

Mr. SCHLESINGER. You mean the same thing over and over again, never change?

Mr. TUNNEY. Yes.

Mr. SCHLESINGER. Well, the only—if the only nominal charge, if there were an ex parte, involves a petition and putting on a petition provisions for order of approval by the court, and the waiver of notice by the Bureau, and if that's all that's involved and attach a copy of the lease, it should only be a nominal charge. I'm talking about \$100, \$150. It would be tops but it isn't necessary. That's not—

Mr. TUNNEY. It's not necessary to have an ex parte order, you would say, in subleasing arrangements, that the master lease should provide for the attorney going to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and being able to sublease?

Mr. SCHLESINGER. For example, Mr. Fey's development at Canyon View, there have been, I don't know, 400—or 150 residences completed there, and in Seven Lakes they had about 120 now, Canyon Country Club, several hundred-plus subleases and they are exactly the same for everybody, every tenant, and as a matter of fact, they've been submitted to the real estate commissioner in connection with approval of condominiums, so they are exactly the same and fortunately, there hasn't been much expense involved in those because they are the same.

Mr. TUNNEY. How much has been charged for each one, do you know?

Mr. SCHLESINGER. We just don't have this situation where we had to come in and sublease because we always provide a master lease, and it is pre-approved form. Now, if these do deviate from the pre-approved form, it would have to be a substantial sublease to justify the attorney even seeking it. It would just be done on an hourly charge, and I estimate it wouldn't take more than a couple of hours to get it.

Mr. TUNNEY. Was it customary, or is it customary for the Desert Bar to charge Indian clients a full day's fee for appearance in court if a number of Indian cases would be handled by the attorney, and were handled by him, we'll say, in a few hours, charging each one of them a full daily fee?

Mr. SCHLESINGER. Well, we have avoided that problem because, as I said, we have done all our billing on the basis of hourly charges. We go down with three men, we divide it in three. This, because it is the only fair way we could feel to do it. If one matter requires more time, say, during the day than the other two, we'd bill that matter the portion of the day, in proportion. We've never double-charged or made additional charges because we're already down there.

Mr. TUNNEY. Is this accepted practice? Is this the customary practice? I want to get a feel for what the standards of conduct are.

Mr. SCHLESINGER. All I can do is contest it with domestic relations where you go down on a number of orders to show cause on domestic relations matters. It's a different situation because your attorney has already made his fee arrangement before that, and the judge is going to make his court order of attorney's fees based on each individual matter, not because one attorney may have six matters that day. You get the same fee, irrespective, because there had been a lot of other time involved. But, on Indian matters, if you are just going down, most of our Indian matters, frankly, are approved without the necessity of appearance, and the only time we have to make appearance is