



# **NUNAVIK MARINE REGION WILDLIFE BOARD**

## **NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

### **MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR BELUGA WHALE HARVESTING IN NUNAVIK**

---

January 21, 2020 - Volume 1

---

INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
Opening Remarks .....	3
Presentation by Wildlife Management .....	11
Presentation by Makivik .....	48
Presentation by DFO .....	105
Certificate .....	185

1           January 21, 2020

2  
3           --- Whereupon the hearing commenced at 10:57 a.m.

4  
5                       MS. SALAMIVA: We will start our meeting  
6 now. The rest will come in today. Some are out  
7 smoking, I think. Thank you for coming here, welcome,  
8 to the public hearing of Beluga. This is a very  
9 important matter. We've been hearing from our parents  
10 for a very long time that animals are not supposed to  
11 be mistreated, so we will have to work together  
12 properly. Nobody needs to get angry; nobody needs to  
13 fight over because we are here to talk about Beluga.  
14 So I want to work well together instead of just  
15 arguing, because the hunters are here and the DFO are  
16 also here, and it will be better for us to work  
17 together properly. That's how we want to see it  
18 happen.

19                       Today different organizations will  
20 start with their presentation and Makivik will be the  
21 first one and then EMRWB, so these are the  
22 organizations that will start first. And then  
23 tomorrow the hunters will have an opportunity. After  
24 their presentation, you will have an opportunity to  
25 ask questions. For example, Makivik will be the first

1 one to do their presentation and then you will have an  
2 opportunity to ask questions. We want you to be very  
3 comfortable while you are staying here, so inform our  
4 staff. Thank you. This is the chairperson of EMRWB.

5 MR. BLACKNED: Thank you all. My name  
6 is Gordon Blackned. I'm the current chair of the  
7 Eeyou Marine Region Wildlife Board. I've been, I  
8 guess, appointed it would be about two years now.  
9 It's challenging, you've been trusting and I'm quite  
10 pleased to be here interacting with the Inuit with  
11 regards to the topic of the Beluga whale hearing.  
12 This is my first time to a function like this. And as  
13 you're aware, the Cree and the Inuit have always been  
14 proactive in the past, you know, with the relationship  
15 they have had for the way they survive. And I'm glad  
16 to help them maintain throughout the years. And  
17 presumably into the future we will come to each other  
18 on account of the Boards that are expected to work  
19 together through NMRWB as well as the EMRWB.

20 First of all, I just wanted to express  
21 my condolences to the community of Sanikiluaq. We  
22 lost one of our Board members before the Christmas  
23 break, Pete (indiscernible). We admire  
24 (indiscernible) and our Board really enjoyed him, his  
25 time with us and we're sad to hear of his passing and

1 I extend my condolences to the community of  
2 Sanikiluaq.

3 Apart from this, I just wanted to  
4 inform you that I'm not a practicing harvester in  
5 terms of what a Cree harvester is. The Cree, they  
6 trap, they hunt, they fish and all the activities they  
7 do in the bush. I went to school most of my time. I  
8 spent a lot of time in school and I came back and I  
9 started working for my people. I'm actually a  
10 (indiscernible). I started out as a teacher and I  
11 worked my way up the ladder to the top position in the  
12 Cree School Board. So thirty years I spent there.

13 I came out of that organization to be  
14 the chief of my community (indiscernible). I did one  
15 term and then after that, I didn't have I guess the  
16 know-how or whatever but, I mean, it was confusing on  
17 how Cree policy works sometimes. But in any case, I  
18 wasn't re-elected, but that's the way the political  
19 ball bounces. In any case, there was an opening to be  
20 a part of the Eeyou Marine Region Wildlife Board and I  
21 took that opportunity and became a director and then  
22 subsequently I became the chair which is what I am  
23 today.

24 Where we are now in this very building,  
25 we're hearing about the issues regarding Beluga whale

1 harvesting and whatnot. This should be very  
2 interesting. It's been very interesting over the last  
3 several weeks that we've been fed with a lot of  
4 information regarding this matter. Just yesterday  
5 when we were came in and we had our preparation  
6 meeting for this hearing and things are very, very  
7 interesting to learn about (indiscernible), and the  
8 animals get harvested.

9 We're here as the Eeyou Marine Region  
10 Wildlife Board because we share part of the waters  
11 with the coastal areas with the Inuit and a little  
12 south of where we are now in (indiscernible). So  
13 we're here. Your interests are our interests and we  
14 want to work with you and also hear you in terms of  
15 what your interests are regarding the Beluga whale.

16 And with that, thank you and we'll be  
17 seeing each other for the rest of this week. Thank  
18 you very much.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Gordon.  
20 Qajaq was working for us for a while but she became  
21 our lawyer again. So we are happy to have her and she  
22 will present you how we will proceed. Thank you.

23 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, Gordon.  
24 Thank you Salamiva for your opening remarks. I'm just  
25 going to give a little overview of what we're doing

1 here. As both chairpersons shared with you, this is a  
2 public hearing about Beluga harvesting and management  
3 within the Nunavik Marine Region. Part of the Nunavik  
4 Marine Region has overlap areas with the Cree and  
5 Makivik and the Cree, Grand Counsel the Cree  
6 negotiated in their overlap agreement how decisions  
7 would be made for that region. And that's why we have  
8 the Eeyou Marine Region Wildlife Board here with us  
9 because for areas of the joint zone, the Boards are  
10 going to have to sit together to make their decisions.

11 So it was very important that the Eeyou Marine Region  
12 Board members hear what you have to say as well. So  
13 that is why they are here today. And we welcome them  
14 and it's a wonderful opportunity for the two Boards to  
15 sit together and learn from you.

16 I want to go over a little bit of the  
17 schedule and we talked about this last night. Today  
18 is going to be presentations from different  
19 institutions. We're going to start right when I'm  
20 done with an overview presentation from the staff of  
21 the Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board. We're going  
22 to talk a little bit about the history and a little  
23 bit about the management systems that have been in  
24 place for Beluga in the Nunavik Marine Region.

25 Then we are, I'm assuming, going to be

1 done by lunch and then following the lunch, we expect  
2 to hear from Makivik. The way it will go is after an  
3 organization presents, we'll go around the tables and  
4 each of the organizations, you'll have a turn to ask  
5 your questions. I ask that you ask questions, don't  
6 engage in a debate. It's not about fighting or, you  
7 know, saying your opinion. This is your opportunity  
8 to ask questions based on what people tell you, what  
9 they present to you. If you disagree, you can say I  
10 disagree with this and this is why.

11 But this is a chance for us to really  
12 understand, test and challenge and ask questions about  
13 what is said. So the Board will know whether that  
14 information is reliable, if it's something that is,  
15 you know, something that they should be considering  
16 when they make their decisions. After you have your  
17 round of questions, the Board, as well as the Board,  
18 me, the Board's lawyers and staff, might have some  
19 questions for you as well. And then once those  
20 questions are done, we'll go on to the next presenter.

21  
22 We want to make sure that we capture  
23 what everybody's saying so we're recording this. But  
24 when it's a recording, it's hard to know who is  
25 talking. So every time you start talking on the



1 microphone, it would be very helpful if you say who  
2 you are and who you are here with. So, for example,  
3 Qajaq Robinson, legal counsel, Nunavik Marine Region  
4 Wildlife Board. Just something like that so we know  
5 when we're going over the recording who's talking  
6 because it's important that you represent your  
7 community and we know where you're coming from.

8 Tomorrow is going to be for the  
9 (indiscernible) and HTO. This is the time for  
10 communities and the hunter's organizations to present  
11 to the Board. And it will go the same way; after you  
12 present, other people in the room will have the  
13 opportunity to ask you questions. The Board will have  
14 an opportunity to answer your questions and then we'll  
15 go onto the next group.

16 On the last morning, Thursday morning,  
17 we want this time to be for elders and community  
18 members. So that whole morning on Thursday will be to  
19 hear and learn from them. On Thursday afternoon,  
20 that's when you can -- that's when we'll go around the  
21 tables again and have an opportunity for each of you  
22 to tell the Boards what you think they need to decide,  
23 what approach you think they need to take, and what  
24 you think their decisions should be after having heard  
25 everybody else's comments and questions and

1 presentations.

2 We recognize that this is really  
3 challenging and a difficult topic. A lot of hurt  
4 feelings, a lot of pain and a lot of anger. But as  
5 Salamiva said, it's important that we do this in a  
6 respectful way, in a clear way because the Board needs  
7 to make a decision on reliable, useful information.  
8 So we ask, please don't ask the same questions over  
9 and over again. We have to make sure we use our time  
10 well.

11 So enough of me, we're going to start  
12 with a presentation from Mark and Kaitlin and I will -  
13 - do you have a mic? I will pass the mic to you.  
14 This presentation from them is mostly an overview. We  
15 don't expect that -- unless you have you have  
16 questions for clarification, we're hoping that as soon  
17 as they're done, we'll break for lunch. Billy, you  
18 have a question?

19 MR. PALLISER: Just to clarify, one  
20 short question for -- when you mentioned about the  
21 overlapping with the Cree and Inuit, is this based --  
22 is the overlapping in the hearing about only Cree and  
23 Inuit zone in Nunavik or also Nunavik and Nunavut  
24 overlap zones? I think it's also important to mention  
25 that we also have overlap areas on the King George

1 Islands and Ottawa Islands and Sanikiluaq.

2 MS. ROBINSON: Yeah, and -- but this  
3 for the decisions of the Boards, it's for the  
4 Cree/Inuit overlap. And then the decision of the  
5 Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board is for the rest  
6 of the (indiscernible) Marine Region. I am hoping  
7 that Mark's presentation will help answer your  
8 question better. It appears we have some more  
9 technical difficulties.

10 MS. SALAMIVA: Unfortunately, the TN  
11 are not here; it's not our fault they had no room on  
12 the plane. So Putulik is on his way right now.  
13 Because we want Nunavut here to be able to listen and  
14 because we are here for Beluga. And NMRWB accepted  
15 them to be here long time ago. So they are supposed  
16 to be arriving tonight.

17 MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay, I think I can  
18 proceed. As I mentioned earlier, my name is Mark  
19 Basterfield, I am the director of Wildlife Management  
20 with the (indiscernible) Region Wildlife Board. I  
21 replaced Kaitlin, who resigned about six months ago,  
22 but she's still working very closely with us as a  
23 consultant. I will let you introduce yourself. That  
24 was enough?

25 So this is an overview presentation.

1 This is not the same as all other presentations you  
2 will hear later. This is meant to be a presentation  
3 that looks at the past and the present and sets  
4 everybody up to be on the same page from where we're  
5 starting with when the parties later will give their  
6 presentations to the Board for questions. So for this  
7 presentation it's not meant to question or criticize  
8 what's in it, it's more meant if you have any  
9 questions if they're for clarity, that's fine. But if  
10 you have things you want the Board to hear, the  
11 suggestion would be to make sure you mention it when  
12 you give your presentation later. And we only have  
13 about 45 minutes for this presentation now, so for  
14 expediency we'll do that. I can't take questions if  
15 something's not clear, but I just wanted to make sure  
16 that was understood.

17 So there's going to be -- yes,  
18 question?

19 MR. OPIK: Yeah. Just a quick  
20 question. We were going on a one-page submission  
21 sheet ---

22 MS. SALAMIVA: You need a mic.

23 MR. OPIK: We were going over some  
24 submission sheet and I asked one of the guys on the  
25 Beluga stock abundance that was latest survey back in

1 2000 -- towards the end of 2018, and he was suggesting  
2 from the previous surveys that the eastern Ungava,  
3 Hudson Bay Beluga was at 3,800. And then last, the  
4 very last survey was indicating that there were 3,200.  
5 And here it's still saying 3,800; I think that needs  
6 to be changed a little bit.

7 MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. I'm going to  
8 proceed with the presentations. So there will be  
9 three main parts to the presentation. First, I'll  
10 give some information on the public hearing and then  
11 some background on research and knowledge that we  
12 already know. And then, the third part we'll be  
13 looking at current and past management and  
14 conservation measures.

15 So I've started with "What is NMRWB."  
16 It's a co-management Board that looks after wildlife  
17 management decisions in the Nunavik Marine Region.  
18 Co-management, that means that our Board of Directors  
19 are made up of appointees from the various places,  
20 government and Makivik. We've got members from the  
21 government of Nunavut, DFO does an appointee, so does  
22 Environment Canada and then we have three Makivik  
23 appointees as well, and a chair. The head office is  
24 in Inukjuak and the Board makes their decision based  
25 on the best available science and Inuit knowledge.

1 But we also have the Eeyou Board here.

2 It's very similar to the NMRWB in its structure. It  
3 has jurisdiction over the Eeyou Marine Region which is  
4 mainly eastern James Bay and part of Hudson Bay. And  
5 the jurisdiction overlaps with the Nunavik Marine  
6 Region. And Kaitlin is going to give a few comments  
7 on those jurisdictions.

8 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So before the --  
9 my name's Kaitlin Breton-Honeyman; I'm with the Board.  
10 Before the land claims were even finalized, there was  
11 a negotiation between the Cree (indiscernible) and  
12 Nunavut Inuit to discuss about how they would deal  
13 with the area where they have overlapping interest  
14 where both Inuit and Cree traditionally harvested.  
15 And the map on the right shows different zones that  
16 were negotiated. The zone in the top, the Inuit zone,  
17 is a zone where the Nunavut Marine Region Wildlife  
18 Board makes a decision. But the Cree have the  
19 opportunity to replace one of the Makivik appointments  
20 with their own. So they would -- it would like the  
21 Board but with a Cree person on it instead of one of  
22 the Nunavut appointees.

23 In the joint zone, both the NMRWB and  
24 the EMRWB come together and talk to a decision and  
25 then they make their separate decisions, one and one

1 for that zone. For the Cree zone, it's the opposite  
2 of the Inuit zone. So it's an EMRWB decision-making  
3 area but a Nunavut -- a Makivik appointment replaces  
4 CNG or Grand Counsel of the Cree appointment on the  
5 EMRWB for that zone.

6 To Billy's question earlier, about  
7 which areas are being discussed in the context of this  
8 management plan, we don't want to prejudice the Board  
9 about what they're going to be able to make a decision  
10 about. But I can tell you that what has been the  
11 area, there's -- been applicable within the previous  
12 management systems is the NMRWB up until the Inuit-  
13 Cree zone and the Cree zone order. So the line just  
14 past Long Island, all of that has been within the  
15 management plan to-date. The question about the areas  
16 of people using occupancy with Nunavut, are not NMRWB  
17 decision-making areas. They're Nunavut Wildlife  
18 Management board and so they're not part of the  
19 considerations today.

20 MR. BASTERFIELD: Mark Basterfield. So  
21 the one point of clarification I could've made  
22 earlier, we talked about our appointee Board members.

23 So our Board members, both the Eeyou Board members  
24 and the NMRWB Board members are appointees, they're  
25 not representatives. So that means they're here as

1 Wildlife Board members, they do not represent the  
2 organization that appointed them. So a Makivik  
3 appointee is not representing Makivik, they're  
4 representing the Wildlife Board. A government  
5 appointee is here for the Wildlife Board Mandate, not  
6 the government mandate. So the idea is that the  
7 Boards are neutral bodies and they bring the expertise  
8 from the organizations that appointed them.

9 So this is the first public hearing  
10 we've held in a long time, only the second in-person  
11 public hearing that the Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife  
12 Board has held. I think the previous one was five or  
13 six years ago and was on polar bears. It's different  
14 from a meeting; it's a chance for the decision-makers,  
15 the Boards, to gather evidence and to hear from all  
16 parties. It's not the place for decision-making, but  
17 it's very important for informing decisions.

18 So why do we hold it? It's a chance  
19 for the Boards to hear from all the parties, the  
20 rights holders and the signatories. It's a chance for  
21 the Boards to question those parties about the  
22 information. And it's a chance for the parties to  
23 question each other about the information they're  
24 providing. And as I mentioned earlier, it provides  
25 the Boards with information in order to make their



1 decisions.

2 So who attends it? Well, it's a public  
3 hearing; anyone can attend. But some organizations  
4 and people have what we call "party status." Those  
5 organizations and people have the right to present  
6 evidence and question the evidence of other parties.

7 So we've been over the schedule; I  
8 think I'll skip this fairly quickly. We're currently  
9 on the background information part of the schedule and  
10 the presentations from parties come up in the next --  
11 into this afternoon and in the next days, and then  
12 there'll be the closing statements.

13 So we'll go into the portion of this  
14 presentation on research and knowledge. And we're  
15 looking at four main aspects of research and  
16 knowledge: migratory routes, genetics and stocks, the  
17 stock population sizes and new information on Ungava  
18 Beluga. And I'm going to turn it over to Kaitlin.

19 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So these two  
20 figures are from interviews with hunters and elders  
21 from Kuujjuarapik, Ivujivik, Quaqtaq and  
22 (indiscernible). The figure on your left shows the  
23 areas where Beluga are summering and it's highlighted  
24 there. So both in Ungava Bay and in Eastern Hudson  
25 Bay, these were all the Eeyou-identified wintering

1 areas. So identifying that place where James Bay  
2 Beluga spend their winters between Sanikiluaq and Long  
3 Island. And for the bigger population of Western  
4 Hudson Bay Beluga and the smaller population of  
5 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, wintering all along  
6 Hudson's Strait, and also into Labrador Sea.

7 On the right-hand side you can see the  
8 migratory routes that elders and hunters all along  
9 Nunavik know about. So it's Beluga leaving those  
10 wintering areas and Labrador Sea and then Hudson's  
11 Strait in the springtime when the ice starts to break  
12 up, and then migrating down Hudson Coast for the  
13 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga into Nastapoka area and  
14 Little Whale River and other areas. And with the  
15 bigger population splitting off and going over to  
16 those Churchill Belugas.

17 People also spoke. There's a quote  
18 from David Oopik about the leaders of Beluga, how  
19 important those leaders are in terms of bringing the  
20 rest of the migration along. And Paul (indiscernible)  
21 from (indiscernible) talked about how important it is  
22 not to kill those leaders. And that's something that  
23 I think the Board would really benefit from hearing  
24 from those of you around the table. It's what are the  
25 practices that have sustained Eeyou and Beluga and how

1 can the management system bring back some of those  
2 practices. Because we've also heard about how the  
3 current management system has gotten away from the  
4 protecting the leaders of the population because  
5 there's a rush in to get Beluga with the quota system.

6 And so how to come back to those practices of  
7 sustained Beluga?

8 So just briefly on genetics and stock  
9 and we expect that you'll hear much more from the DFO  
10 about this. The vast majority of what we know about  
11 Beluga genetics come from the hunter-gathered samples  
12 that have been generated for several decades. And the  
13 genetics tell us that there are different groups  
14 coming from different areas. They also show that  
15 Belugas related to each other tend to travel together  
16 and they tend to travel to the same areas. So a point  
17 near Akulivik, for example, if you look at the Beluga  
18 that are sampled there year after year, they tend to  
19 be the -- that Beluga tends to have had its  
20 grandmother and its mother travel in that same route  
21 in previous years.

22 And then in Nunavik there are four  
23 summary areas, the Western Hudson Bay stock, the  
24 Eastern Hudson Bay stock and the James Bay and Ungava  
25 Bay. And all the way that Helena talked about Beluga

1 is that they're named for the places where they spend  
2 their summers. So that is the summering area for all  
3 of those stocks. The number of Belugas in each of  
4 those stocks, so if you go to those summering areas  
5 and you count Beluga during that time, the number is  
6 quite different. You'll see that for Western Hudson  
7 Bay there is almost 55,000 Belugas. It's the largest  
8 population of Beluga in Canada. It's a very healthy  
9 stock.

10 If you go to Eastern and you can see  
11 that it -- it got -- according the historical  
12 estimates, that population has increased. Conversely,  
13 if you go to Eastern Hudson Bay, you'll see that that  
14 population was never as large as the Western Hudson  
15 Bay Beluga. But it's now estimated to be like a third  
16 of what it was historically. And Mark's going to talk  
17 later about why that -- how that came to be.

18 In James Bay it's thought to be about  
19 10,000 Belugas, so also a pretty -- and it's also  
20 thought to be a healthy population currently. And in  
21 Ungava Bay, in all of the surveys that DFO has done,  
22 they've never seen Belugas but when they put that into  
23 a model, they estimate that there's under -- that's  
24 (indiscernible), but there's under 100 Belugas that  
25 are living in that area. Even though people see them,

1 obviously, from time to time.

2 MR. BASTERFIELD: So also, we talk  
3 about -- I'm not sure where that hissing is coming  
4 from. Okay, have to wait a moment. Are we good to  
5 proceed, Sarah? Okay, we'll proceed.

6 Another piece of research and knowledge  
7 that is quite new is the Board, after receiving a  
8 resolution from the Inuit community of the RNUK, the  
9 Board prioritized looking into the closed area in  
10 Ungava Bay, the Mucalic Estuary. The Board wanted to  
11 prioritize getting information from that area so that  
12 they could reassess whether that area should remain  
13 closed. So the Board conducted its own IK study which  
14 has just very recently been finished and the  
15 information from that is now available, and I'll give  
16 a brief summary of it. Also the RNUK and DFO  
17 collaborated for an observation and genetics study  
18 this past summer which I believe will be continuing in  
19 the future. But DFO will present results on that.

20 So the purpose of that IK case study,  
21 the Inuit Knowledge Study, was to document any new  
22 knowledge of Beluga in Southern Hudson Bay and  
23 perspectives on management. It was also to inform the  
24 upcoming NMRWB Beluga Management decisions especially  
25 regarding the area that's been closed since the 80's.

1           So we did 32 -- we interviewed 32 participants in  
2           total in Kuujjuaq, Kangiqsualujjuaq and Tasiujaq.  
3           Participants were age 31 to 90 with an average age of  
4           62 years. We did participatory mapping as well which  
5           as you can see from the picture up there involved  
6           participants drawing their knowledge on maps and then  
7           we take all those drawings and we digitize them and  
8           show them together on digital maps.

9                        So this is just a brief summary of  
10           information gained from the interviews. Generally,  
11           people noticed decreased use of (indiscernible) by  
12           Beluga in the late 70's and early 1980's. And some  
13           reasons that people talked about for that could have  
14           been increases in noise from outboard motors and  
15           shipping, and changing in harvesting practices such as  
16           chasing whales instead of waiting for them. There was  
17           very little indication from those interviews that the  
18           closing of the area, the hunt closure, had any  
19           positive effect on the Beluga population. Mostly  
20           people noticed less Belugas in the 70's and 80's, the  
21           area was closed in the mid-SC but people have not  
22           noticed any increases.

23                        There is desire for the area to be open  
24           again but most people want it be very cautious about  
25           opening the area. People wanted a locally-managed and

1 limited hunt in that area. And that was largely so  
2 that people would feel welcome in the area again for  
3 the transmission of knowledge of hunting in that area.

4 And also to allow regulation over the hunting as  
5 opposed to just closing it completely and then there's  
6 potential for poaching, if that's the case, and  
7 there's also potential for -- well, it creates -- if  
8 the hunt is limited, it creates a situation where we  
9 know what's going on and we can get information in  
10 that area. A lot of people said that they don't know  
11 very much about that area anymore because they don't  
12 go there because they're not allowed to hunt there.

13 So this onto the third part of this  
14 presentation talking about management and  
15 conservation. There will be a few parts to this part  
16 of the presentation. We'll look at historic  
17 subsistence harvesting, commercial whaling, federal  
18 management, co-management and we'll look at harvest  
19 numbers, and then we'll look at what could be coming  
20 up in the future.

21 So looking at historic subsistence  
22 harvesting, Beluga have always been harvested by  
23 Nunavik Inuit under a system where both Inuit and  
24 Beluga were sustained. Management and conservation  
25 were integrated as opposed to regulated in those days.

1 Sustainable harvest through Inuit knowledge only  
2 taking what is needed, avoiding harvesting the  
3 migration leaders and many other things which I'm not  
4 the right person to give that information on.

5 So what's changed in modern times? The  
6 Inuit population has gone up and Beluga populations,  
7 if at least they -- some Beluga populations have  
8 decreased. And, of course, there's lots of questions  
9 of why and I'll speak to that soon. Modern technology  
10 has changed and that can change hunting, firearms are  
11 more accessible, there's outboards, some noise, and  
12 people can use GPS now. And I'll point out those are  
13 all changes. They're not necessarily -- you know, I'm  
14 not saying it's the cause of any declines or anything,  
15 just pointing out changes that have happened since  
16 historic times. So many things have changed. Inuit  
17 knowledge also changes with time, so we want to look  
18 at what we can learn from the past, and what might  
19 need to change in a modern world from the past.

20 So next I want to look at the  
21 commercial whaling that occurred in several areas in  
22 Nunavik from the 1800's into the early 1900's,  
23 especially in Ungava Bay and East Hudson Bay. So most  
24 of that commercial harvesting was through the Hudson  
25 Bay company and that included much higher harvest



1 levels than we saw before that or that we've ever seen  
2 since that. So a couple of stats on how much Beluga  
3 was harvested commercially; in Ungava Bay between  
4 1860's and 1900's, at least 1,340. In East Hudson Bay,  
5 over only nine years, between 1854 and 1863, an  
6 estimated 7,875 Beluga were harvested, which is much  
7 larger than even the estimate of the population size,  
8 three times the size of today's population.

9 So an accepted theory is -- or you can  
10 call it knowledge, is that commercial whaling caused  
11 the initial declines in Beluga stocks, and that this  
12 is the reason for the historic decline. For example,  
13 the East Hudson Bay stock, it's believed before  
14 commercial whaling, it numbered about 12,500 Beluga,  
15 and that today that's down to about 3,000 Beluga. And  
16 that number 3,000 has been fairly stable since the  
17 commercial whaling; it's stayed about the same.

