

WCVI Salmon Fisheries Timeline:

Nuu-chah-nulth and Canadian policies, conflicts, and rights assertion

Created by Julia Bingham, Ariella Chukwuma, and Bentley Choi. Last revision completed Summer 2023.

Companion text to the Timeline of Canadian fishery development, colonial legislation, and Indigenous organizing and rights assertion figure available [here](#).

This document provides a list of policies, legislation, court cases, community action, and other events relevant to the history of fisheries and Indigenous rights and livelihoods in Canada, focusing especially on the province of British Columbia, specifically but not exclusively on the west coast of the island now known as Vancouver Island, traditionally the *hahouthli* (traditional territories) of *Nuu-chah-nulth-aht* (Nuu-chah-nulth Peoples). 14 Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations have lived in this region for thousands of years. Since the early 1800s, their traditional livelihoods, governance systems, family structures, spiritual practices, and harvest practices - including fishing - have been systematically restricted, even criminalized, by Canada. First Nations and Indigenous communities across coastal BC experienced parallel timelines of colonial extirpation, subjugation, dispossession, and marginalization. Several Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations are among the Indigenous communities who have challenged Canada in recent decades regarding the recognition of their rights and pursued realization of self-determination and a process of reconciliation, especially regarding fishing and self governance. Specific attention is given in this timeline to salmon fisheries, which are integral to the livelihoods and wellbeing of coastal BC communities including Nuu-chah-nulth-aht, and to events in Clayoquot Sound and the *hahouthli* of Tla-o-qu-aht First Nations, which have set several precedents for Nuu-chah-nulth resistance and rights assertion regarding resource sovereignty. This timeline is also meant to provide context relevant to the recent efforts to implement the rights-based *T'aaq-wiihak* fishery by the Five Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations, whose rights to fish, sell fish, and self govern in co-management with Fisheries and Oceans Canada have been recognized, constitutionally protected, and affirmed through the *Ahousaht et al. v Canada* court decision (2009) and subsequent appeals decisions (2014, 2018, 2021).

A visual version of this timeline is available as a companion document to this extended archive. It organizes key dates across four groups: (1) Canadian and BC Court Decisions and Federal Legislation, (2) Federal Fisheries Management Policies and Treaties, (3) Coastal Fisheries and Communities, and (4) Restrictive Canadian Policies and Indigenous Led Organizing and Resistance. The visual timeline is available at:

www.juliaabingham.com/research/nuu-chah-nulth-fishing-rights-assertion

This document serves as a collection or archive (not an original analysis) of dozens of publicly available sources, which are referenced and in many cases directly quoted in each entry. These sources can be accessed through the included links and referenced texts to read more regarding each entry.

This document and the accompanying visual timeline were among multiple products associated with the doctoral research of Julia Bingham, conducted in collaboration with the Five Nations (Tla-o-qui-aht, Ahousaht, Hesquiaht, Mowachaht/Muchalaht, and Ehattesaht First Nations). More information about the research project and a copy of the doctoral dissertation can be found at: www.juliaabingham.com/research/nuu-chah-nulth-fishing-rights-assertion

- ~1003: First Contact (Northeast)
 - Key Actors: The Norse and Indigenous tribes of north-eastern coast of Americas
 - “The Norse (Vikings) were the first Europeans to reach North America, sailing from their settlements in Iceland and Greenland. After several exploratory trips, a settlement was established in “Vinland” (somewhere along the north-eastern coast); the first relations between this community between Vikings and the Indigenous population were peaceful, revolving around trading. Vikings left the settlement after two years when conflict broke out between the two groups.”
 - Canada. 2018. “The Arrival of the Europeans: 17th Century Wars.” Canada.ca. available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/services/military-history/history-heritage/popular-books/aboriginal-people-canadian-military/arrival-europeans-17th-century-wars.html>

- 1534: French Colonialism
 - Key Actors: Jacques Carter, Mi’kmaq, Iroquoians
 - “Jacques Cartier explored the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the name of the King of France. It was here that Cartier’s men met a group of Mi’kmaq, with whom they traded goods. They then went to the Gaspé Peninsula, where they planted a cross to take possession of the land and encountered a group of Iroquoians from the Quebec City area; the interaction ended in conflict, and set a negative precedent for future relationships.”
 - Canada. 2018. “The Arrival of the Europeans: 17th Century Wars.” Canada.ca. available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/services/military-history/history-heritage/popular-books/aboriginal-people-canadian-military/arrival-europeans-17th-century-wars.html>

- 1541-1543: France Attempts to Establish Permanent Settlement
 - Key Actors: French settlers, Iroquoians
 - French attempts to establish a permanent settlement at Quebec City failed. Reasons included outbreaks of scurvy and other illnesses, the harsh climate, and the hostility of the Iroquoian peoples defending their land from the settlers. The violent Iroquoian defense was used to justify the depiction of Indigenous people as savages in France.
 - Canada. 2018. “The Arrival of the Europeans: 17th Century Wars.” Canada.ca. available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/services/military-history/history-heritage/popular-books/aboriginal-people-canadian-military/arrival-europeans-17th-century-wars.html>

- 1725: Articles of Submission and Agreement
 - Key Actors: delegates of Penobscot Norridgewolk, St. John's Native tribes, Nova Scotia Tribes
 - The delegates of the Penobscot Norridgewolk & St. John's Native tribes in Boston in New England signed an agreement affirming the submission of the signing tribes to the power of the King of England.
 - Ratified & confirmed by the Nova Scotia Tribes, at Annapolis Royal, June 1726.
 - Canada. 2010. “Treaty or Articles of Peace and Friendship Renewed 1752.” Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028593/1539609242434>

- 1752: Treaty of Peace and Friendship Renewed 1752
 - Key Actors: Peregrine Thomas Hopson Esquire Captain General and Governor in Chief in and over Nova Scotia, Major Jean Baptiste Cope, chief Sachem of the Tribe of Mick Mack Tribe inhabiting the Eastern Coast of the province, Andrew Hadley Martin, Gabriel Martin, Francis Jeremiah, members and delegates of the Mick Mack tribe
 - This maritime peace treaty involved yearly meetings was based on the Articles of Submission and Agreement; it required that tribes involved in the agreement attempt to bring other tribes into the agreement, and any knowledge of possible insurrection should be reported immediately to the King’s delegates. Under the treaty, aid could be petitioned for any

inter-tribal violence involving tribes who are and aren't involved in the treaty. Native tribes involved in the agreement were allowed to fish and hunt as they normally would; the tribes could also establish a trading post at the Chibenaccadie river, or trade and sell goods to Halifax or any other settlement within the province.

- Canada. 2010. "Treaty or Articles of Peace and Friendship Renewed 1752." Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028593/1539609242434>
- 1760: Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1760
 - Key Actors: Esq. Governor and Commander in Chief over Nova Scotia and the LaHave tribe
 - This was a maritime peace treaty that required the LaHave tribe at Halifax to recognize the King's dominion over Nova Scotia or Accadia. The signing tribe promised not to provoke or start violent conflicts with settlers in the area, and to go through legal channels if settlers start a conflict with members of the LaHave tribe.
 - Canada. 2010. "Treaty or Articles of Peace and Friendship Renewed 1760." Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028596/1539609162567>
- 1774: First Contact between Nuu-chah-nulth peoples and European explorers in Nootka Sound
 - Juan Jose Perez Hernandez, a Spanish explorer, encountered the Nuu-chah-nulth in the Nootka sound and traded with them before continuing on. The Spanish did not lay claim to the area.
 - Captain James Cook later first encountered Nuu-chah-nulth villagers at Yuquot, on Nootka Island, west of Vancouver Island, in 1778. He mistook their name to be Nootka, and mistakenly thought all Nuu-chah-nulth people were of a shared tribe due to the shared language and cultural practices. The British claimed control over the area, and conflict between Spain and Britain continued until the Nootka Conventions of 1790, where the Spanish abandoned their claims. Mowachaht Chief Maquinna was able to use the popularity of Nootka sound to influence trade in the area through strategic relations with the competing European Nations.
 - Arima, E. (2018). Nuu-chah-nulth (Nootka). In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/nootka-nuu-chah-nulth>
- 1779 and earlier: Peace and Friendship Treaties
 - Key Actors: British Crown, Mi'kmaq, Maliseet and Passamaquoddy
 - The British Crown entered into treaties with the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet and Passamaquoddy "to end hostilities and encourage cooperation between the British and First Nations. As the British and French competed for control of North America, treaties were also strategic alliances which could make the difference between success and failure for European powers."
 - Canada. 2015. "Peace and Friendship Treaties." Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100028589/1539608999656>
- 1800: Shift in customary fishing practices and social structures
 - Key Actors: Coastal BC First Nations (Focus here: Gitga'at, Gitxaala, Ts'msyen tribes)
 - "Three key customary fishing techniques have been deployed at K'mKoda: gaffs, stone tidal traps, and drag seines. Up until the late 1800s, fishing by gaffs and with the stone trap was the key technique for harvesting salmon. Coincident with the development of the industrial salmon canning fishery, Gitxaala fishers switched to drag seining; this innovation accommodated the reduction in labor force caused by the waves of disease and dislocation brought by invasive "nonindigenous humans."
 - "Social change came rapidly during the 1800s and early 1900s in Ts'msyen territories. Following the initial forays of merchant traders and waves of disease came industrial resource extraction industries. However, Gitxaala have been fishers for several millennia, and while the most recent century has ushered in a period of significant change, it has not erased the fact that Gitxaala

remain today a nation of fishers with a strong set of social values and practices that are rooted in their *adaawk* (history) and *ayaawk* (laws).”

- Menzies et al. (2007). Returning to Selective Fishing through Indigenous Fisheries Knowledge: The Example of K'moda, Gitxaala Territory. *American Indian Quarterly*. 31(3) 441-464, 509-510. Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/216860999?accountid=10598&pq-origsite=360link>
- 1831 - 1996: Indian Residential School System (IRS)
 - Key Actors: Department of Indian Affairs, Christian churches
 - A method of state-endorsed assimilation was the Indian Residential School (IRS) system. “Residential schools were operated by the Department of Indian Affairs and Christian churches between 1831 to 1996; they had a detrimental impact on the teaching of traditional knowledges by removing Indigenous children from their communities, enforcing the adoption of European customs, and suppressing Indigenous languages and lifeways.”
 - Muller, M. K. (2018). Promoting or protecting traditional knowledges? tensions in the resurgence of indigenous food practices on vancouver island. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 9(4) doi:<https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2018.9.4.4>
- 1867 British North American Act (initial Constitution Act) , establishment of DFO
 - Establishment of Canadian Parliament and Constitution under the British Crown, united the Canadian territories into a single Canada
 - Establishment of multiple Federal systems including the Department of Marine and Fisheries (later became the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) in 1977, now formally referred to Fisheries and Oceans Canada)
 - UK Parliament. 2023. “British North America Act 1867.” Parliament.uk. <https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/legislativescrutiny/parliament-and-empire/collections/parliament-and-canada/british-north-america-act-1867/#:~:text=The%20British%20North%20America%20Act,a%20single%20dominion%20called%20Canada>.
 - Legislative assembly of British Columbia. 2021. “Constitutional Framework and Governance.” leg.bc.ca <https://www.leg.bc.ca/dvl/Pages/Constitutional-Framework-Governance.aspx>
- 1868 - Fisheries Act
 - Provides legislative authority to the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the parliamentary fisheries minister, sets up governmental authority to protect fish habitat, clean water, and oceans.
 - Empowered Department of Marine Fisheries “to conserve and protect fish and fish habitat across Canada.” Regulations made to address specific fish management issues in each of the provinces.
 - Conservation of Fish Resources in Federal Jurisdiction: only the federal parliament, and not the provincial legislatures, can make laws about the conservation and preservation of fisheries.
 - Ecojustice. 2013. “Legal Backgrounder: Fisheries Act.” available at: <https://ecojustice.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Ecojustice-Fisheries-Act-Feb-2013.pdf>
- 1870: Development of Non-Indigenous Coastal Communities
 - “Entrepreneurs built many salmon canneries in Canada and canning technology and settlement patterns gave the BC industry a more concentrated character than that of the Atlantic. Even in isolated places, the industry depended on bringing together many plant workers and many boats to take advantage of the seasonal migrations of Pacific salmon. Railways provided transport to larger markets for salmon and for the halibut fishery, which in its early years used schooners and then steamers”
 - Gough. 2013. “History of Commercial Fisheries.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. TheCanadianEncyclopedia.ca. Available at: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries>
 - Newell, D. (Ed.). (1989). *Development of the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry: A Grown Man's Game*. McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt805b7>
- 1871 BC Joins Canada

- Legislative assembly of British Columbia. 2021. "Constitutional Framework and Governance." leg.bc.ca <https://www.leg.bc.ca/dyl/Pages/Constitutional-Framework-Governance.aspx>
- 1871 Treaty of Washington
 - American-British Joint High Commission met in Washington to negotiate fishery rights
 - Result of this treaty: People in the province of Canada could protect their rights of fishery but ambiguity remained regarding the rights of American citizens to catch fish in northern Pacific colonial waters.
 - Waite, P. (2015). Treaty of Washington. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/treaty-of-washington>
- 1876 - Indian Act
 - Part of a long history of assimilation policies, this one setting precedence for many others
 - Detailed Canadian government control over managing Indigenous peoples housing, health services, environmental use, resource access, and day-to-day affairs on reserves.
 - Detailed requirements for registering as having Indian status, and processes of assimilation or "gradual civilisation"
 - Structure intended to dismantle traditional community and governance structures, and replace with those more familiar to Canadian policy;
 - "The great aim of our legislation has been to do away with the tribal system and assimilate the Indian people in all respects with the other inhabitants of the Dominion as speedily as they are fit to change."– John A Macdonald, 1887
 - Banned many traditional practices such as potlaches
 - First Nations Studies Program. 2009. *The Indian Act*. IndigenousFoundations.arts.ubc. The University of British Columbia https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_indian_act/
 - Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. 2018. *Background on Indian registration*. Government of Canada. Canada.ca. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1540405608208/1568898474141>

- 1870s - mid 1900s: Implementation of Salmon Canneries
 - Key Actors: DFO, Ts'msyen First Nation
 - Salmon canneries were developed up and down the coast of BC to process salmon caught in the growing Canadian fisheries, often built on top of traditional fishing grounds of the Ts'msyen First Nations, Nuu chah nulth First Nations, and other Indigenous groups. The first cannery was built in 1876 on the Skeena River. At first, First Nations peoples were the bulk of the labor force of the canneries, especially Indigenous women, though they were displaced over time by Canadian producers and workers. As salmon stocks began to dip in the mid 1900s, seining camps were shut down by DFO for conservation reasons, and canneries quickly began to close as catch rates dropped, especially following reductions of the fleet after the Davis Plan.
 - Menzies et al. (2007). Returning to Selective Fishing through Indigenous Fisheries Knowledge: The Example of K'moda, Gitxaala Territory. *American Indian Quarterly*. 31(3) 441-464, 509-510. Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/216860999?accountid=10598&pq-origsite=360link>
 - Newell, D. (Ed.). (1989). *Development of the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry: A Grown Man's Game*. McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt805b7>
 - "Cannery operators considered Indigenous peoples to be at most "helpers" in the industrial fishery, and as such "helpers," they were paid only for their labor, and not for the sale of their resources. Despite cannery operators' attempts to marginalize Indigenous economic structures, the industrial fishery operated alongside an Indigenous economy, and people worked for these fisheries as members of house groups and communities, and not simply as individuals."

- UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
- 1880s: Non-Indigenous Coastal Communities Grow following development of transcontinental railways
 - Key Actors: Europeans
 - "From the early nineteenth century on, Europeans became involved in the fur trade, coal and gold mining, and logging and milling, but permanent non-Aboriginal settlement remained sparse along the rugged and inhospitable coast. This changed with the arrival of Canada's first transcontinental railway in the 1880s; with transportation now available both on the western coast and to markets in the East, resource-based industries could grow, spurring immigration and the creation of new coastal communities."
 - Robertson et al. 2002. "Tides of Life — West Coast Communities." Canadian History Museum. HistoryCanada.com. Available at: <https://www.historymuseum.ca/cmhc/exhibitions/hist/phase2/mod9e.html>
- 1888: Fisheries regulations outlawing Indigenous fisheries, food fishing permits required
 - Key Actors: Minister of Marine Fisheries
 - The 1888 fisheries regulations specifically prohibited Indigenous fishing "by means of nets or other apparatus without leases or licenses from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries," but indicated that "Indians shall, at all times, have liberty to fish for the purpose of providing food for themselves but not for sale, barter or traffic, by any means other than with drift nets, or spearing."
 - "Government restrictions on Aboriginal fishing increased, and government officials eventually required Indigenous people to acquire a permit to fish for food. Historian Douglas Harris suggests that the introduction of permits for Native food fisheries is significant in that it "effected the legal capture of the fisheries," which, in parallel to the reserve system, regulated and limited Native access to resources while opening them up to the settler population."
 - By the 1890s, Independent licenses for fishing separately from cannery operations were generally unavailable to Indigenous fishers.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
- 1893 Bering Sea Dispute
 - The US and Canada (with Great Britain), disputed jurisdiction over the Bering Sea, with concerns regarding seal hunting near Alaska. The US asserted control, and seized Canadian vessels, and also claimed the Canadian vessels infringed on Russian rights to the region. An international tribunal condemned the seizures, and interim agreements were negotiated. Indigenous rights were excluded from these agreements, as the dispute assumed State authority.
 - Encyclopedia Britannica. "The Bering Sea Dispute." Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Thompson-prime-minister-of-Canada>
- 1898 Establishment of research stations under the Biological Board of Canada
 - Later coordinated by the Fisheries Research Board, these stations were developed for conducting biological and technical research and investigations related to fisheries, the environment, oceanography, and aquaculture.
 - Trippel, E. 1999. "The first marine biological station in Canada: 100 years of scientific research at St. Andrews" *Canadian Science Publishing*, vol 56. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f99-190>
- Late 1800s: Hatcheries and Recreational Fishing Become Commonplace
 - Key Actors: DFO, Canadian Govt
 - "Hatcheries became a part of active recreational fisheries management in Canada by the late 1800s and included the supplementation of natural stocks (e.g., Wilmot Hatchery on Lake Ontario was

established in 1868 to enhance Atlantic Salmon *Salmo salar* populations) and the creation of private and public put-grow-take fisheries. In many cases, governments engaged in stocking of introduced species (starting in the 1870s—including Brook Trout *Salvelinus fontinalis* in the Rocky Mountains, and Pacific salmon in eastern Canada) to support angler preferences."

- Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- Late 1800s - early 1900s: Tensions Rise among Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Fishers
 - Key Actors: Indigenous peoples, Non-Indigenous fishers,
 - "Although Indigenous peoples harvested great quantities of fish sustainably and, in many cases, worked alongside non-Indigenous fishers across Canada, tensions grew, which often resulted in unfavorable outcomes for Indigenous peoples across Canada. An example of such tensions occurred in British Columbia when industrial fishing practices and salmon canneries of non-Indigenous fishers grew in the late 1800s to early 1900s and were heavily reliant on Indigenous peoples for labor and fish. Indigenous peoples' fishing methods and rights clashed with industrial fishing, and Indigenous fishing methods, such as weirs and inland netting, were blamed for poor salmon runs and subsequently banned or destroyed in some areas."
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- Early 1900s: Destruction of First Nations fishing practices
 - Key Actors: First Nations tribes
 - "Industrial fishing practices and salmon canneries of non-Indigenous fishers grew in the late 1800s to early 1900s and were heavily reliant on Indigenous peoples for labor and fish. Indigenous peoples' fishing methods and rights clashed with industrial fishing, and Indigenous fishing methods, such as weirs and inland netting, were blamed for poor salmon runs and subsequently banned or destroyed in some areas"
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- 1901 Modus Vivendi
 - Modus Vivendi: legal term of describing the status of co-existence of 2 conflicting parties; Federal government and British Columbia government
 - Ottawa & Victoria agreed on provincial control of the non-tidal fisheries
 - Federal government maintained control on tidal or seacoast fisheries
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- 1902 Increasing provincial authorities
 - June: BC Fisheries Act was amended to enable the province to make regulations, issue leases & licenses, levy taxes on output for an independent fisheries administration
 - As a result, the modus vivendi was terminated & provincial Fisheries Act proclaimed
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- Early 1900s (before 1903)
 - Fishing was regulated through weekly closures & net size restrictions
 - Federal government had lax regulation towards BC fisheries
 - Federal revenues (from fisheries) exceeded expenditures

- Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
 - Newell, D. (Ed.). (1989). *Development of the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry: A Grown Man's Game*. McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt805b7>
- 1904 License issued for traps
 - Federal license for traps (other than few experimental licenses in 1894) were issue
 - May 1904: The ban on fishing with all but gillnets was rescinded, allowing trap net, purse seine and drag seine licenses to be issued
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
 - 1912: Discriminatory Policies: "bona fide white fishermen" policies
 - Key Actors: Indigenous fishers, DFO
 - "By 1912, an openly discriminatory policy gave priority to so-called "bona fide white fishermen" on the north coast of the province. Since highly productive Indigenous fishing technologies were banned, and many Indigenous fishers did not have the capital or collateral necessary to buy their own boats, it was difficult to gain entry into the fishery. Many Indian agents denied Indigenous fishers licenses due to pressure from cannery owners objecting to the economic independence such licenses would create."
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
 - 1913 Privy Council Judgment
 - Ruling emphasized & confirmed the public right to fish in tidal waters
 - Instead of focusing on provincial property rights, the public right to fish in tidal waters were emphasized
 - In re British Columbia Fisheries, 1913 CanLII 62 (SCC), 47 SCR 493, <<https://canlii.ca/t/fsm5g>>
 - 1914-1920: Fishing Industry Expanded
 - Key Actors: DFO
 - The First World War interrupted fish supplies to Europe, bringing a huge boom to Canada's fishery. As prices and incomes rose, diesel engines became common on larger vessels in the 1920s, and the federal government abandoned the national system, established before the war, of transport subsidies for fish as it seemed the fishery could do well on its own.
 - Gough, J. (2015). History of Commercial Fisheries. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries>
 - Newell, D. (Ed.). (1989). *Development of the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry: A Grown Man's Game*. McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt805b7>
 - 1916: Formation of Allied Tribes of British Columbia
 - Key Actors: Nishga, Teit, Reverend Peter Kelly (Haida), and Andrew Paull (Squamish)
 - The Indigenous Tribes of B.C. and the Interior Tribes of B.C. met in Vancouver to form the Allied Indian Tribes of British Columbia to pursue a land claim. The organization retained its initial vigor for about 6 years as non-Indigenous advisors played a continuing role, although the Reverend Peter Kelly (Haida) and Andrew Paull (Squamish) became the acknowledged leaders as president and secretary, respectively. Northern interior groups were never involved; the Nishga, while continuing to give verbal support, withdrew by 1922; despite explicit attempts to paper over the coastal-interior differences, the interior chiefs and Teit also withdrew.
 - Tennant, P. 1982. "Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism." *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>

- 1917: Total Colonization of Fisheries
 - Key Actors: DFO
 - “New amendments stipulated that food fishing permits would be subject to the same closed seasons, area, and gear restrictions as the non-Native commercial fishery. The colonization of the fisheries was now complete: the production of fish had been separated from the management of the fisheries, and that management had been transferred to the Canadian state. Indigenous needs and uses were now arbitrarily categorized and highly regulated, and the colonial goal of enabling settler access to fisheries was achieved.”
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. “Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia.” *indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca*. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
 - Tennant, P. 1982. “Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism.” *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>

- 1917 Appointment of Special Fishery Commission of 1917
 - Commission recommended that the number of salmon canneries in the north be limited for five years to the number now operating
 - Casteñada et al. 2020. “A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada.” *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
 - Special Fishery Commission 1917, Report, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1918.

- 1918: Fishery License Restrictions
 - Key Actors: First Nations, Japanese-Canadians
 - In British Columbia after the First World War, the demand of veterans for employment ended "limited entry" (license limitation) in the salmon fishery, at least for white people. Restrictions remained for some time on Aboriginal people and Japanese-Canadians; meanwhile, white fisherman gained clear dominance in the fishery.
 - Gough, J. (2015). History of Commercial Fisheries. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries>
 - Tennant, P. 1982. “Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism.” *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>

- 1920s-1930s: First Nations Fishermen Displaced
 - Key Actors: First Nations
 - First Nations fishermen began to be displaced by the trend toward larger, costlier fishing vessels. This displacement continued during the mid-twentieth century with the consolidation of the salmon canning industry into fewer, larger operations.
 - Macgillivray, P. 2019. *Indigenous Peoples' Tenure Rights in Fisheries: A Canadian Case Study*. Fao.org. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/fishery/static/tenure-user-rights/root/volume1/C11.pdf>
 - Tennant, P. 1982. “Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism.” *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>

- 1920s: Canneries become central to Inter-tribal Relations
 - Key Actors: First Nations tribes
 - “The wages earned in the industrial fishery were an important source of cash in an increasingly mixed subsistence-wage economy. Earnings from the canneries helped to pay for winter supplies, and also fed into the existing potlatching system, through which rights and responsibilities towards customary fishing grounds were recognized and affirmed. Goods and cash therefore entered into traditional systems of exchange, and the cannery itself became an important site of inter-tribal trade, where specialty fish, meat, and plant products were traded between women from different First Nations.”

- UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
 - Tennant, P. 1982. "Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism." *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>
 - Newell, D. (Ed.). (1989). *Development of the Pacific Salmon-Canning Industry: A Grown Man's Game*. McGill-Queen's University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt805b7>
- 1920 discontinuation of federal trap license issuance
 - Federal department decided not to issue trap license except adjacent to the southern & northern borders
 - Traps were seen as a way of harvesting fish migrating across borders, not as an efficient fishing method
 - 21 licenses were still issued in 1930
 - Millerd, F. 2002. *Turning Points in the Development of the British Columbia Salmon Fishery*
 - Woodward, E., *Trap-Net Fishing In B.C.*, Canadian Fishing Company, n.d.
- 1922 The 1922 Commission
 - The 1922 Commission: sub-committee of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons
 - Notable & controversial recommendation: restricting licenses of Japanese-Canadians
 - The Supreme Court (1927) & Privy council (1929) ruled that licenses cannot be restricted on the basis of ethnic origin.
 - British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1922, Report and Recommendations, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1923
 - Millerd, F. 2002. *Turning Points in the Development of the British Columbia Salmon Fishery*
- 1923: Results of the 1922 Commission
 - Key Actors: DFO, First Nations
 - Indigenous tribes were allowed to become commercial fishermen. Prior to this, many Indigenous people didn't have the incentive or the income to obtain large motorized boats. Only with the advent of such boats did Indigenous people attain the ability to travel among coastal villages in relative speed and safety all seasons of the year.
 - Tennant, P. 1982. "Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism." *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>
- 1924: Seine Licenses Made Available to Native Fishers
 - Key Actors: DFO, First Nations
 - "Seine licenses were not available to Native fishers until 1924, as a matter of department policy, and by that time most of the seine licenses had already been allocated to non-Native fishers. Such marginalization of Indigenous fisheries from the industrial fishery may have had the unintended effect of strengthening traditional fisheries governance structures, yet reckless levels of industrial seining at the mouths of bays as well as log drives down salmon-bearing rivers destroyed freshwater salmon habitat and prevented the schooling fish from ascending the rivers."
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
- 1926: Formation of Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of the Commons
 - Key Actors: Reverend Peter Kelly, Andrew Paull, Allied Tribes, Special Joint Committee

- Reverend Peter Kelly and Andrew Paull’s energetic advocacy led to the formation of a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons to inquire into the Allied Tribes of British Columbia's land claim on behalf of all B.C. Natives.
- Tennant, P. 1982. “Native Indian Political Organization in British Columbia, 1900-1969: A Response to Internal Colonialism.” *BC Studies*, vol 55. Available at: <https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/bcstudies/article/view/1132/1176>
- 1927: Land Claim Activities Outlawed
 - Key Actors: Special Joint Committee
 - The Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of the Commons rejected the land claim put forth by the Allied Tribes of BC, and the provision prohibiting fund-raising in pursuit of claims was added to the Indian Act. The Allied Tribes collapsed soon after.
 - Goetze, T. C. (2005). Empowered co-management: Towards power-sharing and indigenous rights in Clayoquot sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265. Retrieved from: www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2
- 1930s: Fishermen Cooperatives Formed
 - Key Actors: Pacific coast fishermen
 - Pacific coast fishermen continued to organize more than Atlantic fishermen, and their organizations had long-lasting influence. In particular, the Prince Rupert Fishermen's Co-operative Association, took hold in the 1930s and became one of the world's most successful fishermen co-operatives, dominating the northern BC fishery for several decades.
 - Gough, J. (2015). History of Commercial Fisheries. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries>
- 1931: Native Brotherhood of British Columbia (NBBC)
 - Key Actors: NBBC
 - Established in 1931, the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia (NBBC) is recognized as Canada’s oldest active Native organization, and a senior BC fishing organization. The NBBC was formed by a group of coastal villages solely for the betterment of Native people. Over the years, the Brotherhood has been a very powerful voice on fisheries issues, and on many other concerns affecting the wellbeing of BC’s native coastal communities.
 - Native Brotherhood. 2022. *The Native Brotherhood of British Columbia: About Us*. nativebrotherhood.ca <https://nativebrotherhood.ca/sample-page/>
- 1931-1940:
 - Key Actors: NBBC, Nuu-chah-nulth
 - Nuu-chah-nulth became modestly involved in the Native Brotherhood. Over the subsequent decades, Nuu-chah-nulth participation increased as the Brotherhood forwarded grievances, including demands for increased recognition of Aboriginal rights relating to traditional resources activities off reserves.
 - Goetze, T. C. (2005). Empowered co-management: Towards power-sharing and indigenous rights in Clayoquot sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265. Available at: www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2
- 1937: Fisheries Research Board of Canada
 - Key Actors: Fisheries Research Board of Canada, DFO
 - In 1937, the Fisheries Research Board of Canada—evolving from the Biological Board of Canada started in 1912—and was established. With mandates to monitor fish stocks and dynamics, Canadian fisheries scientists were free to study fish taxonomy, physiology, and ecology; Canadian scientists have been particularly interested in the taxonomy of salmonids, esocids, lampreys, and

sturgeons and have also produced major compendia on the natural history of fishes in Canada and regional studies that are used to this day.

