In the landmark case of *Haida Nation v. British Columbia*, the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed that “the honour of the Crown is always at stake in its dealings with aboriginal peoples ... [and this is] a core precept that finds its application in concrete practices”. The Court also held that the duty of the Crown to act honourably infuses all phases of treaty making including “the implementation of treaties”. In short, treaty implementation is a fundamental obligation of the Crown that has its source in the honour of the Crown, and as the Court stated in *Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada* “if the respective [treaty] obligations are clear the parties should get on with performance”. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples states in Article 37 that “Indigenous peoples have the right to the recognition, observance and enforcement of treaties”.

For the First Nation parties to the Vancouver Island Treaties, the struggle to implement them has been waged almost from their inception. Yet, in the decades after the treaties were made, the “village sites and enclosed fields” recognized and protected by the First Nations were, for the most part, pre-empted or alienated. For example, at Beecher Bay, in 1877 the Joint Indian Reserve Commission found that village sites and enclosed fields reserved under the treaty of May 1850 were owned or occupied by newcomers. As settlement intensified other First Nations were likewise displaced from their village sites.

Similarly, the rights to hunt on “unoccupied lands” and “carry on ... [their fisheries] as formerly” were also systematically eroded. This occurred primarily through heavy handed government regulation of First Nation hunting and fishing and large scale destruction of historic fisheries through urban and industrial activity.

The landmark case of *White and Bob* was the first time a “Douglas Treaty” was successfully invoked as a defence to a charge under provincial wildlife laws. It was followed by other leading cases including *Bartleman* and *Saanichton Marina*. In 1982, hunting and fishing rights reserved under the treaties acquired constitutional status through their entrenchment in s. 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. However, even with these major legal developments, the comprehensive implementation by the Crown of treaty promises has been absent.

How should the wrongs of the past be remedied through treaty implementation? What can be learned from the experience in Washington State with tribal fishing rights under the Stevens Treaties of 1854 and 1855? Has the specific claims process aided or hindered the task of redressing past wrongs? How does the legacy of denial and neglect of Douglas Treaty rights affect current efforts to chart a new course for treaty implementation? What does a new course for treaty implementation entail (for First Nations or the Crown) and what are the main obstacles or challenges in achieving it? What are the implications of treaty implementation for citizens, local governments, businesses, and proposed land and resource development?