

NOTES TO THE NATION: MARCH 13, 2011

REPORT ON MINERALS COUNCIL GOVERNMENTAL LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING

This committee of the Minerals Council met on March 3 to discuss the Memorandum of Understanding (between the Minerals Council and the Executive Branch) and the proposed changes to the Osage Constitution.

The committee is made up of three members of the MC: Galen Crum, Chair, Melvin Core and Andrew Yates, members; however, all eight members were there and participated. All members of Congress had been invited—eight were able to attend.

The discussion of the MOU concerned a [letter](#) the MC had sent to Chief Red Eagle recently. The letter listed points that had been discussed by the Chief and the MC and, from the MC point of view, had generally been agreed on. The MC members appeared to agree that the point concerning rent was a misunderstanding on their part. What they had thought was rent was actually a charge for their share of the normal costs of maintaining the building and is referred to as space cost. With this exception, the MC wanted to have the remaining agreements in writing.

The response from the Chief was a [7-page MOU](#) that appeared to depart from previous understandings. When the Chief's representative was asked if the Chief had approved the 7-page MOU he offered "no comment." The committee voted to recommend to the full MC that they reject this MOU. The vote will be next Wednesday, but there seems to be no question that it will be rejected since all members were there on the 13th and there was absolutely no support for accepting it.

Since then, there has been mass confusion in the rumor mill; even to the point that some people even think that the 7-page MOU was drafted by the Minerals Council!

The members of Congress did not participate in this issue. I, and perhaps others, considered this issue to be between the Chief and the Minerals Council.

There was a lot of discussion about Constitutional amendments and what the MC wanted to achieve by the changes; one of the amendments being discussed would take the MC out of the Constitution altogether.

The question was asked of each member of Congress there; "Why do you want the Minerals Council under the Constitutional Government?" The question seemed to reveal confusion about the current status of the government and the Constitution; nevertheless, each member of Congress answered in their own way and, I hope, helped toward a better understanding between the MC and the Congress.

The Minerals Council is established as a department under the umbrella of the constitutional government. This is how the constitution was when everyone in office now, was elected; this is the hand we were dealt—this was not created by us—it was in place before we took office. The current government did not put the MC in the constitution, it is what we inherited.

Now there are those who want to completely separate the MC and the minerals estate from the constitutional government. Some wanting this are those who created the current government.

What I said at the meeting on the 3rd was what I have said repeatedly over the last 4 years: I would support any legislation that gives the Minerals Council more independence, more autonomy, as long as it also protects the sovereignty of the minerals estate. I felt that the request for a constitutional amendment regarding minerals should come from the MC for two reasons: 1. I didn't think the shareholders would fully support it if it came solely from the Congress, and, 2. The law of unintended consequences—let me explain: As it is now, the minerals estate is safe and secure, it has the protection of sovereign immunity, there are no problems between shareholders and non-shareholders, we get our checks with no problem and the royalty is not taxed. Will a constitutional amendment improve on that? Will it really gain something for the shareholders?

Any change that directly affects the minerals estate should be thoroughly thought out. The long term effects should be carefully considered and every scenario researched. I don't want to be a part of anything that diminishes or harms the mineral estate in any way and I don't think any other member of this government does either.

As I said on the 3rd: The political climate is such now that whatever the minerals council asks for, they probably will get. There could be a hidden danger in that.

(Some people have said that the letter link does not work for them so I am sending the letter as an attachment also.)

NEWS ARTICLES FROM THE PAST

These articles are taken from Kansas newspapers from the late 1800's. The news was written from the white man's point of view and sometimes the Osage didn't get treated fairly. These excerpts are passed on for their historical value only.

Arkansas City Traveler, December 20, 1876.

INDIAN PHOTOGRAPHS.

We have a few specimens of Mr. T. M. Concannon's Indian photographs, that compare with the best. Mr. Concannon has a variety of scenes from Indian life, that make a very interesting picture.

Among the number purchased by ourselves is a "War-dance," "Issuing Rations," and the chiefs "Governor Joe," "Chetopa," "Strike-Axe," "Hard Rope," "Jump-Over" "Sassy-Chief," "Black Dog," and several others.

Joe is chief ruler of the Big and Little Osages, Hard Rope, the war chief, and Black Dog is one of the most unruly Indians of the tribe. Among them, we recognize many familiar faces. The advertisement of the artist will appear next week.

-0-

Opinions expressed here are mine alone and are not necessarily shared by all members of Congress.

Kugee