer of a case to tribal court?

JG: I—I never had to. And it may be because they didn't—they chose not to push it. When you've got a parent who isn't a tribal member who's objecting. You know, that-- that has happened to me, and so...

RG: Can you tell me a little bit more about how that works when a parent who is not a tribal member has objected?

JG: Well, no. But I know that it happened, and it was the father who was the non-tribal member. And, um, there was-- underlying some of this is the same stuff you get in divorce and custody fights, generally. Which is sometimes you've got parents that are working together to get the baby back. And sometimes you're getting parents that say, "I'd rather have the state have him than you." And this was a case where the parents, their... their-- as far as I could tell, their primary goal was to make sure that the child did not go back to the other parent.

GW: So that's why with the non-tribal member, your understanding was--

JG: Yeah, in this particular case.

GW: --that that was why he was really advocating that the state keep, keep custody of the child?

JG: Well, advocating that -- no, in this particular instance, advocating meant making sure that the tribal court did not get the --

GW: Did not have jurisdiction?

JG: Get, because he was-- figured that they would be predisposed to reunite with Mom, which ultimately -- I really cannot recall the outcome, but I think that they did-- I think we reunited with Mom but-- because she got straightened around. And he continued to be a complete jerk.

RG: That's often the way in divorces.

JG: Well, I don't know. You got the little of both sides.

RG: Absolutely. To the best of your knowledge, if a tribe declines to intervene in a child custody proceeding covered by ICWA, what are the reasons for that decision?

JG: Resources. It's, ah, it's where the money is. And... and like with the one I mentioned, where, you know, you're just so -- I guess it's resources, but it's also distance from some help.

RG: In your time as a judge, would you say that the tribe declining to intervene, did that happen often?

JG: No.

RG: And to the best of your knowledge—

JG: One was a teenager, who, um—oh, I guess they both were teenagers. One was the rehab. And that was a juvenile, not a child protective case. And the other was just... these kids a bit out of control, and, you know...

GW: And at a certain point in time in Maine, if your child wasn't in custody, whether tribal or state, as I understand it, they needed a very expensive, like, residential placement. That was your only option.

JG: Yes. Well, I mean, that was done occasionally, yeah. But generally, those came in through the criminal justice.

GW: Yeah.

RG: To the best of your knowledge, when the state declines to transfer a child custody proceeding covered by ICWA to tribal court, what are the reasons for that?

JG: I have never had that happen.

RG: Alright. When presenting an expert witness under ICWA, what criteria does the state use to establish a qualified expert witness?

JG: Well, let's see, that was, if you -- I don't, I didn't understand that question. If you mean an expert to tell us what the law is and whether or not the, the state -- I've never had that happen. But if the state was trying to educate a judge, is that what you're telling me?

GW: I think the question --

JG: Because what they usually do there is just give me a memo. They wouldn't call a witness to say -- at least in the cases I handled, there really was no fight between the state and tribe. I mean if the-- the state never objected, that I'm aware of, to a tribe taking jurisdiction.

GW: I think we can't take full credit for having dreamed up all these questions. They, there was a large national study that, that-- well, that Casey Family services did with some. And I think my impression, and I'm no expert on it, but I think some of the western tribes, there are some real -- there are some real jurisdiction issues. So I think that question came because sometimes the tribes rely on an expert witness.

JG: Oh, I -- I know. It's on the membership stuff probably is...

GW: Right, yeah.

JG: Yeah. I don't know.

GW: So I think it may be a question that was more relevant for some of the... some of the larger... larger tribes that were in the... in the western area.

RG: Ah, you might not have an answer for this: What do you consider active efforts to prevent the breakup of an American Indian family before ordering an out-of-home placement?

JG: Well, again, this is all stuff that is probably not going to prevent a child coming into custody if it's necessary -- if it appears necessary to protect the child. But, the, in the context of all child protective cases, they're supposed to try to prevent removal from the home. And that usually involves referral to services and... you know, ah, the-- putting a guy out of the home. Often times, you've got either a domestic violence situation, or-- which is blamed upon the guy -- or, you know, some sex offender that Mom has taken up with that the department doesn't... So, you know, sometimes, you-- you'll get issues of referral to services. Sometimes you just get parent education, because it is tragic, the ignorance out there sometimes. I mean, one -- and it wasn't an Indian one -- but one of the saddest cases I ever had was a mom who just parked the kid in the crib and, as long as nothing happened, nothing happened. It was just absolute -- but it was ignorance.

