

NUNAVIK MARINE REGION WILDLIFE BOARD

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR BELUGA WHALE HARVESTING IN NUNAVIK

January 22, 2020 - Volume 2

- i -

INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

	PAGE NO.
Opening Remarks	3
Question Period	5
Presentation by Nunavut Tunngavik Inc	128
Question Period	134
Certificate	187

1

January 22, 2020

--- Whereupon the hearing commenced at 9:42 a.m.

MS. SALAMIVA: We will resume from where we left yesterday. People who wish to comment last night, will have an opportunity after Qajaq explains the schedule of the day.

MS. ROBINSON: Good morning, everybody.

I understand that the earlier morning started with a prayer. So we'll thank you for that and we'll go into the day. The schedule for today is to finish off the questions of -- to start the morning by finishing of the questions for DFO. There were a number of people that still -- that raised their hand yesterday that had questions. I think we're talking about 11 people.

And then, the Board staff and I have some questions and then there will be an opportunity for the Board members to ask some questions of DFO as well. After that, then we'll go into the presentations of the LNUKs and RNUKs and HTA.

I spoke with Johnny, and Salamiva and I proposed that we start from the James Bay/Hudson Bay communities and move up and follow that. So we'll start with Chisasibi and then Kuujjuaraapik. If you don't want to present, that's fine, just let us know.

And we'll go Kuujjuaraapik, Umiujaq, Inukjuak.

Sanikiluaq and NTI will present together. I

understand that NTI does not have a full presentation.

They have some information that they want to provide based on some of the questions that they heard yesterday and comments, but also want to be available to you if you have questions for them.

As for your comments during the prehearing meeting on Monday night, you asked that the
RNUK be the last to present. So today, following
completion of the questioning of DFO, will be for the
hunters and the hunter's groups. And we will take
breaks at natural times.

We don't have time limits for you, but please use your time to present information that will help the Board make a decision about what management plan should be in place. Should there be a TAT? If not, what should there be? What kind of non-quota limitations or (indiscernible) or rules should be in place to help meet the objectives of the land claim which are ensuring Inuit cultural rights, harvesting rights, but also conservation? And what is the conservation objective for some of these populations?

So give the Board information that helps them make their decision. And when it's time for

questions, please leave it to questions because we want to move quickly. If we spend a lot of time on making statements that aren't actually questions, you're taking time from somebody else. And let's try to be considerate, respectful and as fair as possible. So with that, we're going to go to the first person on the list who is Johnny Akpahatek. This is your opportunity to ask questions of DFO.

MR. AKPAHATEK: Thank you people of Nunavik. My name is Johnny Akpahatek. I have a question from yesterday's conversation. First, as (indiscernible), since you say you want to collaborate with us but your documents are not in Inuktitut yet, I wonder why because we don't read English. So we need the translations.

And, the upcoming research, we heard that there will still be an aerial survey. In the beginning when they did the aerial survey, we heard that there were only two Belugas in Ungava. But the traditional knowledge of (indiscernible) there is no - for Ungava they cannot wait for the Beluga every day. It depends on the directions of the wind and also the currents. So you need to know about those situations when you are planning for the survey. And also within Ungava Bay, we've been shown that there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are not many Beluga whales around Ungava. It might be true, it might not be true. Do you also try to observe during the night when they are -- when the Beluga are travelling through the ice? Because Inuit amongst ourselves, we have our own CB Radio, we are able to hear that people from Kuujjuaq, Tasiujaq, Aupaluk, Kangirsuk that are harvesting on the same day, the communities of Ungava Bay. That's how it used to be. And today there are all kinds of tools that you can use to survey, there are cameras, there are drones that you can use, underwater equipments. Everything is there now for you to use as a tool to do your survey. And they are able to let you know that where the animals are when they are migrating. look into those. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Our presentation was a -well, we were trying to have that summarized because
we made many, many pages on our written submission at
first. So the written submission of 30 pages and more
is on the website as Mark just told me and in
Inuktitut as well. We provided the translation last
Friday. And this presentation as well can be provided
if this is the wish of the people to have a
translation. But well, even yesterday morning, since
we were hearing through the day that there was

expectations of some datas as well. Mike was trying to update and prepare the presentation of new figures and all, so it was a work in progress even yesterday. So if there is a wish and a willingness to have that presentation translated, we will gladly offer that. But it will take the delay of translation prior to us providing it.

MR. HAMMILL: For the survey, yes, the first survey was done back in early 1980s, I think were coastal surveys and that's what provided the estimates of very few Beluga. In response to that, and in response to comments from the people, we redesigned the survey and that was the one in 1985 that went off-shore. And so the lines now, they're going over 100 miles off the coast to the west of Belcher Islands. We don't do observations at night. There are techniques and it is possible, I agree, but we do not do anyway.

We do use other techniques. Haven't used them so much in the north but we have used drones and other equipment in the south. We also had hydrophones in the Hudson Strait for the last eight years, I believe, to record noises from ships, ice and other activities, and the whales and seals. We've removed those hydrophones since the support for the

program is no longer there. But it does provide baseline information, for example, if there's any future environmental impact studies, we have some

background information that's available.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NAPPAALUK: Luccassie Nappaaluk. For the people that are here to listen to Thank you. us, for example, SHQ never come up even though our houses are very bad. And when they are constructed, they are constructed anywhere when Inuit wish to have a good view, so we finally convinced them. So now we have an expectation of DFO to make changes. question is, I see the results of survey and they are showing that the Beluga are decreasing. Those Belugas are very important part of our meat, food, and it's difficult just to stop eating them. Even though the quotas were implemented, nothing was put in place. For example, other meats because are depending on a Beluga meat the whole year. So we get to be hungry sometimes since the quotas were implemented. usually the decisions are based on the surveys.

I wonder if you do also the surveys outside of Canadian waters because the animal will tell you that they're going outside of Canada. And when you do a survey while the Belugas are away of Canadian waters, there is an assumption that they are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

endangered. Every spring I see Beluga because they migrate through my community in the spring and fall. And to my observation, I don't think they are decreasing because when they come back they have Even though we've been inviting DFO to come babies. and observe with us, they never come. They would see with their own eyes that they are not decreasing. the Arctic, the animals go to deeper waters, they're moving all the time in the Arctic. There's Russian waters, England waters; they don't know those difference. So I would want to be explained to the survey that you have conducted. I want to know if you can estimate Belugas that are also outside of waters because looking at your surveys, it's a missing information. What I see of your documentation and what I see with my own eyes are not the same.

MR. HAMMILL: Getting back to the idea that there are different stocks. So we surveyed different stocks, so the stock in Eastern Hudson Bay is the small one and due to the efforts by the hunters, the decline appears to have stopped in that stock, and the population is stable. It was possibly increasing; we'll know after we do the next survey. There are surveys, I don't do them, colleagues of mine do surveys in Cumberland Sound. That is another

population that is very, very small and there are quotas on that population. That's a population in Nunavut, and it's the only one that has a quota on it at the moment. The population there is approximately 1,000 animals. Their quota is only -- it's around 40 animals or so.

Again, I don't do the surveys but we have colleagues working in Greenland who do the surveys for the population along the west coast of Greenland and that is a stock that is shared with Canada. They also put in place harvest limitations. And as a result, we've seen improvements in that stock as well. There are Beluga along the Beaufort Sea. We don't have recent estimates. A survey was done last summer, I believe, so we should see how that population has changed since the last one. And then there's one that we don't have, I don't believe, recent estimates for the High Arctic. So I can't answer anything on that stock is going.

MS. SALAMIVA: Markusie Annauta.

MR. ANNAUTA: Thank you. Very good morning. I want to talk about the Beluga that are killed by human and polar bears, and other like killer whales. That is my knowledge. Ever since I was a little boy, there were a lot of Belugas around the

Qikirtajuaq Island. It was the first time I learned that the Belugas were iced-in around that island. But this is not really talked about. When the Beluga are iced-in, they die off. So in my life, four times I think I have witnessed that. And around Akulivik, there are no islands, it's all open water, very far away. So people of Akulivik sometimes see Beluga that has died because of the ice. Especially when they were iced-in, if they are not able to breathe anymore, they die on their own. There are no scars on. When you see those Beluga, they are not killed by human or other animals because there is no scar on them. And it's part of the Beluga decreasement when they are stuck in the ice.

MADAM INTERPRETER: He is repeating now; so I won't repeat.

MR. ANNAUTA: In some summers, Beluga are very newborn and it's easy to tell how they died if they were -- they died because of the iced-in. So you need to know that information also because Beluga die because of the ice. Because sometimes the current goes to one area and it cause those.

And secondly, sometimes when I'm in the south, I go to the zoo and I see Arctic wildlife. For example, the polar bears that are in the zoo are fed

with food that is not their food. They are fed with fish which is not their main course of meal. Their main course of meal is ring seal. But they are fed with fish when they are in the zoo. The polar bear needs to consume in order to survive so the zookeepers should know that. I see that on television and I've been to the zoos. Do you ever talk to the zoo? Do you know about his happening as a DFO? I want to know if you know about that.