18 So another theory which I kind of just  
19 mentioned was that some stocks, for example, the East  
20 Hudson Bay stock, the Ungava Bay stock, have never  
21 recovered. And these stocks have been assessed as  
22 endangered. So why have they not recovered? We don't  
23 know for sure. It could be lots of reasons, climate  
24 change, increased noise pollution, it's suggested  
25 subsistence harvesting, while it didn't cause the

1 decline, could keep them from recovering. But there's  
2 countless other possibilities for why the Beluga  
3 stocks have not recovered to their old numbers.

4 So I'll jump forward primarily to  
5 around the 1980's until the early 2000's when the  
6 Beluga stocks were mostly under federal management.  
7 And DFO had the primary role in setting management  
8 regulations. So, as I mentioned, East Hudson Bay and  
9 Ungava Bay stocks were designated as endangered during  
10 that time. Some federal management and conservation  
11 measures that were put in place included the estuary  
12 closures, quota system and systems to direct the  
13 hunting towards Hudson Strait. And the purpose of  
14 that was to have less chance of harvesting the  
15 endangered East Hudson Bay or Ungava whales.

16 And, actually, I'll point out at this  
17 time, when we say East Hudson Bay, a lot of people  
18 know them as Nastapoka whales. So we can talk about  
19 some successes of those management measures, the  
20 Eastern Hudson Bay stock appears to have stayed stable  
21 under that management. Hunting was not completely  
22 closed and scientific information increased. There  
23 was harvest sampling put in place and we learned more  
24 about the stocks through that.

25 But that federal management also came

1 with challenges. Generally, there was a lot of Inuit  
2 opposition to the restrictions. It was before the  
3 offshore land claim which meant that it was primarily  
4 science-based and Inuit knowledge was not given the  
5 same weight that it is under a co-management system.

6 So moving forward again to the current  
7 time period from about 2008 to the present, this is  
8 when the land claim -- the Inuit land claim agreement  
9 or the NOKA was put in place and the NMRWB was formed.  
10 The Wildlife Board became the main decision-making  
11 body and it considers Inuit knowledge alongside  
12 science in its decision-making. The decision-makers,  
13 the Board, must have input from all rights holders and  
14 I put that map of the joint zones up again. As  
15 Kaitlin had mentioned earlier, the Cree have rights in  
16 those areas and that's why this is a joint hearing  
17 with the Eeyou Marine Region Wildlife Board.

18 So other new things under the co-  
19 management system, about six or seven years ago, the  
20 NMRWB put in place a flexible quota system, also known  
21 as the percentage system. This was sort of the  
22 Board's first attempt at making a system that fit  
23 better with the land claim, and only limited  
24 harvesting to the amount that was necessary for a  
25 conservation purpose. It had pros and cons; we've

1 heard lots about that over the last six years. It  
2 hasn't allowed harvesting at any time of year anywhere  
3 in the Nunavik Marine Region. It has also allowed the  
4 Anguvigaq to decide community allocations.

5 But there's been some cons as well.  
6 It's been a fairly difficult system to understand,  
7 especially for everyday hunters. Another con is that  
8 there's a potential that a small mistake can cause a  
9 big issue under that plan. It's also caused some  
10 regional issues where a small mistake like I talked  
11 about previously, if that happened in Hudson Bay, for  
12 example, it would still affect the hunting in Ungava  
13 Bay. So those regional issues where hunters are  
14 affecting people across Nunavik. So those were some  
15 of the issues with that system.

16 Other changes, we've implemented some  
17 Inuit knowledge-based pilot projects. There's two  
18 examples right now. One is in Kuujjuaraapik where  
19 it's fairly simple. The Kuujjuaraapik hunters said  
20 that the James Bay Beluga occupy the area near  
21 Kuujjuaraapik before they see the East Hudson Bay  
22 Belugas. And so the pilot project that was put in  
23 place was since there's no restrictions on James Bay  
24 Beluga, Kuujjuaraapik can harvest in the very early  
25 spring without quota. Now it's very early in the

1 spring and with climate change and everything, it  
2 hasn't been possible to this point for Kuujjuaraapik  
3 to actually harvest during that time. But that  
4 remains in place for a year or a season when  
5 Kuujjuaraapik has that opportunity.

6 More recently, the Hudson Strait Pilot  
7 Project was put in place. And that was based on  
8 information the Board heard three years ago that Inuit  
9 knowledge in Hudson Strait could predict the migration  
10 of the East Hudson Bay or Nastapoka Beluga versus the  
11 West Hudson Bay Beluga. And the knowledge was that  
12 the East Hudson Bay Beluga passed by first. So a  
13 system was put in place that can sort of give back the  
14 quota if the East Hudson Bay whales are successfully  
15 avoided.

16 I've just a got a few maps to give an  
17 example of that. This is a general idea of the  
18 migration route in the fall that East Hudson Bay  
19 Beluga take. And then, this is the West Hudson Bay  
20 route. So the idea is that the orange East Hudson Bay  
21 or Nastapoka Beluga migrate past first, early November  
22 approximately. And the green arrow, the West Hudson  
23 Bay Beluga, the ones that are not considered  
24 endangered, pass by later. So the idea is to avoid  
25 the Nastapoka East Hudson Bay Beluga. And then to

1 hunt and sample the West Hudson Bay not endangered  
2 Beluga. And if those samples come back showing that  
3 they are not Nastapoka Beluga, then that quota is  
4 returned to the community.

5 So over two years that pilot project  
6 was fairly successful. There was a total of 40 Cree  
7 Beluga sampled, seven came back as EHB. But under the  
8 percentage system, we would've expected 10 or 11 of  
9 those. So that's three or four less EHB-harvested  
10 than expected. And over two years, that resulted in  
11 an extra allocation of 15 Beluga to hunt in the fall  
12 or if it was transferred to the spring or summer, it's  
13 37. So it was a small but important bump in the last  
14 three-year plan.

15 So harvest numbers have also been  
16 tracked over the years. This graph shows that from  
17 the 1970's to the mid-1980's, harvest was quite high,  
18 an average of around 350 Beluga per year. And then  
19 this graph shows more recent times. The line at the  
20 top is the total harvest. The dark green bars are the  
21 East Hudson Bay harvest and the light green bars are  
22 other Beluga harvests. And the line across near the  
23 bottom is the annual total allowable take for East  
24 Hudson Bay, which is 62. So you can see usually it's  
25 been below that.

1                   You can also see that in years where  
2                   the East Hudson Bay harvest has been high, the total  
3                   harvest usually goes down a little bit. And that's  
4                   because of the quota system and largely because of the  
5                   -- what I talked about earlier that it's complicated  
6                   for some people, it's hard to manage for the everyday  
7                   hunters. Yeah, so that's the harvest over the last  
8                   little while. Kaitlin, do you have anything to add to  
9                   this stuff?

10                   So we also had the Nunavik Beluga  
11                   Working Group formed about two years ago. It's a  
12                   group that includes DFO, RNUK, Makivik and the Board  
13                   staff are there as observers as well. And the working  
14                   group prior to launching this public hearing came up  
15                   with some options that they thought that should be  
16                   talked about by the Board and that should be  
17                   considered at the public hearing in terms of where to  
18                   go with future management. One of those was to stick  
19                   with the current system, the next was small changes,  
20                   new pilot projects, improvements. The next one was  
21                   big, major, fundamental changes, possibly separating  
22                   regional Beluga hunting areas, possibly quotas in some  
23                   places but not in other places. And the last was  
24                   management system with no quota based on entirely on  
25                   regulations that do not include a quota, such as

1 seasonal closures for avoidance of certain Beluga at  
2 certain times or in certain areas.

3 So now looking into the future. We  
4 continue to want to bring in these pilot projects,  
5 these Inuit knowledge-based pilot projects into  
6 management. It's been a fairly successful way to  
7 integrate Inuit knowledge and science, and at the  
8 advantage of everybody and the Beluga. For more of  
9 those types of projects, what the Board needs is ways  
10 to local knowledge or Inuit knowledge can be used to  
11 avoid the endangered stocks or especially the  
12 Nastapoka stock. Also in the future, efforts to take  
13 pressure off the EHB or Nastapoka stock with as little  
14 impact to Inuit harvesting as possible.

15 One way that is being talked about is  
16 the idea of a Long Island Beluga Hunting Camp project.  
17 Currently, there's no -- it's assumed that the Beluga  
18 around Long Island are James Bay Beluga which do not  
19 have a quota associated with them. And so finding  
20 ways to make it convenient for Inuit to visit that  
21 area and avoid the East Hudson Bay stock is one  
22 project that lots of partners are looking at. The  
23 NMRWB will also continue to assess older federal  
24 regulations.

25 The Boards inherited federal



1 regulations when the Boards were formed, so many of  
2 those regulations may need reassessment under the land  
3 claim. And that's a big process and it's not possible  
4 to do them all at once. But one example that the  
5 Board is looking closely at now is the closed  
6 estuaries, especially the Mucalic Estuary and  
7 reassessing whether that older federal regulation is  
8 still relevant under the land claim and under the  
9 current management system.

10 So we're almost done. This public  
11 hearing will inform your decisions in the near future.  
12 It will allow the Boards to make the best decisions  
13 with the available information. And then after this  
14 hearing, the Boards will have to make those decisions.  
15 The Boards are planning to meet on Friday immediately  
16 after the hearing. Whether a decision comes out of  
17 that meeting, remains to be seen; they'll have lots to  
18 talk about. But they'll be considering how to proceed  
19 whether to update old decisions, make big changes,  
20 make small changes, those are the things that they  
21 need to hear about for the next two and a half days,  
22 and then talk about. So that's the end of the  
23 presentation. I hope that this week is very  
24 successful and I think Qajaq might have a few things  
25 to say before we break for lunch. And I believe

1 Kaitlin has a few things to say, too.

2 MS. ROBINSON: I wanted to add a couple  
3 of points to Mark's presentation. He spoke the co-  
4 management system and (indiscernible), Nunavik Inuit  
5 Land Claims Agreement is being a way that allow for  
6 wildlife management to improve Inuit knowledge. It  
7 goes beyond that and I think it's important that we  
8 remember the objectives of Article 5 of the NILCA.  
9 And because this isn't just about being able to use  
10 knowledge, the objective of the land claim was to  
11 bring decision-making back to Nunavik. And in  
12 addition to conservation considerations, to fully  
13 respect Nunavik Inuit harvesting rights. Article  
14 5.1.3, the objectives of Article 5 of the NILCA in the  
15 objectives are to create a Wildlife Management system  
16 so the Nunavik would meet (indiscernible) Region that  
17 defines and protects Nunavik Inuit harvesting rights  
18 that is governed and implemented the principles of  
19 conservation that reflects levels and patterns in  
20 character of Nunavik Inuit harvesting.

21 So it's also about how Nunavik Inuit  
22 harvest. That's the objective of wildlife management  
23 in Nunavik as well. That promotes long-term economic,  
24 social and cultural interests of Nunavik Inuit. That  
25 provides for harvesting and continued access by

1 persons other than Nunavik Inuit. That recognized the  
2 value of Inuit approaches to wildlife management, the  
3 Nunavik Inuit law of which wildlife and wildlife  
4 habitat and integrates those approaches with knowledge  
5 gained through science. It's an important word, that  
6 "integration." Integrates the management of wildlife  
7 species and wildlife habitat within a comprehensive  
8 management system. Provides for public participation  
9 and promotes public confidence in wildlife management,  
10 particularly among Nunavik Inuit. Establish the  
11 Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board that provides  
12 effective coordination with other institutions  
13 responsible for management of wildlife migrating  
14 between the Nunavik Inuit Region and other areas.

15 So this is I thought an important thing  
16 to mention because what the Boards have to look at is  
17 balancing that. Conservation, harvesting rights,  
18 harvesting practices and making sure that the  
19 management plan allows that to happen for generation  
20 and generations to come, (indiscernible) for the  
21 grandchildren. I just wanted to add that because I  
22 think it was an important point.

23 Kaitlin, do you have anything else to  
24 add? The food's not here yet, so I'll let Kaitlin  
25 finish and then we'll see if there's any questions

1 from the floor and then we'll break for lunch.

2 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So I just wanted  
3 to come back briefly to this slide, and clarify for  
4 the sake of the record that for the first ten years  
5 that harvest was recorded, the reported harvest on  
6 average between 1974 and 1983 was 490, so nearly 500  
7 Beluga within range between 723 and 296.

8 And then I just wanted to make a couple  
9 of notes that I think might be helpful for people for  
10 the hearing. One is that the information that's  
11 presented here is all available in reports and  
12 publications that are on the Board's website,  
13 including the Inuit knowledge report that Mark talked  
14 about and other Inuit knowledge reports that are  
15 (indiscernible) within. I mean, that's all part of  
16 the Board's record, all of that evidence that was  
17 mostly prepared by the Board, but other organizations  
18 also contributed reports to that.

19 Also to facilitate understanding of  
20 terminology because there's a lot of technical terms,  
21 staff prepared a list of definitions. It's here in  
22 Inuktitut and English and it includes things like non-  
23 quota limitations, what is a non-quota limitation,  
24 what is a total allowable take, what is a population,  
25 what is a stock of whales. So that that is clear and

1 certainly if people want to have side conversations,  
2 any staff members are happy to talk about that  
3 terminology to make sure that we're all talking about  
4 the same thing.

5 We also have maps printed out for the  
6 area of overlapping interest. There's maps of that if  
7 people would like that to have as a reference for them  
8 in front of them. And we apologize that there's not  
9 schedules printed for you yet. It was kind of a work  
10 in progress as you know from participating in the  
11 discussions last night. But we will work on having a  
12 version in English and Inuktitut printed for you  
13 tonight available for tomorrow. Did anybody have any  
14 questions for Mark or myself about -- yes, Billy?

15 MR. PALLISER: Yes. Just for the --  
16 when Mark was mentioning about the pilot project in  
17 Kuujjuaraapik about abundance of James Bay Beluga that  
18 are migrating around here during the early spring, he  
19 mentioned it was not -- it was a non-quota and it's a  
20 pilot project, and I think it was important to mention  
21 that the pilot project -- every pilot project that's  
22 being implemented comes with a study and the research.  
23 So every harvest has to be sampled. And I think it's  
24 important to express that because I think some other  
25 communities, for example, in Ungava Bay will have

1 suggestions in pilot projects. Thank you.

2 MS. ROBINSON: Are there any other  
3 questions from the floor? Johnny?

4 MR. OOVAUT: How many questions am I  
5 allowed to ask? One, two?

6 MS. ROBINSON: How many do you have?

7 MR. OOVAUT: Not all medics are on  
8 call. I remember about 20, 25 years ago -- Mike  
9 Hammill knows -- I had asked that question about the  
10 3,000 whales in James Bay. Now you're reporting that  
11 there's over 10,000 whales. Where did the 7,000  
12 whales suddenly come from?

13 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Is this a  
14 question for Do's presentation?

15 MS. ROBINSON: I think that comes from  
16 Do's science; perhaps if you can make note of that  
17 question and that will be answered by DFO. Is that  
18 okay?

19 MR. OOVAUT: Yeah. Well now, second  
20 question. Where did you get your historical data  
21 from? Who is the source of the historical data?

22 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Can you clarify,  
23 Johnny, which historical data? About this historical  
24 data or the -- about the Hudson Bay company harvests?

25 MR. OOVAUT: No, you mentioned Ungava

1 Bay, 400 to 500 whales and you mentioned that it was a  
2 historical data. The reason I'm asking this is  
3 because I don't trust historical data. It's been used  
4 erroneously in the past.

5 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Do you meant his  
6 slide, Johnny?

7 MR. OOVAUT: No, there was another  
8 page.

9 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Oh. That's also  
10 an excellent question. The DFO can talk about it. I  
11 have this -- the same question about how historical --  
12 -

13 MR. OOVAUT: That 400 to 500 from 1962;  
14 is that per square mile, kilometre? When you say 1962  
15 square -- 3-7 square?

16 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Those are  
17 reference to publications, but they're DFO  
18 publications. They are the ones who come up with  
19 numbers like this, so I think ---

20 MR. OOVAUT: On the line of Ungava Bay  
21 it says, 4 to 5 (indiscernible) 1962/3. What does it  
22 mean 3, No. 32-3?

23 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: It's a reference  
24 to a report that that information is from. We could  
25 put that -- we can put that in, but it's a DFO report

1 and I think Mike's probably diligently making notes to  
2 talk about how they come up with estimated historical  
3 abundance because that's a good question for DFO.

4 MS. ROBINSON: Kaitlin, are you able to  
5 put up on the screen or at least provide information  
6 on what those -- because those little numbers like the  
7 small 3, the small 8. It's -- if this was on a  
8 computer you could go to that link and it would tell  
9 you the reports that were used to get -- that talk  
10 about those numbers. So I think that's important that  
11 you get that. I think that this presentation will be  
12 made available to you and we will try to fix this  
13 slide so that you know what studies were used or  
14 looked at to get to each of those numbers.

15 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Mark and I, over  
16 lunchtime, can put all of those footnotes on a slide  
17 so that when we come back, you could see the -- those  
18 reports. They're all on the website but so that you  
19 know which number is coming from which.

20 MR. PANINGAJAK: Charlie, for the  
21 harvest there was a number of harvested Beluga; do we  
22 have any numbers on Nunavut? I want to know about  
23 Nunavut, do you have the figures? I believe we are  
24 issued also or show figures from Nunavik.

25 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: That's another



1 excellent point about information that's needed for  
2 this hearing. And there's a resource manager from  
3 DFO, Pat Hall, is with -- is here with the hearing and  
4 perhaps Pat could put together that information and  
5 present it along with the rest of Do's proposal and  
6 speak to the harvest levels in Nunavut.

7 MS. ROBINSON: Any other questions?  
8 State your name.

9 MR. MAY: James. I had a question  
10 about the Inuit and Cree zones. Here it shows the  
11 allocations with (indiscernible) and what was  
12 mentioned to us that the Cree, they don't want Inuit  
13 to go to Long Island. I don't know if that show or  
14 not but that's what the information we can find DFO is  
15 it something that is fixed. The Eeyou Marine Wildlife  
16 Board, if they have fixed that, because it was a  
17 stumbling block in the future if it fixed like that.

18 And Ungava Bay Beluga, what you  
19 mentioned, it doesn't seem to be there. There are no  
20 Ungava Beluga, never has been. I've been mentioning  
21 that since a long time. When you mentioned Ungava  
22 stop and -- but there's none. They go through Hudson  
23 Strait, they go into Ungava, we all know that. Two  
24 years ago there was lots of Beluga in Quaqtqaq area. I  
25 went, there was a lot of ice in the Quaqtqaq area and

1 last summer there was not so much Beluga, that's the  
2 way it is. The ones that pass through, they're just  
3 part of -- the stocks that are passing through to  
4 other areas and this has to be researched if --  
5 because there are no Ungava Beluga. This is something  
6 wrong.

7 MS. ROBINSON: Those are really good  
8 questions. About the overlap is I don't believe  
9 something to (indiscernible) the position of the Cree  
10 on Long Island is not something that you know about?  
11 Was that something that we can look into?

12 MR. BASTERFIELD: So from what I'm  
13 aware of, I believe it was this summer, there was a  
14 situation where there was uncertainty on whether Inuit  
15 should be using Long Island. I believe it was a  
16 jurisdictional uncertainty. And as we saw on the map  
17 earlier, it's part of the joint zone, so both Cree and  
18 Inuit have rights in that area.

19 MS. ROBINSON: I think the question  
20 about Ungava Beluga population and how that's  
21 determined to be a population, again is a really  
22 important question to ask DFO as it's based on their  
23 understanding of populations. There's food here now  
24 for lunch. And I think unless there's maybe a couple  
25 of more questions and then we'll break for lunch.

1 MS. SALAMIVA: The one next to Hela  
2 (ph) who are you, I didn't recognize you?

3 MR. AKPAHATEK: Johnny Akpahatek. The  
4 research -- we've been hearing about research every  
5 year; will this go on forever? Well how can we stop  
6 research for maybe four or five years and do proper  
7 research again to see if there's change? Has anybody  
8 thought -- if nobody's thought about it, it's an idea  
9 I have.

10 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. There are no  
11 -- there's one more. After Johnny, Jimmy.

12 MR. ARNAITUK: Since 1995 since the  
13 cold has started (indiscernible) harvesting we want to  
14 know where the stock was coming from -- the Beluga  
15 that was caught in (indiscernible) since 1985. We  
16 want to have that information, so we want to know  
17 where the stock -- which stock we've been harvesting  
18 from.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: Jimmy?

20 MR. JOHANNES: For the decision-makers,  
21 I have a question. If someone from Nunavik gets  
22 hungry and because they are not allowed to harvest  
23 Beluga sometimes we get hungry, how would you think  
24 about that person from Nunavik gets hungry because of  
25 high cost of food in the stores? We don't have money

1 with -- on us all the time. If it gets -- if somebody  
2 gets hungry and there is Beluga available and for the  
3 decision-makers, how would you think about this?  
4 Should we keep them hungry because we keep hearing  
5 research issues?

6 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Jimmy. Billy  
7 Dan?

8 MR. MAY: Thank you. The Belugas  
9 migrate wherever routes they wish to go. And if  
10 Ungava Bay Beluga, if that Beluga decides not to go to  
11 Ungava, it will not go. And it's been mentioned that  
12 there are 32 Beluga but we've been seeing much, much  
13 more. This is not a real reality because we see more  
14 than 32. This report is wrong. Animal can go  
15 wherever they want, there are no laws for them and  
16 they go to wherever the area they wish to go. And  
17 then, so that when they see Beluga around the Ungava  
18 area, they consider it Ungava Beluga.

19 So I'm in Kuujjuaraapik do I -- am I  
20 considered to be a person from Kuujjuaraapik? No, I'm  
21 from Ungava. We don't want to be prevented any more.

22 When you are designated to a certain area and when  
23 the ice are on the way, even up to the point of --  
24 even to the closing time, you never feel those  
25 situation. We were once asked to leave from the

1 community before we even harvested. We get stuck on  
2 the ice, our boats get damage, some almost lose their  
3 lives without ever being assisted. We don't go out  
4 hunting for Beluga just for fun; we go out hunting to  
5 survive, to get some food. So you need to consider  
6 that because you are in the decision-making.

7 These quota system has created a  
8 negative because as soon as we see a Beluga before the  
9 hunting season is closed, we try to harvest them. So  
10 it has taken away -- it make us take whatever we can  
11 while we can. And that's not Inuit way. That's  
12 western way. And 32 Beluga, that's B.S. That's total  
13 B.S. We see more than 32 Belugas a year and the next  
14 community, the next community, how can you put on a  
15 number when you don't know. DFO doesn't know; they  
16 don't even know what Ungava Bay Beluga is. They don't  
17 even know the difference between a EHB and WHB. When  
18 we can, we can, with our eyes we can tell, but  
19 whatever we say doesn't matter because we didn't go to  
20 school. That is wrong.

21 MS. ROBINSON: It's very important  
22 that we hear your thoughts on this. I wanted to just  
23 make sure if you had questions about this  
24 presentation, you had an opportunity. We want to get  
25 to lunch so that we can get presentations and your

1 opportunity to ask. And I'm not going to continue  
2 with questions, and the food is here. So unless it's  
3 a point of clarifying and asking Mark and Kaitlin  
4 about their presentation, I think comments can wait  
5 until your time tomorrow. And then you'll have a  
6 chance to ask questions of other people. That will  
7 (indiscernible) to lunch.

8 MS. SALAMIVA: It's an opportunity for  
9 you to ask questions now of the presentation. And you  
10 will have an opportunity to ask questions tomorrow,  
11 too. For example, when one presentation is done,  
12 you'll have an opportunity to ask questions. For  
13 example, the staff of NMRWB did their presentation and  
14 if you have questions to them, it's time now. And  
15 others will be -- we'll save it for tomorrow. And  
16 after lunch, Makivik will do their presentation.  
17 James?

18 MR. MAY: I just want to mention this  
19 item as a question yesterday about the sampling kits.  
20 He was requesting to see the result of those sample  
21 kits and it was not shown. Some were missing and  
22 Johnny also has a similar question. So we really need  
23 to see the results of those sample kits. LNUK will  
24 have an opportunity to talk tomorrow and before their  
25 presentation, I want to see those results of sample

1 kits.

2 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, James.

3 Billy-Boy?

4 MR. PALLISER: Just to support what  
5 James said. When the NMRWB tried to decide it's a  
6 good opportunity to -- the traditional knowledge was  
7 worked on and it's a good way to keep the population  
8 normal. And the Long Island is joint zone by the Cree  
9 and Inuit. We are friends with Crees since a long  
10 time. So I don't worry about that (indiscernible)  
11 because it will be beneficial to Cree and Inuit but  
12 sometimes there's some obstacles. But I know we can  
13 manage it.

14 MS. SALAMIVA: Noah, do you have a  
15 question to Kaitlin?

16 MR. ETOK: Yes.

17 MS. SALAMIVA: Go ahead.

18 MR. ETOK: My name is Noah Etok, LNUK  
19 of Kangirsuk. You had a report about the fall  
20 migration but we didn't see much about spring  
21 migration. So I would like to know which one are  
22 migrating in the springtime and in the fall. I want  
23 to see more information about the spring migration.

24 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Noah. Mark  
25 and Kaitlin, do you have answers to their questions?

1 MR. BASTERFIELD: That's a good point  
2 for clarification, Noah. So the reason we showed the  
3 fall migration was to describe the Hudson Strait Pilot  
4 Project which happens in the fall. And the reason is  
5 because the Inuit knowledge told us that there was a  
6 difference in the timing of the migration in the fall.  
7 We didn't hear that about spring, so that's why we  
8 weren't showing the spring migration. But from what  
9 we understand, the migration in the spring goes the  
10 other way with the East Hudson Bay, West Hudson Bay  
11 populations but we can't tell -- we can't tell the  
12 difference between the populations on timing of the  
13 migration in the spring.

14 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Mark. We'll  
15 adjourn for lunch while the food is still warm. Have  
16 a good lunch and there are two houses available if you  
17 wish to move from your -- from the place where you're  
18 staying at. There are two rooms and they have Wi-Fi  
19 and television. Because people want -- has been  
20 asking to move and if you want to go out for lunch,  
21 Shirley is available to drive you. Be back at 1:30;  
22 enjoy your lunch everybody.

