

leases, because it has always been the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, before approving any lease, to remove from the conservator's realm of jurisdiction the field of passing upon the financial qualifications of the prospective tenant. Each of the tenants of the leases which have failed have been individually approved as to financial ability by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On page 28 of the task force report it is stated, "Hollowell charged both Mr. Fey and the Patencio estate for the same work."

Gentlemen, this is an outright lie.

The report refers to exhibits 23 and 24 as ostensible proof of the charge. Now, I've prepared a rather lengthy detailed statement which Mr. Sigler has in which it goes in greater depth than I have here.

Exhibit 23 is photographs of checks and a recapitulation of sums paid by Mr. Fey to me. This exhibit is accurate.

Exhibit 24 is the accounting covering the year 1963. I received funds from Mr. Fey in the year 1963 as reflected by exhibit 23. I filed an accounting for the year 1963 as reflected in exhibit 24.

It must be remembered that with the establishment of the conservatorship and guardianship program in the Palm Springs area following the year 1959, there were no guidelines for the courts, the Bureau, or the attorneys or conservators or guardians to follow. The policies followed by the courts in demanding accountings and requests for fees has evolved to the one now followed.

Until 1964, when the policy memorandums were promulgated by the superior court, which memorandums are exhibits to the report, the practice which had been followed theretofore was that generally followed in other probate cases, and each case was handled differently depending upon the particular attorney and fiduciary involved.

It was my practice in the year 1963 to file an accounting specifying the number of hours I had devoted to the particular estate and to request compensation on an hourly basis. In conjunction with the 1963 accounting, I forwarded to Judge McCabe a letter setting forth the number of hours that I had devoted to that particular estate. This letter was and is inserted in the superior court file involving this estate. The task force report conveniently neglected to include that letter as part of exhibit 24, although it is an integral part of exhibit 24. Had the auditors been permitted to confer with me, they would have found that the time devoted to obtaining rights-of-way and other legal orders for Mr. Fey had not been charged against this estate, but were charged against Mr. Fey. Accordingly, there is no duplication of services or charges for the year 1963.

An even more flagrant abuse of the truth by the task force is their accusation that I double-charged in 1964. Mr. Fey did pay me money in 1964. My accounting for the year 1964 sets forth in detail the work I did at the request of Mr. Fey involving this estate and sets forth in detail the fact that I had been paid by Mr. Fey and was not charging this estate for any of the work paid for by Mr. Fey. Exactly the same situation existed for the year 1966. There were no services to Mr. Fey in 1965. Exactly the same situation existed for the year 1966. The fact that the accountings for the periods of 1964 and 1966 were not included as part of exhibit 24 cannot be condoned as an oversight by the task force for the simple reason that the task force at one time or another