MR. HAMMILL: I'm sorry that I don't -I have seen polar bears in zoos as well. I'm afraid
the answer is that I just don't know. We don't check
into that. On the ice mortality it is something that
concerns us especially with climate change and how we
should deal with it. And I think we're open to ideas
on how we might consider it in our assessments. One
thing is that if we feel that it will increase
mortality, then we would have to compensate for that
in the models which means there could be some impacts
on any agreed-upon total allowable take. But it's all
open to discussion and it's something we just don't
know how to deal with it for the moment and so we're
looking for ideas.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Who's next?

MS. SALAMIVA: Charlie.

MR. ANGUTINGUAK: Would you please speak a bit louder? We are now being aired on (indiscernible). What you showed in your presentation on Ungava slide. Is it (indiscernible) enough to say out of 122 Belugas and start that six percent for the Ungava region instead of ten percent? That's my question.

MR. HAMMILL: If I understand, you want to know if we could use six percent in the model instead of ten percent?

MR. ANGUTINGUAK: (indiscernible).

MR. HAMMILL: Okay. We want to redo
things in a major way. So that would be in a year's
time, or not quite. We want to do an update this
spring and we want to include the new genetic
information. So if this says -- I think in the table
it was six percent yesterday, so that would be
included in the analysis. So we use kind of the same
old approach with new numbers, so we would include the
six percent. So it's the ten percent that's in the
management tables as well. We will discuss that, but
I think we would be update for the -- that's for the
spring hunt, I think. Is the spring, yeah. So we
would update that. So when we do the -- we would do
the new numbers for the science review that we will do

in one month where we use the old method, but it's just new numbers. And after that, we would talk to my colleague here and we would update the numbers that we would use in the table.

MS. SALAMIVA: Noah Ittuk. I want the listeners to know that we are now dealing with DFO -- questions for DFO. Please state your name you are now being in the region.

MR. ITTUK: Noah Ittuk. I'm the chairman of our local LNUK. And my question and our request for our support because we are speaking for the community. My first question for the Beluga in the winter and there are other good stock, do they winter in the same place? As Inuit, we know when they winter that the bigger of Beluga leave later than the fewer ones. And for three years, we have had the quota up to 20 a year, but we are always harvest less than that amount.

And we -- the samples from the spring, they have been late because we had caught only two and we wanted to catch the rest in the winter -- in the fall. But they were caught by other communities and take away. So I wouldn't want to share our quota with other communities around because I wouldn't want Kangirsuk other communities' quotas moved to other

1 communities.

And for the Beluga, in the summer we see them all summer around Kangirsuk. We don't harvest them, only in the fall. We like them that way because the skin is healthier and they spend all summer in the rivers nearby. All summer we don't harvest them and we like harvesting them only in the fall.

And the 54,000 and for the 3,000 are owned by DFO? Detect them as such because they're always moving and the ones that you don't want us to harvest, please keep an eye on them. And you keep saying that you don't want them to do away with. So I would ask that each community not go over their quota because in our community, we always harvest less than our quota. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Okay. Thank you for your question. Okay. There's a lot of considerations to your questions that are related to how do you get your share every year? And it starts with the allocation made by the RNUK and so as a first suggestion, I would think that the many things you have said should be known at first when the RNUK invite for local consideration prior to do their allocation. And especially regarding your preference of hunting in the fall and, well, such preferences like that, local

preferences, I think they are the best suited to acknowledge that and take them into consideration before they do their allocations.

Okay. And you referred as well the fact that you have not taken all of your allocation every year. This is something that we have tried through this year to offer as much as we can with other partners from the Board and from Makivic as well, to offer support to the RNUK into the design of what should happen with the allocation throughout the year. Because there's needs for adjustments sometimes depending on what's happening and what are the needs that necessarily evolves through the year as we have witnessed this year, depending on what had been harvested as well.

So your comments and your questions are really important and I think they are showing that there's a need for gearing up altogether on what's going on with the allocation throughout the year. And how we can support the RNUK in doing this responsibility, well, the way it is expected from hunters and local LNUKs as well. So we are ready to explore what can be done to support them and help them. And in that regard, your question is very — it's really along the line of that need. So thank you

1 for this.

MR. ITTUK: Sorry. My other question, there are port wintering places. Do you know if the difference stock winter in the same place, endangered stocks? And DFO, when they close, I wouldn't want them to let us know. We don't want to hear that anymore because we start fighting on our own and because (indiscernible) wouldn't want the DFO to do that job because we start fighting amongst ourselves. And when it's closed, please go to that place where they harvest because we're not there, we're not wardens. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next speaker is Johnny Peters. Last comment had no question in.

MR. PETERS: I'm trying to make it short. I had a question yesterday that Inuit are being blamed for the over-harvesting and for the polar bear. Because in the Fort Churchill area, there's a lot of polar bears. And they have a very shallow waters and a lot of them are taken by polar bears, the Belugas. So they have an office in Winnipeg so I think there's a lot of them taken by polar bears. I mention that again for us elders, we want to -- we're anxious to do our part. We want to see cooperation among Inuit because if it's not there we'll always

1 have problems.

MS. SALAMIVA: Yes, you will have time tomorrow. We're even asking elders from there, from the community to join you. It's open.

MR. HAMILL: We agree, I mean, polar bears are taking a lot of Beluga. It is an important diet item in different areas. Churchill is one area where we've seen it show up in our analyses. So, yeah, I agree with the observation.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next is Adamie Kaittaq.

MR. KAITTAQ: Thank you. Adamie Kaittaq from Salluit LNUK. With your presentation we saw summering places of Belugas. Do you fly over the same areas? Because mammals they move everywhere in Inuit knowledge. I wonder if you look not only in the summering places?

MR. HAMMILL: The surveys are designed to cover the summering places. It goes back to the basic concept that we're managing based on a summering stock. So we want to count the animals in the summering areas. We do realize they move around. What is interesting is there's a lot of consistency between all the surveys and were we see the largest numbers of Beluga. But we cover an extremely large area, basically, it's the whole Hudson Bay arc going

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

more than 100 miles off-shore. We also do the same in James Bay. We cover James Bay from top to bottom. It's always possible we miss some animals and that's a problem with the design and also in all types of surveys. Thanks.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next question coming from Adamie Tayara.

My name is Adamie Tayara, MR. TAYARA: member of LNUK of Salluit. I have a question about Salluit. Usually in Salluit, we don't have -- we have very few quotas. We are requesting for them to be increased because I note that you are about to make a decision. And the quotas that we get are not enough, For example, we are allocated 40, if I never enough. say we want 100 quotas, for sure you would not accept that, but you would accept the lesser. I don't even know the person who usually take decisions for us. don't even know his or her name. If I say the people of Salluit wish to have 100 quotas so when the minister tries to decide and decides to deny, who will make sure that we get what we want and if we are being understood properly? That's my question. Who tried to assist the minister to make her understand? That's Maybe it's "her" now. my question.

MR. DIONNE: Felix from DFO. Well, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decision-making regarding quotas and when we are reaching the point of having what's available locally to communities, this is a shared decision process. And for sure, we are a part of it and the DFO minister has to accept the overall governance of all this. But in the meantime, there's many partners involved into this, and the first level is supposed to be -- well, LNUKs in the definition, of what is needed locally. And this should be in -- well, the actual plan since the last three years, supposed that there's a plan in place. And it is -- or the requests are made to the RNUK that take care of compiling all those requests and trying to make the right share among communities. And this, we have tried to offer support with the other partners as -- that are the Board and the Makivic Corporation as well to offer any support.

MS. ROBINSON: Sorry, Felix, to interrupt you but with the time we have, I think it's important to focus on the question that was asked. And my understanding of the question was that, within the minister's decision-making process as part of the NILCA structure that everybody here understands, what is informing her decision? Is that correct in my understanding of the question? Like we want to know who is talking to the minister, where does the

1 minister get her information, what are the parameters of that? 2 3 MR. DIONNE: Okay, sorry for ---MS. ROBINSON: 4 No, it's okay, I just ---5 MR. DIONNE: I misunderstood. --- know with 6 MS. ROBINSON: 7 translation, it can be challenging. But I think it's important and I hope I've narrowed the question more 8 9 specifically, and can you please answer? 10 MR. DIONNE: Okay. And thank you for this. Well the decision process, it comes to 11 Okav. well, the Board in its last preparation of the 12 13 decision, have made a rationale for the plan. 14 this is something that is climbing the different steps 15 into the department while that 60-days period is in 16 place after a decision from the Board. This is 17 something that, of course, we briefed the minister 18 about. So this is mainly how it works. Next question will come 19 MS. SALAMIVA: 20 from Putulik Papigattuk. 21 MR. PAPIGATTUK: Thank you. My name is 22 Putulik from Salluit. People of Salluit are speaking

Putulik from Salluit. People of Salluit are speaking one after another, it was not planned like that.