23  
24 --- LUNCHEON RECESS  
25



1 MS. ROBINSON: Welcome back from lunch.  
2 We're ready to begin with the presentations from  
3 different institutions. We are going to start with a  
4 presentation from Makivik. When Makivik concludes,  
5 we'll give an opportunity, I'll go around the table  
6 and each organization will have a chance to ask  
7 questions. Makivik, if you're ready to proceed, the  
8 floor is yours.

9 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you. Thank  
10 you for welcoming us here in Kuujjuaraapik. And the  
11 reason why we are here is a major issue to our people.  
12 I would like to apologize first. I will read my  
13 presentation in English to make sure that people  
14 understand Inuit comments for many years, that they  
15 need for many years, because Inuit wish to eliminate  
16 quotas so that's my basis of my presentation and why  
17 we want to do it that way. So I apologize it will be  
18 in English. We have an interpreter.

19 MS. ROBINSON: Adamie, it doesn't look  
20 like the translation is working. It's all static-ey.  
21 Can we do a test soon? I think we're good to go.

22 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: I'm going to start  
23 over. Thank you. Like I mentioned that our  
24 presentation concerning Beluga, our submission to  
25 NMRWB to be reviewed by them. And also usually it's

1 the only DFO who takes the decision. I would want  
2 them to be very attentive for the needs of Inuit  
3 because I will be presenting about the needs that had  
4 history from the past. I will be reading them in  
5 English. We have interpreters so you will be able to  
6 listen to the interpreter reading. I will go directly  
7 to my presentation without explaining what Makivik is.

8  
9 I'm reading our submissions concerning  
10 the modification of the total allowable take on non-  
11 quota limitations for Beluga in the Nunavik Marine  
12 Region. As I stated, I will be skipping the first  
13 portion that explains what Makivik is; most of you  
14 already know what Makivik is and its mandates. But  
15 considering Makivik's mandates, objectives and  
16 history, it is a unique position to comment on the  
17 means in which management of Beluga whales is achieved  
18 in the Nunavik Marine Region and its impact on Nunavik  
19 Inuit.

20 The overview of our submission: Beluga  
21 management in Nunavik has been a contentious issue for  
22 decades dating back to the first imposition of harvest  
23 quotas during the 1980's, quota-based management of  
24 Beluga whales in Nunavik has been decried by Nunavik  
25 Inuit from day one. While the system has yield

1 positive results with regards to the number of Beluga  
2 summering in Eastern Hudson Bay, its negative impact  
3 on Nunavik Inuit indicates that overall the system has  
4 failed. In light of this and considering the current  
5 state of affairs, Makivik will use this opportunity to  
6 examine the quota-based management regime and will  
7 provide recommendations that seek to empower Inuit  
8 communities in managing a resource that is central to  
9 their culture, value, and food systems.

10 Successes and failures of the current  
11 management system: The debate around Beluga quotas  
12 has taken many turns since the concept was first  
13 introduced to Nunavik during the SC. And several  
14 attempts have been made to improve and strengthen the  
15 system. Throughout this time, various forms of co-  
16 management have been attempted, for example, the  
17 Hunting, Fishing, Trapping Coordinating Committee,  
18 LUMAK Committee, the Wildlife Board, Nunavik Beluga  
19 Working Group, as a means of bridging a gap between  
20 the western scientific approach, the Beluga management  
21 and the Inuit perspectives about management and food  
22 security. Despite these efforts, there continues to  
23 be a major communication gap between Inuit and  
24 government with regards to Beluga whales. This must  
25 be addressed rapidly and with the utmost priority.

1                   In Makivik's view, a successful  
2                   management system must achieve a balance between  
3                   conservation of a species, the socio-economic cultural  
4                   impacts that results from it, as well as the  
5                   preservation and continuance of harvesting rights.  
6                   From a species conservation perspective, arguments can  
7                   be made that the management regime has, at least in  
8                   the case of Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, been relatively  
9                   successful at meeting objectives on which decisions  
10                  have been made -- have been based. That is, setting  
11                  harvest limits that will maintain a stable or  
12                  increasing population of Eastern Hudson Bay Belugas.

13                  Aerial surveys of summering stocks were  
14                  conducted in '85, '93, '01, '04, '08, 2011 and 2015.  
15                  The results of these surveys are generally associated  
16                  with a wide confidence interval, but overall suggests  
17                  Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga initially declined despite  
18                  harvest restrictions but have been increasing in  
19                  recent years such that the current population estimate  
20                  is similar to the estimate from 1985, and the stock is  
21                  relatively healthy.

22                  The same conclusion cannot be drawn  
23                  with regards to the socio-cultural impacts that Beluga  
24                  management has on Nunavik Inuit. The comparison of  
25                  the original management plan from 1986 with the recent

1 2017 decision reveals that much of the original  
2 management framework remains intact despite the  
3 concerns raised by Nunavik Inuit. And the most  
4 changes which have occurred have revolved around  
5 regulating the number of Belugas that can be hunted by  
6 each community. While the Wildlife Board has made  
7 attempts to shift some of the decision-making  
8 responsibilities to the LNUKs and RNUKs in recent  
9 years, their role has been limited to one of  
10 implementation rather than decision-making. This  
11 holds even though communities have essentially been  
12 repeating the same message to management authorities  
13 for several decades, namely, the quota system has  
14 eroded core Inuit values, prevented transmission of  
15 knowledge, negatively affected food security and  
16 pitted communities against one another.

17 The events that led up to the  
18 following, the closure of the 2019 Beluga harvest  
19 season are a testament to the level of dissatisfaction  
20 currently felt by Nunavik Inuit with regards to the  
21 Beluga management process. Several decades of Beluga  
22 management by Canada has had only modest biological  
23 impacts, whereas at the cultural and socio-economic  
24 impacts on Inuit have been devastating.

25 Nunavik Inuit self-determination: In

1 2019, Canada has signed an MOU with Nunavik Inuit to  
2 support the advancement of Nunavik Inuit exercise of  
3 self-determination and governance in Nunavik. Through  
4 this process, Nunavik Inuit are preparing to establish  
5 a new governance structure that is based on Inuit law,  
6 values, identity, culture and language. Canada has  
7 agreed to discuss and transfer of authorities and  
8 powers to the Nunavik Inuit over the following subject  
9 matters: environment; food security; renewable  
10 resources; offshore and governance over oceans and  
11 wildlife management and harvesting.

12 Beluga management as well as management  
13 over wildlife and harvesting generally, should  
14 ultimately be transferred back to Nunavik Inuit  
15 through an exercise of their self-determination. The  
16 current process of determining a new management plan  
17 in Nunavik Marine Region provides an excellent  
18 opportunity to move towards this goal. Consequently,  
19 Makivik Corporation recommends the abandonment of a  
20 management system that is focused primarily on harvest  
21 quotas imposed by DFO in favour of an Inuit-led  
22 regime.

23 On equal treatment of Nunavut and  
24 Nunavik Inuit: Under the existing management system,  
25 every community in Nunavik is subject to the

1 imposition of harvest quotas as a means of limiting  
2 the take of Eastern Hudson Bay Belugas. Quotas are  
3 not imposed on Nunavut Inuit from Sanikiluaq who  
4 harvest the same summering stocks. Instead, DFO has  
5 deemed that a set of low quota bylaws sufficiently  
6 limits threats posed by Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, and  
7 that that there is no need to further regulate their  
8 hunting activities. Makivik is not refuting these  
9 values of this approach and agrees that there is  
10 sufficient scientific rationale to support this  
11 position. Instead, we argue that this line of thought  
12 should be extended to Nunavik thereby excluding most  
13 communities from the quota system.

14 Eastern Hudson Bay Belugas, a history  
15 of misguided efforts and inadequate science: Nunavik  
16 Inuit have been subject to a misguided efforts by DFO  
17 on the basis of inadequate science for too long.  
18 Nunavik Inuit have faced hardship over the past  
19 several decades due largely to a perceived risk of  
20 extirpation of the Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga because  
21 of over-harvesting. Management decisions have also  
22 aimed to protect the Ungava Bay summering stock but  
23 these will be treated elsewhere. Most Nunavik  
24 communities also have access to the Western Hudson Bay  
25 and/or James Bay stocks within their traditional

1 hunting areas at some point of the year.

2 In short, should the Eastern Hudson Bay  
3 summering stocks become extirpated due to over-  
4 harvesting, and should there be no recolonization of  
5 these areas, then only communities within Hudson Bay  
6 arc, primarily Inukjuak, Umiujaq and Kuujjuaraapik,  
7 would no longer have regular access to Beluga within  
8 their traditional hunting areas. While this is a  
9 narrow take on the situation, it reflects the views  
10 that have been expressed by many hunters who  
11 questioned the need for a quota system given the  
12 abundance of whales passing by their communities  
13 during migration periods.

14 The closure of estuaries has also been  
15 a long-standing point of contention for many Inuit.  
16 In the case of Hudson's Bay closures were initially  
17 Inuit-led initiatives to reduce disturbance of Beluga.

18 In time, the closures became regulatory in nature and  
19 their purpose changed from one of harvest reduction.  
20 There has been several requests made by Inuit to  
21 resume harvesting activities within these closed areas  
22 but these have usually been presented with caution.  
23 Inuit are aware that Beluga are more vulnerable within  
24 these estuaries. DFO has continuously been opposed to  
25 the reopening of the estuaries for harvesting.



1 For the Eastern Hudson Bay, this is  
2 rationalized by the fact that family groups are more  
3 susceptible of harvesting and that large numbers could  
4 be taken in a single hunting event. The position  
5 taken by DFO regarding the Eastern Hudson Bay closures  
6 is highly patronizing. Makivik strongly encourage a  
7 regulatory framework that allows Nunavik Inuit to  
8 determine if, when and how Belugas should be harvested  
9 in the Little Whale and Nastopoka Estuaries.

10 Regardless, the quota system also  
11 continues to result in misplaced enforcement actions.

12 The latest example came with the closure of the fall  
13 2019 Beluga hunt. Despite positive collaborations  
14 between DFO, the RNUK and Makivik to extend the  
15 season, a number of illegal hunts occurred. In all  
16 likelihood, these posed very little threat to Eastern  
17 Hudson Bay Beluga and taking measures to limit such  
18 actions in the future is likely to have little  
19 positive impact on Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga. Any new  
20 measures must seek to address this issue and should  
21 make the most effective use of existing resources.

22 Ungava Bay: For Ungava Bay, the  
23 closure has been justified by the need to protect the  
24 Ungava Bay summering stock. There is little evidence  
25 that this population continues to exist and based on

1 the Wildlife Board's Inuit Knowledge Study, it appears  
2 that the region is used mostly by transient whales.  
3 Recent genetic evidence suggests low numbers of  
4 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga being harvested in the  
5 region. Yet, little effort has been made to explore  
6 alternatives to quota-based management in these areas.  
7 Makivik strongly recommends adopting an Inuit-led  
8 strategy for Ungava Bay.

9 With regards to the closed area of  
10 Mucalic Estuary, hunters that were consulted during  
11 the Wildlife Board's Inuit Study, appeared to propose  
12 a careful reopening of the area coupled with a harvest  
13 sampling program aimed to determine whether Ungava Bay  
14 continues to occupy this region or whether they have  
15 been extirpated. Makivik supports this approach but  
16 reiterates the need for all co-management partners to  
17 support a relevant LNUK in implementing these  
18 decisions.

19 Regional strategies: Because the  
20 impacts of decline in the Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga  
21 population will have the greatest impact on the  
22 communities of Inukjuak, Umiujaq and Kuujjuaraapik,  
23 Makivik considered it important that they be fully  
24 involved in determining the level of risk that is  
25 acceptable and the corresponding action that should be

1 taken. If it is determined that strict harvesting  
2 limits must be imposed onto these communities, they  
3 must be fully involved in determining what those  
4 levels should be and what they are intended to  
5 achieve. For the rest of Nunavik, alternatives to a  
6 quota, example harvesting season, closures, etcetera,  
7 which transfer harvest pressures onto Western Hudson  
8 Bay or James Bay Beluga, or otherwise limit risk of  
9 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga. Limit on number of whales  
10 taken per hunting event should be implemented.

11 The precautionary approach framework:  
12 The application of alleged precautionary approach at  
13 the expense of Inuit rights has been another grave  
14 concern. When previous Minister of Fisheries and  
15 Oceans, Dominique Leblanc accepted the Wildlife Board's  
16 previous total allowable take and non-quota limitation  
17 decision in May 2017, he asked that the co-management  
18 partners work together to explore that the use of the  
19 precautionary approach decision framework. Makivik is  
20 aware of the work that has been done by DFO science to  
21 determine what a precautionary approach framework  
22 could look like for Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga  
23 including an exploration of various approaches to  
24 determine the limit reference level and precautionary  
25 reference level.

1                   However, this work has not succeeded in  
2                   convincing Makivik that a strict adherence to the  
3                   precautionary approach is compatible with Nunavik  
4                   Inuit Land Claim Agreement. Specifically, while the  
5                   precautionary approach could possibly be considered  
6                   under the principle of conservation, under NILCA  
7                   5.1.5, its application does not consider Inuit  
8                   knowledge nor can it be viewed as respecting and  
9                   reflecting Inuit approaches to wildlife management.

10                   Furthermore, if DFO is committing to  
11                   apply a precautionary approach framework to satisfy  
12                   international commitments that the federal government  
13                   has made, then Nunavik Inuit should have been given  
14                   preferential treatment during consultations as per  
15                   NILCA 5.8.2. Makivik is not aware of any such  
16                   consultation taking place. Given that, Makivik is  
17                   opposed to the adoption of a precautionary approach  
18                   framework on Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga.

19                   Negative impacts on Nunavik Inuit:  
20                   Makivik's position is that the relationship between  
21                   DFO and Nunavik Inuit has eroded so severely in recent  
22                   years that any gains that can be made towards  
23                   conservation of Beluga whales must be initiated and  
24                   carried out by Nunavik Inuit. Ever since the first  
25                   management plan was implemented, the voluntary

1 compliance of Nunavik Inuit has been the primary  
2 driver of Beluga conservation in Nunavik. They have  
3 had to bear the brunt of costs, financial and  
4 cultural, and risk associated to Beluga conservation  
5 efforts without sufficient support from DFO. These  
6 include costs and risks associated with traveling to  
7 distant hunting locations and with local management  
8 efforts.

9 The role of DFO has largely been  
10 limited to data acquisition and approval, enforcement  
11 of management decision. There has been little, no  
12 dialogue established with hunters. DFO has instead  
13 relied heavily on Makivik, the RNUK and more recently  
14 the Wildlife Board to relay the results of scientific  
15 research back to hunters, including the result of  
16 genetic analysis that are central to previous  
17 management plans and which are provided by the  
18 hunters.

19 The erosion of harvesting skills and  
20 loss of traditional values is both a perceived result  
21 of the management system and one of the factors that  
22 extirpates the frictions that are currently felt  
23 between DFO and Nunavik Inuit. The quota leads many  
24 hunters to feel an urgency to harvest what quota has  
25 been afforded by their community before it runs out.

1           Consequently, the hunt is more aggressive than in the  
2           past. This has resulted in new hunting techniques  
3           some of which may be more stressful to the Beluga and  
4           which may lead to more stricken lost whales. In some  
5           cases, there is more wastage or less sharing of the  
6           catch. In all cases, Inuit culture and traditions are  
7           being affected, issues such as reducing wastage,  
8           better hunting techniques, improved stewardship,  
9           etcetera. These issues can only be addressed by  
10          local, regional level and involvement by government to  
11          resolve them is inappropriate.

12                            Implementing a major shift in Beluga  
13          management: This fundament shift in roles and  
14          responsibility is needed to turn the page on a  
15          relationship that has soured over several decades to  
16          the point where it is severely broken. Even though  
17          DFO scientists and managers will be inclined to  
18          distrust and dismiss the changes we propose as being  
19          ineffective means of ensuring Beluga conservation,  
20          they will likely be prepared to admit that the current  
21          system is not working. Makivik believes that there  
22          has never been a better time to transfer  
23          responsibility over the resources to the Inuit than  
24          the present. While Makivik intends to implement a new  
25          government models for Nunavik, the recommendations

1 made here within must be implemented via existing  
2 frameworks and by the institutions and organizations  
3 that are currently mandated to play a role in Beluga  
4 management in Nunavik.

5 To that end, the RNUK and LNUK must  
6 play a primary role in determining the most acceptable  
7 and effective approaches to Beluga management. It  
8 must be given the means to properly implement these  
9 decisions at the local, regional level. Specifically,  
10 this means enabling them to fully undertake the roles  
11 and responsibilities afforded to them under the NILCA,  
12 including the regulation of harvesting practices and  
13 techniques used of non-quota limitations through  
14 implementation of bylaws. Makivik will support these  
15 efforts and it trusts that the Government of Canada  
16 will recognize that support offered to these  
17 organizations in the past has been vastly insufficient  
18 to allow them for proper implementation.

19 When implementing this approach, all  
20 organizations presently involved in the management of  
21 Beluga, Makivik, DFO, RNUK, LNUK, must come together  
22 to determine which indicators should be monitored to  
23 track the successes of this Inuit-led management  
24 effort. Given the history of Beluga management in  
25 Nunavik, we expect that there will be a learning curve

1 associated to the implementation of an Inuit-led  
2 management. It is therefore important that all  
3 organizations agree what is acceptable or not. The  
4 elements that should be monitored, reviewed and the  
5 timeline for doing so.

6 While Makivik establishes an Inuit-led  
7 management regime, DFO, the Wildlife Board and the  
8 Kativik Regional Government's Uumajuit Wardens program  
9 can still play an important role. However, it will be  
10 imperative to reassess the roles of each organization  
11 and confirm that they are given the capacity to fulfil  
12 the tasks that they are expected -- that are expected  
13 of them.

14 Among these deliberations, the role of  
15 enforcement in Beluga management and the means by  
16 which it is achieved must be discussed at length.  
17 While DFO fisheries officers have made efforts and  
18 increased their role in education and communication,  
19 these are overshadowed by the enforcement actions or  
20 lack thereof, as the case may be. The Uumajuit  
21 Wardens continue to be underfunded, have a limited  
22 mandate and are not fully integrated in Beluga  
23 management.

24 The RNUKs and LNUKs have a central role  
25 to play in determining how the hunts should or should



1 not be conducted yet have no formal role for  
2 enforcement beyond enforcement or basic needs level.  
3 An in-depth review of all aspects of enforcement is  
4 required. This should not be limited to roles and  
5 responsibilities, but also to the objectives of  
6 enforcement and the most appropriate means by which it  
7 can be achieved.

8 As well, it is imperative that DFO  
9 science be more actively involved in addressing data  
10 gaps and returning information to communities and co-  
11 management partners in a timely manner. The research  
12 schedule for Nunavik has been almost entirely decided  
13 by DFO, with little input from Nunavik Inuit. Past  
14 efforts show that it is possible to collaboratively  
15 identify research needs and agree on the means by  
16 which we can address -- can be addressed. DFO must  
17 consider investing more heavily in Nunavik-based  
18 research and must make our region a priority. For  
19 example, the management structures in place since 2014  
20 have been based heavily on genetics information, yet  
21 there is a major lag in analysis response time from  
22 DFO and there has been little concerted effort to  
23 fully review the available genetic information, gaps  
24 therein and means of addressing them. This  
25 information could have major and immediate implication

1 for Beluga management.

2 Summary and concluding remarks:

3 Nunavik Inuit have clearly and loudly expressed that  
4 their frustrations with the quota-based management of  
5 Beluga whales in Nunavik have hit a tipping point.  
6 Many are no longer willing to passively abide by  
7 whatever measures the minister has deemed best to  
8 conserve Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga at the expense of  
9 Inuit harvesting opportunities. These decisions have  
10 a proven track record of damaging and threatens the  
11 Inuit values and tradition that Inuit have clearly  
12 expressed they must be in charge of their path  
13 forward.

14 Makivik fully supports this position  
15 and recommends moving away immediately from a quota-  
16 based management system wherever communities can offer  
17 alternative means to effect a conservation purpose.  
18 The local and regional organizations mandated to  
19 regulate the hunting practices and techniques must be  
20 empowered to do so. The timing is ripe for a bold and  
21 significant shift away from a quota-based management  
22 and Makivik is more concerned that a failure to do so  
23 may be more damaging to Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga in  
24 the long-run than it is of a short-term risk  
25 associated with implementing a new, Inuit-led,

1 approach. Thank you very much.

2 MS. SALAMIVA: There will be a question  
3 period starting from here. And if you don't have a  
4 question, it's up to you. So we'll start from here  
5 and around the table.

6 MR. DIONNE: Okay, is it working?  
7 Yeah? Okay, thank you, Makivik for this presentation.  
8 On our side, we would like to ---

9 MS. ROBINSON: Can you please introduce  
10 yourself?

11 MR. DIONNE: Oh, sorry. Sorry for  
12 that, yes. I'm Felix. I'm from DFO, I'm an  
13 Aboriginal Fisheries Coordinator. So my question for  
14 Makivik is that we heard your proposition as a one of  
15 a decentralized model. The current system actually  
16 shares roles between many partners. So we would like  
17 to know if you can describe the way it will work when  
18 there will be interactions with other LNUKs and other  
19 organizations? And we would like to know what is your  
20 estimate of an appropriate timeframe to complete such  
21 transformation so the hunt season can work  
22 efficiently? Thank you.

23 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: I will respond to  
24 him right away. For the four of us, I will do it and  
25 our assistant will do the response. Mark O'Connor and

1 the elders.

2 MS. SALAMIVA: So when one of you is  
3 ready to answer Felix.

4 MR. GILBERT: Gregor Gilbert, Makivik.  
5 I think Felix, in response to your first question  
6 about what the interactions between LNUKs would look  
7 like, it really -- the structure is already there in  
8 that there's the RNUK that provides that forum for  
9 those interactions. I don't think it's necessarily  
10 Makivik's place to say how the interactions would be  
11 born out like in concrete examples. That's really up  
12 for the RNUK and the LNUK's to decide how they would  
13 best see themselves working together. You know,  
14 certainly the NILCA provides the base and the  
15 structure under which that can operate, but the  
16 mechanics of how each LNUK would work with other  
17 LNUK's and how they would interact with the RNUK is  
18 something that I think is solely under their purview.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: When you ask your  
20 questions please, state your name. It has to be  
21 recorded.

22 MR. O'CONNOR: And in terms of a  
23 timeline, I think as we said during the -- sorry, Mark  
24 O'Connor, Assistant Director for the Department of  
25 Environment Wildlife and Resource Research. So as

1 said in the submission, I think we see this -- the  
2 need for this shift to happen right away to empower  
3 the LNUKs and, I think if not right away, then as soon  
4 as possible thereafter. We think that everything --  
5 the tools are in place, it's a matter of making sure  
6 everyone is capable and has capacity to use them. And  
7 essentially, yeah, as Gregor said, everything's there,  
8 it's a matter of putting it in place and opening or  
9 not opening the season, I mean, is a DFO decision but  
10 is also a matter of trusting those structures to work  
11 or not.

12 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: For me, Adamie  
13 Alaku. With the same question, like I mentioned with  
14 the presentation, there has to be a lot of funding  
15 provided for the decision-makers for the LNUKs and  
16 RNUKs to be the decision-makers. Everything will have  
17 to be properly worked with and I'll work with you  
18 because it's getting behind. And research that gets  
19 done, it takes too long to hear the report. And as to  
20 where they had come from so we have to work with you.

21 That's what we planned but for the decision of  
22 management and for the Inuit to be part of the  
23 decision and with this for us to move forward to make  
24 regional authority. We would like to go away from the  
25 existing management practices concerning Beluga.

1 MS. SALAMIVA: Are you done, Felix? So  
2 we can go to David from NTI.

3 MR. LEE: Thank you.

4  
5 --- INTERRUPTION RE TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES

6  
7 MS. SALAMIVA: David Lee  
8 (indiscernible).

9 MR. LEE: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
10 Nunavik Tunnagavit has no questions for Makivik  
11 Corporation.

12 MS. SALAMIVA: Next one, please state  
13 your name.

14 MR. ARRAGUTAINAQ: Lucassie  
15 Arragutainaq, no questions.

16 MR. ANNANACK: Willie Annanack,  
17 Kangiqsualujjuaq. I don't have questions, we just  
18 want you to know that in our communities we need to  
19 harvest nearer to our community because we have to  
20 travel far. If this is going to continue, we would  
21 like to get support because it's very expensive  
22 because if you have to fly over ---

23 MS. SALAMIVA: Please ask questions to  
24 Makivik, please. Your community concerns will be for  
25 another day. So if you don't have questions for

1 Makivik ---

2 MR. ANNANACK: I just want to mention  
3 our community's concern.

4 MS. SALAMIVA: Noah? Johnny, you  
5 raised your hand? Thank you.

6 MR. OOVAUT: I used to be a chairperson  
7 before with the Board. I'm asking Makivik concerning  
8 the NILCA because -- was trampled on by the government  
9 and Nunavut and if there are things not going straight  
10 -- going good with the Board because it seems to be  
11 more talking about facing the government, and if we  
12 ever have to go to court to have funding. It's true  
13 when agreements are broken like the NILCA, sometimes  
14 there are disagreements, sometimes we have to take  
15 others to court. Right now, we're in court with the  
16 federal government because if we see something wrong,  
17 as Makivik we have to take action. We speak for our  
18 people for Nunavik Inuit.

19 And if we would go through court, we  
20 would be able to go to court for them, depending on  
21 the issue. And it would be good that Makivik would be  
22 the one to go to take somebody to court if something  
23 went wrong. I've tried to ask. I wasn't getting any  
24 response for hunters who went over their limit. They  
25 were going to take them to court and I wasn't getting

1 response from the federal. So I would ask Makivik to  
2 do that for us and for the NILCA, and with the DFO,  
3 they can make plans or close seasons for harvesting,  
4 if they see fit. Like for Nastapoka, Little Whale  
5 River, they're still closed and with DFO they seem to  
6 be the only one to make the final decision. So I  
7 would ask Makivik to look into that; I'm asking you if  
8 you could do that?