- Casteñada et al. 2020. "A Brief History of Fisheries in Canada." *Fisheries magazine*, 45,6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsh.10449>. <https://afspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/fsh.10449>
- 1940s: First Nation fishers have difficulty competing with commercial fishers
 - Key Actors: First Nation fishers
 - "Following WWII, the Canadian fishery began to centralize. The fleet became increasingly made up of larger boats with expensive technologies. With limited access to financing, it became increasingly difficult for Native fishers to remain competitive and stay in the fishery, much less access it as a career path."
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "Aboriginal Fisheries in British Columbia." indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/aboriginal_fisheries_in_british_columbia/
- 1950s: Loan & Insurance Support for Commercial Fishermen
 - Key Actors: Canadian govt
 - The federal government extends vessel & unemployment insurance options to self-employed fishermen; sets up license & vessel loan programs for fishermen.
 - Gough, J. (2015). History of Commercial Fisheries. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries>
- 1950s-1960s: Increased funding for Native political organizations
 - Key Actors: National Indian Brotherhood, Congress of Aboriginal People, Native Women's Association of Canada
 - A series of federal government programs and policies enacted during the 1950s and 1960s increased the funding available for Native political organizations in Canada. Although Indigenous peoples had founded political organizations prior to this time, the increased funding meant greater stability, recognition, and in some cases, a larger constituency to represent. This increased federal funding meant three large organizations (National Indian Brotherhood, Congress of Aboriginal People, and the Native Women's Association of Canada) were in place by the early 1970s.
 - Wilkes, R. (2006). The Protest Actions of Indigenous Peoples: A Canadian-U.S. Comparison of Social Movement Emergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(4), 510-525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206294059>
- 1957 Fraser River Treaty
 - Amended in 1957 to include provisions for the management of pink salmon in addition to sockeye
 - further amended in 1980 to establish a supplemental advisory committee.
 - Unsuccessful attempts at drafting and ratifying such a treaty date back to 1908, and U.S. salmon fishers have been catching Fraser River fish since the late nineteenth century.
- 1958: Creation of the Allied Tribes of the West Coast
 - Key Actors: Native Brotherhood of BC, Allied Tribes of the West Coast
 - At the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia's annual assembly in 1958, the Nuu-chah-nulth people formed their tribal council, naming it the Allied Tribes of the West Coast. This alliance was originally formed to increase the Nuu-chah-nulth people's political influence.
 - Goetze, T. C. (2005). Empowered co-management: Towards power-sharing and indigenous rights in Clayoquot sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265. Available at: [/www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2](http://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2)
 - Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. 2023. *History*. Nuu-chah-nulth.org. <https://nuuchahnulth.org/history>
- 1960 Universal Suffrage
 - Right to vote extended to First Nation, inuit, ethnic and religious minorities

- Elections Canada. 2022. *A Brief History of Federal Voting Rights in Canada*. ElectionsAndDemocracy.ca. Available at: <https://electionsanddemocracy.ca/voting-rights-through-time-0/brief-history-federal-voting-rights-canada>
- 1963: Federal Government Commissioned Investigation of the Socio-economic Conditions of Native People
 - Key Actors: Harry B. Hawthorn, University of BC
 - In 1963, the federal government commissioned University of British Columbia anthropologist Harry B. Hawthorn to investigate the social conditions of Aboriginal peoples across Canada. In his report, *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, Hawthorn concluded that Aboriginal peoples were Canada's most disadvantaged and marginalized population. Hawthorn attributed this situation to years of failed government policy, particularly the residential school system, which left students unprepared for participation in the contemporary economy, and recommended that Aboriginal peoples be considered "citizens plus" and be provided with the opportunities and resources to choose their own lifestyles, whether within reserve communities or elsewhere. He also advocated ending all forced assimilation programs, especially the residential schools.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "The White Paper 1969" [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- 1965 *Whitefoot v. United States* (293 F.2d 658 (Fed. Cir. 1961))
 - The flooding of Celilo Falls resulted in litigation which determined that Indian fishing rights on that reach of the Columbia had not been terminated, even though the fishing tribes had been compensated for their loss of the Celilo Falls fishery.
 - The Court of Claims found that the United States had obtained only flowage easements in constructing The Dalles Dam, leaving the tribes with a right to fish above the former site of the falls, in the pool created by the dam.
 - 293 F.2d 658 (Fed. Cir. 1961) ; available at: <https://casetext.com/case/whitefoot-v-united-states>
- 1968: Davis Plan; Limited License Fishing
 - Key Actors: DFO
 - DFO instituted a policy of eliminating smaller boats in the fleet as part of "fleet rationalization" under the Davis Plan.
 - Limiting the number of licenses increased the cost for licensure
 - "Recognition had spread that open fisheries tended to attract more fishermen and fishing power than the DFO could support. To conserve supply and ensure incomes, license limitation began in 1967-68 and encompassed all fisheries by the end of the 1970s. People had to acquire a license, and the number of licenses was limited, though a single fisherman could hold licenses for several fisheries. Although licenses remained a government privilege and property, fishermen could in effect buy and sell them and there was no direct control on the number of fishermen fishing."
 - Gough, Joseph. "History of Commercial Fisheries". *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 23 July 2015, *Historica Canada*. www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries.
 - Holland D., E. Gudmundsson, & J. Gates. (1999). Do Fishing Vessel Buyback Programs Work: A Survey of the Evidence. *Marine Policy* 23: 47–69
 - Grafton, R.N. & Nelson, H.W. (2005). The Effects of Buy-Back Programs in the British Columbia Salmon Fishery. *Economics and Environment Network Working Paper EEN0505*. Australian National University
 - Gamage, M. 2021. "Fishery Closures and the Ghosts of Past Mistakes." *Hakai Magazine*. Available at: <https://hakaimagazine.com/features/fishery-closures-and-the-ghosts-of-past-mistakes/>
- 1967-1972: Federal Fishing Ban on Pacific Coast
 - Key Actors: Canadian govt
 - Overfishing herring stocks on the Pacific coast led to a herring fishing ban from 1967 to 1972.

- Gough, Joseph. "History of Commercial Fisheries". *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 23 July 2015, *Historica Canada*. www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries.
- Late 1960s: Limited Licensing Causes Economic Distress Among First Nations
 - Key Actors: First Nations, DFO
 - First Nations' participation in the commercial fishery declined further when the federal government began to introduce limited entry licensing in the late 1960s and subsequently through government-funded fleet reduction programs. Specifically, many First Nation vessel owners did not meet the initial landing qualifications required to obtain a limited entry license. They were therefore no longer eligible to participate in the commercial fishery; the decline in First Nations' participation in commercial fisheries resulted in serious economic and social distress in their communities, many of which had limited alternative employment opportunities.
 - Macgillivray, P. 2019. *Indigenous Peoples' Tenure Rights in Fisheries: A Canadian Case Study*. Fao.org. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/fishery/static/tenure-user-rights/root/volume1/C11.pdf>
- Late 1960s: BC Fishermen Organizations Push For Improved Licensing Controls
 - Key Actors: United Fishermen & Allied Workers Union (UFAWU)
 - BC fishermen's organizations such as the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union (UFAWU) and processor organizations actively influenced fishery management. The UFAWU pushed for license controls to improve prospects for conservation and incomes; this came about in the late 1960s
 - Gough, Joseph. "History of Commercial Fisheries". *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 23 July 2015, *Historica Canada*. www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-commercial-fisheries.
- May 1969: Response to Hawthorn's recommendations
 - Key Actors: Canadian Govt., First Nations representatives
 - The federal government brought regional Aboriginal representatives to Ottawa for a nationwide meeting. During these consultations, First Nations representatives consistently expressed concern about Aboriginal and treaty rights, title to the land, self-determination, and access to education and health care.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "The White Paper 1969" indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- June 1969: The White Paper on Indigenous Policy
 - Key Actors: Canadian govt.
 - The White Paper proposed to eliminate Indian status, dissolve the Department of Indian Affairs within five years, abolish the Indian Act, convert reserve land to private property that can be sold by the band or its members, transfer responsibility for Indian affairs from the federal government to the province and integrate these services into those provided to other Canadian citizens, provide funding for economic development, appoint a commissioner to address outstanding land claims and gradually terminate existing treaties. The White Paper failed to address the concerns raised by their leaders during the consultation process, and contained no provisions to recognize and honor First Nations' special rights, to recognize and deal with historical grievances, or to facilitate meaningful Indigenous participation in Canadian policy making.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. "The White Paper 1969" indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- November 1969: Kamloops Conference
 - Key Actors: Rose Charlie, Philip Paul, Don Moses

- In November 1969, three Aboriginal leaders—Rose Charlie of the Indian Homemakers’ Association, Philip Paul of the Southern Vancouver Island Tribal Federation, and Don Moses of the North American Indian Brotherhood—invited bands across British Columbia to a conference in Kamloops where they could develop a collective response to the White Paper and discuss the ongoing fight for recognition of Aboriginal title and rights. Representatives from 140 bands attended the conference—at that point the largest meeting ever of the province’s Aboriginal leaders.
- UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. “The White Paper 1969” [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- 1969: Formation of the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs
 - Key Actors: UBCIC
 - The Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) formed as a result of the Kamloops Conference, which occurred to discuss and create a response to the White Paper. The main focus of the group was the resolution of land claims.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. “The White Paper 1969” [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- 1970: UBCIC’s *A Declaration of Indian Rights: The B.C. Indian Position Paper* (“Brown Paper”)
 - Key Actors: UBCIC
 - The UBCIC’s *A Declaration of Indian Rights: The B.C. Indian Position Paper*, or “Brown Paper,” of 1970 rejected the 1969 White Paper’s proposals and asserted that Aboriginal peoples continued to hold Aboriginal title to the land. The Brown Paper would become the cornerstone of UBCIC’s policy.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. “The White Paper 1969” [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
- 1971: The Canadian Govt Withdraws the White Paper
 - Key Actors: Canadian Govt
 - The Canadian Government formally withdraws the White Paper.
 - UBC, First Nations Studies Program. 2009. “The White Paper 1969” [indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca](https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/). Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/the_white_paper_1969/
 - UBCIC. 2022. “Historical Timeline.” *Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs*. [ubcic.bc.ca](https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/timeline). Available at: <https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/timeline>
- 1971: UBCIC formalizes
 - Key Actors: UBCIC
 - The UBCIC adopts its Constitution and By-laws and is incorporated under the BC Societies Act.
 - A copy is available at: <https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/constitution>
 - UBCIC. 2022. “Historical Timeline.” *Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs*. [ubcic.bc.ca](https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/timeline). Available at: <https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/timeline>
- 1972: UBCIC submits BC claim based on native title to the federal government
 - Key Actors: UBCIC
 - UBCIC presents a Claim Based on Native Title to the Lands now Forming British Columbia to Prime Minister Trudeau, demanding recognition of Aboriginal Title and compensation for its loss. UBCIC proposes that Canada establish a claims commission to adjust reserve size and determine the amount of compensation to be paid to Indigenous people for the loss of their territories, but Trudeau ignores the proposal.

- UBCIC. 2022. "Historical Timeline." *Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs*. ubcic.bc.ca. Available at: <https://www.ubcic.bc.ca/timeline>
- 1973: Specific Claims Commission Established
 - Key Actors: Specific Claims Commission
 - Tribe and band members were able to lodge complaints based on treaty rights and Indian Act violations through the establishment of the Specific Claims Commission in Canada in 1973. The establishment of the commission is important because by their very existence, they provide legitimacy to the possibility of government misdoings.
 - Wilkes, R. (2006). The Protest Actions of Indigenous Peoples: A Canadian-U.S. Comparison of Social Movement Emergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(4), 510-525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206294059>
- September 1974: Demonstration by Indigenous Tribe Members
 - Key Actors: First Nations, Parliament
 - In British Columbia, Aboriginal peoples organized a cross-country caravan that left Vancouver on September 15, 1974, and ended September 30 in Ottawa (for the opening of Parliament) with a demonstration by several hundred people on Parliament Hill. The group wanted federal politicians to address key issues surrounding treaty rights, the Indian Act, the Department of Indian Affairs, land claims, Wilkes / Protest Actions 517 housing, economic development, health care, and education. The federal government eventually agreed to regular meetings with the leaders of the National Indian Brotherhood (who had played little role in the caravan) but not with the participants themselves.
 - Wilkes, R. (2006). The Protest Actions of Indigenous Peoples: A Canadian-U.S. Comparison of Social Movement Emergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(4), 510-525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764206294059>
- 1974: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Creates a Newspaper
 - Key Actors: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council
 - Ha-Shilth-Sa Newspaper was established, which helped to further unify the Nuu-chah-nulth and allowed intertribal communication about fishery governance and news.
 - Ha-Shilth-Sa Newspaper: <https://hashilthsa.com/>
 - NTC. 2022. "History." *Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council*. Nuuchahnulth.org. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/history>
- 1976 R. v. Derriksan (1976 CanLII 1270 (SCC))
 - The Supreme Court refused to recognize that a provincial law did not apply where an aboriginal right was claimed
 - Supreme Court unanimously ruled that since Derriksan does not hold an aboriginal right through a treaty, the Fisheries Act and its Regulations can apply.
 - This case was overturned by R. v. Sparrow & section 35 of the Constitution Act
 - 1976 CanLII 1270 (SCC), Available at: <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1976/1976canlii1270/1976canlii1270.html>
- Mid-1970s:
 - Key Actors: Ahousaht Nation, NTC
 - The Ahousaht Nation's increasing opposed logging in Clayoquot Sound, which led the NTC to launch the NTC Forestry Program. This program involved an in-depth study of forestry issues in the area, and resulted in an augmented level of co-operation between forestry companies and Nuu-chah-nulth Nations. A forestry committee was also formed to advise the NTC's forestry manager and interact with companies on a consultative basis, though only relating to activities on reserve lands. At the time, it was one of the most comprehensive forestry initiatives undertaken by a Native group in the province.

- Goetze, T. C. (2005). Empowered co-management: Towards power-sharing and indigenous rights in Clayoquot sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265. Available at: [/www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2](http://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2)
- 1979: Establishment of Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council
 - Key Actors: Allied Tribes of the West Coast/NTC, Nisga'a Tribal Council
 - The Allied Tribes of the West Coast changed its name to the Nuu-chah-nulth - which means “all along the mountains and sea” - Tribal Council (NTC) in 1979. Prior to the formation of these tribal councils, neither state legislation nor state administrators recognized the existence of tribal groups. The creation of tribal councils marked a return to the traditional basis of Aboriginal social and political organization in coastal British Columbia: together with the Nisga'a Tribal Council, the NTC became one of the most powerful and influential Aboriginal lobbying organizations at both the provincial and federal levels, actively shaping Aboriginal peoples' visions of themselves and their relation to the state
 - Goetze, T. C. (2005). Empowered co-management: Towards power-sharing and indigenous rights in Clayoquot sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265. Available at: [/www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2](http://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/empowered-co-management-towards-power-sharing/docview/214175914/se-2)
 - NTC. 2022. “History.” *Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council*. Nuuchahnulth.org. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/history>
- 1979: Formation of Friends of Clayoquot Sound
 - Key Actors: FOCS
 - The Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) was formed in Tofino in 1979, largely in response to the threat of logging Meares Island
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- UBCIC Eleventh Assembly publishes Position On Aboriginal Rights paper.
 - Copy available from UBCIC here: https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/ubcic/pages/1440/attachments/original/1484861446/10_aboriginalrightspositionpaper1980.pdf?1484861446
- 1980s: Call for end to logging on Meares Island
 - Key Actors: FOCS , Wilderness Committee, Sierra Club, Tla-o-qui-aht, Ahousaht First Nation
 - In the 1980's environmental groups such as the Friends of Clayoquot Sound, the Wilderness Committee, and Sierra Club joined with the Tla-o-qui-aht and Ahousaht First Nations to call for an end to logging company MacMillan Bloedel's plans to log Meares Island, in Clayoquot Sound. The Friends of Clayoquot Sound and the Wilderness Committee worked on building a trail network on Meares Island to bring attention to the island's spectacular ancient forests. The Tla-o-qui-aht and Ahousaht First Nations documented the many sites showing aboriginal use on the island and they launched a court case based on Aboriginal Title.
 - This set the stage for the financial gains of First Nations through ownership of their own logging companies.
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 1980s – 90s: Shift in Political Discourse
 - Key Actors: First Nation Activists
 - While there were long-standing philosophical connections between environmental and Indigenous activists, and concern for resource development in Canada especially brought Indigenous issues to the forefront of the environmentalist agenda, practical possibilities for strategic alliances rooted in Aboriginal rights were contingent on the shifting political discourses of the 1980s and 1990s.

- Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1980: MacMillan Bloedel Announced it would log Meares Island
 - Key Actors: MacMillan Bloedel
 - In 1980, MacMillan Bloedel announced it would log much of Meares Island (Wah nah jus/Hilth hoo is)—on which Opitsaht, the main community of the Tla-o-qui-aht, sits—after obtaining a timber license to a portion of it. As with the majority of land in British Columbia, neither the provincial or federal governments had negotiated a treaty with the local Indigenous population to acquire it; Meares Island was unceded Indigenous territory.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1980: Non-Aboriginal Tofino Residents Voice Concern about MacMillan Bloedel’s Logging Interests
 - Key Actor: Tofino residents
 - Non-Aboriginal residents in Tofino, which has a view of Meares Island, were concerned about MacMillan Bloedel’s announcement, given that logging the island posed a threat to Tofino’s only source of domestic water, as well as the area’s lucrative tourism, fish, and mariculture (the cultivation of marine organisms for food and other products) industries.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1980: WCWC Founded
 - Key Actors: WCWC
 - The Western Canadian Wilderness Committee (WCWC) was founded in Victoria in 1980—after getting assistance from Greenpeace at its headquarters in Vancouver—with a broader mandate to protect and preserve wilderness.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “Our Story” *About*. wildernesscommittee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/who_we_are/our_story
- 1980: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Present Land Claim
 - Key Actors: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council, Canadian Govt
 - In opposition of the MacMillan Bloedel licensing, the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council presented a land claim to their traditional territory, including Meares Island, to Canada’s federal government. This was not recognized by the government at the time
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1980: NCC Creates a New Commission
 - Key Actor: NCC
 - The Métis and Non-status Indian Constitutional Review Commission is established by the NCC to canvas the views of Métis and non-status Indian across Canada on the subject of a new constitution
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 1982: NCC President Pushes for Inclusion of Indigenous People in Constitutions Act, 1982
 - Key Actors: Harry Daniels

- NCC President Harry Daniels plays a key role in entrenchment of the terms “Indians, Inuit, and Métis” in section 35 of the Constitutions Act, 1982
 - contains the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and other provisions, including the rights of Indigenous peoples and the procedures for amending the Constitution of Canada
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 1983-1987: First Minister’ Conference on Aboriginal Constitutional Matters
 - Key Actors: NCC
 - The NCC participates in the First Ministers’ Conferences on Aboriginal Constitutional Matters.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 1983-1984 Pacific Salmon Interception Agreement between the U.S. and Canada (Pacific Salmon Treaty)
 - The proposed treaty, formally entitled the Pacific Salmon Interception Agreement between the United States and Canada (Pacific Salmon Treaty), requires ratification by both governments to take permanent effect.
 - Treaty formalized in 1985
 - Treaty available here: <https://www.psc.org/download/45/miscellaneous/2337/pacific-salmon-treaty.pdf>
 - Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 2022. “Pacific Salmon Treaty,” Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/salmon-saumon/pst-tsp/index-eng.html>
 - Pacific Salmon Commission. 2022. “Pacific Salmon Treaty.” *AboutUs*. Pcs.org. Available at: <https://www.psc.org/about-us/history-purpose/pacific-salmon-treaty/>
- 1983: Canadian Govt Agrees to Negotiate with Nuu-chah-nulth
 - Key Actors: Nuu-chah-nulth, Canadian Govt, MacMillan Bloedel
 - The federal government accepted the Nuu-chah-nulth’s claim for negotiation and the provincial government approved MacMillan Bloedel’s logging application, though it stipulated that the part of the island visible from the resort town of Tofino was off limits for twenty years.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1983: Clayoquot Sound Protest Begins - Start of the War in the Woods
 - Key Actors: Ahousaht First Nation, MacMillan Bloedel, Environmental Groups
 - Clayoquot and Ahousaht First Nations who, in conjunction with several environmental groups, began what would be a sustained campaign of road blockades to prevent logging of Meares Island off the coast of Vancouver Island. Logging protests and blockades first began in 1983 when approval was given to MacMillan Bloedel Company to log 90% of Meares Island, one of the larger unlogged islands in Clayoquot Sound. In the subsequent decade, the protests spread as the First Nations, who hold Aboriginal title to the area, non-native locals and environmental groups, including the Wilderness Committee called for protection of Clayoquot’s ancient rainforest.
 - Wilkes, R. 2006. The Protest Actions of Indigenous Peoples: A Canadian-U.S. Comparison of Social Movement Emergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(4): 510-525. doi:10.1177/0002764206294059. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0002764206294059>
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 1984: Attempt to End of Logging Plans on Meares Island and Its Declaration as a Tribal Park
 - Key Actors: First Nations of Clayoquot Sound

- In 1984 the First Nations of Clayoquot Sound won an important court case which put an end to logging plans for Meares Island.
- Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 1984 *Guerin v. The Queen* ([1984] 2 SCR 335)
 - Landmark case by Supreme Court on the Aboriginal rights
 - The court first stated that the government has a fiduciary duty towards the First nations and established Aboriginal title to be a *sui generis* rights
 - *Sui generis*: meaning it is a special one confined to its own facts, and therefore may not be of broader application.
 - ([1984] 2 SCR 335) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2495/index.do>
- 1984: Clayoquot Protest Activities
 - Key Actors: Tla’o-qui-aht, FOCS, Nuu-chah-nulth
 - Among other activities, environmentalists handed out protest leaflets, produced and distributed newsletters regarding the area’s importance for those living in and beyond Tofino, and published their unequivocal support for the Nuu-chah-nulth. Local activists convinced the Tofino Village Council to formally oppose the logging decision. The Tla’o-qui-aht and FOCS constructed a trail on Meares Island so visitors—notably journalists—could access some of the oldest and largest trees.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1984: First Nations Bear the Brunt of the Financial Burden of Clayoquot Protests
 - Key Actors: Tla-o-qui-aht, Ahousaht, Nuu-chah-nulth, Environmental Activists
 - Some accounts have criticized environmentalists for essentially abandoning the Nuu-chah-nulth after the injunction and turning their attention to battles elsewhere; such a generalization is not entirely accurate and requires a more nuanced explanation. Local environmental organizations continued to work to prevent the island’s logging and coordinated with the Nuu-chah-nulth. Local environmental activists who supported the Tla-o-qui-aht and Ahousaht legal action also established the Meares Island Legal Fund to help offset expensive litigation costs; nonetheless, the brunt of these were borne by the First Nations themselves.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 21 April 1984: Tla’o’qui’ah Band Council Declare Meares Island a Tribal Park
 - Key Actors: Tla’o’qui’ah Band Council, FOCS, WCWC
 - In response to the licensing of MacMillan Bloedel’s accepted logging application, both the Tla-o-qui-aht and Ahousaht nations then asserted their jurisdiction over the whole of the island. Utilizing the settler-colonial rhetoric of conservation and park creation as a benevolent means of laying claim to territory, the Tla’o’qui’ah Band Council and hereditary chiefs drew on the discourse of environmental conservation and declared Meares Island a tribal park on 21 April 1984. Both the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) and the Western Canadian Wilderness Committee (WCWC) threw their full support behind the designation.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder

- 1984: The Tla'o'qui'aht Initiate a Blockade Against MacMillan Bloedel
 - Key Actors: Chief Moses Martin,
 - When loggers employed by MacMillan Bloedel headed toward the island in 1984 to begin cutting, they were preceded by a number of Tla'o'qui'aht and non-Aboriginal environmentalists, mostly those from Tofino belonging to the FOCS, who prevented the crews from landing by occupying strategic areas of the island. Thereafter, the FOCS helped to maintain a “forest 186 Jonathan Clapperton protectors’ camp,” established by the Tla-o-qui-aht at Heelboom (C’isaquis) Bay (the proposed logging site). It was in 1984 that Chief Moses Martin initiated a blockade against corporate giant MacMillan Bloedel.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>

- 1984: *Martin v. British Columbia*, 61 B.C.L.R. 145
 - Key Actors: Nuu-chah-nulth, British Columbia Court of Appeals, MacMillan Bloedel
 - The issue ultimately went to the courts, beginning in 1984, for a lengthy, expensive legal battle, which successfully quieted the chainsaws in a quagmire of litigation that dragged on for years. It allowed the Nuu-chah-nulth a highly visible public forum—both in the courts and in the media the cases generated—to express their claim to their traditional territory and its multifaceted importance to them. However, the British Columbia Court of Appeals disagreed. Recognizing the island’s importance from a Nuu-chah-nulth point of view, the Court of Appeals ordered MacMillan Bloedel to stop logging pending the outcome of the Nuu-chah-nulth’s claim to Aboriginal title.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>

- 1985 Fisheries Act
 - Provides framework for (a) the proper management and control of fisheries and (b) the conservation and protection of fish and fish habitat, including by preventing pollution.
 - Fisheries Act provided the framework for management of fisheries and measures to conserve fish and habitats from external disruptions
 - Ecojustice. 2013. “Legal Backgrounder: Fisheries Act.” available at: <https://ecojustice.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Ecojustice-Fisheries-Act-Feb-2013.pdf>
 - Fisheries Act, RSC 1985, c F-14. Available at: <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/laws/stat/rsc-1985-c-f-14/latest/rsc-1985-c-f-14.html>
 - Fisheries Act, RSC 1985, c F-14. Available at: <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/f-14/>

- 1985: Bill C- 31 Amends the Indian Act
 - Key Actors: NCC
 - Bill C-31 amends the Indian Act to remove some rules that discriminate against women. NCC supports the passage of the legislation, yet continues advocacy because of ongoing inequalities.
 - Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. 2018. *Background on Indian registration*. Government of Canada. Canada.ca. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1540405608208/1568898474141>
 - First Nations Studies Program. 2009. *Bill C-31*. indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. University of British Columbia. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/bill_c-31/#:~:text=It%20wasn't%20until%20April,had%20status%20removed%20through%20enfranchisement.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>

- 1988: Breakdown of Relationship Between First Nations and Non-Aboriginal Tofino Residents
 - Key Actors Non-Aboriginal Tofino residents, First Nations:

- Once the injunction successfully halted logging and Meares Island was considered safe for Tofino residents, it appears that many in the community discarded their impromptu alliance.
- Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1988 Canadian Pacific Ltd. v. Paul et al. [(1988), 91 N.B.R.(2d) 43 (SCC);]
 - Canadian Pacific sued the Woodstock Reserve Indian Band for trespass and sought a permanent injunction to restrain interference with its railway right-of-way across the Woodstock Indian Reserve. After several rounds of appeals, the Supreme Court granted Canadian Pacific a permanent injunction against the Indian Band.
 - Sets a precedence where right-of-way is granted to the Crown for use and benefit of lands given the Crown's legal title for development, even on Indian Reserve lands.
 - (1988), 91 N.B.R.(2d) 43 (SCC); Available at: <https://ca.vlex.com/vid/cdn-pacific-ltd-v-680738661>
- 1989 Claxton v. Saanichton Marina (1989 CanLII 2721)
 - Protection clause on Treaty fishing rights established
 - Mandell Pinder. 2023. *Remembering the Saanich Treaties*. Mandell Pinder LLP. Available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/remembering-the-saanich-treaties/>
- 1989: Task Force Created to Address War in the Woods
 - Key Actors: Premier William Vander Zalm
 - As British Columbia's "war in the woods" became more caustic through the rest of the 1980s, then Premier William Vander Zalm, expressing shock at clearcut scars, set up a task force with representatives from industry, environmentalist organizations, government agencies, First Nations, and unions in 1989 to come to some sort of compromise
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1990 Oregon Jack Creek Indian Band v. Canadian National Railway Co. ([1990] 1 SCR 117)
 - Protecting the native fishery along the Fraser and Thompson rivers by obtaining an injunction preventing Canadian National Railway from double-tracking
 - Oregon Jack Creek Indian Band v. Canadian National Railway Co., 1990 CanLII 155 (SCC), [1990] 1 SCR 117, <<https://canlii.ca/t/1ft09>>
- 1990 R. v. Sparrow ([1990] 1 SCR 1075)
 - The Court held that Aboriginal rights, such as fishing, that were in existence in 1982 are protected under the Constitution of Canada cannot be infringed without justification on account of the government's fiduciary duty to the Aboriginal peoples of Canada
 - First Nation (BC) has an Aboriginal right to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes & this right has priority, after conservation, over recreational and commercial harvesting activities.
 - ([1990] 1 SCR 1075) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/609/index.do>
 - First Nations Studies Program. 2009. *Sparrow Case*. indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca. University of British Columbia. Available at: https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/sparrow_case/
- 1990: Last Meeting of Premier William Vander Zalm's Task Force
 - William Vander Zalm's task force met for the last time in 1990 when it failed to come to an agreement.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1992 - 1994: NCC Submits Report to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

- Key Actors: NCC
- The NCC makes submissions to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in support of equality rights, mobility rights, off-reserve rights and self-governance rights of its constituents, published as the 10-volume report “The First Peoples Urban Circle: Choices for Self-Determination”.
- <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 1992: Premier Zalm’s Task Force Officially Ended
 - Key Actors: Premier Zalm
 - Zalm’s task force officially ended.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
 -
- 1993: The Native Council of Canada Changes its Name
 - Key Actors: Native Council of Canada/ Congress of Aboriginal Peoples
 - The Native Council of Canada (NCC) was renamed and reorganized as the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples. CAP participates in the development of the International Labor Organization’s Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Populations, which recognizes the right to self-determination of Indigenous peoples.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 1993: Disagreement in Protest Approaches
 - Key Actors: Environmentalists in Clayoquot, First Nations
 - Environmentalists in Clayoquot argued that clear cutting destroys the original forest ecosystem, which leads to habitat loss, soil erosion, bare mountains, landslides and devastated fish streams; the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nation joined the side of the local environmentalists to stand against clear cutting. However, the aboriginal and non-native organizers disagreed on an appropriate approach to stop clear-cutting. Although the Nuu-chah-nulth sympathized with Clayoquot environmentalists, they refrained from becoming closely involved in the blockades.
 - Vanchieri, N. 2011. “Environmentalists defend old forest in Clayoquot Sound, B.C., Canada, 1993.” *Global Nonviolent Action Database*. Ed: Rennnebohm, M. Swarthmore College. Available at: <https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/environmentalists-defend-old-forest-clayoquot-sound-bc-canada-1993>
- 1993: Friends of Clayoquot Sound
 - Key Actors: Clayoquot locals, FOCS
 - In response to MacMillan Bloedel, Clayoquot locals formed the Friends of Clayoquot Sound. They started as a grassroots campaign and later acquired other groups to help their cause such as Greenpeace and Forest Ethics.
 - Vanchieri, N. 2011. “Environmentalists defend old forest in Clayoquot Sound, B.C., Canada, 1993.” *Global Nonviolent Action Database*. Ed: Rennnebohm, M. Swarthmore College. Available at: <https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/environmentalists-defend-old-forest-clayoquot-sound-bc-canada-1993>
- 1993: Tensions Erupt in Clayoquot Sound
 - Key Actors: Environmentalists, Nuu-chah-nulth
 - In 1993, tensions erupted between the peaceful protesters and industry giant MacMillan Bloedel when government approval allowed for two thirds of Clayoquot Sound to be opened up to logging. That summer over 800 people were arrested, bringing international pressure for Clayoquot Sound to be protected. While environmentalists argued that they supported Aboriginal rights without question but in reality sought an end to clearcut logging by any means, the Nuu-chah-nulth made it

abundantly clear that they wanted control over their traditional territories and that part of this control included plans for industrial-scale logging.