People will mention this many times that they wish to eliminate the quotas for Beluga. They wish to hunt on

23

24

25

their own, but myself, I'm one of the decision-takers. I have a concern if we are going to eliminate the quotas if they are going to push for that. Having a quota is a prevention not to over-harvest. We also -- we have also been saying that we want our generations, our descendants to be able to harvest still. But if we are going to harvest whatever we wish to, there's a concern because the quota is a prevention to over-harvest. Because I'm officially elected while we are trying to decide, I will fully participate to try to find solutions and to propose something that will be better because we are usually always trying to find better solutions.

The quotas that we allocated in 2017, they were reached this fall of 2019 and we have to implement new quotas. I wish to continue to use the quotas but with condition. Because some communities never reach their quota, for example, in Ivujivik, Salluit, Kangirsuk, Quaqtaq, those four communities are the actual migrating routes in the fall and in the springtime. So they have 35 quotas. It was like that. But this is not a good solution. One community of Salluit we are -- we have a lot more population combined those three communities together.

So for the population if we are going to

satisfy our community, we need more quotas. And it's possible if Inuit decided together and come up with a solution. So I think we have no choice but to continue to use the quotas because we need to think about our generations, too, our descendants. Yes, we need to have a discussion like we did before others came in. We had a discussion amongst RNUK and LNUKs. If we agree upon with one thing, we can start off with that and also deal with other community concerns.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The communities that don't get Beluga around their area and Ungava, especially they go to Immilik near Quagtag and Kangigsualujjuag, and to Ivujivik from Hudson Bay to Salluit sometimes. Hunters comes. There's a concern. The hunters arrive with booze also and sometimes it can cause accidents or put people in danger. So these concerns, how can we correct them? How can we find a solution that would correct these because this is a very major problem for the hunters, not only for the Beluga hunters? Because we also have summer camps, we have our own cottages there and sometimes people go to those shacks to have party. So we really need to have a discussion on that and try and find solutions especially by the communities that are responsible for

the hunting. Because this has been our dispute.

If we say we have no choice but to continue use the quota and show that the quotas are not enough for the communities, if this is the situation, we would be able to try and find solutions together. There are also some pilot projects within that management system. So we would be able to enter these and try and find solutions. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

MS. SALAMIVA: Before DFO responds. There didn't seem to be a question, more recommendations. So I will allow James to comment before other people.

MR. MAY: My name is James May, president of RNUK. Salamiva and Qajaq mentioned that we are on a question period. Question for DFO's submission; that's where we are at now. All of us will have an opportunity to speak, to tell what we know. We will be given an opportunity. So now, it's a questioning period for the DFO. I'm just trying to clarify that because both chairs have mentioned that and now, we are asking outside of that. So I'm trying to remind you that it's a question period because we'll have another time to speak. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Okay. Next for

questions, Billy Palliser.

MR. PALLISER: Sorry, Mike, I have another question. Sorry, my papers were under my laptop yesterday, so I forgot two pages. That's why I don't like working with papers anyway. I have two question. I have a question about the Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, not the whole Beluga population. What do the Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga or how does that specific species interact with fresh water?

MR. HAMMILL: How do they interact with fresh water? First part, based on traditional knowledge, is that they're in the rivers and their moulting. And based on that traditional knowledge, some scientists went to check to see how that works, and it's interesting to see how the skin changes in response to the fresh water exposure. So their moulting.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you, Mike. I agree. Second question: how does the La Grande Dam had an impact on the relocation of that EHB population? I agree that through traditional law, it's the moulting in the fresh water, how does it -- I agree with you. Second question: what has the La Grande Dam had had an impact on the Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga population to relocate to such a place?

MR. HAMMILL: To be honest, I don't know. I can't answer; I don't know.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next question will be coming from Mr. Tommy Palliser. Tommy is the last one from yesterday's and this morning we will allow the new people who raised their hands to be able to speak —— I mean, to be able to ask questions. There are six new people.

MR. (TOMMY) PALLISER: Thank you,
Salamiva, chairman. My name is Tommy Palliser from
NMRWB. Concerning the quota system, I feel this quota
is for the commercial fisheries, it's not following
the tradition of Inuit having a quota. So for the
Nastapoka whale, usually arrive first according to the
traditional knowledge of (indiscernible) in the fall,
they are the first one to come back to their wintering
area. And according to the DFO knowledge, it's about
25 percent in the fall.

But when we had a meeting in Ottawa, I think two years ago, DFO's researcher were up to in the middle of October only. And the Beluga from Churchill usually are the second one to migrate after the first one around the Hudson Strait. So according to the DFO knowledge, these were done by Inuit but Inuit don't give you all the information so you don't

1 know all the information.

So after reading the submission of Tasiujaq, they did the samples and they found out that they haven't catched any EHB yet. Is it possible to return these to Hudson Bay because the pilot project was started by Inuit people because they know the animal, not the numbers? So within the pilot project, within a year, Inuit that have a knowledge about the EHB to see if they can — if these can be given to Inukjuak, Umiujaq, Kuujjuaraapik? People of Inukjuak gets three and they are 1,800 population, and Umiujaq, too, and Kuujjuaraapik, too, only they are allocated.

My first question, if those sample
Beluga, if they are from EHB, I would want them to be
a tool to allow to increase their quotas because
Hudson Strait people usually reach their quota while
the Hudson Bay and Ungava Bay gets very few. My
second question, the research funds are around
\$200,000 that usually -- the researchers usually are
allowed to receive almost 200,000 funds. And we need
to have more assistance on funds because we are trying
to create Inuit traditional knowledge.

Usually, we use our own money to do that; they go out hunting to try to have more information while they are hunting using their own

money. And DFO are using the money that we pay for taxes. So we -- DFO needs to assist financially for the research. So my question is, is it possible for the DFO to assist (indiscernible) with the funds?

And also, the drones are also the tools to use research and other tools. I wonder if they can be surveyed while they are migrating? I have other comments, but I will stop here now. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, Tommy. This is Felix. Those are, of course, very good questions. And it brings us to a part of our submission referring to what do we do with science findings and how does it integrate into the management plan? This is important to have in mind that the Hudson Strait Pilot Project was described in the last plan and it enables the partners to use the findings from it into the course of the plan.

So if there is to be a new pilot project regarding another location into the system, well, it will have to integrate the management plan at first, and see what its outcomes -- well, the plan would have to acknowledge what to do with the outcomes as well. We have expressed -- although we have expressed concerns about maybe not trying to implement those changes too fast because it may sometimes leads to

problems in terms of, well, uncertainties and not enough samples and stuff like that.

So, well, first things first, it has to be into the plan, into a framework to make that happen. This is something that have identified by the community of Tasiujaq. This is important information for everyone to have. And if this is the will of the Board to have this integrated into the management plan, well, this is the way to go to have that structured and implemented throughout the next plan.

But as we outlined as well, we have to be careful of how we do this, how we do integrate new findings into -- from research and from initiatives like that into management decision. Because we are dealing sometime with limited information and maybe it's not too careful to take decisions like that. And you have another question about research funds.

Well, this is something that it's a little delicate for us because most of your fundings are coming from the implementation of the NILCA which is not dealt with our department directly at first. But also we have responsibilities in terms of research and, for sure, we are open to ways to get fundings available. But, well, this is a maybe more complex discussion that what I can answer right now. And we

have to take into consideration that there's another

department related to it which is the Crown-relate -
the CIRNAC Department.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. Again, I'll ask that please try and be as concise as possible with responses. Next question opportunity is for Ali Qavavaaq.

MR. QAVAVAAQ: Thank you, my name is Ali Qavavaaq from Ivujivik, president of LNUK. In the beginning of the implementation of the quota, it was supposed to be a pilot project for one year. Your years has not ended yet? To me it's over 30 years now. Because it was supposed to be a pilot project for one year, but now DFO's year has not ended yet. To me, it's been over 30 years. So my question, your one year has not ended yet? And also, in your next survey, you will have to include Inuit people. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Yes, he was asking if your one year has not end yet.

MR. HAMMILL: This goes back to the days of Mimi, Mimi Breton, back in the 1980s. It would surprise me if it was really just for one year. I wasn't involved in the discussions; I was part of the science component but not the management. At that

time, we thought all the animals going past -- or most of the animals going past Ivujivik belonged to Eastern Hudson Bay. Since then, with the genetics, we've learned a lot more. And this has led to us using the proportions which has allowed the harvest to be increased in Hudson Strait. In a way, the year is still continuing but ...

MS. ROBINSON: Next person with an opportunity for questions, Billy Dan May. Again, quick questions, quick answers, please.