9 MS. SALAMIVA: Some people are missing  
10 some comments, so something has to be fixed again. So  
11 you have to repeat -- will have to repeat. Yes, you  
12 will be responded after a break.

13  
14 --- TECHNICAL BREAK

15  
16 MS. ROBINSON: All right. Welcome back  
17 from our break. Before the break, Johnny Oovaut had  
18 questions for Makivik. Do you want the questions  
19 repeated? So if you can repeat your questions, so we  
20 make sure everybody's got the translation and  
21 everything going. And then Makivik can answer.

22 MR. OOVAUT: Okay, thank you. My name  
23 is Johnny Oovaut. I'm a former chairman of the  
24 Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board. My question was  
25 concerning -- I'm forgetting my questions. Concerning



1 the Inuit -- Nunavik Inuit rights. When the NILCA is  
2 violated, will Makivik inquire and make sure that the  
3 NILCA Agreement is being respected because we had  
4 cases where the federal government and Nunavut  
5 violated our rights. But in spite of the NILCA --  
6 Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement -- they went ahead  
7 without the full consent of the Nunavik Marine Region  
8 Wildlife Board.

9 The other question was concerning when  
10 I was chairman, I used to ask the question about the  
11 ten hunters whose charges had been stayed. And when I  
12 asked those questions many times, my questions were  
13 ignored. Is it -- does Makivik have the power to  
14 pursue answers when they blatantly ignore my questions  
15 and seem to refuse to answer my questions?

16 What was the third one? I'm sorry, I'm  
17 forgetting my questions. Oh, yes. In the NILCA  
18 agreement, it talks about estuaries -- it talks about  
19 the NMRWB having the power to open or close estuaries.  
20 How come those estuaries are still closed and does the  
21 NILCA have the power to override the decisions of the  
22 federal government to close these areas because of the  
23 NILCA agreement? Okay, that was it.

24 MR. GILBERT: Makivik, Gregor Gilbert,  
25 Director of the Department of Environment, Wildlife

1 and Research for Makivik Corporation. Just, I guess  
2 I'll try and answer all three questions, Johnny. For  
3 you last question regarding the areas that are closed.

4 Yes, the Wildlife Board does have the authority to  
5 make decisions on whether or not those areas should  
6 reopened. That being said, that decision, like all of  
7 the decisions that the Wildlife Board makes, goes to  
8 the applicable minister.

9 The reason that they haven't been  
10 reopened at this point in time, is that the Wildlife  
11 Board has not made a decision on it. And the closures  
12 of things like Little Whale and Nastapoka estuaries  
13 are included in the federal marine mammal regulations.

14 And there's also a section in the NILCA that says  
15 that any of the acts or regulations that were in force  
16 at the time that NILCA came into force, are going to  
17 be considered as having been made as decisions by the  
18 Wildlife Board until such time the Wildlife Board  
19 makes a new decision on them.

20 So I think if LNUKs and RNUKs feel  
21 strongly that those areas should be opened, that --  
22 and the people in Makivik, it's included in our  
23 submission that we feel it's time that these areas be  
24 reopened. And that's I think on the table for the  
25 Wildlife Board to make a decision on.

1                   In terms of Makivik upholding the  
2 integrity of the Nunavik Inuit Lands Claim Agreement,  
3 I think the answer is fairly clear-cut there, that,  
4 yes, of course, Makivik would be willing to go to  
5 court to protect the integrity of the Agreement. We  
6 have done so in the past, most recently with the South  
7 Hudson Bay Polar Bear judicial review. And I don't  
8 think that, you know, there's any doubt that we would  
9 be prepared to do it again.

10                   I will say that each individual  
11 circumstance is somewhat different and we would need  
12 to do a legal analysis of the pros and cons of doing  
13 it. Sometimes you have to pick your battles and I  
14 think we need to do that kind of assessment before I'd  
15 say definitely that we would take court action.

16                   And, finally, in terms of the charges  
17 that were stayed against the ten Nunavik hunters, we  
18 can push at a political level to get further  
19 clarification on that. I just -- I think I understood  
20 that when you said "they" when you're were talking and  
21 when you were posing your question, you weren't in  
22 fact referring to Makivik but instead, DFO. I hope I  
23 am correct in that. But we will -- we can make  
24 inquiries to see if we can have those charges finally  
25 dropped as opposed to stayed and give the hunters some

1           certainty that they're not going to have this hanging  
2           over them.

3                       MS. SALAMIVA: Did you respond to all  
4           the questions? Any other questions? Noah.

5                       MR. ETOK: Thank you. Noah Etok from  
6           Kangirsuk, LNUK's President. Is it true that Makivik  
7           research centre pays for the sample kits? We made a  
8           request for the payments to be increased because the  
9           payment for doing the sample kits amount stays the  
10          same for a very long time. Because if you can have  
11          the amount higher, then people would look after the  
12          sample kits more. If you have my questions, please  
13          respond if you could.

14                      MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Noah. I  
15          want you to be clear about Makivik is non-profit  
16          organization and our research centre's operation cost  
17          a lot of money. So we have something that we put in  
18          place although we've been hearing hunters to increase  
19          the amount to do the sample kits. But our research  
20          centre doesn't have a lot of money. But I take notes  
21          on your request because when there's money to gain you  
22          want to do your job properly but I want you to  
23          understand when there are a lot of sample kits is  
24          done, it costs a lot. And in the past, they  
25          implemented that amount so that people would receive

1 something, that's why it's there. Thank you.

2 MR. TARRIASUK: Paulusi Tarriasuk from  
3 Ivujivik. I want Makivik to consider to see if the  
4 DFO allocate some funds. As long as they're  
5 implementing the quotas, they should also including  
6 fundings to the Inuit in order to respect the elders.

7 So I would like to see some funds to be allocated  
8 because we have quotas and that the quota -- with  
9 those quotas, we get very little food because of that  
10 quota. So I would want the Makivik to look into it if  
11 they could find more fundings to increase the payment  
12 for the sample kits.

13 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you Paulisi.  
14 Anybody -- is anybody going to respond?

15 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Cousin, I would  
16 like a clarification. It seems like you're asking the  
17 DFO to see if they can allocate some funds. Are you  
18 asking us or the DFO?

19 MS. ALOUPA: Microphone, please.

20 MR. TARRIASUK: I'm sorry. I want  
21 Makivik to make a request to the DFO to request for  
22 funds because they're the one who have implemented the  
23 quotas.

24 MR. ITTUKALLAK: Thank you, Makivik. I  
25 would also like to -- we always talk about the

1 traditional knowledge of Inuit but we never practice  
2 it. Yet, if we were to use the traditional knowledge  
3 of Inuit, there would be a lot less problem because we  
4 fight over the quotas. So I, myself, I would feel  
5 better if the quotas would be eliminated because it  
6 has caused a lot of problem. So instead of  
7 implementing quotas all the time, we should start  
8 using the traditional knowledge of Inuit. Billy  
9 Pauliser, please don't get outside of the question.  
10 Do you have a respond to Jackusie?

11 MR. PAULISER: I have answer to equal  
12 rights of Inuit of Nunavik and Nunavut.

13 MS. SALAMIVA: Please state your name.

14 MR. PAULISER: Billy Pauliser. Unequal  
15 treatment of Nunavut and Nunavik (indiscernible). I  
16 will support that and I also have a question. I am  
17 supporting that article because we are treated  
18 differently by the DFO and we are harvesting the same,  
19 exact same population of Beluga, and they know that.  
20 DFO, NMRWB and us, we know. But this has been going  
21 on for many years. I also have a concern because we  
22 are being treated differently. After using the sample  
23 kits, they have found out that the Belugas that we are  
24 protecting are being killed in Nunavut also. And us,  
25 we are pledged to follow the quotas for the same exact

1 population of Beluga. This is nonsense a long time.  
2 Through the knowledge of traditional knowledges. And  
3 also, the scientists have found out that it is like  
4 that.

5 And I'm going to ask the Makivik now  
6 since you are responsible for NILCA because I feel  
7 this is not being put here that equal use and  
8 occupancy. NMRWB has this right -- don't have this  
9 right and the Wildlife Board of Nunavut, according to  
10 the claims, it's under the Nunavut responsibility and  
11 equal zone Nunavik Inuit and Nunavut Inuit, King  
12 George Islands, Ottawa Islands and Saliquit Islands.  
13 I feel you should -- Makivik should reveal that zone  
14 again to see if something can be modified. For  
15 example, if I went down to (indiscernible), I have a  
16 quota. Someone from Sanikiluaq, who is my cousin,  
17 going to the same zone because my cousin doesn't have  
18 a quota, if we are hunting at the same time at the  
19 same area under the equal zone and occupancy, I have a  
20 quota but my cousin from Nunavut doesn't have one. So  
21 I feel this is so incorrect and I feel that I think we  
22 should go to court, if Makivik feels that we should go  
23 to court, we will support you. I might talk a long,  
24 long time so I'm doing my brief, thank you.

25 I'm asking concerning equal use and

1 occupancy what is the plan or will there be a plan how  
2 we will use that area? And if nothing will be  
3 changed, I think we need to go to court for this  
4 concern. Billy, when I say equal use we've been using  
5 this land since there is an agreement between NTI,  
6 Makivik concerning equal use and occupancy zones. So  
7 we have equal rights as Nunavik and Inuit of Nunavut.

8 MR. GILBERT: Makivik Billy. Gregor  
9 Gilbert, Makivik Corporation. So you are right, there  
10 are two zones identified in both the Nunavik Inuit  
11 Land Claim Agreement, the NILCA agreement and the  
12 Nunavut Land Claim Agreement as areas that are defined  
13 as equal use and occupancy; meaning that Nunavik and  
14 Nunavut Inuit have equal rights within those zones.

15 When the Nunavut Agreement was  
16 concluded in 1993, I believe, when it came into force,  
17 but before the NILCA came into force, there was a  
18 management regime that it was set up for these areas  
19 of equal use and occupancy, whereby the Nunavut  
20 Wildlife Management Board would make decisions for  
21 wildlife harvesting in those areas, except that would  
22 be two Makivik-appointed alternate members who would  
23 sit in place of the Nunavut members on the NWMB when  
24 they made those decisions. When the NILCA agreement  
25 came into force in 2008, that system was supposed to



1 have been replaced by a joint management system that  
2 was meant to have been negotiated between NTI and  
3 Makivik. I fully admit we've been very slow on it.  
4 We've expressed to NTI several times and NTI is  
5 equally amenable to it that we need to get our butts  
6 in gear and get that settled.

7 However, for the time being, we still  
8 have the old system with the NWMB with two Makivik-  
9 appointed alternate members. That being said, because  
10 that management system is in place for the areas of  
11 equal use and occupancy, it in no way lessens Nunavik  
12 Inuit rights to harvest in those areas. Even more so,  
13 in terms of Beluga, there is no total allowable  
14 harvest or total allowable take that's been  
15 established in those areas. I think that probably  
16 says enough and I think any other questions that you  
17 have on that would be best put to DFO and not to  
18 Makivik.

19 MR. ANGIYOU: My name is Adamie Angiyou  
20 from Puvirnitug. While Adamie was reading, he was  
21 mentioning quotas (indiscernible). I don't want to  
22 ask questions; I just want to add on something.

23 MS. SALAMIVA: It would be better to  
24 ask this question tomorrow.

25 MR. ANGIYOU: It seems that the

1 Minister of DFO have implemented two different -- two  
2 different matters like people of Nunavut don't have  
3 quota and here in Nunavik we have quota. This is not  
4 a proper way to do it here in Canada, because some  
5 don't have quota and some do, and it is very evident.

6 So sometimes I even wonder if the minister is in his  
7 or her right mind because Inuit have same traditions  
8 but we are being treated two different ways. So the  
9 Minister of DFO will have to receive this information  
10 from her agents. So I just wanted to support what  
11 Adamie was saying because that's how I understood it.

12 It's like he or she -- the minister hates the other  
13 people and love the other people. So next time we  
14 will have to be treated equally so the minister will  
15 have to hear that Inuit of the north wants their  
16 rights.

17 MS. SALAMIVA: Adamie, we are asking  
18 questions to Makivik right now. Your support or your  
19 recommendations you will have time to ask these  
20 questions tomorrow. So right now, we are asking  
21 questions to Makivik to their presentation. Please  
22 don't get out of our agenda. We will also hear from  
23 DFO after the question period. Are you going to  
24 respond? Who wants to comment? Any other questions?  
25 Johnny? There's so many Johnnys. Please take the

1 microphone right after your next person is.

2 MR. ARNAITUK: My name is Johnny  
3 Arnaituk from Kangirsuk from RNUK, LNUK. I just want  
4 to remind you that the sampling kits are being treated  
5 too slowly, so I would like you to speed it up more to  
6 come up with the results.

7 MR. PITSIULAQ: My name is Pitsiulaq  
8 from Kangiqsujuaq. Concerning the quota for Beluga, I  
9 have thought about it so thank you very much for  
10 giving us opportunity to ask questions. We have quota  
11 here although some don't. Like, for example, this  
12 fall even though I was going the FM local station to  
13 say that we have reached our quotas but when the  
14 Belugas are passing through your community, you are  
15 curious so you go down by the beach and I saw a hunter  
16 more than one who already had their gun with them.  
17 But because he's a hunter like me, my relative, I was  
18 not able to take the gun away from him and told him  
19 that we have reached our quota. Because the quotas  
20 were implemented to us and it is very unpleasant for  
21 us hunters to try to tell another hunter that we have  
22 reached our quota.

23 So I would like to know what kind of  
24 questions that are not hurtful can be asked. Maybe  
25 this question is more to DFO. And also, the DFO

1 officers came the next day. I spoke with one of them,  
2 even though he's an agent he said he sometimes also  
3 wonder how this could be better. Because I was  
4 confused if I should take the gun away from the hunter  
5 after we have reach our quotas.

6 MS. SALAMIVA: I think you will get a  
7 respond when DFO done their submission. So if you  
8 have a question to Makivik, thank you.

9 MR. QIALLA: My name is Qialla, Mayor  
10 of Kangirsujuaq. I grew up before the quotas were  
11 implemented with Beluga hunters. My father was  
12 (indiscernible). And he used to have meeting about  
13 Beluga. So I would like to ask this question to  
14 Makivik once the new government became because we used  
15 to use all the Beluga, skin, meat, everything. But  
16 today, we're not able to make a special fermented  
17 because it has different way of techniques to make a  
18 fermented muctuc, Beluga skin. We don't even get  
19 enough to make oil. We only remember now that there  
20 used to be fermented Beluga skin in the pouch. I know  
21 the Makivik Agreement supposed to protect Inuit  
22 rights. So the people that will be planning for the  
23 self-determination should also prepare for the Beluga  
24 issues.

25 And I would want women who are the real

1 -- who are the one that prepare food, because after  
2 the quotas were implemented, women are not able to  
3 teach anymore. Who is to blame for now that we are  
4 losing our culture? So we need to think about that  
5 because we have lost part of our culture. Thank you.  
6 Culture and tradition.

7 MS. SALAMIVA: We are looking for  
8 questions to Makivik. You will be able to talk about  
9 these tomorrow. Johnny?

10 MR. AKPAHATEK: I would also like to  
11 mention that under our agreement, Makivik are supposed  
12 to protect our tradition. And if we lost something,  
13 there's supposed to be an insurance but it doesn't  
14 exist. In case I lose my hunting equipment because  
15 they are very expensive. For example, if my outboard  
16 motor's got on a rock accidentally, those are costly.  
17 So you also need to consider those to receive there  
18 could be any reimbursement for that.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: Nobody has questions  
20 yet?

21 MR. NAPPAALUK: I think I will have not  
22 enough time because we see Beluga whales at the beach.  
23 We usually see carcasses at the beach. Who do that?  
24 Are my fellow Inuit now doing illegal activities?  
25 Because we have seen Beluga carcasses that are missing

1           only the skin. Is it because they're hiding? And  
2           secondly, I don't know if it's true. Are there any  
3           communities that teaching to prepare food? Are any  
4           communities using nets because we've been in  
5           Kangirsujuaq we are not allowed to use our nets to  
6           hunt for Beluga, which was also our tradition. More  
7           and more we are losing our tradition. Even though we  
8           don't want to lose these traditions and I would like  
9           to thank the Makivik to try to -- for their  
10          protection. So we are waiting and we are expecting  
11          this -- that it will be properly done right.

12                        MS. SALAMIVA: You have not understand  
13          me yet. We are looking for your questions to Makivik.  
14          So do you have a question to Makivik? Jamey, Adamie?

15                        MR. PETERS: I have a lot to say. I  
16          don't have a question but I'm trying to stay quiet.

17                        MS. SALAMIVA: Markusie, do you have a  
18          question?

19                        MR. ANNAUTAQ: No, but I will later.

20                        MR. JOANNES: We will do our  
21          submission tomorrow as RNUK. I will have questions to  
22          DFO of Canada. And my question to Makivik is our  
23          hunters have lost their hunting gears and they have  
24          not been reimbursed. For example, they lost their  
25          nets, their hunting equipment has been damaged by the

1 DFO. So I am asking Makivik if they could assist us  
2 if we want to bring DFO to court to reimburse our  
3 hunter's equipment because they don't hear, they don't  
4 listen. They don't even say that they heard you.

5 MS. SALAMIVA: Would you like to  
6 respond first?

7 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Jimmy.  
8 If we are going towards this, everything will have to  
9 be documented, identify what was lost, how much it  
10 was. The only problem is this. When you go to court,  
11 you have to follow the law. When there is nothing  
12 documented, we would just lose money. If we try to go  
13 to court whether or not under the law, if it's not in  
14 the law to reimburse, I don't think you will be  
15 receiving any reimbursement. If there is nothing in  
16 agreement that a hunter if they lost a gear that they  
17 have to pay reimbursed. So I have a concern if we try  
18 to go to court, we would lose money without any  
19 documentation because we need basis under the  
20 agreement on the law. But if we want to proceed to go  
21 to court, we would have to look into this with our  
22 legal department.

23 For example, there is a reimbursement  
24 under KRG if you lost your hunting equipment. And  
25 also the organizations of Kuujjumiut when their

1 outboard motors propeller breaks down, they able to  
2 make a request to be reimbursed for that particular  
3 part because they're under the Agreement. And there  
4 is funding available that has been set aside for the  
5 purpose. But if this is not under the Agreement or  
6 under the law, I don't think we would succeed and  
7 without any documentation on-hand, I don't know what  
8 kind of basis we would have if we want to go to court.  
9 But we can look into this how it could be realized and  
10 what kind of basis it should have -- it could have.

11 MS. SALAMIVA: Someone beside Jimmy?

12 MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Thank you. My name  
13 is Jobie Oweetaluktuk from Inukjuak LNUK. I have a  
14 question to Makivik concerning the Hudson Bay stocks.  
15 Inuit (indiscernible) are not allowed to hunt those.  
16 We were allowed only five Beluga in our area, in our  
17 hunting area and the population of Inukjuak is 1,800-  
18 plus. And everybody has to get a share so everybody  
19 got a share and they got a lot less than a foot. So I  
20 would like to ask a question. Ever since Nastapoka  
21 Island was closed back in the SC, from that time up to  
22 date, can we get the money reimbursement because our  
23 hunting area has been closed since that time? We have  
24 lost our hunter who drowned while he was going for to  
25 designated area when there is no funding at all. This



1 has been going on for a long, long time, too long. So  
2 we would want to eliminate quotas.

3 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Jobie.  
4 From what you mentioned along the line with what I  
5 said, if you were listening, Inukjuak, Umiujaq and  
6 Kuujjuaraapik, they have to be part of making the  
7 decision. You were going to fix up a new management.

8 If you're not part of us in making a decision, we  
9 won't be able to do anything, so you will be the ones  
10 affected, and if we were free to do as we please for  
11 the Eastern Hudson Bay. So the three communities will  
12 have to really participate.

13 In terms of reimbursement, we would  
14 have to go face DFO, they are the ones who came out  
15 with DFO and ask communities to travel far. So we  
16 have to face them for reimbursement of some kind. And  
17 so when they do their presentation, I would recommend  
18 that you ask the same question, especially concerning  
19 a loss of a person. And with all of the effects that  
20 are used because of having to travel far, having  
21 expensive supplies. So I would want you to ask them  
22 that question, Jobie.

23 MR. KAITAK: Adamie Kaitak from  
24 (indiscernible) Salluit. Makivik if we ever stop  
25 having quotas, will they be able to provide funding to

1 apply the management plan? That is my question.

2 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Adamie.

3 For the DFO, they have to come up with some sort of  
4 funding system with RNUK and LNUK because the funding  
5 is not enough. There's some don't have office, some  
6 don't have proper stuff because they will make the  
7 decisions as to the fundings needed. And because they  
8 will have to come up with the funding for that. Do  
9 you understand?

10 MR. TAYARA: Adamie from Salluit. For  
11 Makivik, I want to ask Makivik to ask DFO to see if  
12 the Inuit can themselves can do their own management.

13 Like in Salluit, as an example, we were told that  
14 there was concern of the Beluga and so I would ask  
15 Makivik to work with lawyers and others to do the  
16 work.

17 MS. SALAMIVA: Is somebody responding?

18 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: For the DFO, from  
19 what you see, they use the information that we provide  
20 them. They can't see us hunting; they're not in the  
21 area. So they have to work with you. They need your  
22 knowledge to apply their -- to promote their knowledge  
23 of our area, we have staff, we have lawyers but we  
24 have to work with you at the local level to share what  
25 you see, what you experience, and what the Inuit's

1 have been needing about the cutting, doing away with  
2 quota that Inuit doing more Inuit traditional  
3 knowledge. So we're pushing for that because you have  
4 been fighting for that for a long time. And we work  
5 with you and with DFO and that we would -- it would be  
6 presented to the Minister of DFO because it's a big  
7 issue.

8 They -- DFO will always be there. They  
9 have funding, they do research. We have to work more  
10 together closely because we're too far apart. And  
11 what we see in the future is not close enough to each  
12 other. For the hunters, they have to a lot more  
13 funding for the hunters by the DFO because if it's not  
14 we'll continue with the miscommunication, lack of  
15 communication. Thank you.

16 MS. SALAMIVA: Simon Tookalook?

17 MR. TOOKALOOK: Thank you. Simon from  
18 LNUK Umiujaq. I have a question for Makivik and DFO.

19 Because we've heard even when I was still a student,  
20 the federal government usually comes from them. We  
21 were told at the time and I want to know if you know  
22 about why wasn't -- why these things were not  
23 problems, were not renewed or dealt with. And for the  
24 Cree and Inuit, our rights seem to be treated  
25 differently. And I'm ask because for the Inuit and

1 Cree rights have been trampled on because it seemed to  
2 be no longer there. So that's my question. And we  
3 keep here turning to other things, other issues. And  
4 I would like to have our rights back to us, to take it  
5 back for all of us here sitting at this gathering, and  
6 not to be treated differently. That was my question.

7 Any response?

8 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Simon.  
9 It's very hard to respond to that. Through Makivik  
10 we're trying to promote and to take back that Inuit  
11 had their own administrative structure. And then we  
12 were looking into the constitution of Nunavik  
13 Government and will work with different ministers for  
14 the -- to push for the Inuit needs. So we're trying  
15 to take it back being controlled from outside. Those  
16 who don't know us never have seen a Beluga, maybe in a  
17 zoo only. So and they make all the decisions for us  
18 so we're trying to deal with that because we're trying  
19 to get our own regional government. We have rights.  
20 They are recognized. We want to be less controlled in  
21 the future. We're trying to set up that and trying to  
22 do away with being controlled from outside, and Beluga  
23 is a good example. Our ways of dealing with Beluga  
24 has been eroded, so it will be a big fight to get it  
25 back; we are starting to work on it. Thank you.

1 MS. SALAMIVA: Next question, Simon.

2 MR. ALIQU: Thank you. Simon Aliqu  
3 from Akulivik from the LNUK. My question concerning  
4 samples. We sent out a lot of samples and we were  
5 getting paid for them. No, they were paying for them  
6 to get reimbursed. So there was a lot of samples from  
7 Akulivik, so we only got a few response. I would like  
8 to have the whole -- response about the whole lot of  
9 samples. I would like somebody to look into this.

10 MS. SALAMIVA: Do you want to respond?

11 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, Simon.  
12 This is under my responsibility. I would like you  
13 people to come straight to me. I can even sign for  
14 you. So if you have these kinds of problems you can  
15 call me right away. Not necessarily wait for a  
16 meeting if you have problems like that, I would  
17 appreciate that you can talk to me right away because  
18 we deal with the funding for all the research being  
19 done. I'll get back to you.

20 MS. SALAMIVA: Next speaker, Putulik  
21 Papigatuk will be the last one. You can also go ask  
22 on your own some comments have been a bit outside the  
23 topic, so try to keep on topic.

24 MR. PAPIGATUK: Putulik Papigatuk from  
25 Salluit for Nunavik Inuit for the rights

1 determination. Right now Makivik had a (indiscernible)  
2 to move ahead for Nunavik Inuit to form self-  
3 government and to show their culture and their  
4 language and their strength, and for Beluga purposes  
5 and all the other things. And a lot of -- some of us  
6 on the Board members of Makivik for Beluga, our own  
7 marine wardens, we would want them to have more power.

8 I would want to expect more power for our wardens and  
9 to be able to apply the work that they have to do, and  
10 for Beluga management. It's been taken away from us  
11 from what we want to do as to how much we could  
12 harvest.