- Wilderness Committee. 2022. "About the Campaign" *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wildernesscommittee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
-
- April 1993: MacMillan Bloedel Allowed to Clear-Cut Again
 - Key Actors: Michael Harcourt, MacMillan Bloedel
 - Michael Harcourt, the province's premier, announced that logging companies, mainly MacMillan Bloedel, had the permission to clear-cut, a logging process of cutting down trees, sixty two percent of Clayoquot land. Harcourt argued that his decision exemplified how industry and environment could work together. Thereafter, Clayoquot Sound would once again become a space of colonial encounters where thousands of environmental activists, representing myriad environmental organizations, converged to (re)establish relations with the local Indigenous population
 - Vanchieri, N. 2011. "Environmentalists defend old forest in Clayoquot Sound, B.C., Canada, 1993." *Global Nonviolent Action Database*. Ed: Rennnebohm, M. Swarthmore College. Available at: <https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/environmentalists-defend-old-forest-clayoquot-sound-bc-canada-1993>
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- July 1, 1993: Protesters Set Up Camp For Long-Term Protest of MacMillan Bloedel's Clear-cutting
 - Key Actors: FOCS,
 - The local protests were centered on the Clayoquot Peace Camp set up by the Friends of Clayoquot Sound on Canada Day, July 1, 1993. 11,000 people visited the camp during the summer, and around 200 people lived in the Peace Camp at one time. The camp offered workshops and became a place for protesters to gather information.
 - Vanchieri, N. 2011. "Environmentalists defend old forest in Clayoquot Sound, B.C., Canada, 1993." *Global Nonviolent Action Database*. Ed: Rennnebohm, M. Swarthmore College. Available at: <https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/environmentalists-defend-old-forest-clayoquot-sound-bc-canada-1993>
- Summer 1993: Protests Grow and Gain International Attention
 - Key Actors: Environmentalists, NDP, Harcourt, the Nuu-chah-nulth
 - Protests continued to emerge throughout the summer of 1993. Protesters physically blocked logging trucks from getting to clear cutting sites, violating a court ruling obtained by MacMillan Bloedel.; the protests recieved internantional media attention. Throughout the protests in 1993, Harcourt's New Democratic Party (NDP) government was reeling in response to the sustained and completely unexpected size and strength of the environmentalist campaign. The protests prompted the government to seek out the Nuu-chah-nulth for negotiations.
 - Vanchieri, N. 2011. "Environmentalists defend old forest in Clayoquot Sound, B.C., Canada, 1993." *Global Nonviolent Action Database*. Ed: Rennnebohm, M. Swarthmore College. Available at: <https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/environmentalists-defend-old-forest-clayoquot-sound-bc-canada-1993>
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- October 1993: The Canadian Government Attempts to Make Concessions
 - Key Actors: the Nuu-chah-nulth, Canadian Govt
 - With environmentalist blockades still in place, the government's first concession came when it established the Scientific Panel for Sustainable Forest Practices in Clayoquot Sound. The panel, which excluded government, industry, and environmentalist members, was mandated to combine First Nations' traditional knowledge with Western scientific practices in establishing "world class

logging standards.” While the Nuu-chah-nulth perceived this gain as a fracture in colonial control, environmentalists dismissed the panel’s creation as a stalling tactic designed to “divide and conquer” supposedly staunch allies.

- Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- December 1993: The NDP Signs Interim Measures Agreement
 - Key Actors: NDP, Tla-o-qui-aht Chief Francis Frank, the Nuu-chah-nulth
 - The NDP had little choice but to sign an Interim Measures Agreement (IMA) in December 1993, after more than a month of negotiations with the Nuu-chah-nulth, that secured the Nuu-chah-nulth a greater grip on both government and logging activity in the area until the Scientific Panel could complete its work. Among other measures, the IMA recognized Nuu-chah-nulth traditional governance structures and a government-to-government relationship between the Nuu-chah-nulth and the province. Most significantly, the agreement provided the Nuu-chah-nulth with, according to Tla-o-qui-aht Chief Francis Frank, a veto on logging operations, and logging was to continue at a reduced capacity and according to Nuu-chah-nulth standards.
 - Clapperton, J., & Piper, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Environmental Activism on the Ground: Small Green and Indigenous Organizing* (1st ed.). University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbd8j4n>
- 1995 *Blueberry River Indian Band v. Canada (Department of Indian Affairs)* ([1995] 4 SCR 344)
 - The Supreme Court confirmed that the Crown’s fiduciary (trust) duty is engaged when it manages land for the Indians. This duty requires the Crown to give precedence to the Band’s interests.
 - ([1995] 4 SCR 344). Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1322/index.do>
- 1996 *R. v. Gladstone* ([1996] 2 SCR 723)
 - First established Aboriginal right to fish commercially
 - The fisheries regulations infringe on their aboriginal right, but a new trial must be held to determine whether this infringement is justified or not (8 against 1 – 2 concurring).
 - Issue: Do the fisheries regulations infringe on the Gladstones aboriginal right to trade herring spawn on kelp? If so, are they justified for conservation reasons?
 - ([1996] 2 SCR 723) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1409/index.do>
- 1996: Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People
 - Key Actors: Canadian Govt., First Nations
 - The report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples concerns government policy with respect to the original historical nations of Canada. It urged governments at all levels to open the door to Aboriginal participation in the life and governance of Canada; recognition of Indigenous knowledge within policy can be traced to this.
 - Government of Canada. 2016. “Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.” *Library and Archives Canada*. Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/aboriginal-heritage/royal-commission-aboriginal-peoples/Pages/final-report.aspx>
- 1996 Mifflin plan
 - The Mifflin Plan, also known as the Pacific Salmon Revitalization Strategy, was a DFO initiative announced in 1996.
 - Targeted economic objectives, or "fleet rationalization": inefficient boats are being removed from the fleet through buyback.
 - Amplified rate of fleet reduction and license ‘stacking,’ towards a more centralized fleet
 - Meant to address fleet overcapacity and by extension mitigate fishing impacts on collapsing salmon populations. With heavily industrialized fleet and the advancement of gear technology, in

combination with a disproportionate impact to owner-operators / small-scale fishers, capacity of the fleet was not effectively reduced.

- James, M. (2004). The British Columbia Salmon Fishery “Buyback” Program – A Case Study in Capacity Reduction. *IIFET 2004 Japan Proceedings*.
- Teh, L.S.L., Hotte, N., & Rashid Sumaila, U. (2017) Having it all: can fisheries buybacks achieve capacity, economic, ecological, and social objectives? *Maritime Studies*. 16,1. doi: 10.1186/s40152-016-0055-z
- Muse, B. (1999). Fleet Reduction in British Columbia’s Commercial Salmon Fisheries: 1996-1998. *Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission*, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. CFEC 99-2N.
- Grafton, R.N. & Nelson, H.W. (2005). The Effects of Buy-Back Programs in the British Columbia Salmon Fishery. *Economics and Environment Network Working Paper EEN0505*. Australian National University
- Haas, A.R., Edwards, D.N., & Sumaila, U.R. (2016). Corporate Concentration and processor control: Insights from the salmon and herring fisheries of British Columbia. *Marine Policy* 68: 83-90
- Pacific Salmon Revitalization Plan Review Panel. 1996. “Tangled Lines: Restructuring the Pacific Salmon Fishery.” *A Federal-Provincial Review of the Mifflin Plan*. Available at: <https://waves.vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/library-bibliotheque/199880.pdf>
- Gamage, M. 2021. “Fishery Closures and the Ghosts of Past Mistakes.” *Hakai Magazine*. Available at: <https://hakaimagazine.com/features/fishery-closures-and-the-ghosts-of-past-mistakes/>

- 1997 *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* ([1997] 3 SCR 1010)
 - Expansion of Aboriginal rights
 - The inherent limit (that the protected uses not be irreconcilable with the nature of the group's attachment to the land) is derived from one of the purposes of Aboriginal title: maintaining "the relationship of an aboriginal community with its land here is that it applies not only to the past, but to the future as well."
 - Only the federal government has the authority to extinguish an Aboriginal right, and an instrument relied upon for this purpose must reflect "clear and plain" intent to extinguish the rights.
 - ([1997] 3 SCR 1010). Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1569/index.do?q=%5B1997%5D+3+SCR+1010>

- 1997-2002: Moratorium on Salmon Fish Farm Licenses
 - Key Actors: DFO
 - In British Columbia, public resistance to salmon farming has resulted in protests against fish farming activities, vandalism to farm sites, consumer boycotts of farmed salmon, and lawsuits against the salmon farming industry. In response, the BC government imposed a moratorium on new salmon fish farm licenses from 1997 to 2002. During this time, there was a coast-wide ban on salmon farming, which effectively limited expansion of the industry for five years.
 - Joyce, A.L. and Satterfield, T.A. (2010), Shellfish aquaculture and First Nations' sovereignty: The quest for sustainable development in contested sea space. *Natural Resources Forum*, 34: 106-123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2010.01297.x>

- 1997 - 2007: CAP Intervenes in several court cases
 - Key Actors: CAP
 - CAP intervened in a number of key court cases related to Aboriginal rights in the interests of its constituents: *Sawridge Band v Canada (1997)*, *Corbiere v. Canada (1999)*, *Ardoch Algonquin First Nation & Allies v. Ontario (2000)*, *R. v. Blais (2003)*, *R. v. Powley (2003)*, *Misquadis v. Canada (2003)*, *R. v. Bernard (2005)*, *R. v. Sappier (2006)*, and *McIvor v. Canada (2007)*, and the repeal of *Section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act*. CAP and other organizations successfully advocated for the repeal so that First Nations people now have access to make complaints to the Canadian Human Rights Commission.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>

- 1998: Memorandum of Understanding
 - Key Actors: MacMillan Bloedel, First Nations, Environmental Groups

- MacMillan Bloedel's cutting rights were transferred to a 51% First Nations-owned logging company, Iisaak Forest Resources. Iisaak then signed an historic agreement with the environmental groups working to save Clayoquot, including the Wilderness Committee that ushered in a new era of peace in the woods. The agreement, known as the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committed Iisaak to only logging outside the intact ancient forested valleys of Clayoquot Sound; Iisaak would only log in those areas that already had some logging and roads in them.
- Wilderness Committee. 2022. "About the Campaign" *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 1999 - Salmon Allocation Policy (SAP)
 - Officially set conservation of salmon as the primary objective for management, followed by First Nations FSC needs, then the recreational sector, then the commercial sector, and dictates the setting of annual target allocations for the commercial sector by gear type and region
 - Salmon as a common property resource for the people of Canada as a fundamental principle
 - Changes to the policy have since included: "increased conservation requirements for stocks of concern, changes to fisheries management, as well as new treaties and reconciliation agreements with First Nations"
 - The application of the policy was found to unjustly infringe upon the rights of five Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations in 2018 (see *Ahousaht et al. v Canada* 2018, above); the policy is under revision by court requirement as a result
 - Original policy available at: <https://waves-vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/library-bibliotheque/240366.pdf>
 - DFO. 2022. *Initiative to update the Salmon Allocation Policy*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/consultation/smon/sap-prs/index-eng.html>
 - DFO. 2022. *Review of the Salmon Allocation Policy in British Columbia and Yukon (2022)*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/consultation/smon/sap-prs/review-examen-eng.html>
 - Point, J. 2021. *SAP Working Group Feedback to the Draft TOR for SAP Review*. First Nations Fisheries Council of British Columbia. [Letter]. Available at: <https://www.fnfisheriescouncil.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/FNFC-letter-to-DFO-re-draft-SAP-TOR.pdf>
- 1999: CAP Files a Suit Against the Canadian Govt
 - Key Actors: Harry Daniels, Leah Gardner, Terry Joudrey
 - CAP President Harry Daniels, Leah Gardner, Terry Joudrey, and CAP filed a suit against the Government of Canada for the court to determine which level of government, federal or provincial, has jurisdiction over Métis and non-status Indians.
 - CAP. 2022. "About us." *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 2000: Clayoquot Designated a UNESCO Biosphere
 - Key Actors: Grassroots Organizations
 - In 2000, after many years of grassroots efforts, Clayoquot Sound was designated a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. This distinction, however, did not provide legislated protection for all the unlogged watersheds in Clayoquot Sound.
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. "About the Campaign" *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 2001: Nuu-chah-nulth Agreement in Principle
 - Nuu-chah-nulth Agreement in Principle was a lengthy agreement between the Canadian government and several First Nations tribes that defined the terms for a future treaty. It included the following topics: general provisions, lands, water, forest resources, access, crown corridors and roads, fisheries, wildlife and migratory birds, environmental assessment and protection, parks and

protected areas, governance, local and regional government relationships, the Indian Act transition, capital transfer and negotiation of loan repayment. The fisheries section acknowledged the Nuu-chah-nulth's right to harvest, but limited their fishing right by measures necessary for conservation and measures necessary for the purposes of public health or public safety.

- PDF of agreement available here:
https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC%2fDAM-TAG%2fSTAGING%2fexte-text%2fntcaip_1100100032203_eng.pdf
- 2001 Osoyoos Indian Band v. Oliver (Town) ([2001] 160 BCAC 171)
 - Entrenching the Crown's fiduciary obligations in relation to the taking of reserve lands
 - This decision confirms that Band Councils have the power to adopt property tax by-laws on expropriated reserve land, unless the Crown has stated in a clear and plain way its intention of extinguishing the aboriginal title.
 - Issue: Can an Indian band assess and impose a property tax on expropriated land located within the limits of its reserve? - Yes.
 - ([2001] 160 BCAC 171) Available at: <https://ca.vlex.com/vid/osoyoos-indian-band-v-681451669>
- September 2002: The Ahousaht come to an agreement with Pacific National Aquaculture
 - Key Actors: the Ahousaht, Pacific National Aquaculture
 - In September of 2002, the year the province lifted the moratorium on granting new tenures to the industry, the Ahousaht came to an agreement with the main fish farming company in the area. In this agreement, which was a matter of courtesy and a statement about how the informal relationship between the company, Pacific National Aquaculture, and the Ahousaht people was to develop, the Ahousaht accepted the presence of salmon farms in exchange for recognition of the existence of the hereditary chiefs (*ha'wiih*) and their territories (*hahoulthee*). The agreement was interpreted very differently by the fish farming industry: as a license to become involved in producing what is often referred to as "Traditional Ecological Knowledge," or TEK.
 - Schreiber, D., & Newell, D. (2006). NEGOTIATING TEK IN BC SALMON FARMING: Learning from Each Other or Managing Tradition and Eliminating Contention? *BC Studies*, (150), 79-102,147-148.
<http://uri.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/negotiating-tek-bc-salmon-farming-learning-each/docview/196881865/se-2>
- 2003 British Columbia (Minister of Forests) v. Okanagan Indian Band ([2003] 3 SCR 371)
 - Awarding advance costs for Aboriginal people to enable litigation of title and rights issues in the courts
 - Issue: What conditions must be fulfilled for the courts to exercise their inherent jurisdiction to award interim costs when dealing in Aboriginal law?
 - ([2003] 3 SCR 371) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2106/index.do>
- 2000s: BC Salmon Farming Industry is Largely Controlled by 2 Companies
 - It was reported that five companies owned the majority of the BC salmon industry in 2004, although further consolidation through mergers and buyouts has resulted in two principal companies owning 96% of the BC salmon farming industry.
 - Joyce, A.L. and Satterfield, T.A. (2010), Shellfish aquaculture and First Nations' sovereignty: The quest for sustainable development in contested sea space. *Natural Resources Forum*, 34: 106-123.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2010.01297.x>
- 2005: Wild Salmon Policy, and WSP Implementation Plan
 - From DFO, "the Wild Salmon Policy marked a major turning point in the management of Pacific salmon by articulating a conservation ethic to preserve genetic diversity as well as salmon abundance. The ultimate goal of the WSP is to: "...restore and maintain healthy and diverse

salmon populations and their habitats for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of Canada in perpetuity.”

