

Response to 7/7/12 Boone's Bulletin July10, 2012

<http://www.Osages-You-Need-To-Know.com>

Subject: Boone's Bulletin 7-7-12

To:

Date: Tuesday, July 10, 2012, 2:21 AM

FYI:

From the desk of Councilwoman Boone:

1. In the last bulletin, I let you know that Councilman Redeagle had reminded us that it was time to elect a new chairman. He highly recommended Councilman Bear. When the subject came up on 6-20, Councilman Redeagle didn't even make the motion to elect a new chairman. I made the motion. It was seconded by Councilman Whitehorn. Discussion: Chairman Crum said he had some unfinished business he wanted to take care of and he liked his leadership position on the Negotiated Rule Making Committee. The vote: Redeagle, no; Whitehorn, yes; Yates, no; Abbott, no; Boone, yes; Bear, yes; Core, no; Crum no.

I wonder what changed Councilman Red Eagle's mind?

- 2. On 6-20, Councilman Redeagle wanted us to vote to rescind the injunction against his brother, the chief. The chief's attorney filed a motion to dismiss on 6-5-20. Motion by Redeagle. Seconded by Abbott. Vote: Core, yes, Redeagle, yes, Whitehorn, no; Yates, yes; Abbott, yes; Bear, no; Boone, no; Crum, no. Core's vote is not recorded on the telephone poll. Yates voted to file the injunction but now voted to rescind it. Isn't it a conflict of interest for Councilman Redeagle to bring up this subject? Wasn't his vote a conflict of interest?*

Possibly. There may have been a phone poll, but this vote was taken in the Council Meeting on the 20th. I was there, and I didn't hear ANYONE on the Council object because of a conflict of interest. Did I miss something? I was hoping for a motion to temporarily withdraw the filing until after August 13, 2012. I guess Councilman Red Eagle

saw it differently. The motion failed anyway and a motion to withdraw would have probably failed, also.

3. *On March 1, a telephone poll vote was "Should we change the current non-political emphasis of our quarterly newsletter to one that weill include personal political opinion articles by all council members?" Abbott, yes; Bear, yes; Redeagle, yes; Boone, no; Core, no; Crum, no; Whitehorn, no; Yates, no.*
4. *On April 18 we voted to reverse our vote of 3-1 and use our newsletter for political purposes by promoting and educating the shareholders on the amendments. Vote: Bear, no; Boone, no; Crumj, yes; Abbott, yes; Core, yes; Redeagle, yes; Andrew Yates, yes Whitehorn, absent;. And by the way, we shareholders will be paying not once but twice for a newsletter. The Minerals Council is thinking about doing a special newsletter dedicated to the "Special Election." Newsletter chairman Redeagle allowed 2 full columns in the June newsletter to promote the amendments.How much space was used for the other viewpoint? Is our newsletter biased? Sound familiar.*

Of course it is biased. The other view point doesn't matter. The 'Council's view point' is what matters and that was decided by a majority vote of 8 Councilpersons. Do you express opposing view points in Boone's Bulletin? That option would be decided by a majority vote of 1 person, unless you let Danny vote, too. There's nothing wrong here, in either case. The Majority Rules!

5. *ONCR 10-19 Sec. 25 says the Osage Nation shall not tax the Osage Minerals estate. I do not believe the Secretary of Interior would all the Osage nation to tax our trust asset. ONCR 10-19 further states the Osage Nation Congress shall not tax Osage minerals royalties. We shareholders know that they can't do that because of the Bigeagle vs. US lawsuit. This lawsuite information appears on our IIM tax account information we get at the end of the year from the Office of Special Trustee.*

There is no reason what-so-ever that this shouldn't be a part of the Constitution. It, in part, simply reaffirms 'Big Eagle.' I'd bet that several currently sitting in Congress don't even know about 'Big Eagle'. In the future, if passed, they would have no excuse for not knowing.

6. *ONCR 11-12 Sect. 5 gives compositon but the 1906 Act gave us the Principal Chief and Asst. Principal Chief plus 8 members. The ON constitution infringed on the minerals by removing 2 positions and changing the name. Passage of this amendment will only strengthen the constitution.*

If passed, we would still have a Chief and Asst. Chief. They just won't be controlling minerals matters or the funds of the Shareholders by a "One Man Decision" like it is now, AND LIKE IT WILL CONTINUE TO BE IF THESE AMENDMENTS FAIL. Do you really want that?