13 So if it's DFO to make final decision,  
14 it's been taken away from us and, consequently,  
15 Makivik corporation recommends the abandonment of the  
16 management system that is focused for a merely on  
17 harvest quotas imposed by DFO in favour of an Inuit-  
18 led regime. There's no Inuit-led regime right now  
19 except for Makivik, or is it us? The RNUK, the  
20 Nunavik Marine Board, I should ask the authority? And  
21 I also want to understand, we want to do away with  
22 quota. There's this issue all the way for eternity to  
23 catch any amount they want. We want to do away with  
24 quota if we say that -- if we decide that, is it  
25 really what we want to do away with quota and harvest

1 as we please? Or as our wildlife management groups,  
2 RNUK and others? Then we would work on our own  
3 management plan. And if we do away with quota, then  
4 it would be easy -- the plan that the region would  
5 make their own management.

6 I want this to be clear because if they  
7 harvest as they please, it could put us in more  
8 trouble. We can -- we expect that and some sort of  
9 management not to do with Beluga and the work that  
10 we've been doing, there's getting to be more  
11 regulations, 2019 was the last year for the last  
12 management. And now we're saying we don't want no  
13 more quota and say what we want to come up with  
14 instead, to make it clear -- more clear. Thank you.

15 MS. SALAMIVA: Putulik was the last one  
16 to ask questions. If you have a response, thank you.

17 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Thank you, uncle.  
18 You have good questions. What we are trying to work  
19 on will not come out right away because we are  
20 preparing to have our own self-determination until we  
21 get our own self-determination and my documents are  
22 translated into Inuktitut. I was reading in English,  
23 for example, all Inuit wardens that don't have the  
24 power and to get self-determination using Inuit  
25 culture. Inuit culture was to share with everyone but

1 when we are using DFO orders, we don't do that  
2 anymore. Although our population have grown, for sure  
3 we need to look after our wildlife and we have to  
4 observe what is migrating. Like, for example, Lucassie  
5 was mentioning the outboard motors are scaring away  
6 the Beluga from their usual migrating routes.

7 So would we want the RNUKs and LNUKs to  
8 take a decision how we will proceed for this, an  
9 Inuit-led regime, that's who we are. Makivik and  
10 NMRWB are more neutral but RNUKs, LNUKs since they  
11 have the power, they should take a responsibility to  
12 take care -- to look into the wildlife issues. For  
13 example, if the arctic chars were endangered, you will  
14 be able to decide as responsible for the wildlife so  
15 can do the same thing for the Beluga.

16 I was also mentioning about the people  
17 of Hudson Strait, the EHB Beluga usually migrate  
18 through Hudson Strait and some don't have quotas. And  
19 if we are to do our own management, we would also be  
20 able to decide when to close it and when to open it.  
21 But we want to come up with our own management instead  
22 of being controlled by the government because the  
23 control of the government is destroying is destroying  
24 our culture and traditions. Our way of hunt Belugas  
25 has changed. So if we are the ones to be responsible



1 to decide to see if it will be better than the DFO  
2 quota implementation. Because to respect an elder  
3 because they know and they can say that it's enough  
4 now. We'll respect them and respect our leaders and  
5 our elders. Like Pitsiulaq said that it was hard for  
6 him to stop the hunter. So we will implement to say  
7 when to stop and work with the DFO because they will  
8 still have to do a research. This will have to be  
9 fixed.

10 In my documentation, it's also  
11 mentioned a learning curve. It's not going to be  
12 perfect right away; we will have to work on it and fix  
13 it. But us who are the responsible -- but us we want  
14 to be responsible to come up with a management plan  
15 instead of being controlled by other organizations.  
16 We wish to try that way to see if it will be better.  
17 This is our submission to you from Makivik to see if  
18 we can have Inuit instead of DFO to be decision-  
19 takers. Am I clear now?

20 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you. Qajaq also  
21 has a question. After Qajaq's question, Eeyou Marine  
22 Region, NMRWB, they have question, they will have an  
23 opportunity also.

24 MS. ROBINSON: A few questions for  
25 Makivik. In your submissions, you talked about how

1 the current or the success of the last couple of  
2 management plans have resulted in the deterioration of  
3 cultural practices, transfer of cultural knowledge as  
4 well as disrupting hunting activities, and a number of  
5 other social-cultural impacts. You identified this as  
6 being the elements of the management plan that have  
7 not been successful. Is it Makivik's position that  
8 these impacts now result in the current management  
9 plan as being an unjustified infringement of the  
10 harvest rights of Nunavik Inuit as articulated in the  
11 land claims as well as recognized and protected under  
12 S. 35 of the Constitution?

13 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Yes.

14 MS. ROBINSON: Can you please break  
15 down a little bit how? Or here's my question for you,  
16 is a failure to change the management plan going to  
17 result in continued infringement, in your submission?

18 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: If we are going to  
19 continue using the quota, we can see right away in the  
20 future that something very bad will be happening  
21 because Inuit people will no longer respect because  
22 some people have mentioned that even if the DFO will  
23 not accept our demand, we will just go ahead with our  
24 plan. So we -- this is a critical situation because  
25 the hunters can get into trouble and have their

1 hunting gears taken away from them. And if we are  
2 going to continue using the quotas, our way of  
3 tradition, you know, hunting ways, sharing ways, have  
4 been impacted. And we also have learned that there  
5 are some people that kill Beluga and rush to take the  
6 skin before other people see them. So that way they  
7 leave the carcass. So using our rights, our  
8 Agreement, that's what our plan is now as Inuit people  
9 to be the one to take decisions.

10 MS. ROBINSON: Gregor?

11 MR. GILBERT: I would totally agree  
12 with Adamie, and I would like to add to that. Sorry,  
13 Gregor Gilbert, Makivik. There are several clauses  
14 directly from the NICLA, the Nunavik Inuit Lands Claim  
15 Agreement, such as "Nunavik Inuit shall have an  
16 effective role in all aspects of wildlife management"  
17 such as the objective of Article 5 is, "to promote the  
18 long-term economic, social and cultural interests of  
19 Nunavik Inuit," that the current management regime or  
20 the one that is just about to expire, is clearly not  
21 meeting. So, you know, before we start talking about  
22 S. 35 rights, I think we need to look at whether it's  
23 actually accomplishing what it was set out to do in  
24 the NILCA in the first place. And I think the simple  
25 answer -- and I would doubt very much that if you went

1 around the room, you'd find anybody who would disagree  
2 with me -- that this management system is not  
3 fulfilling those goals and the objectives that are  
4 stated in the Agreement.

5 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. You  
6 identified the preference for the adoption of an  
7 Inuit-led management system. And when asked by the  
8 parties, it wasn't quite clear what that would look  
9 like and you indicated that it would require a level  
10 of consultation and engagement. The Nunavik Marine  
11 Region Wildlife Board as well as the Eeyou Marine  
12 Region Wildlife Board have a mandate to fulfill. In  
13 light of their role in this public hearing, what is  
14 Makivik's position on what the Boards should be doing  
15 in the interim as this management plan expires, and as  
16 the Inuit-led management system, as you've described,  
17 is developed and established?

18 MS. TUCKER: Katie Tucker, Makivik  
19 Legal. I see, personally, two options. There's the  
20 option of eliminating the quotas until the Inuit-led  
21 system is developed. And that that would encourage  
22 DFO and all the parties to work quickly. The  
23 alternative is to sustain the existing plan until a  
24 new plan is formed, an Inuit-led plan is formed. But  
25 I prefer the first one because I think there would be

1 a lot of enthusiasm to make an Inuit plan, to get that  
2 developed and off the ground as quickly as possible.

3 MS. ROBINSON: By quota system, you  
4 mean remove the total allowable take? What about the  
5 non-quota limitations as they exist?

6 MR. GILBERT: I was actually going to  
7 continue on from what Katie said and then maybe we can  
8 come to that. So Gregor Gilbert, once again, Makivik  
9 Corporation. I think just further to, you know, your  
10 initial question is I think that the role for the  
11 Board actually remains unchanged under that system, so  
12 at least in the interim. I think ultimately, what we  
13 would like to see this moving towards is something  
14 where the federal minister is no longer the final say.  
15 And that if we can't reach an agreement to something  
16 like that, meaning Makivik and the federal government,  
17 that there would at least be a system for dispute  
18 resolution in the case that Makivik felt strongly that  
19 the minister's final decision ran contrary to the  
20 interests of Nunavik Inuit.

21 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you. Thank you.  
22 There are three more people to ask questions. Next  
23 question will be from Peter Hale. Peter.

24 MR. HALE: Thank you. Peter Hale with  
25 the Eeyou Marine Board. Makivik, you provided a

1 summary at the end of your presentation. And in the  
2 second paragraph of that you state that you fully  
3 support moving away from quotas, and you recommend  
4 moving away immediately from the quota-based system  
5 where ever communities can offer an alternative means  
6 to affect a conservation purpose. My question to you  
7 is where in Nunavik do you think communities are ready  
8 to effect a conservation purpose as an alternative to  
9 quotas? And related to that, do you think there are  
10 communities ready to do that for the 2020 harvest  
11 season?

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Peter. Mark  
13 O'Connor, Makivik. I think the short answer to that  
14 question is that all of those organizations are here  
15 and will be speaking to that tomorrow. And I think  
16 that question is better directed to them. Our  
17 position is that we want to lay the framework, and the  
18 tools for them to take that space when they can and  
19 want to do that, is their question to answer.

20 MS. SALAMIVA: Harry Okpik.

21 MR. OKPIK: Hello, my name is Harry. I  
22 also want to comment concerning Beluga. I think we  
23 also need to consider about the Beluga skin because  
24 today people sometimes sell them. This activity has  
25 been there not too long now but it's growing very

1 rapidly. Even one whole Beluga was sold amongst the  
2 hunters before elders got their share. When this is  
3 happening, when a Beluga is sold, some people don't  
4 get their share because people tell us a lot of time  
5 that they did not get share. So especially when you  
6 know someone is selling Beluga skin, you can know that  
7 some people are not getting their share.

8 And this fall, last fall, for example,  
9 this was a major issue that I noticed within ten years  
10 more and more people are selling muctuc, Beluga skin.  
11 Since the people is growing, a lot of people are not  
12 getting their shares from their own quotas in their  
13 community. So this also has to be looked into because  
14 we're not freely to harvest. We have to follow our  
15 quotas and I don't think we should sell Beluga meat or  
16 skin since we have a quota. But this is growing very  
17 rapidly to sell Beluga and so many times we've been  
18 saying that people are leaving the carcasses, but more  
19 and more are being left without taking the whole  
20 Beluga. Before we fix those problems, if we eliminate  
21 our quotas, it will not be good for us especially in  
22 the fall time.

23 MR. SAVARD: You mentioned that you  
24 preferred to eliminate quotas until a new plan is  
25 formed. But are you looking for a community plan, a

1 plan that will differ from community to community  
2 depending where they are? Or are you looking for an  
3 overall plan? And what will be the incentive of  
4 having people developing a plan if they can harvest --  
5 they're given free reign to harvest in the absence of  
6 non-quota limitation? Just another point.

7 The idea of non-quota limitation to  
8 replace a quota is not bad as long as they work. The  
9 idea is there is that from another means you reduce  
10 the level of harvest to what the population can  
11 support. But if you don't have any quota limitation  
12 or they don't work, you're treading a very fine line  
13 here. And you're putting at jeopardy the future of  
14 the younger Inuit, of your young kids where they may  
15 not have the same results as you did.

16 MR. DELISLE-ALUKU: Thank you for your  
17 question, Jean-Pierre. These are all plans that we  
18 will have to elaborate amongst each other. I don't  
19 have a magic solution for a community plan or overall  
20 plan. But what I'm saying, the plan today, it don't  
21 work and we need to think outside the box. When we're  
22 stuck on the box, you have to go outside the box to  
23 find a solution. And right now, what we're saying is  
24 we want to empower our hunters to be decision-makers  
25 and they will develop their own plans. And with the



1 help of the RNUKs, they will have an overall plan.

2 But we're trying to feed our families  
3 and to what Harry was saying, some elders and some  
4 homes don't get a share of the catch. So we're trying  
5 to address that. We're trying to feed our communities  
6 and that is the overall objective in this food  
7 insecurity, the high cost of living we want to feed  
8 our families, and that is the plan.

9 MR. GILBERT: Gregor Gilbert, Makivik.

10 On top of what Adamie said, I think like a  
11 fundamental question in this is, you know, who has the  
12 right to determine what an acceptable risk is?  
13 Nunavik Inuit are the ones that have the highest stake  
14 in Beluga management. The outcomes are going to  
15 affect Nunavik Inuit and their children and  
16 grandchildren for generations. So, you know, I really  
17 think that when we talk about success or failure of  
18 whether it's a community-driven plan, whether it's a  
19 non-quota limitation or an open hunt, the ones that  
20 ultimately should be making the decision on whether  
21 that risk is acceptable or not, are Nunavik Inuit.

22 And I realize the Board has a very  
23 privileged position within that structure and the  
24 Boards, in fact. But I think the Boards also need to  
25 look at the damage that the current system has done

1 since quotas were introduced in 1985 versus in this  
2 evolving landscape and the move towards recognition of  
3 indigenous rights and reconciliation, who should be  
4 the determinants of Beluga management when Nunavik  
5 Inuit are the ones that have the highest stake in it?

6 MS. SALAMIVA: Yes, I see you. We are  
7 in the question period, even though someone did not  
8 want you to comment. You will be the last one to  
9 comment and then we'll hear from DFO after.

10 MR. PETERS: Salamiva, hey Salamiva.  
11 Thank you for giving me an opportunity. I'm not going  
12 to ask a question. Him and him, we would want to have  
13 an opportunity to talk about this to tell you what was  
14 happening before the DFO existed.

15 MS. SALAMIVA: Yes, you will have all  
16 day on Thursday.

17 MR. PETERS: RNUK will have something  
18 to look into.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you for giving me  
20 an opportunity. We'll go for a short break and then  
21 DFO will do their submission. We'll go for 10  
22 minutes' break.

23  
24 --- A BRIEF RECESS  
25

1 MS. SALAMIVA: Please, we are sort of  
2 behind due to many technical problems we didn't  
3 anticipate. DFO will now do their submissions. And  
4 then after their submission, you will have an  
5 opportunity to ask questions. Don't forget that,  
6 you'll have an opportunity to speak about something  
7 else but your question will have to be towards Do's  
8 submission. Today we are doing the submissions and  
9 then the questionnaires and after we do the  
10 organizations, we will give you an opportunity to  
11 speak. Comprends-tu? How about here? The people  
12 that were sitting here, where are they, do we wait for  
13 them? Okay. Only two of them are over there. There's  
14 four missing. Okay, Mr. Hammill. Felix, your floor.

15 MR. HAMMILL: Thank you very much,  
16 Salamiva. Thank you very much everybody for the  
17 opportunity for making a presentation today, and for  
18 everybody to listen in. The presentation will present  
19 some of the science information that we've been  
20 gathering over the years, try and show you how it all  
21 fits together. Then we will go onto some management  
22 considerations and now my friend here, Felix, will  
23 handle that section. And then also certain positions  
24 that we have on some of the options that were  
25 presented through the Beluga Working Group and also

1 through the submissions.

2 Okay. Some of you have seen this.  
3 This is an old slide. It goes back a little bit to  
4 Mark's presentation just to give you a little bit of  
5 the baseline. We have the concept that there are two  
6 or more management stocks that overwinter in Hudson  
7 Strait. The idea of stocks within much of the whale  
8 literature, conservation literature and DFO, for  
9 Beluga is based on the distribution of animals in the  
10 summer. So in the summer, we have whales along the  
11 Hudson Bay coast on the west side, down into James Bay  
12 and then we also have whales on the Eastern Hudson Bay  
13 side between Quebec and Sanikiluaq. And these animals  
14 on the east side move back and forth between  
15 Sanikiluaq and the coastal areas. There's a small  
16 stock that also is resident in Ungava Bay. It was  
17 formerly much larger but as we have heard today, there  
18 are very few if any animals there still exist from  
19 this stock.

20 At one time very early on, we had the  
21 impression that most of the animals left James Bay and  
22 completely through some of the genetics and the  
23 telemetry, traditional knowledge and also survey work,  
24 that we now know that are animals that do overwinter  
25 somewhere between James Bay and the southern part of

1 Hudson Bay south of Sanikiluaq. So we have a summer  
2 stock that's defined based on where these animals  
3 occur during the summer. Many of these animals move  
4 together to overwinter in Hudson Strait.

5 So why are we managing? The idea is as  
6 I brought up a little bit earlier, a stock for us and  
7 our definition differs from that presented by the  
8 Board or circulated by their sheet. It's close but  
9 there are a few differences. And there are many  
10 different definitions; they can be very complicated.  
11 But we have found perhaps one of the simplest  
12 definitions is it is a management unit established to  
13 avoid local depletion and loss of genetic diversity.  
14 So the idea of where we're operating is that we want  
15 to maintain a presence of Belugas along Easter Hudson  
16 Bay coast. What we've seen in some of our science so  
17 far is that the same animals return to the same areas.

18  
19 We have seen in other areas, in other  
20 populations, that if Beluga disappear from an estuary  
21 or from a certain inlet or a bay, we don't see them  
22 returning for periods of more than 50 years. And I  
23 say that more than 50 years because we've never seen  
24 them return but the records are only existing for the  
25 last 50 years or so. So the idea is that if you

1 eliminate the resident population, you're basically  
2 eliminating a group of Belugas that has the knowledge  
3 to return to those areas during the summer. In never  
4 means that there will never be any Beluga that will  
5 return, you will always have a few males that will  
6 come through, but the main stock will have  
7 disappeared.

8 So based on the definition of having  
9 summering stocks that traditionally return to the same  
10 areas, we have four the waters around Nunavik a group  
11 of animals called the Western Hudson Bay stock, the  
12 Eastern Hudson Bay stock, a very small Ungava Bay  
13 stock and then, it's not mentioned here, but we also  
14 have a James Bay stock. Because of the low numbers  
15 for Eastern Hudson Bay and Ungava Bay, DFO has been  
16 concerned about the future of these animals. The idea  
17 being that we want to conserve them and if we are able  
18 to conserve them, they are still available for  
19 harvesting by the people in Nunavik.

20 But it doesn't mean open harvesting, it  
21 means we want to limit it to allow the population to  
22 at least stay stable and this is the management  
23 approach that has been used over the last nearly 30,  
24 40 years. And this is the approach that has been  
25 agreed upon in discussions between DFO and the

1 different hunting groups, when before the Board, and  
2 since the Board has assumed responsibility is the  
3 management framework that they have accepted up until  
4 now.

5 The Board asked me to provide some  
6 information on abundance. We evaluate abundance of  
7 the different stocks using aerial surveys. I was  
8 involved in the first survey back in 1985 and this is  
9 where we had the estimate of 4,282 and I've been  
10 involved in the surveys since then. The survey  
11 estimates do vary considerably between years. But in  
12 general, we have seen an increase in the populations  
13 since about 2000. Much of this variability depends on  
14 how clumped the animals are together, the conditions  
15 of the tide, are the animals moving inshore or  
16 offshore and do we detect them. If they're more  
17 scattered, it's maybe easier to detect one whale,  
18 whereas if they're clumped together, if those whales  
19 are close to where we fly, we see them, but if they're  
20 far away from where we fly, then we tend to miss them.

21  
22 Three surveys have been completed in  
23 the Western Hudson Bay area. And generally, the last  
24 two surveys have shown the population as stable. As  
25 mentioned earlier, it is probably the largest Beluga

1 population in the world. We've also completed surveys  
2 of Belugas in James Bay. The numbers there have also  
3 varied in part due to survey conditions but also in  
4 that area in years when there's been a lot of ice, we  
5 get the impression the whales move around onto the  
6 Ontario side. And when years, when there's no ice,  
7 they move into the James Bay side and that tends to  
8 cause a lot of fluctuation in the survey estimates as  
9 well.

10 The final stock is the Ungava Bay  
11 stock. We have seen Belugas in Ungava Bay but we've  
12 never seen them on the transact line. And because of  
13 this, we are unable to generate an estimate of  
14 abundance from the surveys. We agree with everybody  
15 that there are whales in Ungava Bay in the summer, but  
16 the numbers are so low that it's not possible to give  
17 a reliable count with the methods that we use now. To  
18 get better counts, we'd have to probably fly lines  
19 that are a lot closer together. With the observations  
20 that we have, we had worked out the probability of  
21 what number of Beluga would we have to have in order  
22 to detect them. And from this, this is where we come  
23 up with the estimate of about 100 animals. The  
24 population is less than 100 animals meaning that as  
25 it's below that threshold, we are unable to detect



1           them on the surveys.

2                           Another point that's -- I just want to  
3           make here, we'll come back to it later. But if there  
4           are 100 animals back in 1985, given what we know on  
5           Beluga abundance and how fast that they can increase  
6           or how fast the population can grow, there's probably  
7           -- and if there had been no hunting over that period  
8           of time, which we know is not quite correct -- then  
9           there is probably no more than 300 animals in Ungava  
10          Bay today. So it's not surprising that we're not  
11          seeing much of a change even though there's been a  
12          closure in the estuary for over 40 years.

13                          So we have aerial surveys, we have  
14          different stocks. There's a stock in the summer along  
15          the Eastern coast of Hudson Bay but during the fall,  
16          winter and spring, these stocks mix together. We're  
17          not so concerned about the Western Hudson Bay stock  
18          because the population is very large, but we are  
19          concerned about the Eastern Hudson Bay stock because  
20          the population is very small. To try and solve this  
21          problem, we've asked hunters to provide us with  
22          samples from their harvest. From that, we're able to  
23          work out the proportion of Eastern Hudson Bay animals  
24          that they harvest and this has been used in setting  
25          the quotas to try and work out what kind of a harvest

1 would still allow the population to stay stable.

2 The program has been -- the first  
3 samples were collected in the mid-1980's, late 1980's,  
4 Bill Doig (ph), many of you know, was one of the first  
5 contributors working with people from Kuujjuaraapik  
6 and Quaqtaq. The program has continued and just for  
7 this meeting, I've only included the last three years  
8 of data that we have. We see that different  
9 communities have provided different numbers of  
10 samples. So over the period of 2016 to 2018,  
11 Kuujjuaraapik has provided 16 samples from their  
12 harvest. And this represents more than 90 percent of  
13 animals harvested. So the middle left-hand column is  
14 the village, the middle column is the number of  
15 samples, and then, the right-hand column is the  
16 proportion of animals that are killed where we have  
17 samples.

18 So Kuujjuaraapik has provided -- has  
19 been very good in sampling most of the animals that  
20 they harvest. Quaqtaq has also been extremely good in  
21 providing samples from their harvest. Other  
22 communities that have done very well are the blue  
23 stars, Akulivik, Kangiqsujuaq, Aupaluk, Tasiujaq. And  
24 then there are other communities where it'd be nice to  
25 have some more information. What this means, these

1 communities that are providing lots of information,  
2 lots of samples, it is their information that is very  
3 important in working out the proportion of Eastern  
4 Hudson Bay animals in the harvest. So it is the  
5 numbers of animals taken from Quaqtaq, these  
6 proportions that are affecting or having the biggest  
7 effect on the quotas that we assign for Hudson Strait.  
8 So even though other communities are providing some  
9 samples, the proportion is so low that they're not  
10 having as much an effect in working out the proportion  
11 of Eastern Hudson Bay animals taken in the hunt.

12 This is a very complicated slide. The  
13 idea is to show you how we use the information. We  
14 take it from all the samples. From Eastern Hudson  
15 Bay, we take the samples from Hudson Strait and from  
16 Ungava Bay. We divide them into the spring and into  
17 the fall and then we look at the proportion of animals  
18 that are harvested that are from the Eastern Hudson  
19 Bay or from the Western Hudson Bay. And the other  
20 columns there we have the number of samples that are  
21 collected. So Hudson Strait in the spring hunt which  
22 is between February 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup>, we had the  
23 Hudson Strait harvest, 770 samples over time.

24 This is the total number of animals.  
25 Not all animals are harvested at once and not every

1 harvest shoots only one animal. So sometimes maybe  
2 more animals are shot on the same day, so this is an  
3 event. The reason this is important is because often  
4 if hunters are after animals or a herd of animals,  
5 they're often shooting animals from the same family  
6 group. So there's something that we call co-relation  
7 there.

8 So out of the 770 samples that we have,  
9 82.9 percent belong to the Western Hudson Bay stock,  
10 that's for the spring hunt. And if we move over, we  
11 have a measure of how confident we are in this total.

12 So the true total could be as low as 78.5 or as high  
13 as 87. The other is just another measure of the  
14 uncertainty. And then the other part that is  
15 important to the group here, is the proportion of  
16 Eastern Hudson Bay. So in the spring, Hudson Bay --  
17 Hudson Strait hunt, 11.7 percent of the animals belong  
18 to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. And we see that the  
19 confidence interval that is our confidence in this  
20 result is not too bad. It could be as low as 8.1 or  
21 as high as 16 percent.

22 This is a complex model that we used to  
23 do this. The model recognizes from the samples that  
24 we provide it, it is able to have some confidence in  
25 assigning animals to the Western Hudson Bay stock or

1 the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. But some animals, it's  
2 just not sure; it can't allocate them to one herd or  
3 the other. Although this proportion is very low, so  
4 that's only 5.3 percent.

5 As you all know, there is another zone  
6 called "Northeastern Hudson Bay," but we don't have  
7 many samples from this, only two from the spring hunt.  
8 So we were unable to provide a proportion for that  
9 group. Ungava Bay, from all the years now, we have  
10 122 samples from the spring; 87.4 percent of those  
11 animals belong to the Western Hudson Bay stock. And  
12 six percent of the harvest from Ungava Bay in the  
13 spring, belongs to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock.

14 Moving into the fall, which is the  
15 period from the 1<sup>st</sup> of September until January 31<sup>st</sup>, the  
16 fall Hudson Strait sample is at 454 animals and 67.6  
17 percent of the harvest is consisting of Western Hudson  
18 Bay animals and 29.1 percent of the harvest is  
19 consisting of Eastern Hudson Bay animals. We have a  
20 few more samples from Northeastern Hudson Bay from the  
21 fall harvest, 31 samples to-date. And from this it  
22 looks like it's about 49.1 percent of the animals  
23 belong to the Western Hudson Bay stock and about 44.5  
24 belong to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. And then the  
25 samples from the fall from Ungava Bay, we don't have

1 many and this is only up to 2018 so far that have been  
2 brought into us. And with this the sample sizes are  
3 too small to make a determination.

