

I was beginning to get concerned about not receiving the Minerals Council's quarterly newsletter. This has turned out to be a very good source of information about some of what is going on with your Minerals Council. It has always been available within a day or two of payment, but for some reason, I didn't get mine by e-mail until the 12<sup>th</sup> of June. I don't know what happened, but I was glad to get it anyway. Now that I got it, I gott'a say, I'm a little disappointed this time.

It has been my understanding that this newsletter was established to represent the facts about minerals matters and the position of the Minerals Council on political issues concerning the Minerals Estate, and not for the presentation of the political views of individuals. It also has been my understanding that the content of each newsletter must be approved by the Council before release.

I see where Councilwoman Boone has now injected her personal views, using an editorial statement denouncing ONCR 11-14 in this most recent newsletter. In my opinion, her statement is, at best, totally misleading. The words "The Osage Minerals Council may promulgate it's own rules" was **NOT** simply replaced in the manner she states. It was replaced by the entire Section 2, which reads as follows:

**"Section 2. Powers of the Osage Minerals Council.** *The Osage Minerals Council is vested with sole authority to lease and develop the Osage Mineral Estate and to administer the duties previously granted to Officers for the Osage Tribe by the Osage Allotment Act of June 28, 1906 (34 stat. 539), as amended, provided, the right to receive income from the Osage Mineral estate may not be diminished. The Minerals Council shall be protected by the laws of the Osage Nation."*

This “authority to lease and develop the Osage Mineral Estate and to administer the duties previously granted to Officers for the Osage Tribe by the Osage Allotment Act of June 28, 1906” etc., goes much further than the previous language toward the goal of full autonomy we are all striving for. And it does so without using words like “promulgate,” which I don’t understand and never could spell. And, Section 2 invokes the 1906 Act as the basis for this amendment. I just don’t find anything wrong with that. I thought that’s what we all wanted. I would also think that the term “administer the duties” would certainly include “promulgating rules.” And, what could possibly be wrong with the Council being protected by the laws of the Osage Nation. It looks to me like this connection simply reaffirms the sovereign status of the Mineral Estate. Like I said, in my opinion, Councilwoman Boone’s statement in the newsletter is, at best, misleading. This looks to me like a classic example of the “THIS IS WHAT WE WANT SO DON’T VOTE FOR IT” theory.

This was not what I understood that this newsletter was intended for. If the Council approved this personal political view to be published, then I have to wonder why Councilman Abbott was denied access to the newsletter three months ago when he asked to make a statement about suing the Chief. I wouldn’t think that the fact that Ms. Boone is on the newsletter committee would have anything to do with it. Councilman Abbott also had access to the committee. The entire committee bears the responsibility for these decisions. And, if the entire Council approved what the committee has done, then I guess that’s the way they must want it. But, this editorial statement on page 3 by an individual Councilperson is in direct conflict with the position the Minerals Council has taken, by resolution, on the Constitutional Amendments as set out on page 1 of that same Newsletter. Maybe someone will volunteer to explain this at the meeting Friday.

I can understand the reason for the confusion. If there had been a clear and comprehensive set of policy and procedures established for Media and Communications, we wouldn't be having this problem. Just last month, the Council was presented with, and adopted, a set of policy and procedures for Media and Communications. It consisted of 8 (count'em...8) sentences, or less than ½ a page of text. Even the smartest lawyer on the planet couldn't stuff a comprehensive set of policy and procedures for shining shoes into 8 sentences. And, wouldn't you know it. Nowhere in those 8 sentences was the subject of how to handle individual political commentary or Minerals Council political views ever addressed.

We have nearly a \$100 MILLION business going here, with 4,000 or more Shareholders to answer to. There's no reason we can't do better.

I think that maybe political statements should be allowed, but they should come under the category of "letters to the editor,"---even political statements by individual Council members, should they decide to so indulge themselves. Whatever they decide to do, they can't have it both ways. Right now, it looks like Media and Communications is just operating by the seat of their pants. "We did it one way yesterday and we'll do it another way tomorrow" seems to be the motto.

Com'on Media Committee, promulgate some rules. Then use them!

Ray McClain, Osage Shareholder