Thank you. My name is Billy MR. MAY: Dan May, LNUK's President. We are on a question period, so I am going to ask this question. I would like to receive an answer. In Ungava when you harvest Beluga, there are 87 percent of EHB and in Sanikiluaq alone, 76.8 alone. Only Ungava, 87.4 percent, WHB is harvested. Why are we all located -- very few amount while Sanikiluaq alone have 76.8 percent spring harvest alone? And Ungava is 87.4 percent. Why do we still have a quota? And I don't want you to respond it's because there's no Beluga in Ungava. Beluga because 87.4 percent are from Churchill stock.

MS. SALAMIVA: After the response, next person will be Willy Annanack.

MR. HAMMILL: I'm still trying to figure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

out if I understand the question. For Sanikiluaq, they've set the -- they set up a season so they limit their harvest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBINSON: I think, Mike, if it would assist, Kaitlin, I think can refine the question or make it -- to help you better understand the question being asked.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: The question as I understand because I had a similar question, but I was going ask it related to EHB. So why is it the DFO takes a different approach to managing the harvest in -- or I shouldn't say takes a different approach because that is approach is driven by Sanikiluaq. is Sanikiluaq allowed a harvest that they control with their regulations when the proportion of EHB is higher than what the proportion of EHB is in Ungava Bay for the period of hunt up until -- so in the case of Tasiujaq, it's actually, it's 3.1 I think is what's contained in Tasiujaq's statement. And in -- as Charlie referenced, it's six percent which is very close to what it is in Sanikiluaq in the spring. why is Sanikiluaq allowed to have a harvest that they control with their regulations, where Nunavik Inuit are confined to a quota limitation?

MS. ROBINSON: Billy Dan, just to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

confirm that this is the question? Kaitlin has reiterated it correctly? Okay, he's nodding for the record. Mike, can you please answer the question?

MR. HAMMILL: Part of it is that we -- I mean, the information -- the three percent or the four percent for Tasiujaq, is something that's new; we didn't have the information. So you had information for Sanikiluaq, you did not have the information for Ungava Bay. We set up a management framework for a period of three years. So that's one aspect.

You will also note very closely that Sanikiluaq has provided about 350 samples. So it's something that we have been able to document very It was an initiative that they led. The other component is in Ungava Bay, we were trying and we still are trying to protect two stocks. So you've got the problem or the challenge of Eastern Hudson Bay for which we did not have the genetic information. have to check the samples sizes for what we have for Tasiujaq because when I look at it overall from all the years of sampling, it's 11 percent. So this is using a different approach but this is the -- so right away, it's a much higher approach than what you're proposing.

So we'd have go back and look at the why

the differences. The sampling rate is much smaller for Tasiujaq so we have less information. We're coming up to s new management period and I imagine this would be something that would be discussed in a new framework. But we still have that challenge of trying to protect the Ungava Bay as well. So it's a - in a way, it's nice and clean, easy in the Sanikiluaq place. More complex, more difficult for Ungava.

MS. ROBINSON: Billy Dan, did you have -- was that the only question? Mark will bring you the mic.

MR. MAY: I'll speak in English. Billy Dan, Tasiujaq. If you are going to look at previous harvest data, I don't think it's -- it's not relevant because we were imposed to go hunting in the Hudson Strait for many years so we did hunt there. And that's where you're getting 11 percent. Ever since we were able to hunt in Ungava Bay, like I said, it's at 87.4 percent. So you'll have to look at the sample location, where it was harvested. You can't just pool it all in one for two different regions. I just want to make you remember that.

So 6.6 unknown, 6.0 EHB, 87.4 percent WHB. We -- why cannot -- why can't we hunt more than

15 whales when they can hunt 170? One community, why? If we have higher proportion of WHB-hunted in our area, then why do we still have quota limitation? And if you're going to say, closure, so if my community can have a closure from May 31 to July 1, coinciding with Sanikiluaq's voluntary closure because you seem to think that you and them have a maybe higher IQ than us. We can coincide with their closure than according you all EHB is already in Eastern Hudson Bay. So, sorry, it's not really a question, I just want to put that in your mind.

And when you said you were going to do a survey if you have time in Ungava Bay, we want a real survey. We don't want to be on the side. We're not important enough and July is better for Ungava Bay. If you look at the harvest data, most of the harvesting happens in July. You're saying you're going to come in August. You have to come earlier, look at our harvest data and go by that.

MR. HAMMILL: You are right. We have to look at the seasonal difference and when I go back and say the 11 percent, it's from all of the samples collected in Tasiujaq. So I agree but it has taken time to build up the sample database for Tasiujaq and I have to go back and see if we have enough now to

look at seasonal differences. This is something that we can look at probably in the review after the aerial survey when we come up with a brand new -- with a new framework. The Sanikiluaq, they harvested 170 in one year but usually it's around 30, 40. When we say it's four percent, this is for the extended spring. If they're taking samples before July 1st, then it's actually only one percent Eastern Hudson Bay. And if they're taking the animals in the fall, it's zero percent. So it depends, we have to look at these other factors when we're bringing it into our discussions, and it makes it much more complicated.

MS. SALAMIVA: Willie Annanack.

MR. ANNANACK: For the surveys, I think it's not fixed right.

MS. SALAMIVA: Please state your name.

MR. ANNANACK: Willie Annanack from Kangiqsualujjuaq LNUK. Some whales go through Killiniq in May, moving straight to Quaqtaq. And but I wonder if it's known when now they are more going nearby our community and we would like to know which stock they're from either from Ungava or somewhere else. And our quota would go -- we have 20, we have to harvest from somewhere else, not from close by. I would want this to be increased and to be able to

harvest from hear our community. The ones that arrive, I would want a survey to be done to see which stock they are from.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next speaker. Charlie Papingajak.

MR. PAPINGAJAK: I'm Charlie Papingajak from Ivujivik. I just want to say something that was mentioned to me. And with the seasons that are set by DFO, there are fines that are substantial that could be done and they could have their taken -- their government taken away. If this is a law by the government, they wanted to know where this law come from?

And we keep hearing increase of mammals everywhere and in the Quebec area when there are surveys, we see whales from -- in other countries like Alaska and Norway and others. And I want to know if their -- if we have the same, similar stocks from different areas outside of Canada. And with the survey results that we see, we know of other whale stocks from other parts of the world, are they included in Canada?

MR. HAMMILL: There are many -- there are a few species that we share with other countries, and narwhal is one. Beluga, there is the population

that overwinters along the west coast of Greenland.

Some of them do summer in Canadian waters. And that population, the harvest is limited in Greenland by a quota. And the quota limitation there has allowed the population to recover to some extent.

In Alaska, we share stocks from the exchange between Beaufort Sea in Canada and into the United States. There are also other Beluga that do not come into Canada. There is a population near Anchorage, Alaska, a very, very small one currently numbering about 360 animals. And there's no hunting allowed on that population. There does not seem to be a quota on other Beluga populations in Alaska such as Bristol Bay where the population is doing quite well. So, yes, there is some sharing or some across international borders.

MS. SALAMIVA: Simon Aliqu.

MR. ALIQU: Simon Aliqu from Akulivik, LNUK. Why, why are you not answering straight to the questions? With the three-year plan and with insufficient responses to some questions and with this new management plan that we are working on now, I want to know why you are not straightforward with the questions that we have for you. I want to be -- this to be cleared up.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

2223

24

25

MR. DIONNE: Felix here. Well, I regret that you feel that way. But I have to say that many questions are directed to us and in part, many of those considerations has to be dealt with our partners into this definition of what will be the next plan. The main starting point is that the Boards have organized this gathering for listening to different point of views and to take that into consideration. So, of course, we are ready to answer your questions, but we have to deal with the fact that many of them have to take into considerations that we are not alone in that decision process. So I regret the fact that it is more complicated that if we were the only one making the decision but this is the way it is. this is maybe why we are not able to have straight and simple answers to your important questions.

MS. SALAMIVA: Next question will be coming from Mr. Jimmy Johannes. Our last question from the hunters.

MR. JOHANNES: Kuujuaq LNUK. My question is not with my submission. What happened in the winter -- with the fall, in Mucalic there was some waters that were taken for research and there were two staff members from -- they took some water where the Beluga was and they took other -- three samples. I

wonder what happened to the waters that were taken for sampling? That's my question. Did you lose the water?

MS. ROBINSON: I think the question is do you have the results from that study?

MR. HAMILL: I think there are two batches of water samples. There were some water samples that were taken before we arrived and those were no good because they were not properly preserved. It was because they were sampled before we were able to show the protocol. I believe also there was samples that were taken after we showed our partners how to do the sampling, and those are in the process of being analyzed, that's the water. We have received results from the three skin samples, the biopsy samples. But it's only three; it's a very small size. And we value those samples; they're like gold but we need more. But they have been analyzed.