4 We have heard about the pilot projects.  
5 We've been using them the last few years. People have  
6 looked at these quite intently. For us, they have  
7 caused some problems because we've been asked to make  
8 decisions or provide feedback to the Board and to  
9 hunters quite quickly. And I think the methods are  
10 used in this are probably not the best because we're  
11 relying on very small samples. Whereas if we put it  
12 all together, we see that the picture of what we have  
13 is maybe slightly different.

14 So taking all the samples that we  
15 received to-date from the pilot project, that's 45  
16 animals, 68.5 percent of the animals collected belong  
17 to the Western Hudson Bay stock, whereas 25 percent  
18 belonged to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. This  
19 differs from Mark's numbers a bit earlier in part  
20 because we have more samples since Mark put his  
21 information together, and also it's partly a product  
22 of trying to develop your plan based on small sample  
23 sizes.

24 Something that's important here is that  
25 this is based on three years, only 45 samples which is

1 good. I think if we want to continue with this  
2 approach, we need to build up our sample sizes. We  
3 also need -- I think it would be better rather than  
4 trying to make adjustments on the fly, it would be  
5 better to wait for the end of the management plan,  
6 pull it altogether, do a proper review and then  
7 present the results.

8 Part of the problem is that hunters are  
9 complaining that it's taking us time to get the  
10 results back. It is a slow process and I think, for  
11 example, we still have not received the 2019 samples  
12 in our lab. So we're still waiting on that; that's one  
13 aspect that slows down the process. The other part is  
14 it still takes about a month to six weeks to move the  
15 samples through the laboratory. It's not worth  
16 running one or two samples at a time. It's best to  
17 wait until we get 50 or 100 samples, then we run them  
18 through in a single batch. So this slows down the  
19 process as well.

20 We also have our colleagues from  
21 Winnipeg, DFO office in Winnipeg and Pat is here to  
22 answer any questions related to some of the work that  
23 goes on there. They have a very extensive sampling  
24 program as well. We're looking at over 300 samples  
25 that have been collected over the years from that

1 area. We have broken down the analyses of their hunt  
2 into different seasons. We see in the spring, the  
3 spring harvest which is from the 1<sup>st</sup> of April until the  
4 end of June, we have 301 samples. And we have 76.8  
5 percent of those animals belong to the Western Hudson  
6 Bay stock. Only 1.6 percent of the animals belonged  
7 to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. And then we have a  
8 high number of unknown; they could be animals from the  
9 James Bay stock. It's hard to tell for the moment and  
10 this is something that we need to investigate more.

11 Looking at the extended spring which  
12 just means extending the season for another two weeks,  
13 so from April 1<sup>st</sup> to July 14<sup>th</sup>, we had 324 samples.  
14 When we see that the proportion of Western Hudson Bay  
15 animals, it's about the same, 75.1 percent, but the  
16 proportion of Eastern Hudson Bay animals has increased  
17 to 4.6. This is still quite small and this has been  
18 influential in Sanikiluaq developing their harvest  
19 measures. Summer, fewer samples again because  
20 Sanikiluaq has limited their summer hunts. And so we  
21 see that when they do harvest, the proportion has --  
22 of Eastern Hudson Bay does go up quite dramatically,  
23 up to 25.6 percent. So by limiting their harvest to  
24 closing by about mid-July, they're reducing  
25 considerably the chances of taking any Eastern Hudson



1 Bay animals.

2 Then we get into the fall hunt after  
3 September, the proportion of Eastern Hudson Bay  
4 animals drops out of the harvest completely. And then  
5 they had a harvest a few years ago, winter is  
6 (indiscernible) and there the proportion of Eastern  
7 Hudson Bay was quite higher. It may -- it doesn't  
8 have the same profile as other animals that belonged  
9 to the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. And some of the work  
10 that we've been doing now, it looks more like they  
11 were James Bay animals that moved up north.

12 So this is a resume, a summary of  
13 what's been done up until now. Under the DFO review  
14 process, we want to re-examine the entire genetic  
15 approach that has been used over the last three  
16 decades. We're using new methods which I don't  
17 completely understand, but they involve a new process  
18 examining snips, new classification approaches and we  
19 want to go back and look at things, you know, why are  
20 some of the unknown identification is so high. Can we  
21 improve the discrimination between stocks or can we  
22 improve how we define the differences between stocks  
23 so that we can provide you with better information.

24 This review is planned for probably, if  
25 we're lucky, it will be the fall of 2021 and if we

1 can't get it all done, it may not be until February --  
2 sorry, it'll be, if we're lucky, it'll be done in fall  
3 2020. And if we get hit with too much backlog and too  
4 much problems in trying to bring it all together, it  
5 would be put off until February 2021.

6 This is just an overview of the  
7 harvests. This is all in our submission. The last  
8 data point does not include the final quota overrun.  
9 We prepared the graphs before the final overrun of  
10 about 27, 30 animals. So it underestimates the total  
11 number of animals that have been harvested in Nunavik  
12 region. But this is the stats that we collect -- the  
13 weekly stats that we collect on harvests from the  
14 wardens. It's interesting that harvest now is almost  
15 400 animals per year which is about half of what the  
16 commercial harvest took out during the 10 years that  
17 it was operating in Eastern Hudson Bay.

18 So what do we do with this information?  
19 We bring it altogether because it is confusing and  
20 it's tried to simplify things or bring it altogether.

21 We put it into what we call a population model. This  
22 is also a model that we use. It's quite complex but  
23 it's based on very simple principles. Basically, we  
24 have an abundance of how big the population is now.  
25 There's some calves, of course, and then during the

1 year there's some animals that die naturally, either  
2 calves or adults just because they starve, they get  
3 some disease, old age, many different things. And  
4 then we also have harvesting.

5 So to get an idea of the population,  
6 let's say it's 100 animals right now, we have 10  
7 calves that are born, but there's seven animals that  
8 die. So just based on that, the population should be  
9 103 animals at the end of the year; this is after one  
10 year. But if we have a hunt and we remove two more  
11 animals, then in fact at the end of the year, the  
12 population will only be 101 animals. So this is  
13 basically a population model that we're using. And  
14 you can see, I already made a mistake. Yeah, so I put  
15 109 at the bottom and it should be 101. Really, it is  
16 easy.

17 So how do we actually apply this?  
18 Okay, so by the current population size, we had the  
19 aerial surveys. We include a term that we call  
20 "Lambda," where we combine births and deaths, we put  
21 that together into the model. So it's -- so that's  
22 basically your net productivity, the net number of new  
23 animals that are in the population and then you take  
24 out your harvests. And that's how we get the number  
25 of animals that are alive at the end of the year. So

1 your Lambda is a term that we use; it's related to  
2 general Beluga biology. Usually Beluga have a rate of  
3 increase of about three percent. It could be as high  
4 as -- a little bit higher but generally, it's around  
5 three percent.

6 We have our weekly reports that we get  
7 from the wardens on the number of kills and this we  
8 incorporate into the model as well. Based on the  
9 genetics, we have the proportion of EHB animals that  
10 are in the harvest. So for the fall harvest from  
11 Hudson Strait, it was approximately 29 percent of the  
12 fall harvest was made up of Eastern Hudson Bay  
13 animals. So we take the total number of kills that are  
14 reported for Hudson Strait, multiply it by the  
15 proportion of Eastern Hudson Bay animals and this  
16 tells us how many Eastern Hudson Bay animals were  
17 actually killed. And so this is included into the  
18 model as the harvest figure.

19 We have another factor that goes into  
20 the model because, as you know, some animals are  
21 killed but were unable to recover them because they  
22 sink. And so we try to build this factor into the  
23 model as well. And it's treated as an unknown factor  
24 but it's a proportion that actually increases the  
25 number of deaths. So what that means is you have your

1 reported catch but it's actually slightly higher than  
2 that because not all animals that are killed are  
3 recovered.

4 So when we put that together here we  
5 have a figure of the population. You can see the  
6 aerial surveys; those are the black points. We also  
7 have a measure of how confident we are in the surveys  
8 given by the black lines that shows how wide the  
9 interval of confidence is. And so in this figure, the  
10 thick blue line in the middle is the mean number of  
11 animals that are alive in the population. The thinner  
12 blue lines on the outside is how confident we are in  
13 that number. And you see we're more confident in what  
14 we get out of the model than what we have from the  
15 several different aerial surveys.

16 The red line is the catches that have  
17 been reported over time and we can see that when  
18 catches were very high back in the 1970's, the  
19 population was declining, catches started to decline  
20 and so we see the rate of population decrease,  
21 actually going down. And then around 2000, we saw a  
22 very sharp reduction in the harvest and we see that  
23 there's been a stabilization or even an increase in  
24 the population, at least up until about 2012. But  
25 with the most recent harvests, the population may --

1 is either stable or it may have decreased slightly  
2 again, in part due to the higher harvest.

3 The problem with models is that they  
4 are only as good as the information that you have. We  
5 like to try and update them. The next survey is  
6 planned for summer 2020. It will probably go from  
7 about -- we start about mid-July or the third week of  
8 July in James Bay and then we move into Hudson Bay  
9 after that. And we will cover the Eastern Hudson Bay  
10 area. So this will allow us to update the model, it  
11 will also tell us how good the model has been in  
12 predicting the trend or the change in abundance of  
13 Hudson Bay Beluga. The results from this survey again  
14 would be reviewed in that meeting that I'm saying  
15 should take place in the fall of 2020, or possibly as  
16 late as February 2021.

17 Based on the recent high harvests that  
18 were documented for Eastern Hudson Bay, if we were to  
19 roll over the management plan, the suggestion would be  
20 that the TAT should be reduced to 58 animals. And  
21 this is to meet the management objective that has been  
22 in place for over -- well, for close to 40 years.  
23 That is the objective agreed upon by all parties has  
24 been that we would keep the population stable and that  
25 the population -- the probability of any decline in

1 the population should not exceed 50 percent. So this  
2 results in a TAT of about 58 animals.

3 Western Hudson Bay, there is no plan to  
4 update the survey in the short term. The last one was  
5 2015. The total allowable harvest identified for that  
6 stock was 753 animals. The landed catch from Nunavut  
7 and Nunavik back in 2015 when we did the calculations,  
8 was 495. But you have to remember that there is some  
9 struck-and-lost; some animals are not brought ashore,  
10 they're lost. So in actual fact, the harvest is  
11 probably higher; probably closer to 584.

12 So I think one of the strategies that  
13 we have approached in developing our management  
14 framework for Eastern Hudson Bay whales, has been to  
15 try and redirect our harvest towards the Western  
16 Hudson Bay animals. Up until now, that has not been  
17 any problem because the population is quite abundant.

18 In looking at the calculations, the total allowable  
19 harvest that we have, we call it potential biological  
20 removal, but what we would say is if the harvest is  
21 below 753 animals, there's no problems. The current  
22 harvest is probably closer to 584. So that means we  
23 have about 160 animals to play with.

24 So if we wanted to redirect harvesting  
25 towards the Western Hudson Bay animals, we could only

1 probably increase the number of Western Hudson Bay  
2 animals that could be taken to somewhere between 103  
3 and 139, depending on what factor you use to calculate  
4 your struck-and-lost. So there is some flexibility  
5 but it's not unlimited. And if we exceed the 753,  
6 then at some point, there would have to be discussions  
7 on bringing management measures in place to manage the  
8 harvest from that stock as well.

9 We have, as others have mentioned  
10 before us, there is an interest of moving towards a  
11 precautionary approach. One benefit is it's more in  
12 line with international practices but it also has  
13 other benefits. We currently have a fairly high-risk  
14 approach; we would say 50 percent probability of  
15 decline. But we haven't defined if it ever starts to  
16 decline, what would it decline to? I mean, where  
17 would we start to say, well, whoa, we're in really big  
18 trouble? One of the benefits of the precautionary  
19 approach is that everybody participates and you  
20 identify a limit where you were serious worried, you  
21 would even seriously consider shutting down or  
22 minimizing your hunt.

23 The other benefit of it is that it  
24 forces everybody to say, okay, well the population is  
25 about 3,400 right now, 3,200. The Inuit population is



1 increasing, we would like to see a larger Eastern  
2 Hudson Bay population. So therefore, how much would  
3 we like to see? It forces us to identify, okay, where  
4 would we view the population as being recovered or as  
5 being healthy?

6 So the benefits of the precautionary  
7 approach is it forces everybody to think about where  
8 we would take management actions and then also, what  
9 would be the consequences of those actions? This is a  
10 general framework. It is true that DFO has put this  
11 together as a strawman, as a way to start discussion.

12 We've heard that there's been some reticence. We  
13 would prefer to see if there is a traditional way that  
14 could be used to generate a precautionary framework.  
15 That would be actually much more exciting than the  
16 figure that I'm presenting here. But it is something  
17 that could be used but what I wanted to do is use this  
18 as a starting point for discussion.

19 So we have some information from  
20 Sanikiluaq. Since 2010, these are the harvest  
21 figures. So they've -- we've been receiving these  
22 figures, they're available and we have incorporated  
23 them into the population model that I talked about  
24 earlier. I think Lucassie will talk a bit more about  
25 it tomorrow, and the framework that the Sanikiluaq

1 people have developed.

2 The harvest by Sanikiluaq is mostly  
3 non-Eastern Hudson Bay Belugas and what we've been  
4 able to estimate from the harvests that they have, is  
5 probably less than five animals per year. In fact,  
6 it's probably lower than that, but in a worst-case  
7 scenario, that's less than five animals belonging to  
8 the Eastern Hudson Bay stock that are killed per year  
9 in Sanikiluaq. We see generally harvests are from  
10 about 30 to 60, 70 animals. One year, 2015, it was  
11 much higher; reported harvests of 170 animals. But  
12 for the last few years, the last couple of years -- or  
13 last three years, it's been fairly stable.

14 And then this is the reported harvest  
15 from other communities which are thought to be taking  
16 animals from the Western Hudson Bay stock for the last  
17 four years. Arviat, 100 animals in 2015, 30 animals  
18 in 2016 and 120 animals in 2017. And that's all I  
19 have from the science component. I'll hand over to my  
20 colleague, Felix, and he'll talk about the management  
21 component.

22 MR. DIONNE: Thank you, Mike. Okay, so  
23 I'll start with the evolution of the TAT over the last  
24 management period. With the initial information from  
25 the plan in 2017 starting at 187 EHB Beluga. In 2017,

1 there have been an addition from the Hudson Strait by  
2 the project of 1.5. In 2018, an addition of 2.25 and  
3 in 2019, there have been an additional allocation  
4 authorized by the DFO Minister of 15.45 for a total of  
5 206.15 EHB. I put the table here for the harvest data  
6 during that management plan as well because it was  
7 expected I guess from some of you here. What are the  
8 harvests is indicated there. What have been the EHB  
9 value of those especially outlined in 2019 what's the  
10 portion of -- pertaining to the interim decision and  
11 after November 15 as well. To give you a better idea  
12 as well, I put the impacts on EHB which means that out  
13 of ten harvests, let's say for 2017, two were  
14 associated with EHB. These are rounded numbers, of  
15 course, to make that easier to understand. So that's  
16 the portrait of the actual takes compared to the TAT  
17 over the management period.

18 As Mike slightly touched the subject,  
19 this is part of the very first step of a resource  
20 management cycle is to determine the management  
21 objective. It's the fundamental starting point. The  
22 current objective is to maintain a stable stock. And  
23 our proposition is to suggest a new direction toward a  
24 management objective of stock growth. The tools  
25 toward that goal is the continuation of our research

1 activities, the development of it as well, the  
2 precautionary approach that Mike just spoke about, and  
3 as well, the integrated fisheries management plan.  
4 Those are our tools that DFO has developed over the  
5 years that tries to have integration for partners, not  
6 only, let's say Inuits, but also partners like in  
7 commercial fisheries as well there's that integrated  
8 fisheries management plan in place.

9 Integration of research and science  
10 findings in management plan: So what we encourage in  
11 DFO is the identification of research priorities and  
12 the integration of traditional knowledge and research.  
13 The Hudson Strait Pilot Project is a good example in  
14 that regard. But we would also encourage proper  
15 mechanism to incorporate new research results into  
16 management. One of the key part that we see as well  
17 would be the conduct risk-assessment of new management  
18 measures.

19 We can see that Hudson Strait Pilot  
20 Project have brought results and we are under the  
21 impression that it might be too fast to incorporate --  
22 to transform those results that might be considered  
23 preliminary at some -- in some sort, and to make  
24 decision out of it right away. So this is why we want  
25 to promote the practice, the good practice of risk

1 assessment of new management measures.

2 The following slides will be plan  
3 implementation considerations as follows, allocations  
4 and roles of partners: Real-time awareness of  
5 remaining TAT has been a concern frequently expressed  
6 locally. This comes from reports from our fisheries  
7 officers and from wardens as well. What follows the  
8 allocation is very important. It appears very  
9 important to us that a communication strategy is in  
10 place which is important to offer explanations and  
11 also regular and efficient communication among  
12 partners. The operational level of LNUKs, wardens,  
13 hunters and fisheries office needs frequent updates,  
14 and that communication strategy would improve  
15 communication of the management objective as well. In  
16 achieving this, we have in mind that any partners in  
17 management should benefit from the support of the  
18 others to achieve his goal.

19 Monitoring: Harvests are reported from  
20 hunters to the KRG, Uumajuit Wardens network. DFO  
21 comes by and shares harvest data with our science  
22 counterparts and also co-management partners. We  
23 consider this to be an efficient organizational  
24 structure relying on in-field collaboration, frequent  
25 communication and training, and also, follow-up and

1 quality control. We put a lot of effort into that  
2 network and we try to make sure that the communication  
3 is frequent. There's occasions for wardens to ask  
4 questions and also to organize training for them. So  
5 in a way, that practice that has been taken care of  
6 DFO, we consider that it might be a good inspiration  
7 for other parts of the management plan should the  
8 intention of the Board being to develop a better  
9 organizational structure to support the governance of  
10 the hunt.

11 Compliance: Compliance is expected  
12 from hunters but has been uneven within the last  
13 planned timeframe. So we are putting here some ways  
14 to improve compliance that could be explored through  
15 an action plan that we suggest. Parts of these would  
16 be to try to bolster readiness in case of non-  
17 compliance with a prepared set of progressive  
18 measures, investigating why non-compliance happened  
19 and also this action plan should be communicated as  
20 well.

21 To give you an idea as well, we  
22 consider that this has the same approach as the  
23 precautionary approach in terms of having an intention  
24 to develop in advance what should happen if there is a  
25 problem. And to be ready as well to have that mindset

1 of there will be a progression in terms of not only  
2 having enforcement taking care of a situation, but  
3 maybe having a reinforced communication coming in,  
4 well a wider awareness and maybe more contacts and --  
5 because all of those are not yet enforcement. It is a  
6 suggestion that can be made to, well, I almost say it  
7 again, but progressively comes to -- what I mean is  
8 this demonstrates that the situation is taken  
9 seriously and that every partner is taking care of  
10 this as well. And on top of that, any modification of  
11 management measures should imply an impact assessment  
12 on the level of compliance it might bring.

13 And now regarding enforcement, our team  
14 of conservation and protection have implemented a  
15 community-based approach since the recent years. And  
16 actually, being more in contact with the local  
17 population, they received a wide range of feedback  
18 about their presence. Sometimes felt as provocative  
19 and sometimes it's felt insufficient at the same time.  
20 So we take the occasion today to make an invitation to  
21 every stakeholder for an open dialogue over the ways  
22 enforcement is done.

23 As I just mentioned, the compliance  
24 aspect not only has to be dealt with by enforcement,  
25 but enforcement itself is something that has the

1 possibility of being applied in many different ways.  
2 So the invitation is there for a discussion about  
3 this. I am sure it will take time to make progresses  
4 and at least we would feel getting your expectations  
5 towards this would be very important and beneficial to  
6 our action.

7 On communications, DFO encourage  
8 greater communication among all of the different  
9 Beluga co-management partners from the co-managers to  
10 the community level and the other way as well because  
11 this is something that we have been made aware, that  
12 the message doesn't reach the local communities. And  
13 some messages from the communities doesn't reach the  
14 decision-makers as well. Monitoring of messages is  
15 consistent with management decision and well-  
16 understood is another -- would be another key  
17 indicators for us to see if this is going well or not.

18 So our proposition is that the Board should also  
19 support the partners in their communication efforts,  
20 provide a communication strategy to follow.

21 Collaboration: DFO would like to see  
22 more collaboration between partners as well. We think  
23 that positive experience should be promoted and that  
24 when the level of trust appears altered between  
25 stakeholders, partners altogether should address the



1 situation and try to do it. Of course, we think that  
2 the Board could be the catalyst of that kind of action  
3 because of their specific role. But as we indicated  
4 here, every partner has a responsibility and we're  
5 willing to, of course, try to promote that as much as  
6 we can.

7 Now, plan renewal and adjustments:

8 Last year of a plan is a critical period. We have  
9 experienced this this year. But for us to consider  
10 any changes, there need to be sufficient details. It  
11 is imperative to assess the ability of a new system to  
12 ensure conservation. Towards that goal, there's a  
13 necessity for us to have science planning to prepare  
14 for those modifications. So scientific assessment of  
15 change appears to us as something that is needed.

16 So this leads to our positions on the  
17 options. So I have labeled this as our  
18 recommendation, recommendation of the status-quo  
19 because as we just outlined in the previous slides,  
20 our position is to have transformation as well. Some  
21 minor tweaks into the system could be labelled as  
22 Option 2. But as Option 2 has also many  
23 considerations and changes that we would not  
24 necessarily support, we prefer to present this as a  
25 position of status quo. All right.

1                   So at the basis of our recommendation  
2                   is that the EHB has stabilized since the  
3                   implementation of the system. So in that regard, this  
4                   is an achievement of that system. This system is  
5                   already understood and implemented as well and it has  
6                   the capacity to be flexible enough to test scenarios  
7                   if there's change to be experienced. DFO position  
8                   suggest to prioritize general management practices  
9                   benefitting anyways to any plans. Any transformation  
10                  would benefit from the valuable information and  
11                  framework. The changes we promoted can implement and  
12                  as well keeping the use of a TAT would enable the  
13                  reconciliation of the interim TAT that the minister  
14                  provided in 2019.

15                  Our position on minor tweaks to the  
16                  current plan regarding genetic information update and  
17                  flexibility: Recent initiatives to promote DFO  
18                  genetic analysis capacities are on the way. There  
19                  will be, as well, the 2020 aerial survey that will  
20                  also bring new information. And as Mike presented  
21                  briefly as well, there's a review of the management  
22                  framework that comes with all this. So the  
23                  integration of all those new things, we consider that  
24                  it would be really preliminary to make decisions based  
25                  on something that is either really recent or to come.

1  
2 Management of closed area: Those areas  
3 are -- have been designated as where harvest has a  
4 higher risk and impacts. Research and close  
5 monitoring should precede any consideration to allow  
6 harvest with a clear management of expectations  
7 regarding this. And for DFO as well, we consider  
8 these closed areas as potential sanctuaries as well  
9 and maybe more an occasion for work towards habitat  
10 enhancement especially if there is work to be done to  
11 make sure that, I don't know, favour the return of  
12 population if it has left.

13 Regional TAT and seasons options: That  
14 option that involve the actual tool of the management  
15 system which are the closure of zones to reduce the  
16 inter-dependencies that comes with the actual plan.  
17 Sharing the actual TAT between regions has not been  
18 detailed nor is the governance of this option for  
19 hunter's access to other region. So because EHB  
20 harvest happens everywhere in NMR, the Nunavik Marine  
21 Region, to minimize impacts in our sense there needs  
22 to be visible measures that are developed towards  
23 this. So this is where we are talking about what  
24 actually would -- what the sharing of the TAT would  
25 look like. And what would be, as well, because

1           there's visitors into other regions especially in the  
2           fall in the Hudson Strait, for example. And this is  
3           part of our question as well to the Makivik  
4           proposition as well. What will be in place for the  
5           proper governance of those visits and access to other  
6           zones?

7                           For the moment, this has not been  
8           developed yet and this is why we consider that an  
9           implementation of this option is premature and would  
10          be a risk for conservation if implemented for 2020  
11          hunt season. By the way, this is not because this is  
12          a bad idea at all but as you might have seen in our  
13          presentation, we consider that we need the sufficient  
14          time to discuss and describe how this will be  
15          detailed. And after that, assess scientifically if  
16          this would keep us in the way of a stable and possibly  
17          growing population.

18                           Option of non-quota limitation only or  
19          no TAT: Any management system must be assessed in its  
20          ability to address conservation concerns for us. A  
21          removal of a TAT means an important effort to estimate  
22          and predict the impact of the harvest will have on the  
23          EHB population; this will still prevail. For us right  
24          now, it isn't considered as a not realistic timeframe  
25          before the hunt season of 2020. And it also introduce

1 a higher risk for conservation. In the meantime, the  
2 TAT system provides a flexibility and conservation at  
3 the same time. Maintaining it will allow for  
4 experiment if this is the will of the Board and our  
5 partners. And we have to think as well that it might  
6 generate more limits if compared to the actual  
7 situation when, let's say, compared to a season, the  
8 actual system allow Inuit to hunt all through the  
9 year.

10 In conclusion, conservation also means  
11 recovery of the population for DFO. And we believe  
12 that precautionary approach has that potential. DFO  
13 recommendation of a two-year roll-over of the current  
14 system would enable the situation that could be  
15 labelled as transitory. The implementation of  
16 improved management practices direction, organization,  
17 etcetera, the consideration for new scientific  
18 information as well, and the proper assessment of a  
19 new framework. Thank you.