Ah, so, with these things, you've got your rehab, you've got your get the guy out of the house, you've got your just plain parent education, you... you have folks coming in to the home to sort of model good parenting. I think they probably are still doing this, although the money was being cut back -- severely -- at the time I left.

Um, one of the-- this is a digression, but I will -- Gail reminded me -- her being here. Back when I started, the caseworker for the department was the case manager. The services-- it was up to the caseworker to find and make sure the services were implemented and to oversee all of that. There has been a tremendous diffusion of responsibility since the 70's. So that there-- the DHS worker is at the top of a pile of intermediaries. And there is far less active management by the department. And I think that that is a... that has been a deterioration in the level of -- you know, we usually think we're more modern, we're doing better. Well, that part of it, I don't think-- now, how that functioned with tribal kids, I don't know because I think that the level of hostility between -- or hostility isn't the right word. The, um... justifiably, I think, it's true for any parent, when DHS shows up at the door that you feel threatened. And I think that tribal people, I don't want to do stereotyping either, but I think that the tribal people may have felt... even more of that threat than just average bad parents, or good parents that somebody said bad things about. So that it may actually work out better in the tribal situation to have these layers between them and the state.

GW: Yeah, we privatize services.



JG: Yeah, but I-- when Gail-- I don't want to make her sound like god's gift to DHS, but I think she is. When she was in charge of her own caseload, I think things worked very better. Of course that was up in Dover-Foxcroft, the end of the world, but...

RG: In what ways do you see the Indian Child Welfare Act and the Adoption and Safe Families Act working together? And in what ways do you see them not working together?

JG: Well, the thing-- part that doesn't work together is the, um, permanency requirements. This is, this is true. I am not in favor of some of the push to permanency, that -- whether it be tribal or not tribal. There are some people who need more time and more work. And I think we also... and I think we're lucky in Maine that people do kind of make exceptions. But I think that because it sometimes takes time to determine if someone is a tribal member. It takes time, like on the case I told you for... people to get together to find a family member, or... who can volunteer to be the home. And you've got this clock ticking on permanency that, you know, we've-- child's been in custody for 15 out of the last 22 months. Time to terminate. That doesn't necessarily work out for the best. But I don't know that it's a conflict between -- I think it makes-- may make Indian cases even more complicated than non-Indian cases. But it's, you know, it's a pressure on all of them. And then there's Dad, who doesn't even show up. And that may be the fault of Mom really tell-- who lies about who Dad is.

RG: Over your course work as a judge, found the question, what do, or did you see as barriers to the state's promoting ICWA compliance?

JG: I think the state, ah, was also, you know-- in the period before, whenever that consciousness raising report from the feds came, they also just kind of, "if it comes up, we'll deal with it." But I don't, I don't oversee the state's attorneys. And, ah, I think you also had a problem with defense attorneys. I assume you're going to interview-- or parents' attorneys. But, it-- it's... they didn't, they weren't proactive, they didn't-- and we didn't either -- ask the question. We figured, well, if we need to know it, somebody will tell it to us. And it's all very complicated too, you know, it's... which is where your expert witness may come in, if... in terms of what really is a tribal member, and...

GW: And then the other piece that we've also heard of even more recently is when you have a parent who's a tribal member, but the child isn't.

JG: Yes, but I, in terms -- I wouldn't have known. I would have assumed that would still go to tribal court if the tribe wanted it.

GW: But when you--but it, it can lead to challenges, you know, depending in those situations like you were talking about with the dad, you know--Dad's tribal, Mom's not tribal, child isn't on the census, it, it... it... yeah.

RG: How could the state improve in terms of ICWA?

JG: Okay, I've been out for 2 years, you know, so I... I don't know. I think that... the... and gain, I... I don't, my cont-- my regular contact would have been in the Bangor court, which was essentially the Penobscot tribe. All we-- I have had... I guess the worst case I ever had was a divorce, which was one Passamaquoddy and one Penobscot.