MS. ROBINSON: And the results have been obtained although a small sample, and do you have those results available?

MR. HAMMILL: One, two, three, yeah. So for the moment, there are two EHB and one Western

Hudson Bay but we don't -- but because we don't have an Ungava Bay sample, that's all we can say. So we

need more samples to build up to see if we can define an Ungava Bay or an Ungava Bay sample population may no longer exist, and then we can help answer the whole question. But we need more samples.

MS. SALAMIVA: Okay. We're going to take a quick break and then the Board staff and the Board have some questions for DFO. So 15 minutes, back here at 11:25.

--- A BRIEF RECESS

MS. SALAMIVA: Welcome to (indiscernible) until the food is delivered. DFO will be asked by the NMRWB Board. Next questions for DFO will be coming from Nunavik Marine Region and Eeyou Marine Region, staff and Board.

MS. ROBINSON: Mark Basterfield.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Mark Basterfield, director Wildlife Management for NMRWB. So I think my first question would be directed to DFO science. It's a series of brief questions. Am I correct, Mike, in understanding that the 95 percent confidence interval for the Ungava Bay stock population at the last assessment was zero to 92?

MR. HAMMILL: (indiscernible)

International Reporting Inc. 1-800-899-0006

	- 42 -
1	MR. BASTERFIELD: He's nodding, for the
2	record.
3	MR. HAMMILL: One, two, three. Okay,
4	yeah. So, yes.
5	
6	TECHNICAL PAUSE
7	
8	MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. In your
9	professional opinion, if approximately three to five
10	whales were taken from that stock since that last
11	estimate, is it realistic in your professional opinion
12	that the Ungava Bay stock would still be persisting?
13	MR. HAMMILL: Yes. More on the three
14	rather than the five, but, yes. But there would be no
15	recovery.
16	MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay.
17	MR. HAMMILL: But there would be no
18	recovery.
19	MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. And then in
20	terms of the sample results from those three samples
21	that you got this past summer, I'm not sure if it's
22	too early to say, but have you identified any unique
23	haplotypes from those samples?
24	MR. HAMMILL: Too early to say and my
25	impression is, no. But it's too early to say.

They've just completed the lab analyses; they've just looked at them. It's -- and they had to do a rush to get that, so ...

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. And the last one on that line of questions is the EDNA methods being used? Is there any sense that Ungava tides are huge, some of the highest in the world? Is it reliable with such huge tides?

MR. HAMMILL: I don't know. Those (indiscernible) samples are still being processed because they're in the line-up so to speak. We didn't have them as high priority, they are going through the system. I can't say. I would like to continue it because that's an easy enough sample to get. So if it doesn't turn out, it's not a big investment but it's worth trying to see. So that's more something I hope would answer in a year or two.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. Thank you. The next few questions are probably directed at Felix, DFO management. So in the DFO presentation you mentioned in terms of compliance and enforcement, DFO wanted a system that had readiness in case of non-compliance with a prepared set of progressive measures. So despite Makivic's submission stating that enforcement responsibility should be given to Inuit, currently

there's an understanding that enforcement is largely DFO's responsibility. So the readiness in case of non-compliance with prepared progressive measures, what do you have in mind for this, or are you expecting the Board to develop this through their decision-making?

MR. DIONNE: Okay, Felix here. Well, the idea about this was to begin the discussion, of course. And we have thought of many examples, mainly relying on providing more information should some predetermined triggers would be attained like certain level of harvests and coming close to what has been allocated, for example. So who is responsible might not be the right question for this in my mind in terms of if there is a communication setup, well, our thinking was that it may be, well, communicated from all partners all together that would be -- that would have a higher impact that if we at DFO just do it.

So that's the kind of mindset that we are -- that we have. When I made allusion to investigation as well, it doesn't mean that it should be an investigation conducted by CNP officers. It could be better to have an administrative investigation done instead and the right body, the right organization to do it still has to be precise as

1 well. But it was a line of thought mainly.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. You also mentioned that you have heard the whole range of dissatisfaction with DFO enforcement from it being too heavy-handed to it not being there enough. Does DFO - aside from what you just said, does DFO plan to address that and specifically by increasing capacity?

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, well, this team is trying to get all those positions filled which is not the case at the moment, but they are having new recruits right now. So this is progressing, making it more -- yeah, more teams available to do patrols. They have tried as well to look at the intense part of the hunt to make sure that they have reached the right community at the appropriate time. And, yeah, that's mostly what they are about to do now. And, as well, well, there's that invitation for dialogue on how enforcement is done. It is coming from them and they want to make sure that that message is sent at this hearing.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. Thanks, Felix. The next few questions would be probably directed towards Mike. This is following -- Billy Palliser actually asked a question I had in mind yesterday about the reference stock for the EHB, and it was

answered that that original reference stock was from Nastapoka. Am I correct in understanding that this reference stock continues to be updated?

MR. HAMMILL: Yes. And the samples have continued well after Bill Doig into the 90s and they're from all hunts that are -- where people are -- have reported taking animals within the Hudson Bay arc. It's not to say we cannot improve on the sampling, but it does -- just to clarify, we do have more recent samples than 1990. So we're updating the base, yeah.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay. I think I'll end there. Sorry, I did have one brief other line of questions. It's regarding Beluga samples taken in Western Hudson Bay. Are any EHB Beluga found in those samples and specifically, males versus females of the EHB stock?

MR. HAMILL: The answer is, yes.

There's a few haplotypes that we associate with

Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga. I think they tend to be

males but I have to check.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Okay, thank you.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Kaitlin Breton-Honeyman, a consultant to the Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board. I just wanted to follow-up on a

1 couple of questions to start. So Mark just asked the question about the reference population, the genetic 2 3 reference population that's used in Eastern Hudson 4 Bay. Could you comment on what the impacts of a 5 shifting baseline may mean? So if there's immigration 6 into Eastern Hudson Bay, say from a wandering James 7 Bay Beluga or a Western Hudson Bay Beluga that decided to stay with Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga, and they are 8 9 indeed harvested in Nastapoka -- I shouldn't say "in" 10 Nastapoka -- near Nastapoka or in Richmond Gulf, by 11 definition, they are automatically assigned as Eastern 12 Hudson Bay Beluga. And that stock, therefore starts 13 to shift over time to reflect new Beluga who may be 14 immigrate. Is it possible that that EHB signature 15 over time to reflect new immigrants into the area? 16 MR. HAMMILL: Okay, the answer's, yes, 17 of course. I mean, yes, that's what I would expect. 18 What I would see, two possible outcomes, one is that 19 20 so it would resemble Western Hudson Bay. 21

the Eastern Hudson Bay signature would be less defined So we would say -- probably say if that is happening, we would probably report smaller proportions of Eastern Hudson Bay in the Hudson Strait hunt. This is theoretical, but that, I think could be one impact.

22

23

24

25

The other impact is that it increases

your uncertainty and if that is happening, larger confidence limits around that, it may result in giving a signature of more Eastern Hudson Bay animals in the sample. So we might end up -- what I'm trying to say is I think it could have -- it could work on both ways. It could say either we could increase the hunt because there are fewer Eastern Hudson Bay in the harvest, and that's incorrect, if we want to base it on the reference. Or it could the reverse possibly and say there are -- because of the wider confidence limits, there's actually more Eastern Hudson Bay animals in the hunt and so we should reduce overall takes.

This is something -- it's a very good point. I would like you to remind us about it because this is something we could look at when we do the big review scheduled for fall 2020, yes.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So two follow-ups to that. Is it possible then -- it sounds that it is then possible that the increase in proportion of Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga in Hudson Strait in the fall, could be reflective of that issue with sampling, kind of, bias? And then further to that, in I believe it was 2017, Umiujaq harvested, you know, in the individual stock identification, they had one Eastern

Hudson Bay Beluga and two Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga.

Can you -- they had two Western Hudson Bay Beluga

contained within their samples. Would those have been

also assigned as Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga once it got

into the model, the genetic mixture model?

MR. HAMMILL: Probably, yes.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So I'm going to shift to talking about the population model. And I was surprised to read a new population estimate based on harvest data alone which I believe is the only new input into the model. And so the most recent estimate that we have from aerial surveys is about 3,800 whales. In DFO's submission, you talk about that being revised down to 3,200 which is a decline of 600 whales when the harvest of Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga in the last three years has been 212 or 218, I believe. Could you explain how that works?

MR. HAMMILL: Okay. This is messy. On the graph that I have on the screen, we have a square box. That's the aerial survey estimates, then we have the black lines. Those are the confidence intervals. That means there's a 95 percent probability that the true answer lies between those limits. We think the central or the main point is at the 3,800 but as we have seen in some of the -- in of the exercises I

tried to do at -- you take any one sample, it can come from a distribution, but it's not the mean.

