

*Government Orders*

or thereafter and no date is available in the whole process to say how long these negotiations in British Columbia will continue.

On the money concept a clause states that an annual budget will be presented to the principals. Considering all these points, auditing is essential. Clause 20 addresses the audit situation but it says:

The accounts and financial transactions of the Commission shall be audited annually—

• (1025)

That is good.

—by a qualified independent auditor designated by the Commission, and a report of the audit shall be made to the Commission.

It does not go any further than that. Considering that a portion of this is federal funding, it seems very logical to me that auditing of the federal funding portion at least should be done by the auditor general.

Clauses 18 and 22 are of concern as well. Clause 18 says:

The Commission may make by-laws consistent with this Act and the Agreement—

The agreement in this case means the agreement of September 21, 1992.

The Commission may make by-laws consistent with this Act and the Agreement respecting the carrying out of the work—

That in itself is all right. Clause 22 says:

Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as preventing the principals from amending the Agreement from time to time.

That is the September 21 agreement. I find that quite difficult from the point of view the whole bill is the agreement of September 21, 1992. Therefore, if the principals are to go back and change this agreement after the legislation has been passed, it is a logical follow through that the bill should be amended to incorporate the changes the principals have made to the initial agreement.

We offer qualified support to the establishment of the B.C. Treaty Commission and to Bill C-107. We are a little after the fact, but nevertheless we hope any discussions facilitated by the commission would include our recommendations which, as I said, come from the grassroots, both native and non-native.

The concerns of aboriginal people are Canadian concerns. They are concerned about jobs, personal safety, social service and control over their own government just like the rest of us are. We need to give aboriginals the same rights and responsibilities for meeting those concerns as other Canadians have.

We believe aboriginals will welcome the chance to free themselves from the paternalism of the department of Indian affairs, to assert a more genuine, democratic control over their own affairs and to realize brighter futures for themselves, for their children and their grandchildren.

**Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in my place today to join the debate on second reading of Bill C-107. The Government of Canada has maintained that providing justice and equity for aboriginal peoples requires two ingredients, self-government and the process of making modern day treaties through comprehensive claims.

Canadians have been wrestling with these issues for years. The Reform Party, for its part, has used the self-government issue to fan the flames of fear and apprehension during the debates over the Charlottetown accord and now it continues to stir up controversy in British Columbia through its misrepresentation of the treaty process.

I have heard hon. members opposite make a great deal of the media reports of the total First Nations' claims adding up to 110 per cent of the province. That total should not surprise us. Why should not the claims overlap one another? The First Nations have shared the land and its resources for centuries. They have migrated and tapped the resources of different locales at different times.

• (1030)

They have been asked as part of the treaty making process to describe the geographic area of the First Nations' traditional territory in British Columbia. They provided a map of the traditional areas of their ancestors which depicts a territory that a nation occupied historically. These maps are used to provide negotiators with a general idea of what area of land is under question, which is part of stage one of the process, the statement of intent.

A statement of intent is not a settlement. A claim is not a treaty. A treaty is a result of negotiations and the negotiations are just beginning. The claims are but the start of the bargaining position. No first nation would expect to receive the entire region described in its statement of intent. The First Nations do not expect fee simple title to the entire province.

When two First Nations have overlapping traditional claims they will settle the matter as the negotiations proceed. The federal and provincial governments do not participate in negotiating an overlapping settlement. However, several of the members across the floor, members who ought to know better, have been using the claims to instil fear among British Columbians.