7. *ONCR 11-13. The current constitution says under Article 15 Sect.4 "As an independent agency within the Osage Nation the Osage Minerals Council may promulgate its own rules and regulations as long as such rules and regulations are not inconsistent with the laws neither of the Osage Nation nor with the rules and regulations established by the U.S. Congress in the 1906 Allotment Act."*

And that's the very reason for the new amendment. As it is now, Congress can make any law they want concerning Minerals and Minerals could only go to court to stop it, and that's a roll of the dice. It is a template for trouble like it is. Failure of ONCR 11-13 leaves it that way. Why do you want it "left that way?"

The Minerals Council has had its elections procedures in place for years. Again, passage of this amendment strengthens the Osage Nation authority over the Minerals Council.

No, it does not. It clearly removes Osage Nation authority. Just READ it.

ONCR 11-14 removes the current language and references the 1906 Act to another area.

Correct! It does remove the current language, but it replaces it with language that clearly expresses what the Shareholders have been wanting for 6 years. It does reference the 1906 Act, but you lost me when you say "to another area." What "Other Area?"

The new language in Sec.2 now says the Minerals Council shall be protected by the laws of the Osage Nation.

Why not? It doesn't say "subject to the laws of the Osage Nation" like the Constitution does now. VOTING YES CHANGES THAT!!

Sect. 4 says members of the Osage Nation are eligible to hold office on the Minerals Council.

Many are eligible. Naturally, you fail to mention that members of the Osage Tribe are also included, and you fail to mention that anyone holding office on the MC must have a headright interest. What more is there?

8. *In closing, I leave you with these thoughts:*

1. Passage of these amendments only serve to weaken the current Minerals Council and strengthen the Osage Nation constitution.

This is total nonsense! Approval of the amendments will release the MC from the control of it's business being in the hands of a possible future non-Shareholder Chief and Congress. I for one, don't understand why you don't want that for your constituents and for all future Shareholders. I'll bet your other constituents don't understand why, either!

2. How is taking away our authority good for us?

This is more rhetorical nonsense. Approval of these amendments gives the MC FULL AUTHORITY. Something they haven't had in six years, and you, of all people, should know this. You were there.

3. Why are non-shareholders allowed to vote on amendments that have nothing to do with them?

Because that's the current law, the one you seem to not want to change! I don't like the current law as it stands, and I want to change it. Failure to pass these amendments leaves these laws standing, maybe forever.

4. Why would you allow a member of the Osage Nationa non-shareholderto hold office and conduct shareholder business? What next, redistribution of our headrights?

I was about to ask you that very question. That's exactly the situation we would be in right now, if all of Executive and Congress were non-Shareholders. Thank goodness that's not the case, and most, if not all, are, or probably will be, Shareholders. But, as it stands today, Executive and Congress can control the destiny of the Minerals Estate by negating lease agreements and making laws the MC is required to follow. We must totally eliminate any possibility that this non-Shareholder influence can ever happen, by approving these amendments NOW. No one knows what might happen in the 2014 election. If the people happen to elect 6 non-Shareholder Congresspersons and a non-Shareholder Chief and AP, how in the world could you ever change the Constitution then. Please give that some serious thought.

5. What will passage of these amendments do to the trust?

Absolutely nothing. The Trust can't be touched. The only thing that can be changed is our Constitution. And, we'd sure better do it now, while we've got the chance.

6. 5 of our elected Minerals Council officials developed and worked with Congress on these amendments. They strongly agree that these amendments need to be passed. They are Abbott, Core, Crum, Red Eagle and Yates. A constituent told me Friday that these 5 should be sued as individuals.

Do you agree with your constituent? Would you include all 12 Congresspersons, including Danny, in your suit.?

*For these reasons above, we should **VOTE NO** on all of the amendments in August.*

From the desk of Congressman Boone:

In June the Chief appointed Jim Parris, an Osage CPA to the Osage LLC. Special Session will be July 20 to elect officers and committees. We both attended the July 4th Inauguration Ceremony. It was very nice. On a hot summer day, brevity was appreciated. The opinions expressed within are our own and do not reflect the full Minerals Council or Congress. Copies of documents available upon request.

Contact Councilwoman Cynthia Boone at tom@cowboy.net

The above is a copy of the text, in it's entirety, contained in a "Boone's Bulletin" dated July 7, 2012. I have scattered them out whereby each issue raised can be addressed in an orderly fashion. Ms Boone's statements, usually disguised as questions, echo the theory: **"This is what we want, so don't vote for it"** over and over again.

If we miss this opportunity to correct the mistakes of the past, this "theory" will be ringing in our ears for many years to come. Help our leaders secure the future of our precious Minerals Estate for our children and grandchildren.

Vote YES on the 4 amendments on August 13, 2012.

Ray McClain, Osage Shareholder