This is the problem with aerial surveys; they have wide confidence intervals. This is also the value of the model because it takes all of those surveys, it weights their importance, but it incorporates the other information that we have related to biology, the harvest and it pulls it all together and to say, well, the best estimate that we can give you, is that blue thick line. But it still could, between the -- it could still lie between the upper and the lower blue line. So we're more confident in the size of the population now with the model, but there's still uncertainty.

That's why we tend to like the model better than the aerial survey estimates on their own. So when we ran the model the first time back in it was 2015 I think for the advice, we had partial harvest data at the time because we were trying to do it before the end of the plan, which is fine, this is the way the system works. So we had harvest data available at the time, we made assumptions that the harvest would not -- would stay within the quota by the end of the plan, and we ran the model. And the population estimate that came out from that advice,

was 3,400 animals.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

Then because we were approaching the time of the roll-over, or at least at the end of this

management plan, I said, okay, well, let's go back and check things to see how things will turn out. We've got harvest data and everything else. In the meantime, since the 2015 advice, we had the total

just by running those, the slight changes, because

harvest figures for the last year of the plan.

there was a quota overrun in the last year of the

plan, just by running that, the population in the model dropped from 3,400 to 3,300. Not big change but

there's still a bit of a change. And there's actually

3,350 or something so that's basically -- if you want

to round off to the nearest 100, it's still -- you

could still stay at 3,400.

of roughly 3,400.

And then I assumed -- because I

presented to the Board in June, I assumed we would

stay within the quota and so what would happen, basically what came out of that was that the

population is basically stable and if people -- if the

harvest quotas were respected, we would probably end

up with our predictions at the end with the population

Then we had the quota overrun and so I

went back and re-ran the model with the new harvest data and up until the end of the year and putting that through the model, it tells us the population is currently -- our best estimate is about 3,200. So that's how things have evolved. So during all of this with the new updates, I've incorporated the new genetics information, so it's still the same methods but it's the result of the sampling program up until the end of 2018. So same turning the crank but updated information on genetics and harvest.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: You spoke in your response -- you spoke about weighting different variables, model weights, different variables. Can you confirm if it's DFO who is deciding on the weight of those variables based on your understanding of Beluga?

MR. HAMMILL: Weighting is -- the aerial surveys, it's a bit of a function of the variance, so it's just -- it's kind of weighted, it's kind of unweighted, it's a bit more complicated. With the struck-and-loss, it was based on some information that we had and so that was a distribution. And this is an area where I think we can definitely improve on things because it's a bit more important than we figured at the time. For the genetics data, the weighting is

1 related to the statistical outputs from the genetics So it's not a DFO decision, it's a modeling 2 data. 3 decision, it's a science -- it's a decision related to 4 the statistical analyses. So the genetics is not 5 something that we consciously make. The struck-andloss was based on some information we had which can be 6 7 The population estimates, the contribution or the weighting is related to the variance. 8 9 again, it's a statistical thing. 10 MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Okay. Figure 7 in your submission shows -- provides a lower Eastern 11

your submission shows -- provides a lower Eastern

Hudson Bay Beluga recommendation from DFO. That's the

figure -- the probability of a population decline. I

think go back.

MR. HAMMILL: This one or is it ---

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: No.

MR. HAMMILL: --- this one?

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Yeah, that one.

MR. HAMMILL: That's the 58 one because

there were a few. I can't remember what I put in that, but, yeah.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Yeah, it's the 58

one.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAMMILL: Yeah.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Can you explain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this, how there's a lower quota recommendation coming from DFO now than there was three years ago without any new aerial survey inputs? And I'm guessing it may be related to the conversation we just had about updating the model. And I'm wondering if you can elaborate on that?

MR. HAMMILL: Okay. There is no aerial survey estimate and that's the weakness in this because we have -- the nice thing about the aerial surveys is you can always recalibrate, you can always reset it to something that's hard and fast, or at least this new information. So the last aerial survey was 2015, the new estimates of the population size that I provided are based on projecting the model with the same parameters forward including the harvest Two things operate, the further forward you go data. since your last calibration, your confidence intervals tend to widen out anyway, that's just a natural function of the projection. You're less certain on how things are the more you go into the future. can think of it as a weather forecast. We're often pretty good at forecasting what the weather would be like today in the afternoon, a few hours. We're not too bad next day, but trying to go more than one or two days, it becomes really uncertain, so we have less

1 confidence.

So the idea of this is the management objectives set by the Board is that what is the harvest that we can have that has a 50 percent probability where the probability of a decline does not -- is not higher than 50 percent. And this comes up with the 5,800. If you kind of do the math, we went over by 30 animals which is roughly 10 animals a year. So it's actually -- I was happy in a way because it's sort of -- we went over the quota by 30 animals and the model is saying that we should reduce the quota by 10 animals per year, so that's 30 animals. So the two kind of line up.

So these are probabilities, so again, if you have a higher -- if you want to have a higher harvest, then the probability or the risk of respecting your management objective, the risk will increase. And that's something for the Board to evaluate.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Okay. I'm going to shift into a question related to DFO management. It may be most relevant even to Patt and that is, how does DFO justify having such varied approaches to managing Beluga stocks across Inuit Nunangat? How it relates to the question that Johnny Oovaut asked about

why are you nicer to Nunavut than Nunavik, and about Billy Dan's question about why does Sanikiluaq get treated differently when the results are similar?

put up about Nunavut harvests from Western Hudson Bay, and by my rough calculation, the -- between the harvests posted there plus other communities such as Sanikiluaq that are also harvesting from Western Hudson Bay and Nunavik who is also harvesting from Western Hudson Bay. Those numbers equal the PBR that you posted that you said would trigger a conservation concern in Western Hudson Bay. And yet, we've never heard about -- and I don't want take PBR on because PBR has its own set of issues.

Potential biological removal, it's a way of calculating allowable harvest. I'm just providing those as examples of how different it is — that DFO is taking Cumberland Sound is another meaningful example about how different approaches are taken. And at the most simple, is how many Belugas are allowed to be harvested based on what the population estimate is. And that percentage varies dramatically between those three populations that I referenced. So the question is, how does DFO justify that kind of variation in acceptable harvests?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HALL: Thank you, Kaitlin, for your My name is Patt Hall, I work for Fisheries question. and Oceans, Central and Arctic Region. Louder? Okay. There's a lot to unpack, Kaitlin, in your question. would say, in general, the DFO's approach to stock management, goes stock by stock by stock. We also are in a co-management relationship with all of the wildlife boards that have been set up across Inuit Nunangat. So for the management of Western Hudson Bay Beluga that's projected on the graph here, the information that we use for management is collected in a way that is consistent with the Nunavut Land Claim There are no community quotas for Beluga Agreement. that we associate with the Western Hudson Bay population. We work with the regional wildlife organizations and the community hunters and trappers associations. Hunters and trappers associations under the agreement are responsible to coordinate the activities of their members. Every year, the community HTOs provide DFO with a harvest summary of their catches. And DFO uses that in the tables that it provides to the regional wildlife organizations, to the Nunavut Wildlife Board and internally to our science departments for use in their analysis and for presentation at meetings.

Cumberland Sound Beluga, the situation there is analogous to Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga situation. There have been quotas in place for Cumberland Sound Beluga since the mid-1980s. Based on surveys that were done, the Nunavut Management Board and DFO agreed to increase the quota. This was implemented, I believe, in 2002. That quota increase was accompanied by the development of Beluga hunting rules by the Pangnirtung HTO and they, too, are asked to provide an annual harvest summary to the comanagement organizations.

I'll just flip back up to that table for 2018, the orange squares represent information that is still to come from the communities. I didn't include that in the slide that I provided to Mike earlier, but just to clarify that, that's what those orange square represents.

MS. ROBINSON: Sorry to interrupt you, Patt.

MS. HALL: Yeah.

MS. ROBINSON: I appreciate your willingness to go into the different factors that you consider in each of those regions but the question was sort of what's the justification. And perhaps go a little bit more high level in terms of this rather

than going into each of the different considerations.

just -- I'm very mindful of the clock. I'm sorry.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

killed.

MS. HALL: Yeah. (indiscernible). Qajaq. The short answer is the DFO manages on a stock by stock basis. Each stock has different considerations associated with it. In Central and Arctic Region, we work with our co-management partners consistent with the provisions of the Nunavut Land Claim. This applies to the Western Hudson Bay communities that you see here and also to the community of Sanikiluag. And Mike has already spoken to the amount of information that Sanikiluaq community have provided over the years in terms of biological samples, and also the voluntary harvest closure that was implemented during the time that Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga are thought to be most at risk of being

And I don't want to tread into

Luccassie's territory here. I believe that Luccassie

will be speaking to this again tomorrow. My question

I guess to you, Kaitlin, is that -- does that answer

your question sufficiently?