- Formalized an action plan directed at protection and conservation of wild Pacific salmon stocks.
- The 2018-2022 action plan expanded upon the original 6 strategies, to “nine overarching approaches and 48 activities the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) is committed to undertaking over a five year period in order to implement *Canada’s Policy for Conservation of Wild Pacific Salmon* – also known as the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP).”
- DFO. 2022. *Wild Salmon Policy 2018 to 2022 Implementation Plan: Annual Report 2020 to 2021*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/salmon-saumon/wsp-pss/annual-annuel/2020-2021-eng.html>
- 2006 R. v. Morris ([2006] 2 SCR 915)
 - Establishing the Treaty right to night hunting and the role of Indigenous laws
 - The Court confirms that public safety limits aboriginal and treaty rights, and that the means used to practice treaty rights can evolve in time.
 - The right to hunt by night using illumination is protected by the Douglas Treaties
 - Mandell Pinder. 2023. *Remembering the Saanich Treaties*. Mandell Pinder LLP. Available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/remembering-the-saanich-treaties/>
 - ([2006] 2 SCR 915) Available at: <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2006/2006scc59/2006scc59.html>
- 2006 R. v. Sappier; R. v. Gray ([2006] 2 SCR 686)
 - Establishing the Aboriginal right to harvest timber on Crown land
 - The right to harvest wood for personal use is crucial to these Aboriginals, and it constituted an aboriginal right. They could therefore harvest wood on Crown lands within their traditional territory (unanimous decision).
 - ([2006] 2 SCR 686) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2329/index.do>
- 2007: Cooperative Land Use Planning by Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation
 - Key Actors: Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation
 - Cooperative land-use planning began in 2007 by the Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation, who began collecting information from its members and non-native neighbors for a proposal to provide economic development while protecting pristine areas in a huge swath of its traditional territory.
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 2007: First Nations Buy Out a Big Forest Tenure Holder
 - Key Actors: First Nations of Clayoquot Sound, International Forest Products
 - In 2007, the First Nations of Clayoquot Sound bought out International Forest Products, one of the last big forest tenure holders. A First Nations company, MaMook entered into an agreement with a Port Alberni logging company, Coulson, to conduct logging operations in Clayoquot Sound.
 - Wilderness Committee. 2022. “About the Campaign” *Clayoquot Sound Backgrounder*. wilderness committee.org. Available at: https://www.wildernesscommittee.org/clayoquot_sound_backgrounder
- 2007: BC First Nations Fisheries Action Plan & creation of the First Nations Fishery Council (FNFC)
 - The FNFC supports coordination of “BC First Nations’ political and technical capacity [to] develop a cohesive and united voice among BC First Nations. FNFC’s approach is to convene First Nations, listen to their priorities and perspectives, and help clearly articulate their shared messaging to decision makers. These structures and processes support coherent messaging to the government.”
 - “Our mandate was given to us by BC First Nations through the BC First Nations Fisheries Action Plan (2007), ratified by the participants at the 2009 Fall Fisheries Assembly in Nanaimo BC, and

endorsed by resolution of the BC Assembly of First Nations, the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, and the First Nations Summit. It is a shared vision on how to effectively achieve progress on First Nations' goals and priorities, and create transformative change in Pacific fisheries.”

- Action plan available at: <https://www.fnfisheriescouncil.ca/pillars/bc-first-nations-fisheries-action-plan/>
- FNFC. 2021. *BUILDING PROCESS, CAPACITY AND RELATIONSHIPS*. “About Us.” fnfisheriescouncil.ca. <https://www.fnfisheriescouncil.ca/about-us/>
- 2007 - Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI)
 - Program launched by DFO to “support eligible First Nations to develop commercial fisheries and increase access to commercial fishing in the Pacific Region. PICFI facilitates the development of self-sustaining operations, creates capacity-building opportunities, generates Indigenous employment, and increases long-term Indigenous participation in commercial fisheries and diversification related activities.” <https://cfehub.com/program-overview/>
 - Designed to support development of First Nations' commercial fishing enterprises (CFEs) by providing assistance with business counseling, fishing trainings, fish monitoring and traceability systems, and designated licenses to First Nation Bands (communally held licenses)
 - In coordination with Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy and ATP
 - Aboriginal Policy and Governance. 2008. *Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI): Supporting First Nation Participation in Integrated Commercial Fisheries, An Application Guide for British Columbia First Nations*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Government of Canada. Available at: https://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/dfo-mpo/pacific_integrated_commercial-ef/Fs144-2-2008E.pdf
 - DFO. 2021. *Evaluation of the Indigenous Commercial Fisheries Programs: Final Report*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/ae-ve/evaluations/20-21/icfp-ppca-eng.html>
 - DFO. 2023. *Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/reconciliation/picfi-ipcip/index-eng.html>
- 13 September 2007: UNDRIP was Adopted by the UN
 - Key Actors: Government of Canada, CAP, First Nations
 - The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) was adopted by the UN on September 13, 2007. Today the Declaration is the most comprehensive international instrument on the rights of indigenous peoples. It establishes a universal framework of minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world and it elaborates on existing human rights standards and fundamental freedoms as they apply to the specific situation of indigenous peoples.
 - The Government of Canada failed to sign on to the declaration until 2010.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
 - Summary and copy of UNDRIP available from the United Nations at: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>
- November 2008: Petition to UN Requesting Ban on Salmon Aquaculture in BC
 - Key Actors: NGOs, First Nations, UN
 - In November 2008, a petition against unsustainable salmon farming was sent to the United Nations, requesting a permanent ban on salmon aquaculture in BC. The declaration, undersigned by several Aboriginal groups in conjunction with a number of NGOs and environmental organizations, claimed that current salmon farming practices were ecologically damaging and threatening to local food security. Although this petition specifically addressed salmon farming in BC, increased growth of the BC shellfish industry is likely, and experience elsewhere suggests that future conflict, particularly over Aboriginal territorial rights, may be anticipated .

- Joyce, A.L. and Satterfield, T.A. (2010), Shellfish aquaculture and First Nations' sovereignty: The quest for sustainable development in contested sea space. *Natural Resources Forum*, 34: 106-123.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2010.01297.x>
- 2009 - *Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada*, or “*Ahousaht et al. v. Canada*” (2009 BCSC 1494)
 - B.C. Supreme Court releases judgment on *Ahousaht Nation v. Canada*, where Madam Justice Garson determined that the Five Nations (*Ahousaht*, *Tla-o-qui-aht*, *Ehattesaht*, *Mowachaht/Muchalaht*, and *Hesquiaht*) have the aboriginal rights to fish any species in their territories and to commercially sell that fish.
 - Canada's fisheries regime Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) was determined to infringe on those rights (with the exception of harvesting clams and fishing for food, social and ceremonial purposes or ‘FSC’ fisheries)
 - Canada / DFO has a duty to consult and negotiate with the Five Nations regarding the manner in which to accommodate the rights, such that the rights can be exercised without jeopardizing legislative objectives and societal interests.
 - A landmark decision, setting precedence in proving aboriginal rights -
 - The second case in Canada where aboriginal rights to sell fish have been established outside of a treaty
 - The first case in Canada that expressly applies that right to any species of fish available in the First Nations’ territories
 - Details on precedence set for determining an aboriginal rights claim from Mandell Pinder, LLP available at:
<https://www.mandellpinder.com/ahousaht-indian-band-and-nation-v-canada-attorney-general-2013-bcca-300-case-summary/>
 - Articles from *Ha-Shilth-Sa* Newspaper regarding this case and the following events through 2022 available at: <https://hashilthsa.com/special-reports/ahousaht-case>
 - *Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2009 BCSC 1494
 - Full case available at: <https://caid.ca/AhoDec2009.pdf>
 - Kirchner, F.M. 2010. The Aboriginal right to sell fish: *Ahousaht Nation et al v Canada. Ratcliff LLP*. Available at: <https://www.ratcliff.com/publications/aboriginal-right-sell-fish-ahousaht-nation-et-al-v-canada/#:~:text=On%20November%203%2C%202009%2C%20the.fish%20into%20the%20commercial%20marketplace.>
 - Full text of *The Aboriginal Right to Sell Fish* available at:<https://www.ratcliff.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/The-Aboriginal-Right-To-Sell-Fish-Ahousaht-Nation-Et-Al-V-Canada-Ratcliff.pdf>
- 2010 *Rio Tinto Alcan Inc. v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council* ([2010] 2 SCR 650)
 - This decision confirmed that First Nations can obtain compensation for lack of consultation. Any effect on an Aboriginal right must be harmful and novel in order to trigger a duty to consult. If the resource was modified a long time ago and the government action poses no new threat, the obligation is to compensate and not to consult.
 - Issue: Is the British Columbia Utilities Commission (the “Commission”) required to consider the issue of consultation with the CSTC First Nations in determining whether the sale of excess power from a dam to a Crown corporation is in the public interest?
Does the duty to consult apply in situations where a land claim is pending?
 - ([2010] 2 SCR 650) Case brief available at:
https://casebrief.fandom.com/wiki/Rio_Tinto_Alcan_Inc._v_Carrier_Sekani_Tribal_Council
- 2011 *Lax Kw’alaams Indian Band v. Canada (Attorney General)* ([2011] 3 SCR 535)

- The Supreme Court refused to recognize an extended aboriginal right to trade fish on ancestral territory. The possible evolution of Aboriginal rights is acknowledged, but within qualitative and quantitative limits that do not permit the creation of a new right.
 - From Crown: There is no evidence of express or implied promises regarding the right to commercial harvesting. The Crown never had the intention to grant such a right and has therefore no duty implicating its honor.
 - ([2011] 3 SCR 535) Available at: <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/7972/index.do>
- 2011: The Maa-nulth Treaty for five Nuu-chah-nulth Nations
 - The Maa-nulth Treaty for five Nuu-chah-nulth Nations—Huu-ay-aht, Toquaht, Uchucklesaht, Yuułuʔiłʔatḥ and Ka:ʔyu:ʔkʔtʰʰʰ/Che:kʔtles7etʰhʰ—came into effect on April 1, 2011. It is the first modern-day treaty to be concluded on Vancouver Island and the first multi-nation treaty in the province under the B.C. Treaty Process.
 - The Treaty was intended to remove barriers to socioeconomic prosperity by settling claims of Aboriginal rights to land and resources, and by enabling each of the five Maa-nulth First Nations to govern themselves. As a comprehensive agreement that both settles the Maa-nulth First Nations' land claims and establishes their self-government, the Treaty: establishes 24,550 hectares of Maa-nulth First Nations Lands ("Treaty Settlement Lands" or "TSL"); provides the Maa-nulth First Nations Capital Transfers of \$96.7 million (total paid in unequal installments over ten years); sets out how Canada, British Columbia, and the Maa-nulth First Nations will share benefits from natural resources, and how those resources will be managed; establishes, within the Canadian Constitution, democratically-elected Maa-nulth First Nations governments with powers to make laws, deliver programs, manage lands and resources, protect and enhance culture, and collect taxes; Provides tools for new government-to-government relationships between Canada, British Columbia, and the Maa-nulth First Nations.
 - NTC. 2022. "History." *Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council*. Nuuchahnulth.org. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/history>
 - CIRNAC. 2019. "Maa-nulth First Nations Final Agreement: Annual Report 2014-2015." *Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1546539718081/1546539753301>
 - Copy of report available at: https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca%2fdAM%2fdAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC%2fdAM-TAG%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fmaa-nulth_1415_15476548819_07_eng.pdf
- 2011 - Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada, or "Ahousaht et al. v. Canada" (305 BCAC 191)
 - Canada appealed the 2009 decision
 - B.C. Court of Appeal denied most of the appeal, but allowed some in part.
 - Canada appealed to claim rights of title - dismissed
 - Determination of whether the infringement on the rights by Canada was not made - instead, court required that Canada and the Five Nations work to negotiate within a period of two years
 - Court allowed Canada's appeal regarding specification of species; the rights instead apply to all species "with the exception of geoduck"
 - Canada appealed the decision to the Supreme Court, which remanded the case back to the BCCA and in 2012 directed the BCCA to reconsider the 2011 decision in accordance with *Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band v. Canada* (Attorney General), 2011 SCC 56, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 535 - a rehearing occurred in 2013 (see below).
 - Articles from Ha-Shilth-Sa Newspaper regarding this case and the following events through 2022 available at: <https://hashilthsa.com/special-reports/ahousaht-case>
 - *Ahousaht Indian Band et al. v. Canada (Attorney General) et al.*, (2011) 305 B.C.A.C. 191 (CA)
 - Full appeal available at:

- Lewis, D. 2014. *Salmon farm expansion in Clayoquot Sound*. Clayoquot Action. Clayoquotaction.org. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/salmon-farm-expansion-in-clayoquot-sound/?_ga=2.144535989.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 21 September 2015: Cermaq Removes its floats from Ahousaht territory
 - Key Actors: Cermaq, the Ahousaht
 - Cermaq agreed to remove their floats from Ahousaht territory following the 13 day occupation of the facility by Ahousaht First Nations members.
 - Lewis, D. 2014. “Salmon farm expansion in Clayoquot Sound.” *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. ClayoquotAction.org. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/unprecedented-fish-farm-win/?_ga=2.250010886.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 2015 *Alexandra Morton v. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Marine Harvest Canada Inc.* (2015 FC 575)
 - The decision emphasizes the primary role of DFO and primary objective of Fisheries Act
 - Industry should not make risk assessments and decisions about what fish are safe to release into marine waters.
 - (2015 FC 575) Available at: <https://ca.vlex.com/vid/morton-v-can-680944797>
- 2015 *Chartrand v British Columbia (Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations)* (2015 BCCA 345)
 - Clarifying the Crown’s obligations when engaged in deep consultations and that there is no reciprocal duty on Indigenous people to consult if the Crown offers inadequate consultation
 - The Court found that the provincial Crown had not adequately consulted the Kwakiutl First Nation regarding provincial decisions between 2007 and 2012 to remove private lands from a Tree Farm License and to approve and renew a Forest Stewardship Plan in Kwakiutl traditional territory. The Crown consulted the Kwakiutl regarding their Douglas Treaty rights, but ignored their asserted aboriginal rights and title claims. The Court held that this was the wrong approach.
 - (2015 BCCA 345) Case summary by Mandell Pinder LLC available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/chartrand-v-british-columbia-forests-lands-and-natural-resource-operations-2015-bcca-345-case-summary/>
- 2016 *Gitxaala Nation v. Canada* (2016 FCA 187)
 - Federal Court of Appeal overturned Canada’s approval of Northern Gateway Pipelines Project
 - FCA agreed with what Canada’s approval of the Project could not stand as Canada had failed to fulfill its constitutional duty to consult.
 - (2016 FCA 187) Available at: <https://ca.vlex.com/vid/gitxaala-nation-v-can-679846765>
- 2016: Ha’oom Wild Seafood Starts Selling to Consumers in Tofino
 - Key Actors: Ha’oom Wild Seafood, T’aaq-wiihak Fisheries
 - Consumers in Tofino, BC were allowed to purchase to purchase Ha’oom Wild Seafood’s *Puu?i* or halibut – available for the first time since inception of the business in 2012
 - Ha’oom Wild Seafood implement the ThisFish traceability program to tag all Ha’oom halibut destined for the marketplaces, which gives consumers the opportunity to learn the origin of Ha’oom halibut and its’ journey from ocean to plate through the ThisFish website, using a unique and trackable identification number.
 - Ha’oom Nuu-chah-nulth Wild Seafood. 2016. “HA’OOM WILD SEAFOOD IMPLEMENTS THISFISH TRACKABLE SYSTEM.” Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/news/272>
- February 2016: Clayoquot Action Sent Representatives to Speak with Cermaq
 - Key Actors: Clayoquot Action, Cermaq