20 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, DFO. It's  
21 after 6:00. I think you'll go for supper, come back  
22 at 7:30. And then you will have an opportunity to ask  
23 questions to DFO after supper. We are behind our  
24 schedule, that's why we need to come back and some  
25 people have not gone to their house yet. You are

1 going for supper and come back at 7:30. You should  
2 come and see my equipment here. Some people have  
3 moved today and haven't seen their new homes yet, so  
4 they'll have a few minutes to do that.

5  
6 --- EVENING BREAK

7  
8 MS. SALAMIVA: Who are we missing?  
9 Jobie, Jobie Oweetaluktuk, Johnny Peters. Markusie,  
10 do you have a question to DFO? James are you going to  
11 have questions for DFO? We're taking the list now.  
12 James May, Lucassie, would you also like to comment,  
13 no? I mean ask question, no. Johnny (indiscernible)?  
14 There are so many Johnnies. And the reason why we are  
15 asking you to raise your hands is because it was  
16 taking too long to pass on the microphone to everyone.  
17 Charlie, you will be the first one to ask question.  
18 Mark? Microphone. Yes.

19 MR. PANINGAYAK: Thank you. I asked  
20 this question yesterday. It was mentioned since 1985,  
21 there has been a survey, 108 population, 10 were born,  
22 seven killed. The number of 109, I want that to be  
23 corrected because I live in an actual area and the  
24 only way you could find out is by the documentation.  
25 So because I witness and I live in the region, that's

1 why I want you to correct your number. And there was  
2 no number for struck-and-loss and there are other  
3 animals that also attack Beluga whales, for example,  
4 by polar bear. I would also want to see the loss by  
5 other wildlife and I would also want you to do a  
6 research on those that are lost by other species, that  
7 are killed by other species.

8 MS. SALAMIVA: Johnny Peters.

9 MR. PETERS: I'm going to ask  
10 questions, Salamiva. DFO be very attentive. My  
11 question concerning the Beluga that are in Churchill  
12 and in around Churchill there are a lot of polar bears  
13 so they kill a lot of baby whales. So I would like to  
14 know how many are killed by polar bears.

15 And second question: RNUK and NMRWB --  
16 RNUK and DFO I think should have something in writing  
17 because some communities have quotas and sometimes  
18 communities are trying to save their quotas to the  
19 fall but when other communities are using up all the  
20 quotas, they have no more quotas because some other  
21 communities don't respect their quota numbers. And  
22 they prevent other communities to reach their quotas.

23 So I want this to be corrected. And I would want the  
24 one that over-harvested to be prevented from hunting  
25 and allow other communities that still have quotas to

1 continue hunt.

2 MR. HAMMILL: Is that okay? I can  
3 answer anyway. The polar bear, we don't know how many  
4 are killed by the polar bears. Don't forget on the  
5 western side especially some are probably killed by  
6 killer whales as well and some will be killed by  
7 killer whales in the Strait. But that's included in  
8 the mortality, in the natural mortality factor. So as  
9 long as we're in a so-called normal range, because  
10 animals are always dying. Animals are always dying  
11 from different reasons and the reasons you identified  
12 are excellent. So that's just part of natural  
13 mortality and so it works itself in the population  
14 model.

15 MR. DIONNE: Okay, and regarding your  
16 second question Mr. Peters, well, the notion of saving  
17 the harvest for the fall, well, this is to me a good  
18 example of misunderstanding of the system and  
19 especially the allocation that have been prepared by  
20 the RNUK. This was not supposed to be that way. It  
21 was supposed to mean that there are specific  
22 allocations for the spring and there's specific  
23 allocations for the fall. And they cannot add up like  
24 a simple addition of it.

25 So to pinpoint that the consequence of



1 over-harvesting should be -- not be allowed to hunt  
2 the year after. Well, to me it appears to be -- it's  
3 a suggestion of one possible consequences. Maybe  
4 there's something else that could work better and  
5 ensure that compliance is met the year after. Is it  
6 by punishing a specific community that we will achieve  
7 that? Well, this may be an option and this is why we  
8 think that meetings and discussions over how to  
9 achieve compliance should happen. And we must see  
10 what range of possibilities that we have to achieve  
11 compliance on the long run. Thank you.

12 MS. SALAMIVA: Next speaker -- I mean,  
13 next question will come from Billy Dan May.

14 MR. MAY: Thank you. Billy Dan May,  
15 LNUK from Tasiujaq. Around (indiscernible) in  
16 Nunavut, I wonder if you also do a survey around that  
17 area and also in Rankin Inlet there have -- looking at  
18 your number, they harvested so much. I wonder if you  
19 do a proper observation or conduct a research because  
20 these are the same Beluga whale that we hunt, and we  
21 are prevented to hunt them. Here it's you say six  
22 percent, but how come we are always on ten percent  
23 mark? And when you say not determined, it sounds like  
24 you say you don't know. Without any proof you are  
25 saying there's no Ungava Bay stock. You don't even do

1 a survey on it. So how come we are following those  
2 that are not realistic because you say not determined  
3 and known?

4 And the Beluga that are harvested in  
5 Nunavut, maybe you can do a sampling on them because  
6 there's a word unknown there and I'm not happy about  
7 that word. Because we always try to follow what has  
8 been given to us. We always harvested non-EHB but our  
9 quota is never increased. And this this is not a  
10 proper way to do it. And it would be good because  
11 there's a big debate in this and people are  
12 disagreeing a lot on that.

13 MR. HAMMILL: Okay, for Ungava bay in  
14 this table, you'll see the stars under UB for Ungava  
15 Bay. Those are years that surveys were flown in  
16 Ungava Bay to look for whales and they didn't see any  
17 Beluga whales on the transects. In some of them, they  
18 saw them, you know, when you turn and you fly along  
19 the coast a little bit, they saw Belugas along the  
20 coast. But they didn't see them on transect but they  
21 didn't seem them on transect. That means the  
22 population has to be very small if we do not detect  
23 any whales when we fly along the transects. We came  
24 up with the probability -- or it's very unlikely that  
25 there are more than 100 animals in Ungava Bay at the

1 current time, otherwise we would have detected them.  
2 And that's based on -- well, the last survey was 2008.

3  
4 They have been protected for an awful  
5 long time and even if there had been no poaching, no  
6 nothing else going on, if there were 100 animals, the  
7 best that we could expect for the Ungava Bay stock  
8 right now, is probably around 300 animals. So again,  
9 not very many. This summer, if the weather is good,  
10 we try to fly Ungava but our priority is going to be  
11 James Bay and Eastern Hudson Bay. Those are the two  
12 priorities for the surveys.

13 On your question for WHB, our  
14 colleagues in Winnipeg do have a sampling program in  
15 Arviat. So they are getting animals from the hunt  
16 there. They also have a sampling program in Arviat,  
17 so they are getting animals from the hunt there. They  
18 also have a sampling program in Naujaat but up until  
19 now, most of the samples appear to be narwhal. So  
20 less for Beluga, more for narwhal. So it is being  
21 monitored, the Western Hudson Bay, but as you can see  
22 in this table, under WHB estimate, we're probably  
23 around 54,500 whales. So that's why there's no limit  
24 on the harvest for that stock.

25 For Ungava Bay, the communities on

1 Ungava Bay, we have two issues. The one issue is that  
2 we have Eastern Hudson Bay whales that do go into  
3 Ungava Bay. And from the sampling that we've done, it  
4 looks like it's about six percent of that total  
5 consists of Eastern Hudson Bay animals. So that's  
6 this column here, Ungava Bay 122 samples, six percent  
7 on average for Eastern Hudson Bay, that's from the  
8 spring hunt. We don't have many samples; we only had  
9 four samples from the fall hunt. And that's really  
10 too small a sample size to be able to make any kind of  
11 logical assessment. So that's why we put non-  
12 determined. If we get more samples and could build  
13 that up to 10, 15, 20, then it starts to become  
14 worthwhile to estimate a proportion.

15 The second problem or the second  
16 challenge with Ungava Bay is that we're trying to  
17 protect the Ungava Bay stock and so it's difficult to  
18 open up hunting for that given that it's such a small  
19 population and would remain a small population for a  
20 very long time. What question did I answer?

21 MS. ROBINSON: Can you please give him  
22 the microphone? And could we see the data from the  
23 Nunavut data if it could go up, too, on the board?

24 MR. MAY: I was trying to ask you which  
25 population are the one that are harvested in Arviat,

1 (indiscernible), Coral Harbour are close to us and  
2 Rankin. So my question was which stocks do they  
3 harvest? We see many, many Belugas in Ungava. I have  
4 pictures, I have proof, I'm not telling you a lie. I  
5 see them with my own eyes; I wish you could see them.

6 How come we are being mistreated, we are hungry, too,  
7 we need to have food, too? So I really want to know  
8 which stocks are being harvested in Nunavut. The one  
9 -- usually you identify Beluga as non-EHB, maybe  
10 you're hiding something, maybe you could -- avoiding,  
11 it seems like avoiding answering real questions and  
12 showing us real facts.

13 MS. ROBINSON: So the question is where  
14 are those -- what stock are those harvests coming  
15 from? If that could be answered, please.

16 MR. HAMMILL: So the communities along  
17 the west side of Hudson Bay and southern -- south-  
18 western Baffin are harvesting from Western Hudson Bay  
19 stock. We tend to say often non-EHB because sometimes  
20 we question if there's maybe more than one stock on  
21 the west coast for the moment -- that's the west coast  
22 of Hudson Bay -- for the moment, we still generally  
23 consider that's a single stock and it's the largest  
24 stock that's roughly 54,000 animals. So that's where  
25 the communities from Arviat, Baker Lake, Cape Dorset,

1 Coral Harbour, Rankin Inlet, Kimmirut are harvesting  
2 from.

3 MS. ROBINSON: Johnny Oovaut is up next  
4 for questions.

5 MR. OOVAUT: All right. Thank you.  
6 I'll ask my questions all at the same time. How are  
7 you going to -- I guess this is for enforcement  
8 department. How are you going to investigate when you  
9 don't have any offices in Nunavik? You don't have a  
10 station, you have no office, nothing. If a person is  
11 charged, are they considered criminals? How come DFO  
12 is afraid of us? And the reason for this question  
13 because DFO officers have told the Inuit that they are  
14 afraid of us and I think that's an insult to us.  
15 Stereotypical, saying we are a dangerous people. My  
16 granddaughter was protesting this fall; she's only  
17 five years old. You're afraid of my granddaughter.  
18 And my last question is how come DFO is nicer to  
19 Nunavut?

20 MR. DIONNE: Okay, Felix here from DFO.  
21 Thank you for your questions. Okay, first question,  
22 that was how, okay ---

23 MR. OOVAUT: How are you going to  
24 investigate, that's the question.

25 MR. DIONNE: Okay, the investigations

1 are done by the fisheries officers that conduct  
2 patrols. The patrol is intended to collect data and  
3 also conduct interviews. So the actual physical  
4 presence, in permanent presence in that regard, is not  
5 necessarily something that is mandatory for conducting  
6 a proper investigation. But on top of that, there's  
7 still the intention for DFO to try to recruit, of  
8 course, officers from Nunavik. This is an effort that  
9 has been done since many, many years but has been  
10 proven unsuccessful. This is not something that is  
11 wished to have officers from -- based somewhere else,  
12 but it doesn't impede their capacity to conduct  
13 investigation.

14 The question of having somebody being  
15 charged as being a criminal, well, I'm not actually an  
16 expert in those enforcement components, but these are  
17 two separate things in my mind. Putting charges is  
18 not actually a -- having somebody labelled as a  
19 criminal. It has to wait for the proper judicial  
20 process.

21 The question of being afraid of Inuits:  
22 Well, I don't have the exact numbers of patrols that  
23 have been conducted by CNP in the last year and the  
24 few years before, but I can say that they do go into  
25 the communities and they are not only patrolling by

1 staying at the hotel. They are trying to meet local  
2 people, they have tried regularly to make sure that  
3 they meet the wardens, the mayors and as many key  
4 stakeholders into the communities and that includes  
5 LNUKs as well. And invitations are regularly made to  
6 meet RNUKs as well, too.

7 And your last question is how come DFO  
8 is nicer to Nunavut? I'm afraid I'm not able to  
9 answer that question. I don't feel that way but if  
10 this is the perception you have from our action in  
11 comparison to the Nunavut, well, at the very least  
12 this a good subject of a very important conversation  
13 that we should have. I guess there's differences in  
14 the way that it is governed in between those regions.

15 It has to do as well with the land claim that is  
16 different. And I guess to have a clear answer on  
17 that, it will have to be part of a wider assessment  
18 than what I can think of at the top of my head.

19 MS. SALAMIVA: Hi, Mark. Next is  
20 Johnny Arnaituk.

21 MR. ARNAITUK: Thank you. Johnny from  
22 Kangiqsujuaq. My question, you mentioned that you  
23 would do counting in the coming year. I would ask you  
24 to listen more to the local communities as to go about  
25 it because you come at the wrong time. When you go to



1 Nunavik area, I would ask you to listen to the hunters  
2 because they know when and where the animals are  
3 travelling. And the other one, somebody from DFO came  
4 over. I didn't really like it, they met us on a  
5 weekend. They were asked to meet with us on a weekend  
6 when we were ready to go hunting. I would ask that  
7 this not be repeated, not to do that again because it  
8 affects the community.

9 MR. HAMMILL: In the past when we've  
10 discussed the survey, people have asked us to fly in  
11 the Strait earlier and the problem with trying to fly  
12 in the Strait, in Hudson Strait at an earlier time is  
13 that it may be before the animals have started their  
14 migration. So we have a mixture of animals from  
15 Eastern Hudson Bay and Western Hudson Bay. And from  
16 the aircraft, it's not possible to distinguish between  
17 the two.

18 Going back to the beginning of my  
19 presentation, I said that the separation is based on  
20 the summer distribution of whales into a Western  
21 Hudson Bay stock and an Eastern Hudson Bay stock. And  
22 this is based on the summering areas where these  
23 animals are found. From other sources of information,  
24 these animals return to the same locations every year.  
25 So when we do our surveys, we want to try and count

1 the Eastern Hudson Bay whales when they are in their  
2 home territory, and this tends to be July and August.

3 So that is why we time to fly at that time.

4 MR. DIONNE: And, Johnny, you made a  
5 second comment about the visits of CNP patrols  
6 happening in the weekend. Well, I will pass along  
7 that comment to them. But in the meantime, I need to  
8 say that when they organize a patrol, they will  
9 organize it for reaching several communities in the  
10 same -- at the same trip. So they will try to use as  
11 much as possible their time to try to figure out the -  
12 - a good meeting time. But for sure they will take  
13 good note of your availability.

14 And if there is an issue again about  
15 this, well I suggest that at first this very well can  
16 be a response given to them. It is not a subpoena to  
17 meet the fisheries officer in a way they are intending  
18 to do their patrols. They want to meet you, they want  
19 to talk to you and they want to engage. So this is  
20 the main message I have to tell you about this and for  
21 sure, I don't want this to be an insult to propose a  
22 meeting in the weekend. So we'll put some highlights  
23 on this comment for sure.

24 MS. ROBINSON: I think we're ready for  
25 the next group for questions, and that's Makivik.

1 MR. GILBERT: Makivik, Gregor Gilbert,  
2 Makivik Corporation. I've got a number of questions  
3 that I think just to give each question and response  
4 justice, I'll do them one at a time. The first  
5 question is actually kind of an overarching question  
6 but I'd like to hear from DFO and for the benefit of  
7 people in the room. Who does DFO manage Beluga for?

8 MR. DIONNE: Well, that is a simple  
9 question but I consider it really important. And,  
10 well, there's a focus for DFO on the conservation of  
11 marine species. So when there's that status that  
12 comes with COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of  
13 Endangered Wildlife Species in Canada) well, this is  
14 the main trigger. It doesn't mean that we don't care  
15 of anything else but the management of marine species  
16 is one focus that we have. We also commit to manage  
17 in a way that respects who are the users of the marine  
18 resources. And, of course, this is intended to be  
19 made with respect to the harvesting rights of  
20 aboriginal people, so ...

21 MR. GILBERT: Makivik. I've stolen the  
22 other mic so I guess considering those statements a  
23 follow-up question for DFO is that the Government of  
24 Canada has made many statements, especially recently,  
25 about supporting and promoting the indigenous right to

1 self-determination and self-government, including, as  
2 we alluded to in our submission, the signing of a  
3 memorandum of understanding with Nunavik Inuit on that  
4 issue. And committing to implementing United Nations  
5 Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,  
6 otherwise known as UNDRIP. I'm wondering you could  
7 answer how is DFO changing its approach and  
8 incorporating these considerations in the current  
9 submission especially given the important of Beluga  
10 harvesting to Inuit?

11 MR. DIONNE: Okay. Well, there is work  
12 that has been done internally in the department  
13 regarding how we will achieve that reconciliation  
14 agenda of the government. These are actually at the  
15 state of general considerations and there's -- well, I  
16 try to make links to what has transpired in our  
17 presentation. For the most part, those invitations to  
18 dialogue and to bigger collaboration is one of them.  
19 And, of course, I don't want to say that it's perfect  
20 in that regard, and in the meantime, at the very first  
21 reconciliation means that we would have a relation.  
22 This is the basic need for anything in that regard so  
23 we want to pursue this dialogue and this is not that  
24 concrete as you may expect but this is where we are at  
25 the present time.

1 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Makivik, thank  
2 you. I guess as a follow-up question to that one, I  
3 didn't actually ask about reconciliation. I was  
4 talking about self-determination but I would like, if  
5 possible, for you to give me specific examples from  
6 the DFO submission where those were taken into  
7 consideration, sorry, self-determination.

8 MR. DIONNE: Okay. I'm sorry, Gregor,  
9 about the saying -- talking about reconciliation  
10 instead of self-determination. But it's because at  
11 the very baseline of our agenda for self-  
12 determination, it was as a -- one of the pillar of our  
13 strategy to reconciliation was self-determination.  
14 And try to seek where there's opportunities for it and  
15 especially because for aboriginal people across  
16 Canada, the use of marine resources is a central  
17 piece. And so it makes DFO, well, heavily considered  
18 for -- as a key partner in that regard. So this might  
19 have to be the first precision I need to make.

20 And in the meantime, you are referring  
21 to initiatives that are conducted at the really high  
22 level between ministers and Makivik that are closely  
23 linked to politics and to have the time to make it  
24 concrete, policy changes and even more into management  
25 plans, these are several steps below I believe the

1 discussion that you are having right now. So we are  
2 trying our best to keep in touch with those  
3 discussions that you might have and we are -- well, we  
4 are, of course, curious about what was into that  
5 proposition you made. But in the meantime, we are  
6 partners with you in terms in making it more concrete  
7 and for now, it's maybe too preliminary to have really  
8 concrete answers to provide for this.

9 MR. GILBERT: Okay, I've got one final  
10 question that's I guess kind of multifaceted. Do you,  
11 I guess, meaning DFO, have faith that Nunavik Inuit  
12 are capable of managing Beluga harvesting in a manner  
13 that is consistent with the terms of Article 5 of  
14 NILCA? And if the answer is no, then why not? And,  
15 equally, if the answer is no, do you see a role for  
16 DFO to aid Nunavik Inuit in self-determination in  
17 Beluga management?

18 MR. DIONNE: Okay. Well, it's really  
19 difficult to give a yes or no answer to your question  
20 especially since we don't have a lot of details on how  
21 things will effectively work. And this is why we are  
22 ready to listen to what is your ideas and what are the  
23 ideas of the Inuit people about this. And we have to  
24 careful as well of the political aspect of all this.  
25 So we might look closed to the idea but we are not, we

1 are open to ideas, we are open to discussions. But,  
2 of course, we have to see what it may look like before  
3 we make any judgment on this. So this is really  
4 important to see that this is our way of proceeding to  
5 this.

6 MR. GILBERT: Okay, I think I will  
7 leave it at that for now.

8 MR. O'CONNOR: My first question is  
9 for Mike. Regarding the genetic information, if we  
10 can go back to one of the slides that you have. One  
11 of the -- there's two things that jump out is first  
12 that there's quite wide confidence intervals around  
13 the genetic information. And the second is that the  
14 time periods that are analyzed as being either spring  
15 or fall are quite wide ranges. So if we compare to  
16 the Sanikiluaq information that is broken down into  
17 much smaller chunks of time, how -- I guess, so  
18 there's two parts to that question. The first is how  
19 confident are you in the genetic information that  
20 you're using in terms of applying those mean numbers  
21 to the management structure? And the second is with  
22 regards to the timeframe around these data sets, is  
23 that something you will be looking at when you  
24 reassess all of this information?

25 MR. HAMMILL: Mike Hammill, DFO. The

1 thing I like about this table which also shows how  
2 messy science can be, is that as we have added  
3 samples, we've reduced the width of those confidence  
4 intervals. I think they are important to include so  
5 that everybody remembers that these are measurements  
6 and measurements always have some uncertainty  
7 associated. As you get -- as you add samples, the  
8 mean tends to stabilize. So what is nice about that  
9 is you're not seeing huge variations between plans or  
10 between years. So it's nice and stable.

11 I can make this a lot more complicated  
12 in showing you this one, in the sense that this could  
13 be an example of the types of samples that we're  
14 getting from the hunters. So you take a column, any  
15 one of those columns could be one sample from one  
16 community or one hunter. How do you choose to apply  
17 that across a broad region? The way we have done that  
18 is to try and choose the 50 percent or the middle of  
19 the pack which is the red line here. But any sample  
20 at any one time could be anywhere within this  
21 distribution. That's just the way sampling works with  
22 this kind of a scientific program.

23 So to try and get some stability, try  
24 and get near the central tendency which is sort of the  
25 true value, you want to be near the mean, and you want



1 to try and narrow the width of that distribution, and  
2 this is what we're doing with increasing the samples.

3 So we're becoming -- we're confident right now in the  
4 trends that are showing up because we're starting to  
5 see less variability as we add samples, and we're  
6 starting to narrow the confidence intervals, when we  
7 treat them as big groups.

8 Unfortunately, as I showed you before,  
9 is that for some communities we don't have those nice  
10 big samples. And in fact, all of this is being -- or  
11 most of this is being driven by the sampling from  
12 Quaqtaq because they have been very good in  
13 participating, in spite of the disagreements we have  
14 on the management framework. They have contributed a  
15 lot to the science for this program. And so that  
16 community I would be confident in starting to break it  
17 down into different periods to look at it because we  
18 now have a lot of nice samples.

19 For other communities, I would be more  
20 reluctant simply because we just don't have the number  
21 of samples from those communities. And I think I had  
22 -- yeah, so this is one example. And it's not nice to  
23 pick on communities but we -- it's very difficult to  
24 start looking at things with POV over the years  
25 because we don't have -- if you want to split that

1 into spring and fall, and then you want to split that  
2 even further, you don't have enough samples for POV.  
3 But with Quaqtaq, with Kuujjuaraapik -- well, for this  
4 period, it's only 16 samples. But for Quaqtaq, we're  
5 up to 100 so it's nice to split it into spring and  
6 fall, and we could even make smaller subdivisions.

7 We are not planning -- okay, I can turn  
8 this around as a -- there are many different ways we  
9 can analyze this genetic information. What would help  
10 us a lot, as we do work for you, is that what do you  
11 want us to look at? So when your ideas -- and this  
12 could come from Makivik through my fisheries  
13 management colleagues, to say we would like to look at  
14 a finer scale separation of the hunt or inter-seasonal  
15 changes in the hunt. And this is something that we  
16 can address specifically. So that's another that we  
17 can look at it. But there are many ways we could  
18 split it and we may not get what -- it's better if you  
19 can let us know what you would like us to look at.  
20 And we can include that in the review for fall 2020.

21 MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, Mike. Perhaps  
22 that will happen if we get invited to the research  
23 priority sitting.

24 MR. HAMMILL: Actually, sorry, you  
25 don't even have to wait for a resource priority. You

1 can send it into ---

2 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, we have for some  
3 other species that never made it.

4 MR. HAMMILL: Yeah, yeah.

5 MR. O'CONNOR: The second question I  
6 had was with regards to the model itself. And this  
7 slide, actually the one where you put in the example  
8 with the parameters that are -- yeah. I just wonder  
9 in this exercise, I think for people to understand it  
10 better, is it possible for you to explain out of the  
11 different factors that are going into the model, how  
12 many of them are known factors, the parameters that  
13 are known? And with what confidence and how many of  
14 them are -- I won't say guesses, because that reduces  
15 it to something that is less than what it is, but  
16 basically, assumptions that you're plugging into the  
17 model and what confidences are around those  
18 assumptions?

19 MR. HAMMILL: Well, you see the aerial  
20 surveys, we're fitting the model to the aerial surveys  
21 over time. And a single survey has, again, a lot of  
22 uncertainty. It's a sample, it's a picture from one  
23 period at a time. Sometimes we're able to fly two  
24 surveys so we can improve the variance on it. That's  
25 why just using the surveys I don't like. I think the

1 width of the confidence intervals shows that there's a  
2 wide level of uncertainty. It's when we start to  
3 include it in the model that we start to improve our  
4 understanding or our confidence with the population.  
5 So I'm more confident in the abundance estimate from  
6 the model than I am from the abundance estimate from  
7 the aerial survey. To get to this stage, we needed a  
8 lot of aerial surveys to try and fit it into the  
9 model.

10 The other component is the rates of  
11 increase which is births minus deaths. And this is a  
12 component that we actually adjust for the model to fit  
13 to the aerial survey data and it gives an output of  
14 how uncertain that is. The other input is the catch  
15 data. We assume that the hunters are telling us all  
16 the animals that they catch and so we assume that this  
17 is good data. Then we include, there's the genetics  
18 data. The genetics data, again, is based on the  
19 sampling. And when we use the large samples that  
20 actually provides an estimate of variance, we are more  
21 confident now especially because some of them have  
22 very nice sample sizes. Some of them are still too  
23 small; we can't do anything with it or we're not  
24 comfortable in doing something with it. Now that's  
25 the NDs. So in this one, Northeastern Hudson Bay, two

1 samples I would not be confident using that data. But  
2 the Hudson Strait where 770 all told over the years,  
3 so that's a really nice sample, so I have more  
4 confidence in that.

