

Brodie calls for treaty reset on CBC as K’ómoks figures face scrutiny

News for BC · BC Politics · Updated 22 October 2026

CBC interview update to our existing K’ómoks treaty report. Original interview: October 21, 2026.

Dallas Brodie is calling for a pause and reset in treaty negotiations, arguing that British Columbia is making commitments that are too generous and lack sufficient finality. But the records behind her CBC interview distinguish a roughly $90-million funding package from recurring annual payments—and contain legal commitments missing from her claim that the province receives “nothing in return.”

Speaking with Stephen Quinn on **CBC’s The Early Edition on October 21, 2026**, the OneBC leader said governments should “push pause, reset the parameters for these negotiations, and put a timeline on when these need to be done.” News for BC recovered CBC’s approximately 12-minute original audio and compared its treaty discussion with the supplied Facebook repost. The repost includes an introduction by **The Shift has Hit the Fan**, whose description of the process as a “grift” is commentary, not an established finding of corruption. [1–2]

The interview is a new source, distinct from the May 20 legislative speech examined in our earlier report. It does not replace that earlier speech or its source trail.

The money: a real package, but not a verified $43-million annual commitment

B.C.’s April 14 backgrounder lists rounded federal and provincial capital, fisheries and start-up components totalling **$89.8 million**. That supports “about $90 million” as a package description. It does not establish one wholly new “signing bonus” paid when the provincial bill passed. The treaty records a **$5,794,620 provincial advance paid in March 2023**, with advances reducing subsequent capital payments. [3–4]

Brodie’s statement that governments committed to **“another $43 million a year under the terms of this treaty”** is not supported by the published breakdown. It lists approximately **$6.2 million annually for self-government**, $600,000 in ongoing federal fisheries funding and $400,000 in interim annual provincial lands/resource-management funding. Those components total $7.2 million, but they are **not an exhaustive, permanent total of all public support**: other arrangements and timing conditions matter. Nor can historical total revenue simply be added to treaty funding, because fiscal agreements may replace existing funding arrangements. The complete net-new annual cost requires the executed fiscal schedules. [3–5]

Brodie also cites a **$63-million accumulated surplus**. That figure is not matched to a date or statement in the records reviewed. The March 31, 2025 audit reports accumulated surplus of **$100,412,676**, including **$41,530,990 in cash and cash equivalents**. Accumulated surplus is net assets—not a bank balance or money automatically distributable to members. These figures demonstrate substantial resources while preserving the distinction between cash and accounting surplus; they are not presented as an exhaustive search for the newest accounts. [6]

The **$5.3-million loan** has a reported basis: Douglas magazine describes federal negotiation debt of that amount. But the recovered primary records do not establish that it was entirely lawyers’ fees or newly forgiven by the 2026 treaty. Federal negotiation-loan forgiveness policy dates to **2019**. Debt cancellation and a new cash payment are different transactions. [7–8]

Renewal does not mean an automatic new payout

The treaty requires periodic renewal discussions, beginning no later than ten years after its effective date—not automatically ten years after the provincial vote. Parties must participate in good faith, but chapter 2 expressly says they are not required to accept requested amendments. Bad-faith participation can attract costs and a financial penalty; agreed amendments can create new commitments. Neither is an automatic increase every decade. [4]

The agreement also contains restrictions on the assertion of specified rights and releases of defined claims. It preserves other recourses and does not extinguish Aboriginal rights. That makes both sweeping descriptions —“all lawsuits are over” and “nothing in return”—inaccurate summaries of a more specific legal arrangement. Whether the terms represent good value remains open to political debate. [4]

Five Conservative supporters—but not Milobar

The May 28 third-reading record identifies five Conservative supporters: **Á’a:líya Warbus, John Rustad, Ian Paton, Brennan Day and Lawrence Mok**. Brodie’s suggestion that “probably Milobar” was among them does not match the record: **Peter Milobar voted against** the bill. The recorded votes also do not prove her account of changing colleagues’ private intentions. [9]

Her “six treaties” and “197 left” formulation should not be treated as a verified liability forecast. The Province’s April baseline distinguishes **four implemented modern treaties covering eight First Nations**. Treaty documents, governments and agreements still undergoing ratification are different categories; one treaty can cover multiple nations. [3]

The constitutional and historical distinction

The interview begins this discussion with section 35, which recognizes and affirms existing Aboriginal and treaty rights. Repealing an ordinary provincial law is not the same as changing Canada’s Constitution; a provincial government cannot simply erase section 35 through an ordinary repeal. [10]

Brodie is correct that the **1969 White Paper proposed repealing the Indian Act**. Her reference to opposition by the Assembly of First Nations uses the later organization’s name: the AFN was established in **1982**, with the National Indian Brotherhood among the earlier opponents. The federal historical account records concerns about consultation and loss of rights—not simply a desire to keep people on reserves. Opposition to that repeal package is not proof of support for every restriction in the Indian Act. [11–12]

What accountable scrutiny should produce

Taxpayers deserve an accessible schedule separating federal and provincial costs, one-time transfers, recurring funding, replacement funding, debt relief and revenue sharing. First Nation members deserve equally clear information about what is committed and how it supports services and governance.

Those are legitimate demands. They are stronger when tied to records rather than unsupported allegations of corruption. **No new requests for comment or interviews were conducted for this update.**

Sources and production notes

1. CBC — The Early Edition, Dallas Brodie: OneBC Party Leader Interview, October 21, 2026. Original audio recovered; treaty discussion approximately 4:52–10:02. Automatic transcripts compared, not a forensic audio-authenticity examination.
2. Supplied Facebook repost — The Shift has Hit the Fan. Includes approximately 40 seconds of uploader commentary before the interview excerpt.
3. B.C. treaty backgrounder, April 14, 2026. Also reports 351 registered members at that date, rather than the clip's unsourced 340; not an October live count.
4. K'ómoks Treaty — consolidated February 20, 2026. Chapters 1–2 and 19–20: releases, renewal, fiscal relations and capital transfers.
5. K'ómoks treaty chapter summaries. Fiscal-agreement replacement design; page includes older negotiating-stage language and is not a substitute for final executed schedules.
6. K'ómoks audited financial statements, year ended March 31, 2025. Financial position, printed page 4.
7. Douglas — K'ómoks treaty and economic impact. Secondary reporting of the $5.3-million negotiation loan, not the debt-cancellation instrument.
8. Canada — negotiation-loan reimbursement policy. Historical federal reforms, including 2019 forgiveness.
9. B.C. Votes and Proceedings, May 28, 2026. Third-reading division; compare May 20 proceedings before making causal claims.
10. Constitution Act, 1982 — section 35 and section 52. Constitutional recognition and supremacy.
11. Canada — First Nations historical account. White Paper proposals, opposition and withdrawal.
12. AFN history and AFN-authored historical account, archived copy. Distinguishes AFN from its National Indian Brotherhood predecessor.

Publication note: This update supplements the earlier October 15 report at https://newsforbc.com/komoks-treaty-brodie-funding-audits-votes.html . The earlier legislative video and source trail are retained. Provincial assent is not full treaty implementation: the BC Laws consolidation current to October 13 still marks core provisions not in force.

Media and independence: Full supplied Facebook repost and a short policy excerpt framed by News for BC. This is not the complete original CBC interview. Political claims are not findings of corruption. No affiliation with CBC, OneBC or the repost account. Interview/repost reuse permission remains unconfirmed; attribution is not rights clearance.

Banner credits: Michael Konen, CC BY 3.0 (Mount Robson); dronepicr, CC BY 2.0 (grizzly). Cropped/composited, resized and masthead added.