- The Wild Salmon Delegation (from Clayoquot Action) met with Cermaq, the Norwegian company with 15 salmon farm sites in Clayoquot Sound UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. They visited Cermaq to share with them the reasons why the Delegation had come to Norway; and to discuss their perspective on the similarities and differences between British Columbia and Norway, the emerging consensus that open-net salmon farming is a dinosaur technology, and the tide change unfolding daily in major Norwegian media.
- Lewis, D. 2016. "Tide Change in Norway." *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. ClayoquotAction.org. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/tide-change-in-norway/?_ga=2.149912246.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 1 June 2016: First Nations Meet with the Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD)
 - Key Actors: MCFD, NTC, Canadian Govt
 - Over 400 First Nations leaders, front line workers and representatives from Aboriginal children and family organizations gathered to meet with the Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD) at the BC First Nations Child and Family Gathering. The meetings showed little progress and the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council (NTC) was frustrated with the lack of committed action from the Ministry and the province of BC. On the heels of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's calls to action, Canada's \$8 billion budget committed to First Nations services and Canada's full support of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP), NTC thought that there was no excuse for the lack of tangible action seen from the province and MCFD.
 - NTC. 2016. "NTC frustrated with lack of immediate action from the province of BC for First Nations Child and Family Services." *News*. Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/news/273>
- October 2017: DFO Allows Commercial Salmon Farms to Restock
 - Key Actors: DFO, First Nations
 - The Nations of the Broughton Archipelago disagree with the DFO for allowing nearby commercial salmon farms to restock. They had said no to fish farms for 30 years, and watched their wild salmon populations crash in the same time period. The First Nations also proposed alternatives they consider to be more sustainable.
 - Lewis, D. 2017. "Fish Farms Occupied!" *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. ClayoquotAction.org. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/fish-farms-occupied/?_ga=2.148822455.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- November 2017: Clayoquot Action Protests the Creative Salmon's PRV-infected Salmon
 - Key Actors: Creative Salmon, Clayoquot Action
 - It was made public during testimony at the Cohen Commission in 2012 that Dr. Kristi Miller from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans had detected PRV on two Creative Salmon farm sites. It has since been established that this is a Norwegian virus, which causes the deadly Heart and skeletal muscle inflammation disease (HSMI). Clayoquot Action was concerned that the Norwegian pathogens in Creative's farmed chinook salmon are now perfectly adapted to transfer to local wild fish.
 - Lewis, D. 2017. "Tofino's Tainted Fish Farm Blood" *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/tofinos-tainted-fish-farm-blood/?_ga=2.187676200.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- November 2017: Cermaq's Controversial Use of Pesticide to Combat Sea Lice
 - Key Actors: Cermaq, Clayoquot Action, BC Ministry of Environment
 - Norwegian-based salmon farming giant Cermaq applied to the BC Ministry of Environment for a permit to use Interlox® Paramove® 50 to combat sea lice. Their application is to deposit 2.3 million litres of pesticide—enough to fill an Olympic-sized swimming pool—into the waters of the Clayoquot Sound UNESCO Biosphere Reserve over a three-year period. Clayoquot Action

expressed concern over the permit as sea lice may be a vector for transmitting disease from farmed fish to wild fish.

- Lewis, D. 2017. “Deny Cermaq’s Pesticide Permit” *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/deny-cermaq-s-pesticide-permit/?_ga=2.139751987.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 2018: CAP and Canadian Government Sign a Political Accord
 - Key Actors: CAP, Canadian Govt
 - CAP and the Government of Canada sign a Political Accord that acknowledges the *CAP Daniels v. Canada* decision to reaffirm a “renewed relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples based on recognition of rights, respect, cooperation, and partnership”.
 - CAP. 2022. “About us.” *Congress of Aboriginal Peoples*. abo-peoples.org. Available at: <http://www.abo-peoples.org/en/about-us/>
- 2018 - *Ahousaht et al. v. Canada* “justification trials” come to an end with a decision by the BC Supreme Court (2018 BCSC 633)
 - The “justification trial” lasted a cumulative 120 days from 2017-2018.
 - Given “no meaningful consultations” had taken place since the 2014 decision, Canada and the Five Nations were not able to “reconcile” in negotiations during the required two year window, the AFN had determined that Canada’s engagement had been in “bad faith,” and the Five Nations determined that “Canada had done nothing to implement a right-based multi-species fishery” - the Five Nations reactivated their case and brought Canada back to court
 - BCSC took the case to determine whether Canada’s infringement of the rights was in any way “justified”
 - Madam Justice Humphries found that Canada was NOT justified in their infringements on the right. Additionally, specificities of the right and the requirements to accommodate were detailed:
 - Canada has a court-defined duty to consult and negotiate with the Five Nations, and either party could again return to court if agreements were not made within a two year time frame
 - A ninemile seaward boundary offshore was named as the limit to the area to which the territorial aboriginal rights apply, later referred to as the Court Defined Area (CDA)
 - The aboriginal right holds priority to other commercial sectors
 - The 1985 Fisheries Act was explicitly noted as infringing on the aboriginal rights to fish and sell fish
 - The Salmon Allocation Policy (SAP) specifically could not be justified and must reviewed and changed accordingly
 - DFO cannot justify providing priority salmon allocations to the recreational fishery
 - DFOs restrictions on halibut and other groundfish could not be justified
 - The commercial fishing right does not guarantee a level of income or economic viability, and cannot be used to guarantee or protect a right to accumulate wealth
 - The right is multi-species, so it is the total fishery that is relevant and not the individual allocations of particular species
 - The right is not unrestricted nor exclusive
 - The right is not to an industrial fishery - The size of fishing vessel, type of gear, and structure of fishery protected by the right was limited to “small, low-cost boats with limited technology and restricted catching power and aimed at wide community participation” - later referred to as a “mosquito fleet”

- Specific requirements for fishery participation by DFO and other considerations as determined within the Fisheries Act, Salmon Allocation Policy, and DFOs management policies which impeded on the rights included the following:
 - requirement in the commercial fishery for a licence;
 - requirement for species-specific licencing;
 - requirement in the commercial fishery for a registered vessel;
 - costs associated with pursuing a fishery, for instance licences and monitoring costs, particularly electronic monitoring;
 - prohibition against retention and sale of bycatch;
 - restriction on transfer of licences;
 - necessity for one licence per boat per species to harvest and sell fish; and
 - requirement for Individual Transferable Quota (“ITQ”) in the groundfish fishery.
 - “Humphries J. concluded that the regulations setting out the following requirements would be too costly for a small boat multi-species fishery and were not justified for the entire right-based fishery of the Plaintiffs: (1) one commercial licence per vessel; (2) all vessels to be registered; (3) licence fees; (4) a restriction on splitting or transferring licences; (5) one licence per species; and (6) licence allocations that depend on limited entry based on previous catch.”
- Other aspects of DFO salmon management practices were considered justified, including specific decision considerations for sockeye and pick salmon, review of and standards for catch monitoring and reporting, conservation related management of chinook and coho terminal fisheries, and setting limitations on bycatch totals. Similar details were specified for other species / fisheries.
- Though the decision regarding Canada’s unjustified infringements was generally considered a “win” for the Five Nations, Humphries specifications on the scope and nature of the rights including the size, type, and economic viability of the fishery was viewed by the Nations as unjust limitations and counter to the nature of the protected right; the Five Nations ultimately appealed several such specific details of this decision.
- Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v Canada (Attorney General), 2018 BCSC 633, Available at: <https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2018/2018bcsc633/2018bcsc633.html>
- Case Summary and details of Madame Humphries findings from Mandell Pinder LP available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/ahousaht-indian-band-and-nation-v-canada-attorney-general-2018-bcsc-633-case-summary/>
- Case Summary and details of Madame Humphries findings from CanLII at: <https://canliiconnects.org/en/summaries/62180>
- JFK Law LLP. 2016. *Justifying Canada’s Infringement: Trial Heads to Ahousaht in Nuu-Chah-Nulth Fisheries Justification Trial*. JFK Law LLP. Available at: <https://jfkllaw.ca/justifying-canadas-infringement/>
- NTC. 2018. *Nuu-chah-nulth Seek Intervenor Status in T’aaq-wiihak Court Case Appeal*. Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. [Media Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/sites/default/files/news/NTC-to-Intervene-Taaq-wiihak.pdf>
- BCAFN. 2018. *BC Assembly of First Nations Applauds BC Supreme Court Decision in Ahousaht*. British Columbia Assembly of First Nations.bcafn.ca. Available at: <https://www.bcafn.ca/news/bc-assembly-first-nations-applauds-bc-supreme-court-decision-ahousaht>
- DFO. 2018. *Statement from the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard following the B.C. Supreme Court Decision - Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation et al v. Canada*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/fisheries-oceans/news/2018/04/statement-from-the-minister-of-fisheries-oceans-and-the-canadian-coast-guard-following-the-bc-supreme-court-decision---ahousaht-indian-band-and-nat.html>
- May 2018: Salmon Lice Outbreak on Cermaq Farms
 - Key Actors: Cermaq, Clayoquot Action
 - A massive outbreak of salmon lice in the Clayoquot Sound UNESCO Biosphere Reserve threatened to wipe out this 2018’s salmon runs. Salmon plague the salmon farming industry globally, but the chemical treatments Cermaq used to treat the issue were highly protested by Clayoquot Action.

- Glambeck, B. 2018. “Clayoquot salmon lice outbreak devastating” Clayoquot Action. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/clayoquot-salmon-lice-outbreak-devastating/?_ga=2.81706391.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 28 August 2018:
 - The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council (NTC) has decided it will seek BC Court of Appeal consent to intervene in the T’aaq-wiihak Fisheries court case that sought a ruling on the Government’s past and ongoing infringement of five First Nations’ commercial fishing rights.
 - NTC. 2018. *Nuu-chah-nulth Seek Intervenor Status in T’aaq-wiihak Court Case Appeal*. Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/news/502>
- November 2019: Cermaq Salmon Farms Experience Mass Die-Off
 - Key Actors: Cermaq, Clayoquot Action
 - Cermaq is experienced a mass die-off at three of their salmon farm operations in the Clayoquot Sound UNESCO Biosphere Region, north of Tofino, British Columbia, in the territory of Ahousaht First Nations. Cermaq reported the die-off is happening due to a Harmful Algae Bloom (HAB), which are occurring more frequently around the world due to warming ocean temperatures. The die-off sparked concern about Cermaq’s farming practices from Clayoquot Action.
 - Lewis, D. 2019. “Mass Die-Off on 3 Tofino Fish Farms” *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. Available at: <https://clayoquotaction.org/mass-die-off-on-3-tofino-fish-farms/>
- 2019 Squamish First Nations v. Canada (2019 FCA 216)
 - The Department sets annual limits on the amount of Fraser sockeye salmon which can be harvested by First Nations for food, social and ceremonial purposes
 - Squamish asked for an increase in the quota due to increase in their population, but the Department rejected their request.
 - In a unanimous decision, the Federal Court of Appeal found that the Department’s decision was unreasonable and in breach of the duty to consult.
 - (2019 FCA 216) Available at: <https://taxinterpretations.com/content/530471>
 - Gunn & Donocan. 2019. “SQUAMISH V. CANADA: CASE COMMENT.” First Peoples Law. Available at: <https://www.firstpeopleslaw.com/public-education/blog/squamish-v-canada-case-comment>
- 2019: Bill C-68 revises the Fishery Act
 - Modifications to the Fisheries Act designed to address several concerns related to fish and fish habitat protections, clarification of terms, transparency requirements, commercial regulations, rightsholder consultation processes, and consideration and involvement of Indigenous peoples in decision-making.
 - Among other adjustments, the bill includes the following provisions specific to the consideration of Indigenous knowledges and rights:
 - Provided Indigenous traditional knowledge must inform habitat decisions
 - Requirement to consider adverse effects of decisions on the rights of Indigenous peoples
 - Protection for Indigenous knowledge when provided in confidence to the Minister
 - DFO. 2021. *Introducing Canada’s modernized Fisheries Act*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/campaign-campagne/fisheries-act-loi-sur-les-peches/introduction-eng.html>
 - DFO. 2021. *Guidance and transitional provisions of Bill C-68*. Available at: <https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/guidance-ligne-directrice-eng.html>
- 2019 - Review of the Salmon Allocation Policy (SAP) initiated

- The application of the policy was found to unjustly infringe upon the rights of five Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations in 2018 (see *Ahousaht et al. v Canada* 2018, above); the SAP provided priority to the recreational sector over the aboriginal fishing rights in their classification as a commercial sector; the policy is under revision by court requirement as a result
 - The First Nations Fishery Council (FNFC) is supporting the revision through the SAP Working Group
 - As of 2021, The terms of reference for the BC review, or “Phase 1” of four proposed phases, is considered complete. The TOR was to be co-developed by DFO, First Nations, and other stakeholders.
 - Original policy available at: <https://waves-vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/library-bibliotheque/240366.pdf>
 - DFO. 2022. *Initiative to update the Salmon Allocation Policy*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/consultation/smon/sap-prs/index-eng.html>
 - DFO. 2022. *Review of the Salmon Allocation Policy in British Columbia and Yukon (2022)*. Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/consultation/smon/sap-prs/review-examen-eng.html>
 - Point, J. 2021. *SAP Working Group Feedback to the Draft TOR for SAP Review*. First Nations Fisheries Council of British Columbia. [Letter]. Available at: <https://www.fnfisheriescouncil.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/FNFC-letter-to-DFO-re-draft-SAP-TOR.pdf>
- 2020 Supreme Court ruled PRV screening for all farmed salmon
 - In 2019, there was an piscine orthoreovirus (PRV) outbreak that infected 90% of Cermaq’s active farms
 - Two federal court judges have ruled in three cases that DFO’S policy of putting farmed salmon into open-net pens without screening for PRV is unlawful, yet DFO continues to allow the transfer of PRV-infected farm salmon.
 - Lewis, D. 2020. “ Harmful Norwegian salmon virus found on Clayoquot fish farms” *Salmon Farming*. Clayoquot Action. Available at: https://clayoquotaction.org/harmful-norwegian-salmon-virus-found-on-clayoquot-fish-farms/?_ga=2.173905571.1490506996.1640819952-847077174.1640819952
- 6 July 2020: BC Government’s Amendments to the Clean Energy Act Spark Disapproval from NTC
 - Key Actors: NTC, BC Government
 - The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council was very perturbed with the BC Government’s proposal of amendments to the Clean Energy Act without their consent or consultation. The amendments allowed for the elimination of self-sufficiency from the Clean Energy Act, meaning that the government could buy power from other jurisdictions and not have to buy power from First Nations independent power producers.
 - NTC. 2020. *Nuu-chah-nulth Calls on BC Legislature to Table Bill 17- Amendments to Clean Energy Act until First Nations Consent Given*. Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/sites/default/files/news/Press%20release%20on%20Clean%20Energy%20Act%20%28004%29-2-3.pdf>
- 20 October 2020: Racialized conflicts in Nova Scotia lobster fisheries draw attention of Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations and spark concern over Federal treatment of affirmed Indigenous fishing rights.
 - The Tla-o-qui-aht Hawiik and TFN Elected chief and council are outraged over the ongoing racial violence inflicted on the Sipeknekatik peoples as they assert their inherent right to implement their lobster fishery plan. The Mi’k Maq/Maliseet Treaty of 1752 affirms their Right to those fisheries and management. The Sipeknekatik First Nations have their own sovereign indigenous right to create their own modern livelihood and was reaffirmed with *R. v. Marshall* 1999.
 - Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations demands that the Federal government must immediately engage in a nation to nation dialogue with the Sipeknekatik and the Mi’k Maq nations who have been denied justice since the Marshall decision that was over 21 years ago. The inaction of the Liberal and

conservative governments in power to refuse to recognize and uphold the Marshall decision, which has led to the racial violence that is happening in Nova Scotia.