5 One factor that we do not have a lot of  
6 information is struck-and-loss. That is hunters, they  
7 tell us how many they bring home but they don't always  
8 tell us how many they've lost. Not that they've done  
9 this on purpose, it's just that, you know, it doesn't  
10 make sense, why would I tell everybody I lost a whale.  
11 I only want to tell people how many whales I bring  
12 home. But we know there is some loss and so this is a  
13 factor that I would say is we based it a little bit on  
14 information from other jurisdictions, but it is close  
15 to being I'm less confident in that. And it is a  
16 factor that can have an effect on the model output.  
17 And it's something where we need to put more effort to  
18 try and narrow it down. I think those are the --  
19 yeah. So the struck-and-loss is a factor that's sort  
20 of associated with the harvest.

21 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: So how do you get  
22 to 18 percent?

23 MR. HAMMILL: Eighteen percent of  
24 struck-and-loss?

25 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Yes.

1 MR. HAMMILL: Okay, 18 percent of  
2 struck-and-loss is based on published information from  
3 other jurisdictions.

4 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: Sorry, this is  
5 Adamie from Makivik.

6 MR. HAMMILL: Yeah.

7 MR. DELISLE-ALAKU: I'm just uneasy  
8 with that figure knowing all these hunters when  
9 they're hunting, they usually harpoon it first and  
10 shoot it after. And not all the time, but when there  
11 is a whale that is lost, we do everything we can to  
12 retrieve it. We have tools to harvest to try to  
13 retrieve whales. And I find that your guesstimate is  
14 a bit high on our side, knowing our hunting  
15 techniques, utilize traditional tools, harpoons and  
16 then modern tools, guns to kill the whale.

17 MR. HAMMILL: Actually, from most of  
18 the literature, that's probably not a high estimate.  
19 That's probably more middle of the range. When you  
20 get into floe edge hunting, it can be much higher as  
21 the whales are going by at the floe edge. Some places  
22 they do sort of shoot whales in the water and then  
23 they wait until the tide goes down which I have  
24 nothing against, it's a good way. But that could lead  
25 to higher losses because the animals were shot and

1 then when they sink, the current takes them away. So  
2 I agree the harpoon first is the best approach, it's  
3 an excellent approach and when that is used, it is  
4 extremely low struck-and-lost. And, in fact, from  
5 what we've seen in Greenland, the problems that have  
6 occurred there, it's only when the rope breaks that  
7 they sort of have a real struck-and-lost. So it's  
8 like three percent, one percent; it's really peanuts.

9 But for other hunts where they are not harpooned  
10 first, I respectfully disagree with you.

11 MS. ROBINSON: Makivik, Jimmy Johannes.

12 MR. JOHANNES: I will talk about a  
13 little bit what of what we've been hearing for many  
14 years. The estimates are possibilities, and if we  
15 don't follow through something bad will come out. We  
16 are being informed those possibilities. It's DFO  
17 implemented it. They even went to university. So  
18 tradition of Inuit, traditional practice of Inuit,  
19 it's completely different. They are not even -- DFO  
20 are not even to respond properly. I know that for  
21 many years they have these estimates, hunting areas  
22 have been closed. Our way of life have been impacted.

23 We will never been treated priority by DFO. Beluga  
24 is more important than us, always. They learned from  
25 us, they understood those -- from us. Because of that

1 we are being treated differently. We even argue or go  
2 against each other.

3 It's Mike Hammill who implemented  
4 quota. Where did he get that authority? For who did  
5 he implement that? It was for us; we're using this  
6 for many years now. They always do come out with same  
7 numbers when they do their aerial survey and we've  
8 been trying to tell them where to fly over. And  
9 usually they fly and do their survey when the Belugas  
10 are not there anymore because they learn from school  
11 how to do it; not by people, not by practicing it.  
12 For many, many years we've been telling DFO to do  
13 their survey while they're migrating, but nothing has  
14 been changed. Because of that, our understanding will  
15 be priority because if we want to go properly for  
16 self-determination. You need to know how much Inuit  
17 knows how they know to take care of wildlife. They  
18 have that understanding. Those white people don't  
19 have that same understanding. They use numbers, they  
20 use those screenings, that's how they understand.  
21 Those are not understood by Inuit people but they are  
22 being used today.

23 Is it better for us now? No, no, it's  
24 not. We've been following this for too long and it  
25 will still continue to, we are being used by DFO.



1 Even when they make a mistake, they will never confirm  
2 that and right now you can tell that they are trying  
3 to respond to you very carefully not to make a mistake  
4 because they're hiding something. They don't want to  
5 mention it accidentally. Yes, they went to school and  
6 learned how to write, and still today they will never  
7 tell you how they are, how they were in their own  
8 land. We know that they use dynamites to kill the  
9 Beluga and they were paying their people to kill the  
10 Beluga. How come this was never told? Why aren't we  
11 being informed?

12 So until we start to work on our own,  
13 this will continue. We will never be happy about it.

14 I will save some of my comments tomorrow. They would  
15 not know anything if there were no wardens and those  
16 wardens are from our region. They give those DFO some  
17 information. They have a meeting every week. They  
18 cannot work on their own, never. It's the wardens who  
19 are feeding the information, what is lost, what is  
20 being caught. They even want to have an everyday  
21 meeting. And if we don't want to go through same  
22 problems, we will have to stand stronger. Thank you.

23 MS. SALAMIVA: Are you going to  
24 respond?

25 MR. HAMMILL: I think I won't be

1           flippant but a lot of the science presented is always  
2           -- Mike Hammill. I've had the pleasure of working  
3           with you guys since 1998, I think. Actually, I  
4           started the 1985 survey so I've been involved in  
5           affairs in Nunavik and Nunavut since -- well, Nunavut  
6           since 1978. But -- so you guys are kind of stuck with  
7           hearing the same name which is -- I know a lot of your  
8           discussions and your perspectives and I appreciate  
9           them. You guys do live here and you're the ones with  
10          the expertise in the hunting. And I try to understand  
11          that and try and figure out the perspective that is  
12          being portrayed.

13                        When I present you with the science,  
14                        it's not like Hammill science; sure I've done a lot of  
15                        it. But the results that I present to you, they then  
16                        go to a meeting, to a committee. Yes, another  
17                        government committee, but it involves people,  
18                        sometimes people from the Board, sometimes people from  
19                        Makivik, sometimes people from universities. Other  
20                        people who can look at our methods, they are asked not  
21                        to bring their political views but to look at the  
22                        science methods, are there faults that they see in  
23                        these methods?

24                                And then we discuss them and we try and  
25                                make corrections so that we get the best information

1 from a science perspective. And then they say, okay,  
2 Mike Hammill, you take it back and present it to  
3 Nunavik. So it's not Mike Hammill who's made this  
4 decision, it's a committee of experts inside and  
5 outside of government who have pooled it together and  
6 said, all right, this is our best view for the moment,  
7 at this time, so present it to the people. And it  
8 just happens to be it's for the last 20 years, it's  
9 Mike Hammill. So that is just something I would like  
10 to correct. I don't mind if people blame me for the  
11 information but it's not just Mike Hammill who is  
12 coming together to give you this information.

13 I think a lot of the discussions have  
14 been interesting. The department I think is open to  
15 new approaches, thinking outside of the box. We're in  
16 this together. I think what we'd like to see are some  
17 details. We've heard some general themes and these  
18 are really good, but they're above my pay scale. I  
19 can't help you with that. When it gets down to lower  
20 levels, you know, how are we going to work through the  
21 next couple of years with some level of detail until  
22 we develop a new approach? How are we going to move  
23 longer term until some of the dreams that you guys  
24 have are put in place. But until we get there, we  
25 need to work out some concrete mechanisms and time is

1 going very fast. So that's my response. Thank you  
2 very much.

3 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. Short  
4 reminder to keep this time for questions. Comments  
5 and criticisms of other people's -- other  
6 presentations can be at your time. Also, it's  
7 important to be respectful. People come from  
8 organizations, people have jobs and we might not like  
9 the outcomes or some of the things they have to say.  
10 But it's important to not make this personal and to  
11 maintain a respectful way of speaking to each other.  
12 Billy Palliser you have the mic for questions. Billy  
13 Palliser. Everybody will have a chance to comment who  
14 we wanted to comment.

15 MR. PALLISER: Thank you. Could I go  
16 one question at a time? For the genetics, for the  
17 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, data genetic, where did you  
18 get the genetics? First question. Where did the  
19 analyzed genetic EHB come from to represent such an  
20 analyzed EHB species?

21 MR. HAMMILL: Okay, the original --  
22 Mike Hammill here, DFO. The original data -- the  
23 original, original data came from Nastapoka. There is  
24 also Little Whale River information in there. So that  
25 formed the initial sources to help us define the

1 Eastern Hudson Bay hunting. Now included in the  
2 samples, are data coming from anything hunted within  
3 the arc, sort of, by communities such as Inukjuak,  
4 Umiujaq and Kuujjuaraapik. If they hunted in Long  
5 Island, that's not included in the analysis but it's  
6 ---

7 MR. PALLISER: You're passing my  
8 question. You're going too far now.

9 MR. HAMMILL: Okay. Sorry.

10 MR. PALLISER: I don't want a -- in  
11 technical all the way answers. I have a very ---

12 MR. HAMMILL: Okay.

13 MR. PALLISER: --- clean, clear  
14 question.

15 MR. HAMMILL: Okay.

16 MR. PALLISER: So as you said, these  
17 analyzed data that represents Eastern Hudson Bay  
18 whale, comes from Nastapoka. I asked you now from how  
19 many individual animals?

20 MR. HAMMILL: Individuals from  
21 Nastapoka? I don't have that right now; I can get it  
22 for you probably by tomorrow.

23 MR. PALLISER: Because from the best of  
24 my knowledge, and first in the 1980's, I believe, I  
25 don't -- if you want to correct me, you can correct me

1 on this. I believe you guys stayed three summers with  
2 Bill Doig, late Bill Doig from the Makivik Research  
3 Centre. Is that correct?

4 MR. HAMMILL: Yes, those are the first  
5 samples from when Bill Doig was there. It was a DFO  
6 camp there, yeah.

7 MR. PALLISER: On three different  
8 summer, correct?

9 MR. HAMMILL: Correct.

10 MR. PALLISER: On the animals that were  
11 harvested by the people there at that time?

12 MR. HAMMILL: Correct.

13 MR. PALLISER: From my point of view, I  
14 think that's too limited information. I believe we  
15 have a lot to work together with, the Department of  
16 Fisheries to really understand the genetics because  
17 this is too limited. My example or my other question  
18 is that for the abundance of James Bay Beluga  
19 population versus Eastern Hudson Bay population, there  
20 were about the same early in the first aerial survey  
21 in 1985, as it is in your statement. And in 1993,  
22 it's staying, staying. And all of a sudden in James  
23 Bay, just to be clear that these aerial surveys that  
24 were flown are from July and August.

25 For the abundance estimation, I think

1           there is a lot we have to understand on behalf of the  
2           Eastern Hudson Bay whale's sub-population. Because in  
3           James Bay something's growing a lot and in Eastern  
4           Hudson Bay it says stable. And whatever methods  
5           you're using I think it's also important to consider  
6           the ships that are heavily coming more during summer  
7           in August and since the past. That also includes  
8           canoes that are being driven now more than usual than  
9           before. Could that have an effect on the population  
10          of Eastern Hudson Bay to relocate?

11                         On the case of the noises, I know you  
12          don't have this method and I know you don't -- it's  
13          not in your study. I think it's very important  
14          because from the traditional knowledge under your  
15          consultations with communities, it is a big main  
16          concern that the noise plays a big role in Belugas.

17                         MR. HAMMILL: Can I talk now? Okay.  
18          So, I agree. In James Bay, like in 1985, there's a  
19          huge chunk of ice in a northwest corner of James Bay  
20          in that year. As I mentioned earlier, part of the  
21          thing with James Bay is that if it's a heavy ice year,  
22          and ice is still there in July, our counts seem to be  
23          lower. We do know that there are Beluga along the  
24          Ontario coast. We think some of those may come into  
25          James Bay and stay in the northwest corner or they may

1 not, depending on the year. So that might explain  
2 some of the bouncing around in the numbers. Fisheries  
3 and Oceans has a major project underway across Canada,  
4 looking at the impacts of noise on marine mammals. So  
5 I think you have an excellent point that's worth  
6 checking. The thing is, and what we've seen in the  
7 north when Beluga and narwhal have been faced with  
8 exposure to loud ship noise, particularly ice-  
9 breaking, then they do respond very much. So these  
10 are things that we could investigate.

11 If we assume that some Eastern Hudson  
12 Bay whales have moved away because it's not a very  
13 nice environment, then what can we do to encourage the  
14 whales to move back? So that means again one aspect  
15 is looking at large ships but the other aspect would  
16 probably be to look at canoe traffic and how we could  
17 change that. So, again, it comes back to the people  
18 living in the area, we can do something maybe with  
19 large ships but the people in the area have to think  
20 of what some solutions might be as well to make the  
21 Beluga want to come back to the area.

22 MR. PALLISER: I think by saying Beluga  
23 want -- to make the Beluga want to come back to the  
24 area that they live, I think it's not even common  
25 sense, Mike. And I want to have a common sense



1 because that's it. You're not going to stop them;  
2 we're not going to stop them. The population is  
3 growing, we're not going to stop them. How can we  
4 bring those Belugas back when the cause is the noise?

5 MR. HAMMILL: At the present time, I  
6 have not easy answer for you, Billy, no.

7 MR. PALLISER: Okay, thank you.  
8 Another question, would there be any -- would the DFO  
9 be willing to put or to fix a mechanism to open the  
10 Little Whale River and the Natsapoka for more genetic  
11 information because I went through a lot of with your  
12 study on -- not just your submission, on the line,  
13 your 1999 study did on -- in the sample that I really  
14 disagree that in the analyzed data, that you just --  
15 sometimes consider the whale as Western Hudson Bay  
16 whale, when the data, the analyzed data is so close to  
17 the Eastern Hudson Bay whales, analyzed data.

18 So I think it's important to gather  
19 more information in these estuaries and also James  
20 Bay. And very important to involve the communities  
21 close by. I think there is a big gap and a  
22 miscommunication between Nunavik Inuit and the  
23 Department of Fisheries because from my point of view,  
24 to get to the point where our people want to be is  
25 going to be is only working together. Thank you.

1 MR. HAMMILL: Thank you.

2 MS. SALAMIVA: Jobie Oweetaluktuk will  
3 ask questions. Thank you, Billy. Thank you, DFO.

4 MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Thank you. I will  
5 speak in Inuktitut. The Beluga migrate through Ungava  
6 Bay, Hudson Strait in the spring and then they arrive  
7 to James Bay as they travel down to Hudson Bay, we're  
8 no longer able to harvest as we please, only up to  
9 five. And it's not enough to do a proper survey for  
10 genetics, and the quota system for Nunavut. And  
11 they're also being harvested by Nunavut like in  
12 Sanikiluaq and Arviat. And this is going in circles,  
13 nothing is happening and we're getting into worse  
14 problem. Lots of people are not -- don't have jobs,  
15 lack of education and our hunting areas, Little Whale  
16 and Nastapoka, it's been closed since 1980 and since  
17 then, and the -- among a funding we've incurred, now  
18 is millions. There have to be some sort of  
19 reimbursement for Hudson Bay people. If not, we want  
20 our hunting grounds back because we can harvest some  
21 nearby where we are familiar with. Because we have  
22 been blocked by you, the DFO, they want a relation --  
23 good relation with Inuit and maybe if you let us have  
24 what we need, we can forgive you if you give us what  
25 we need.

1 MS. SALAMIVA: This is question period.  
2 You will have your say, all the hunters and the elders  
3 as well. Right now we are having questions, asking  
4 questions to DFO. There's a lot to speak. It's 9:00  
5 now, let's get back to the questions. Next speaker,  
6 James May.

7 MR. MAY: Thank you. James May. For  
8 DFO, I have a few questions. I saw earlier on your  
9 presentation it was noted the whales that were caught  
10 after November 15, and also the credit that was taken  
11 from the -- or for the next management plan. My  
12 question is what is Do's plan on doing with the 11.95,  
13 is -- are they planning to take it off next year's or  
14 is it going to stay like that as a non-reported  
15 harvest?

16 MR. HAMMILL: I think one thing to look  
17 at is we're moving into a new plan. We looked at it  
18 from a science perspective which suggests that the TAT  
19 be reduced by 10 per year. This would be advice that  
20 is in our submission and it's part of the aspects I  
21 assume the Board will consider when they are making  
22 their judgments for next year. We will also be  
23 reviewing it from a science perspective more  
24 thoroughly next month.

25 MR. MAY: Okay. For the Beluga surveys

1 do you -- does DFO plan to have any surveys more  
2 closer together because I know the Quebec Government,  
3 for example, they are concerned about the Caribou. So  
4 they have surveys every two years. So what I'm asking  
5 is, if you guys are so concerned about the Belugas,  
6 how come there hasn't been as many surveys as there  
7 should be?

8 MR. HAMMILL: We have found that a  
9 survey cycle of three to five years works quite well.

10 One of the things with Beluga is that the population  
11 can only double once in 18 years. It's a very slow-  
12 growing species. So it doesn't -- it's not worth  
13 surveying more frequently because the numbers will not  
14 change very much since the last survey. So it won't  
15 give us any added value to fly the surveys more  
16 frequently. What we do try to do is repeat the  
17 surveys in the same year. So our plan this year, and  
18 I didn't quite answer I think it was Billy's question  
19 -- we will do the James Bay, we'll start in mid-June -  
20 -- July. I should say mid-July or the third week of  
21 July and then we will move north.

22 This year we hope to use three aircraft  
23 and if we can cover some parts of the area more than  
24 once, the areas where there are more Beluga, we find  
25 that this gives us a better number. So it's probably

1 better to repeat the survey than it is to fly more  
2 surveys. And when we get to Hudson Bay it will be by  
3 early August and we hope we can get it done in a  
4 period of three to four weeks with three aircraft.  
5 Then if there's time left, we hope to do Ungava, but  
6 we will not use the same design for Ungava that we  
7 have used in the past. We would probably try to focus  
8 on specific areas which, based on the study that the  
9 Wildlife Board has done with your help, that will help  
10 guide this I think in how we design the survey.

11 MR. MAY: Okay. I don't agree, but  
12 I'll leave my comments for tomorrow. What's DFO --  
13 does DFO have any ideas on how to help the southern  
14 Hudson Bay communities be able to harvest in their  
15 home waters because if DFO is looking to reconcile  
16 with the communities, you guys have to have a plan.  
17 There's no way you're going to reconcile with these  
18 three communities if you guys can't figure out a plan.

19 So do you guys -- are you guys working on any kind of  
20 plan to speed up the process to get more information  
21 about what's going in this area? Is there a way we  
22 can gather more samples to -- or have surveys, maybe  
23 something like the Mucalic Project DFO could spearhead  
24 with the Inuit of the communities? Is there any talks  
25 within DFO about that?

1 MR. DIONNE: Okay, I'll answer that.  
2 It's Felix here. Well, although our presentation was  
3 referring to many initiatives and invitation to  
4 dialogue, it was mainly to, all over the place, it  
5 sure can be prioritized that we start with this  
6 precise area you are talking about. And in the  
7 meantime, as well, there have been many programs that  
8 maybe Inuits are not aware of, and that we would like  
9 to promote more and make sure that they are known.

10 At the very first, there need to be  
11 contacts with every communities for making sure that  
12 the information happens when there's opportunities  
13 like this. I've been trying to inform the main  
14 contacts I have of new programs mainly the Board  
15 meetings I attend and the partners I met there. One  
16 of them is the Northern Integrated Initiatives, it's  
17 dedicated to aboriginal communities all over Canada.  
18 And it has been, at the very base of the initiative  
19 that have been presented this morning regarding the  
20 Long Island Project. This program intends to build  
21 local capacity over building fisheries -- it could be  
22 fisheries enterprise, commercial fisheries enterprise,  
23 but it can also be redistributive communities'  
24 enterprise as well.

25 So it has been -- well, Tommy Palliser

1 has been talking to me about this project trying to  
2 use that program. But this doesn't mean that this is  
3 the only option there for using this program. Every  
4 single community can use it and put in a form that I  
5 can easily explain to you to try to ---

6 MR. MAY: Stop. I'll stop you there.  
7 I wasn't asking about Long Island. I was asking how  
8 can DFO help these communities to maximize their catch  
9 from their home waters, from their backyard? An idea:  
10 Ungava Bay is set to have a six percent harvest of  
11 EHB. But in the management plan it's ten percent. Why  
12 not take that leftover and give it to the communities,  
13 change it to six percent? That way we can maximize  
14 the management because if we're following the  
15 percentage system, we have not exceeded the numbers  
16 that you have put down. So the question was, what are  
17 Do's efforts to try and help these three communities?

18  
19 MR. DIONNE: Okay.

20 MR. MAY: Because we, the RNUK and the  
21 Wildlife Board, we're stuck on something we didn't  
22 create.

23 MR. DIONNE: Well, in the first place,  
24 two big components of what you've just said are either  
25 linked to management Board decision and RNUK decision

1 as well. The percentages that are associated with  
2 regions have been a decision made by the Board, of  
3 course, in relations with the genetic information that  
4 research has provided. But starting from there, using  
5 this afterward, is part of the decisions that are made  
6 by the RNUK in allocating those communities some --  
7 well, their community allocations. So for sure the  
8 idea that you've just mentioned about Ungava Bay, it  
9 has been a comment that have been made by Billy Dan as  
10 well. And we are not opposed to having this being a  
11 pilot project, an idea to pursue. And we are ready to  
12 have that discussion regarding this as an option. But  
13 you have to figure out that this is coming from the  
14 results of the application of the entire three-year  
15 plan. And changing the plan in the middle of it,  
16 might be difficult but as this is an occasion, we  
17 might push or explore it.

18 MR. MAY: So you don't have any plans  
19 to do any genetic or field work within Eastern Hudson  
20 Bay other than the aerial survey, is what I  
21 understand?

22 MR. HAMMILL: Mike here. First off, we  
23 started a Mucalic Project last year which was a very  
24 good one. But we figured it would be another one to  
25 two years to get up enough samples and also to get



1 enough observations that we can make a comment to the  
2 Board on use of the Mucalic River by Beluga in Ungava  
3 Bay.

4 The other part is in most of the last  
5 aerial surveys, they've hardly seen any whales in the  
6 Nastapoka. We've been toying with the idea of  
7 approaching Umiujaq and/or Kuujjuaraapik to set up  
8 observation camps in Little Whale and Nastapoka. Less  
9 for the idea of genetic material right now, but more  
10 with the idea of just getting an idea of how often the  
11 whales still go into those rivers. But we haven't --  
12 this is just something that is sort of in the mind,  
13 but no actions have occurred yet to move that forward.

14 MR. MAY: Thank you, you finally  
15 answered my question. Last question: With the Ungava  
16 Bay Beluga uncertainty, there's so many numbers across  
17 the board, what's DFOs plans on that? It seems like  
18 it's been going on in circles for many years. Are you  
19 going to continue with this model or are you going to  
20 take our word for it that maybe there was never any  
21 Ungava Bay Belugas?

22 MR. HAMMILL: I would like to take your  
23 word for it, but the problem or the challenge with  
24 that is that we saw this morning some indication that  
25 observations of 400 whales in the Mucalic area, which

1 means if they are from the summer, which means there  
2 was a Mucalic herd at one time. We do not -- it is  
3 very small right now and this is a huge question to  
4 try and answer. At what point does a herd disappear  
5 versus how long do we have to wait for recovery? And  
6 I don't think this is a point for the discussion, but  
7 that's the challenge. For sure if there's been no  
8 hunting, there's probably no more than 300 resident  
9 whales. There's no way we can hunt from that or we  
10 could biopsy more to see if they are true -- a true  
11 Ungava Bay herd. If they are, that allows us to move  
12 in one direction. If they are not, then that allows  
13 us to take another decision.

14 So I think we need more information  
15 from that herd and it's something we have not put much  
16 effort into for many years, mainly because it was so  
17 small. You guys suggested doing a pilot project last  
18 year which we thought was an excellent idea. But we  
19 can't just make a decision based on one year of data.

20 MR. MAY: Okay. One more comment for  
21 the Beluga harvest after the closure. I just wanted  
22 to make a quick comment for your record that it  
23 wouldn't have happened if there was enforcement. So  
24 DFO has to take a bit of responsibility for that.

25 MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you. Be prepared

1 for your questions and also DFO tried to respond  
2 briefly. Our interpreters get tired, too. There are  
3 still 11 people who wish to ask questions and the  
4 response will take a long time. So we're going for a  
5 small break, 10 minutes. After all the questions are  
6 done, we will adjourn. Dan took a long time and there  
7 are 10 more people who wish to ask questions. I'm  
8 sure it's going to take a long time, too, so we're  
9 going for a break. Oh, my God, I go to bed at 9:00.

10  
11 --- BRIEF RECESS

12  
13 MS. SALAMIVA: Okay, we'll adjourn now.  
14 We would like to know if LNUKs will have their meeting  
15 first thing in the morning before we tell you what  
16 time we'll start. Would you like to have a meeting  
17 before we start our meeting? Okay, 8:30 LNUKs will  
18 have a meeting, RNUK, LNUK will have a meeting at  
19 8:30. What will be our purpose to have a meeting?  
20 What you were discussing about yesterday at the Club  
21 Hotel so you will have time to have a short meeting;  
22 8:30, have a good evening. Please don't have  
23 strangers at your place because somebody got robbed.  
24 Don't bring strangers home. Don't keep your next-door  
25 neighbours awake, please, respect your fellow Board of

1 Directors. Thank you and good night.

2

3 --- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the foregoing  
is a true and accurate transcription of  
my recordings and notes provided to me,  
to the best of my skill and ability.

*BarPollard*

---

Barbara A. Pollard  
Certified Court Reporter