GW: Oh, wow, that's another layer of...

JG: Well, but, in any event, I don't know how they could improve. I think that there is-- that the, just... it's like the steady drip, drip, drip of water. If you-- drips long enough, you'll make an impression. And that seems to have been what's happened with ICWA, is that, you know, if we started dripping in '78 we began to make an impression about 20 years later. Now we're here workin' on another 20, and it's... But the other thing, and I think is that for people in the field, the whole child welfare system is so sad. It's, it's... and it's not getting any better with drugs and alcohol, which I think is one of the biggest problems, plus just plain, you know, people drifting in and out of families. Ok, I'm making a speech. But it's a little hard to be told well, let's concentrate on this one aspect. But I think that we have been sensitized. As I say, steady drip makes an impression in the end.

RG: What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses -- and or weaknesses -- that the state possesses in ensuring ICWA compliance?

JG: Well, what should be a benefit is that we're such a small state and we know each other. I mean we've-- I've been up to Indian Island to a conference that involved, I think... I'm not -- yeah, it was statewide. They invited a couple of judges. They invited some prosecutors. They invited caseworkers and you know, tried to bring us together to share an experience and discuss problems and things like that. So, the fact that we're a small state and everybody should be able to get together and talk these things out -- which is very different, I'm sure, from what goes on in Nevada or Arizona or wherever. But, then you've got the other side of it, which is that there's this personality stuff where people have chips on their shoulder. And that... that's -- there's no way to get rid of each other. (*Laughs.*) But you know, that's not my jud-- that's just me observing. And I did have another thought, but I wasn't right on the question you asked. Oh, one of-- you may be getting to it. The one about, ah, ensuring that they have connection to the tribe? Is that? You can keep going then.

RG: Yes. We'll get there, I promise. What strengths and/or weaknesses do you see the Wabanaki tribes possessing in ensuring ICWA compliance and working with the state to ensure ICWA compliance?

JG: I don't know.

RG: That's all right. Could you --

JG: Proving that I don't have an opinion on every conceivable topic.



RG: That's all right. Could you talk a little bit about the importance of judges learning about, and having some knowledge of American Indian family structure and culture? If you think it's important?

JG: I think it is, I mean, important, but I mean, I'm not sure th-- I mean, one of the things, obviously, the white folks coming in and, you know, we basically blasted the culture, the Native American culture. So, and I don't know how much-- this is philosophy, but... if we could turn the clock back, you know, the-- the tribe would -- part of the problem, I guess, is that the tribal members who need to be told how to be good parents by the tribal elders. In the America we live in, A, it's not your business and B, you can't tell me anything, is the attitude that you get. I'm sure that if the tribal structure could be -- and of course a lot of your, the kids that we deal with aren't living on the reservation either, but let's assume, I'm sure that in the day, the tribe would notice that some mother was not taking care or some dad was beating up on the children and a delegation would come in and, you know, it's sort of like the Amish in shunning, I suppose, you'd make sure that this got taken care of. So I don't think we can -- yes, it would be useful for us to know how that-- how the system worked, how social norms were enforced. And I think too, people kind of got banished if we -- you know, you steal enough from your neighbor, you, you know -- yeah, it would be useful to, to know that, but the problem is we can't re-create it in the -- at least, I don't -- go for it, but I don't see it being re-created.

RG: Can you talk about the importance of having an Indian child who's placed in out-of-home care to be placed within a reasonable proximity to his or her family -- natural family?

JG: Well, yes, but I mean, it's the same with... others. They-- this is a little -- it came to me in the night. It's not about child welfare either, but one of my nasty little divorce fights involved, there's a -- and I -- it's either in the spring or the fall or some kind of get together that's important. And... the child was placed with the non-Indian parent and the Indian parent wanted to make sure that the child would be coming every year to the -- is it called a pow wow?

RG: Uh-mm.

JG: Okay, to the pow wow. And that got broke down onto a question of who pays. You know, we're talking about driving from Waterville to Washington County, Princeton, wherever. And, you know, you're the one that wants him to come to this, you should pay. Well, you know, I can't pay. I...you know. You -- you're the one that has the money. You should... and it... you know, this kind of thing. You'd be amazed at the number of small things that create problems. Well, of course you wouldn't, but things can break apart on stuff just like this. You know, who's going to pay? Because -- and that was back when gas didn't cost almost \$4 a gallon.

