

in Indio which the task force has been working on for a year and **only** done half of them.

One quite logical question should be answered for the benefit of all concerned, but primarily for the benefit of my Indian clients who are here today. Why have I been singled out by the task force? I think the reason is quite simple. When Mr. Cox was here in 1965 and 1966, I discovered what was happening and what the purpose of his investigation was. I was thoroughly familiar with the list of grievances sent to Washington. Every person who stood up to Mr. Cox during his first visit ended up being a major target in this past year's so-called investigation. The parties who stood up to Mr. Cox, and you have the list, were Judge McCabe, Judge Brown, Judge Therieau, Stanley Spiegelman, the Bank of America, and myself. As I resisted these efforts during the past year, I became more and more the target.

My exhibit "H," my lengthy earlier report clearly shows that I have been working for a solid year in pecking away at these investigators finding out what was wrong. Mr. Cleary will present to you what I think is an excellent critique of their report and I think he pretty well destroys it.

One last point is, Mr. Cleary makes certain alternative recommendations.

As a conservator and guardian myself, I am not recommending automatic termination of the trust status when an Indian client becomes emancipated by marriage or reaches the age of 21. The effect of the trust status over and over again has been declared by the U.S. Supreme Court to be that of wardship, the Indians being incompetent and thus protected by the United States of America. This is the legal effect of the trust status.

In January of this year the task force directed some form letters to certain of my Indian clients stating that the conservatee involved was sufficiently competent to handle his or her own affairs. This keys in with what Mr. Cleary will state, wherein the task force on page 5 states that a person who might reasonably be expected to do a creditable job of handling the income is not necessary capable of managing the corpus of his estate.

The effect of one of Mr. Cleary's recommended alternatives is to give the adult Indian a chance to choose or determine his future. If an adult Indian feels competent to handle his or her own affairs and the Bureau of Indian Affairs believes him competent, and the court should so determine that this is correct, then the Indian should be freed of the trust and be allowed all of the privileges of competency.

The position of the Bureau is deliberately intended to deceive the Indian. They are saying that although you are incompetent and we must preserve the trust status and keep you a ward of the United States, you do not need a conservator, for you're competent. The great white father speaks with forked tongue. What they really mean is that we wish to perpetuate the bureaucracy and keep the Indians dependent and subservient to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I am the conservator for a number of adult Indians. If they feel that they wish to remain as wards of the Government, Mr. Cleary's alternative proposal is open to them. They should be afforded the right to demand that the Bureau of Indian Affairs determine whether they are competent or incompetent. My Indian conservatees should be given