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Yes. Just a follow-up to that point because you raise Sanikiluaq's sampling again. It's my understanding that the past

regulations prevented harvesting in harvesting in Ungava Bay for those communities. And so, is it possible that it's related -- this is probably a better question now for DFO Quebec. Is it related to past harvest regulations that is the reason why there are so few samples in Ungava Bay?

MR. HAMMILL: Yes. It's a vicious circle, as you know. If you limit harvest, you limit

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: That's good.

MR. HAMMILL: --- unit sampling.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: So Mark's pulling up a slide and I just have a quick question while he's doing that. Your recommendation to go with status quo will be very disappointing to many around the room who are calling for transformative change. If it's decided that more time is needed to be ready for that kind of transformative change, is DFO prepared to speed up the survey and genetic re-analysis so that it could be a single-year roll-over rather than the two-year roll-over that you've proposed? Also recognizing your reference to how the model reacts to uncertainty and that it's already been four years since the last survey was done. And the last time it was more than four years between survey intervals, was over 20 years

that.

ago. And given that this is such a strong priority in the region, could that survey not be done earlier?

MR. HAMMILL: No, the survey cannot be done earlier but that is not the limitation, I think.

The limitation is getting the data analyzed. You just don't walk out of the plane and have an estimate.

It still takes another month to a month-and-a-half to pull the data and do the analyses. So that's the limitation factor. The peer review is another thing that's beyond my control. You would have to make a strong case to Ottawa that we would have to have an earlier peer review. So that's -- I can't answer

The thing is, we do a survey and we will be finished in August. It's not work doing end of July because there's still ice. So it's -- we're finished in August. You do your analyses, your peer review is in the month of November, staff still have to run the model after you have your analyses and then you have to write the papers. And it's -- that's tight. It's hard to do. So to get you -- and this even -- that's why I left open the door that it may not occur until later, but having it occur later would probably be linked in a bit with other things on the schedule for the peer review. But getting it ready

for November is going to be tight as it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DIONNE: And may I add also,
Kaitlin, that in my mind there's also the fact that
getting peer-reviewed information might trigger as
well a need for consultation that would be needed
probably in terms of -- this is the science timeframe
and there's that management considerations above that
and that would need to be taken into consideration as
well.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: My last question I wanted to present to you a possible hypothesis, a possible narrative around this figure. This figure shows -- on the left-hand side are harvest numbers prior to the implementation of the quota, a formal top-down quota system that's implemented in between those two harvest years that are separated. evident that harvest was declining quite markedly in the 1980s prior to the imposition of a quota system. Is it possible that that decrease was an Inuit-led response to concerns the DFO had raised about how Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga were doing, and their own concerns about how Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga were doing that had already commenced prior to the implementation of those quotas? And further to that, could you -- I know you were just beginning then.

We're wondering if there's a record available of those conversations that DFO had with hunters at that time.

Many people have referenced the pilot project, the one-year quota that they agreed to do as a trial period. We're wondering if there's meeting minutes or workshop reports or some form of consultative record that could be provided?

MR. HAMMILL: I showed in my presentation that the major part of the decline continued until '82, that was when Mimi started to become more involved in the discussions. And I'm not exactly aware of, you know, where we were as far as those discussions. But the population, one thing there's a -- quotas came into place, reported harvests did decline but there's a lot of over-harvests, a lot less respect for the quotas at that time. And the population continued to decline right through until about 2000. And then due to the efforts of the hunters, the quota -- or the harvest went down considerably and this is contributed to the stabilization or the increase in the population.

There is some information available.

It's going to be hard -- we can dig it out. It's going to be hard because it's -- there's a lot of history. There were a couple workshops, for example,

some people here, I know Harry Okpik, I'm pretty sure he came to the workshop in Mont Joli; things like that we can dig out. But it's, whoa, yeah.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. I just have -- it's Qajaq here, legal counsel for the Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board. There have been significant changes in the Eastern Hudson Bay region over the last 50, 60, 70 years. A major environmental impact was the establishment of dams through hydroelectric projects and there is considerable evidence, scientific but also from hunters that the hydro dams have shown to have an impact on the annual flow of fresh water into Eastern Hudson Bay. It's been noted that fresh water flows in Eastern Hudson Bay less in the summer from the major rivers and it's redirected into James Bay area.

With this in mind, is it your view that the change in the salination, the saltiness, of the water in Eastern Hudson Bay including the estuaries has had an impact on the interest of Eastern Hudson Bay whales to remain in this area?

MR. HAMMILL: The simplest answer is I don't know because if you want me to try and present a position based on science, we don't have it.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. I don't want you to

guess. That's just -- it's not ---

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAMMILL: But I will say, there is hydrostatic rebound, so the land is rising, so this is another contributing factor that could make a place, such as Nastapoka less interesting.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay.

MR. HAMMILL: We do see that whales still continue to return en masse to the Two Whale River, so that's sort of makes me question, you know, is the oceanographic impact is important. And we do see that when we reduce harvesting, the population has responded by increasing, so ...

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. In the Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement, Article 5, the provisions in relation to conservation, one of the conservation objectives is the restoration and revitalization of depleted stocks. What is DFO's understanding of what those terms mean, what is the goal for revitalization and what is the goal or objective to be reached for restoration? follow-up question to that is has there been agreement between DFO and co-management partners including Makivic, RNUK, LNUK, with respect to what the goal is when we're talking about restoration and revitalization?

MR. HAMMILL: This is one of those circular questions, which is first, the chicken or the egg. And my answer to that is we want to discuss with our partners to see what kind of recovery objective they would like to see. And we've had difficulty in engaging that discussion. We can provide an estimate to say what the population might have been in the 1800s when the Hudson Bay Company started to harvest. But then, people would argue, and justifiably, that eco-system conditions are not the same as what they were 200 years ago. And we could agree with that.

So the discussion we would like to see for a recovery, and this gets back to the precautionary approach in the sense that what is the population that the hunters, the LNUKs, RNUKs and the Board, what would they like to see as a recovery objective?

MS. ROBINSON: Okay, thank you. In your presentation you talked about different management objectives and modelling that's been used as you develop your positions. What is DFO's internal mechanisms to ensure that the development of these objectives and models, consider Inuit and indigenous rights, and include indigenous and Inuit knowledge and practices including inter-generational knowledge

transfer? So to be more refined, what are DFO's internal mechanism to ensure that the development of these objectives and models are taking into consideration and including these rights considerations?

MR. HAMMILL: You're a lawyer.

MS. ROBINSON: Mm-hmm.

MR. HAMMILL: We do have consultations. We do have meetings and traditional is identified by the people that we work with, so pilot project is one example that's the most concrete and easy to identify. So the process, at least within science, is that it depends on the inputs that we receive through these meetings from people who present perspectives that are worthwhile investigating further. And I go -- I guess the easiest one to identify as a good example is the pilot project.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay, thank you. Are Nunavik Inuit and Cree of this region given the opportunity to critique your setting of objectives and the models you develop and implement?

MR. HAMMILL: The management objectives are set through discussions and I believe we could say the management objective is basically the one that was accepted by the Board. The Board could have set

1 another objective if they had wished to. It's, again, discussion but this is something that I think is open. 2 3 We do -- we have invited hunters to our 4 peer review meetings, generally the representation is 5 through members of the Board and members of Makivic. For these meetings, they are asked to criticize or 6 7 critique the science components. Then after the meeting ends, DFO has a science position and this goes 8 9 into the discussions. In the old system, it went into 10 the discussions carried out by the managers where they considered the hunter's perspectives and the science. 11 Now I believe it goes into the Board's perspective 12 13 where the Board looks at the science and consider the 14 hunter's perspectives. 15 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. When you say 16 "the Board," you mean the Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board? 17 18 MR. HAMMILL: That's correct. MS. ROBINSON: 19 Okay. And there's that. 20 But not signatories or rights holders, Inuit 21 signatories to claims and rights holders, because the 22 Boards are an independent institution. 23 MR. HAMMILL: I ---

My question was

MS. ROBINSON:

specifically rights holders, signatories.

24

25

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24 25

23

MR. HAMMILL: Okay, the information in the peer review, the signatories have been invited in the past, then the information is publicly available and it's -- so they are able to examine that and when they make their representations to the Board, they can include it, as from their viewpoints, their perspectives on how they feel about that science.

Okav.

Thank you.

MS. ROBINSON:

Finally, with respect to the minister's decision, and this was a question asked earlier, and I just need to understand this a little bit better. In response to a question from the floor to how the minister makes their decisions, the internal mechanisms, the response was that the rationale developed by the management board goes to DFO, there's an internal review process. Then the minister is briefed and advised by DFO employees prior to the respective minister making

MR. HAMMILL: Yes and no. And I say some of the initial briefing material is -- no, the initial science -- the initial briefing material is

their decision. Am I right to understand that DFO

formulated the submissions and recommendations that

have been presented before these two Boards, are the

employees, potentially the same employees that

same people briefing and advising the minister?

prepared by our management colleagues at the regional level. And they take the material from the science, then it's submitted up the scale. So those people are the ones who look at that advice and they're the ones who review it. So that includes managers that were not involved in the review process. And then it goes up to -- it can end up then going up to, I'm assuming it's the deputy minister.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Those are all my questions. The Board members may have questions for you as well.