RG: Mmhmm. Is that what you'd wanted to mention about cultural practices?

JG: I think that was. Yeah, it was-- and it's come up more. But the cases I had that got into a big fight about cultural practices were divorces. Where you've got one tribal member and one non and the child is with the non. And... I also had one that had something to do with going across the border because it was a Micmac child. But I can't remember anything about it except the part -- whoever was in Maine was terrified that if you let the child go across the border, he'd never come back again, which was a, I think a legitimate fear for people. And particularly in a situation where you have decided you don't trust this person anymore, and he's done this terrible thing.

RG: Do you think ICWA does enough to protect the rights of Indian children and/or Indian tribes?

JG: I can't answer that. I mean, I don't-- I really can't.

RG: If you could change anything or make anything happen for Native American children involved in ICWA, what would you do?

JG: It's the same thing I'd do in the others, you know. Get parents who are going to be-- maintain a stable family home and be willing to reach out for the family and tribal support that's out there and, you know, be nice to each other.

RG: That would be ideal. Is there anything else that you want to share with us today that I didn't ask about?

JG: I'm trying to think. *(Pause.)* Um, I think -- this has just come floating across my mind. Um, when I was leaving judging two years ago, there was a concern that adolescents were ageing out of the system. And that there really was no -- no place for them to go once they turned 18. And the problems began even earlier at age 16 or even younger, when people-- kids were running away from whatever home they'd been adopted into or their foster placement. And the department was even at the point, you know, 8 years after the child has been adopted, of finding the birth parents -- usually the birth mother, and saying, you know, "Can you help us?" You know. "I know we took Johnny away, but he has no home when he turns 18. He doesn't-- you know, there's nothing." Now, I don't know how possible it would be for the tribes to just -- there, there must be some Native American children in this unhappy situation, who have been... and that could -- but I, I would follow up with the department to find out what -- because I know this was an area that they were really working toward, was trying to make sure that every child had a family when he or she left foster care. That you didn't have just children who spend their last 2 years on the streets, and then you turn 18, and then you, you -- so I don't know what -- this is an area that I know nothing about. It isn't a judicial area, really either. But, I was impressed that the recognition of -- okay, you're 18, you're a legal adult, but it's not like you, you know what you're doing yet. And if it--I think it would be useful to try to figure out if the tribes could be part of the reconnection process for some of the kids who have been adopted out, or just a general, make your-- I don't know if kids are made

aware of their -- if there was a some place that a kid who was adopted -- is there a place? If a kid knows he was adopted out and was Native American, is there someplace he can...

GW: I mean, yes. Some of the kids can go home. It partially depends on what they've been told. What the department -- what the department knew.

JG: But in any event, that's, that's -- I think that would be an area that I think might bear some investigation. Have I done okay for what you--? Ok. (*Laughs.*)

GW: Yes, thank you. Yes, absolutely.

RG: Is there anything that you want to ask that I've missed?

GW: No.

RG: Any last things that you want to add?

JG: Well, I mean obviously, I'm sorry that, um, there's, that the—you know, the arrival of us folks has been such a disaster for your folks. But you know there's... there it is. And I'm assuming you're Indian.

RG: I am.

JG: Ok. (*Laughs.*)

RG: I actually think you might be the only person that's ever assumed that right off the bat. I don't get that very often.

JG: Oh. Ok, all right.

RG: I want to thank you so much for taking the time to sit down with us and for being the guinea pig for these questions.

JG: Okay, well, I hope that the information -- and, you know, the... It's just... I mean, it's sad for the Indian children. It's sad for all the children. It's not a good -- you know, we're trying, but, you know, we aren't doing as well by these kids as I'd like. So.

GW: Thank you so much for coming.

RG: Absolutely. Yes. Thank you.

JG: Oh, you're welcome. Well, thank you for... And if I think of anything that I... you know, I-- I'll be in touch with you, but I think I'm...

[END OF RECORDING]