- Sipeknekatik fisherman and their families continue to be under attack with death threats and intimidation by the non-native communities and there has been domestic terrorism inflicted on them with their vehicle's, boats, and infrastructure torched.
- Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations. 2020. "Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations call for action to support the Sipeknekatik lobster fisheries." Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/sites/default/files/news/mi%27kmaqPROct2020.pdf>
- HFS. 2020. "5 NATIONS SUPPORT MI'KMAQ RIGHTS-BASED FISHERIES." Ha'oom Fisheries Society. [Press release]. Available at: <https://www.haoom.ca/news/2020/10/16/5-nations-support-mikmaq-rights-based-fisheries>
- 2020: T'aaq-wiihak Fisheries is incorporated as Ha'oom Fisheries Society (HFS)
 - The "demonstration fisheries" are referred to as the Five Nations Multispecies Fisheries following the 2018 court decision. HFS is the official fisheries management and rights implementation organization for the Nations' Fisheries
 - HFS Mission: "The Ha'oom Fisheries Society (HFS) works cooperatively to support and facilitate the participation of the Ahousaht, Ehattesaht, Mowachaht/Muchalaht, Hesquiaht and Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations (the "Five Nations") in the implementation of their commercial rights-based fisheries."
 - Ha'oom website: <https://www.haoom.ca/>
- 19 April 2021: Ahousaht Court Decision from BC Court of Appeals (2021 BCCA 155)
 - BC Court of Appeal rejects 2018 limitations placed on Aboriginal commercial fishing rights by Justice Humphries decision, though the 9 mile boundary of the CDA remained intact
 - The right to an economically viable fishery and a moderate income was guaranteed
 - Limitations to vessel size, gear type, cost of operations, etc were removed
 - Determination of the fulfilled right by a sum of all allocations was removed; allocations will be negotiated on a species by species basis.
 - "The Nuu-Chah-Nulth Tribal Council celebrated after the court of appeals unanimously ruled that the Federal Government has been infringing on the five Nuu-chah-nulth Nations' right to a commercial fishery. The commercial fishermen of the Five Nations represented in the Ahousaht et al case had long awaited to exercise their right to a commercial fishery. For many years, they had been limited to a very small fishery and this has not been acceptable as fishing is a way of life for them. The NTC also urged Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) to act immediately in implementing the court ruling."
 - Justice Groberman described this case as "one of the most complex that courts have had to deal with."
 - *Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2021 BCCA 155. Available at: <https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/ca/21/01/2021BCCA0155.htm>
 - Case Brief Available at: <https://www.dgwlaw.ca/case-brief-ahousaht-indian-band-and-nation-v-canada-attorney-general-2021-bcca-155/>
 - Case Summary from Mandell Pinder LLC available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/ahousaht-indian-band-and-nation-v-canada-attorney-general-2021-bcca-155-case-summary/>
 - NTC. 2021. *NUU-CHAH-NULTH TRIBAL COUNCIL CELEBRATES THE AHOUSAHT ET AL DECISION FROM THE BC COURT OF APPEALS*. Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://nuuchahnulth.org/sites/default/files/news/MEDIA%20RELEASE%20-%20Nuu-chah-nulth%20Tribal%20Council%20celebrates%20the%20Ahousaht%20et%20al%20decision%20from%20BC%20Court%20of%20Appeal.pdf>
 - Fong, L.C. 2021. *Affirming a Fuller Expression of the Nuu-Chah-Nulth's Right to Fish and Sell Fish: Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2021 BCCA 155. Ng Ariss Fong, Lawyers. Ngariss.com. Available at: <https://www.ngariss.com/our-in-dispute-posts/affirming-a-fuller-expression-of-the-nuu-chah-nulths-right-to-fish-and-sell-fish-ahousaht-indian-band-and-nation-v-canada-attorney-general-2021-bcca-155/>

- 2021 Southwind v. Canada (2021 SCC 28)
 - The Court affirmed the importance of the Indigenous interest in reserve lands, the importance of consent, negotiation, and the Indigenous people’s perspective
 - There was lack of assessment of the Crown’s fiduciary duty (commitment to act in the best interests of another person or entity) towards protecting the First Nations’ land
 - (2021 SCC 28) Available at: <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2021/2021scc28/2021scc28.html>

- 2021 Yahey v. British Columbia (2021 BCSC 1287)
 - first case in Canada to consider treaty infringements arising from the cumulative effects of development rather than infringement based on a specific project, authorization or legislative restriction.
 - For the first time a court has found that:
 - a Province breached treaty promises by permitting the cumulative impacts of industrial development on treaty rights
 - infringed a treaty by taking up lands to such an extent that there are insufficient lands for the meaningful exercise of treaty rights
 - In terms of land development:
 - The Court’s declarations may be construed as requiring Blueberry’s consent for any such development. This could lead to conflict, not only with proponents, but also perhaps with other Nations with overlapping territories.
 - (2021 BCSC 1287) Case summary from Mandell Pinder LLC Available at: <https://www.mandellpinder.com/yahey-v-british-columbia-2021-bcsc-1287-canlii-case-summary/>

- 2021 - Bill C-15 makes UNDRIP federal law
 - “Bill C-15: An Act respecting the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” - an act to ensure Canada’s laws “are consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and must prepare and implement an action plan to achieve the objectives of the Declaration.”
 - Full act available here: <https://parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/43-2/bill/C-15/third-reading>

- 2021 - Bill C-5 Chapter 11 recognizes National Day for Truth and Reconciliation
 - “An Act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, the Interpretation Act and the Canada Labour Code (National Day for Truth and Reconciliation) ... This enactment amends certain Acts to add a new holiday, namely, National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, which is observed on September 30.”
 - Full act available here: <https://parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/43-2/bill/C-5/royal-assent>

- 2021 - Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative (PSSI)
 - From DFO: “The strategy aims to stem the steep decline of many Pacific salmon populations and to protect and rebuild stocks where possible by implementing a series of immediate and long-term solutions that focus on four key areas: conservation and stewardship; salmon enhancement; harvest transformation and integration and collaboration.”
 - DFO. 2023. *Pacific Salmon Strategy Initiative*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Government of Canada. Available at: <https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/campaign-campagne/pss-ssp/index-eng.html>
 - Gamage, M. 2021. “Fishery Closures and the Ghosts of Past Mistakes.” *Hakai Magazine*. Available at: <https://hakaimagazine.com/features/fishery-closures-and-the-ghosts-of-past-mistakes/>
 - DFO. 2023. *Pacific Salmon strategy Initiative: Overview Engagement Deck*. Fisheries and Oceans Canada. [Presentation Slides]. Available at: https://frasersalmon.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Nov-28-CRRI_PSSI-Secretariat-Phase-3-Engagement-Deck.pdf

- June/July 2021: DFO put a moratorium on Salmon fisheries
 - Key Actors: First Nations, DFO, Bernadette Jordan

- In June, Canada’s fisheries minister, Bernadette Jordan, announced the closure of nearly 60 per cent of B.C.'s commercial salmon fisheries. The decision was made in order to protect the species, which has experienced a stark decline in numbers in recent years. First Nations continued to fish under the authority – which, according to the April appeal, they had the right to do. This has influenced how First Nations are planning their next round of fishing, and set a precedent that if the DFO does not accommodate First Nations’ rights, they will implement their rights for the DFO.
- Simmons, M. 2021. “Canada’s sweeping closures of Pacific coast salmon fisheries leave workers reeling.” *The Narwhal*. Available at: <https://thenarwhal.ca/fisheries-oceans-canada-commercial-closures/>
- Hamilton, T. 2021. “DFO shuts down 79 commercial salmon fisheries.” *Terrace Standard*. Available at: <https://www.terracestandard.com/news/dfo-shuts-down-79-commercial-salmon-fisheries/>
- July/August 2021: the Five Nations assert their right through “assertion fisheries”
 - The Five Nations reject DFO’s authority to restrict their right through the Canadian moratorium, and announce that the T’aaq-wiihak fishers will continue to fish their salmon allocations
 - Five Nations have set a precedent holding DFO accountable and exercising leverage to force a return to meaningful negotiations with fulfillment of the right, based on interpretation of the April 2021 decision: *if you don't accommodate our right, we will implement our right for you*
 - These actions have influenced how the Nations are approaching future years of fishing, reconciliation, and co-governance; there is a cost to pursuing assertion fisheries and a risk of arrest or internal political conflict. However, it was also viewed as a general success in ensuring fishers could more wholly access their existing rights and in emphasizing that the Canadian Government / DFO is not the final authority over the sovereign Five Nations
 - Bailey, A. 2021. “Five Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations ready to exercise fishing rights” *Vancouver Island Free Daily*. Available at: <https://www.vancouverislandfreedaily.com/news/five-nuu-chah-nulth-first-nations-ready-to-exercise-fishing-rights/>
 - Plummer, E. 2021. “Five nations assert right to half of overall catch.” *Ha-Shilth-Sa*. Available at: <https://hashilthsa.com/news/2021-08-05/five-nations-assert-right-half-overall-catch>
 - T’aaq-wiihak. 2021. “FIVE NUU-CHAH-NULTH FIRST NATIONS’ FISHERS REMAIN ‘TIED TO OUR DOCKS’ DESPITE THE COURT AFFIRMING OUR RIGHT TO FISH ALMOST A DOZEN YEARS AGO.” Ha-oom Fisheries Society. [Press Release]. Available at: <https://taaqwiihakfisheries.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/FIVE-NUU-CHAH-NULTH-FIRST-NATIONS-FISHERS-REMAIN-%E2%80%98TIED-TO-OUR-DOCKS-DESPITE-THE-COURT-AFFIRMING-OUR-RIGHT-TO-FISH-ALMOST-A-DOZEN-YEARS-AGO.pdf>
- September 30, 2021: First National Day For Truth and Reconciliation
 - September 30, 2021 marked the first National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. The day is meant to honor the lost children and Survivors of residential schools, their families and communities. Public commemoration of the tragic and painful history and ongoing impacts of residential schools is a vital component of the reconciliation process. The creation of this federal statutory holiday was through legislative amendments made by Parliament (Bill C-5) earlier in 2021.
 - Government of Canada. 2021. *National Day for Truth and Reconciliation*. “Canadian Heritage.” Government of Canada. Canada.ca. Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/campaigns/national-day-truth-reconciliation.html>

As of Spring 2023, the Five Nations and Fisheries and Oceans Canada continue to engage in negotiations regarding the implementation and full realization of the rights to fish and to sell fish. The Nations and Canada are also engaged in a parallel reconciliation process, with an annually renewing interim agreement in lieu of a finalized agreement. [Ha’oom Fisheries Society](#), with support from multiple partners and researchers and with guidance from the Five Nations’ leaderships, continues to work according to the [HFS strategic plan](#) towards full implementation

of the rights in its support of the Five Nations' fishers participation in the T'aaq-qiihak Fishery / Five Nations Multispecies Fisheries and the growth of a resilient, economically viable, community engaged, environmentally and socially responsible fishery secured for future generations to come.

Additional sources specific to Nuu-chah-nulth fishing, governance, worldview, language, the history of WCVI & Clayoquot Sound, and the Five Nations' journey of rights assertion:

Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada (Attorney General), BCSC 1494 (2009).

Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada (Attorney General), BCSC 633 (2018).

Ahousaht Indian Band and Nation v. Canada (Attorney General), BCCA 155 (2021).

Arima, E. Y. (1983). *The West Coast Nootka People*. British Columbia Provincial Museum.

Assembly of First Nations. 2022. *Submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans RE: Study the Implementation of Indigenous rights-based fisheries across Canada*. Available at: https://sencanada.ca/Content/Sen/Committee/441/POFO/briefs/2022-04-14_AssemblyofFirstNations_e.pdf

Atleo, C. (2008). From Indigenous nationhood to neoliberal Aboriginal economic development: Charting the evolution of Indigenous-settler relations in Canada. *Can. Soc. Econ. Hub*.

Atleo, M. R. (2006). The ancient Nuu-chah-nulth strategy of hahuulthi: Education for indigenous cultural survivance. *International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability*, 2(1), 153-162.

Atleo, M. R. (2008b). Watching to see until it becomes clear to you: metaphorical mapping – a method for emergence. *Int. J. Qual. Stud. Educ.* 21, 221–233.

Atleo, R. E. (Umeek). (2004). *Tsawalk: a Nuu-chah-nulth worldview*. UBC Press.

Atleo, R. E. (Umeek). (2011). *Principles of tsawalk: an indigenous approach to global crisis*. UBC Press.

Bingham, J.A. (2023.) *Knowledge and Power through Pluralisms and Relationality in the Governance of Salmon on the West Coast of Vancouver Island*. [Doctoral Thesis].

Bingham, J. A., Milne, S., Murray, G., & Dorward, T. (2021). Knowledge Pluralism in First Nations' Salmon Management. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 0, 405.

Braun, B. (2003). *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, Culture, and Power on Canada's West Coast*. University of Minnesota Press.

Clayoquot Sound. (2021). *Friends of Clayoquot Sound*. Retrieved from: <https://www.focs.ca/clayoquot-sound>

- Coté, C. (2019). hishuk'ish tsawalk—Everything is One. Revitalizing Place-Based Indigenous Food Systems through the Enactment of Food Sovereignty. *J. Agric. Food Syst. Community Dev.* 9, 37–48. doi:10.5304/jafscd.2019.09A.003.
- Coté, C. (2022). *A Drum in One Hand, A Sockeye in Another: Stories of Indigenous Food Sovereignty from the Northwest Coast*. University of Washington Press.
- English, P.A. et al. (2023). Spatial Restrictions Hinder Avoidance Of Choke Species In An Indigenous Rights-Based Fishery. (Forthcoming)
- George, E. M. (2003). *Living on the Edge: Nuu-Chah-Nulth History from an Ahousaht Chief's Perspective*. Winlaw, British Columbia, Canada: Sononis Press.
- Harris DC. 2001. *Fish, Law, and Colonialism: The Legal Capture of Salmon in British Columbia*. University of Toronto Press
- Harris, D. C. 2009. *Landing native fisheries: Indian reserves and fishing rights in British Columbia, 1849-1925*. UBC press, Vancouver.
- Horsefield, M., & Kennedy, I. (2014). *Tofino and Clayoquot Sound: A History*. Harbour Publishing.
- James, M. (2004). The British Columbia Salmon Fishery “Buyback” Program – A Case Study in Capacity Reduction. *IIFET 2004 Japan Proceedings*.
- Marshall, Y. M. (1993). *A political history of the Nuu-Chah-Nulth people : a case study of the Mowachaht and Muchalaht tribes*. Simon Fraser University.
- Menzies, C. R. (2006). *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Natural Resource Management*.
- Milne, S. D. H. (2022). *Haahuupa and fisheries: an indigenous methodological approach to Tla-o-qui-aht knowledge systems in support of community renewal*. [Doctoral Dissertation]
- Murray, G., & Burrows, D. (2017). Understanding Power in Indigenous Protected Areas: the Case of the Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks. *Human Ecology*, 45(6), 763–772.
- Murray, G., & King, L. (2012). First Nations Values in Protected Area Governance: Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks and Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. *Human Ecology*, 40(3), 385–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-012-9495-2>
- Muse, B. (1999). Fleet Reduction in British Columbia's Commercial Salmon Fisheries: 1996-1998. *Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission*, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. CFEC 99-2N.
- Newell, D. (1993). *Tangled webs of history*. University of Toronto Press.
- Pinkerton, E. (1999). Factors in Overcoming Barriers to Implementing Co-management in British Columbia Salmon Fisheries. *Conservation Ecology*, 3(2).

- Pinkerton, E., & Davis, R. (2015). Neoliberalism and the politics of enclosure in North American small-scale fisheries. *Marine Policy*, 61, 303-312.
- Schwindt, R., Vining, A. R., & Weimer, D. (2003). A policy analysis of the BC salmon fishery. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, 73-94.
- Silver, J. J., Okamoto, D. K., Armitage, D., Alexander, S. M., Atleo, C., Burt, J. M., Jones, R., Lee, L. C., Muhl, E. K., Salomon, A. K., & Stoll, J. S. (2022). Fish, People, and Systems of Power: Understanding and Disrupting Feedback between Colonialism and Fisheries Science. *American Naturalist*, 200(1), 168–180.
- Tindall, B. (2021). Studying the War in the Woods and Other Environmental Controversies from the Left Coast. In S. H. Riggins & N. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Canadian Sociologists in the First Person*. McGill University Press.
- WCA (West Coast Aquatic). (2023). *Supporting collaboration in natural resource management*. West Coast Aquatic. <https://www.westcoastaquatic.ca/about/#history>