MR. SAVARD: Thank you. I would like to go back to the model. The model assumes a growth rate. Am I right to think that a model determine the actual growth rate used to calculate your population?

MR. HAMMILL: The model takes -- the short answer is yes. The model fits to the aerial survey data and it does that by adjusting the growth rate. It does a little bit more but that's the main component.

MR. SAVARD: Okay. You asked us earlier to specify what we would like to see. I would like to see a much simpler model that assumes that the growth rate of the population is at its highest. Because the population is supposed to be below its normal level,

should be 8,000 according to your data. So the pressure -- so that should be a population that's always growing at its maximum rate. It would be interesting to see what the results are.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBINSON: Please introduce yourself.

MR. SAVARD: I'm Jean-Pierre Savard and I'm NMRWB Board member. Okay, Kaitlin asked you the question of comparison between the allowable take or the method they use in -- for different stock, like Cumberland Sound. And the reason I'm raising it is if you take Cumberland Sound harvest and apply it to here, you should be allowed to harvest 150 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga. So it shows you how DFO seems to be using different criteria depending where they are. And not only that, that if we use what you recommend in your submission which is 58 Beluga for 50 percent chance, I came across your recommendation for 2018. And if I follow your recommendation for 2018, I arrive at 68 Belugas instead of 58. The reason for that is that you changed your axis. In one case, you calculate a probability for the target population after 20 years and, in the other case, after 10 years. And I don't understand why you're making that difference. And I would like to ask you, could you

calculate for five years which is the aerial survey schedule?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAMMILL: Yes, I can recalculate it for five years. One of the difficulties in looking at five-year blocks is that any changes in populations, they won't be much so it's -- you kind of want to see what are the longer-term impacts of a projection. don't think it will change too much. But the 68, that included as well the allocation we identified for Sanikiluaq which dropped down what the Eastern Hudson Bay or the Nunavik allocation to about 62, 63. reduction that we're recommending now is based on the over-harvest in the final year which is basically, well, double what we suggested be the roll-over number, but that's how high the harvest was. But I can re-do it, yeah. And I can probably even re-do it for you tomorrow.

MR. SAVARD: Okay. Thank you. One more. The genetics seems to be a problem and, in my mind, there seems to be a circularity here. You've defined the stock based on old data and now you, assuming that every bit of your present in the area, represent that stock. And there's something wrong there, so probably you'll correct it when your new analysis is done. But you see what I mean here, it's

kind of like a circle. So make sure that it's -- you explain it correctly or at least in a way that we can understand, once you do the proper -- or the newer analysis.

And my -- one of my last question is, are there other Beluga stocks or population that are managed based on the mitochondrial DNA like we're doing, or do they use a regular population genetics? The reason I'm saying that it is that if you take the wintering areas as the base for the population basically, you have a James Bay population and you have a Hudson Bay population including the Eastern Hudson Bay.

MR. HAMMILL: I don't think there are other stocks. We're looking at -- actually, so the best of my knowledge there are no other Beluga stocks managed in this way. In a way, like if you look at Greenland, it's a west coast versus east coast -- it's west coast Beluga -- or west coast narwhal versus east coast narwhal. James Bay is actually a separate breeding population. It's micro -- nuclear DNA that shows that it is a separate breeding population, so in a way, that's a much cleaner system. The major aspect that's contributing for why we define an Eastern Hudson Bay stock is this idea of maintaining a

distribution or maintaining an availability of whales for people living in the Eastern Hudson Bay area.

What we've seen is that when you drive down a stock, they don't come back. They abandon areas and so you don't -- you can see the odd whales coming, the odd whale coming back but you don't see any recovery in any significant numbers in any reasonable time. So you and I will be long gone before there's any possibly that we might see any recovery or re-colonization if we eliminate the stock.

MS. SALAMIVA: Short arms. There you go, Peter. State your name first.

MR. HALE: My name is Peter Hale, I'm a member of the Eeyou Marine Board. My question relates to S. 2.1 of the DFO submission. And in that you state:

"... The aerial survey counts are corrected for diving animals using data from satellite transmitters that provide information on the time that the animals spend under water ..."

So my questions are is this satellite information collected at the same time and in the same location as the aerial survey?

MR. HAMMILL: No. The satellite

telemetry data was collected in the same area. So it's relevant in that aspect. It has not been conducted in the same year and the people have asked us not to conduct satellite telemetry studies, so we've been unable to try and update that information. So we used a fixed value based on the studies that were done in the early 2000s, but they were not conducted in the same years necessarily as the surveys.

MR. HALE: Peter Hale, again. Do you have information to suggest that the time spent below the surface by the Beluga changes over the seasons and might it be different when the survey was conducted than whenever the data on diving were collected?

MR. HAMMILL: From the information we have, we see that after August, the time spent diving increases. So this would require a more significant correction factor. This is one of the reasons why we work hard to try and get the surveys finished by August 31st. It's not always possible. There are other indications from areas where people have been able to update their satellite telemetry work such as Churchill where different factors can be applied, but it's related to water clarity. We've been working intensively in the St. Lawrence to try and develop a

new approach to improve the correction factors, but it's a work in progress.

Cumberland Sound, where the stock is very small, they've been working also very hard with the people with the satellite telemetry to try and get better or more updated correction factors. So there's more information coming along and hopefully, within the next couple of years, we can look to see if these correction factors vary between populations or areas or are differences more related to time of year and water clarity.

MR. SAVARD: Thank you, Mike. That's helpful. I have just a couple of short questions related to the Cumberland Sound harvest. My understanding is that initially the harvest level was approximately 35 animals and that it then increased to I think 41, and that the increase was in part because of a community-based management system that was put in place. Could such an approach be adopted in the area under discussion here?

MR. HAMMILL: On the science part of it, it was partly increased due to aerial survey estimates. I think it was a 2002 aerial survey that was quite high. Based on that, it provided the information that the population could support a higher

harvest. Subsequent surveys have shown that the population has declined dramatically or it was never actually that high, and that a much lower quota would be needed to respect -- would be needed to stop the decline. But now we're getting into management discussions and I can't answer those because they're -- like in every situation, they're quite complex. And I don't know if -- no, Patt might be it because Patt's been in the firing line on that a bit, so ...

MS. HALL: This is Patt Hall, Fisheries and Oceans in Winnipeg. Peter, you're correct in terms of the historic harvest and the subsequent increase to 41 animals. In terms of community-based management, Pangnirtung was not part of that initiative because it was harvesting under quota. Iqaluit, Kimmirut, operated under community-based management and reported their harvests to DFO. They did not have quotas previous to that.

The other thing I would point out with respect to Cumberland Sound Beluga, is that population is harvested mainly by one community, the community of Pangnirtung, so in that case, considerations of other communities were not a focus of those conversations. And with respect to what's going on with Cumberland Sound now, I am not on that file anymore. So -- can

you hear me? Okay. There is a co-management working group that is operating now that has representatives from all of our co-management organizations involved in that file. They are having regular working group meetings to discuss the new science information, and ways to go forward with management considerations. I hope that's helpful.

MR. HALE: Peter here. Yes, it is, would you recommend that we investigate their approach more closely to see what we could learn from it?

MS. HALL: You mean the Cumberland Sound Beluga example?

MR. HALE: Yes, the community-based management approach.

MS. HALL: Well, a community-based management certainly is something that the Board might want to consider, and there is historical information, historical record amongst all the co-management partners, so DFO, the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, Nunavut Tunngavik and others. And if requested, we can make that available.

MR. HALE: Thank you.

 $\mbox{MS. SALAMIVA:} \quad \mbox{One last question.} \quad \mbox{We} \\ \mbox{will have lunch after.}$

MR. CARON: My name is Daniel Caron, I'm

with the Eeyou Board. And my question to Fisheries and Oceans is related with your S. 3.8 in your presentation, title "Communication and Collaboration," where we can read that DFO believes that the Board, the Nunavik Board, can have a significant influence over the level of collaboration that partners can have together. DFO is certainly one of those partners. And, obviously, my sense is that there is a gap in terms of communication and this, my question would be, how to address this gap?

You referred to it in your presentation yesterday, Felix, in DFO 24 you talk about the communication strategy but I'm not sure what is that strategy. And when you talk about compliance and other issue, you referred a couple of times to communication. This is also recognized by other partners that there is a huge gap in communication. To answer the implementation of an approach, of a plan or of an initiative, whatever our plan is a good communication have to take place. And DFO will need to address this issue in an efficient way with the Inuit people, with Inuit institutions.

I understand there is no DFO office on the territory. If you go to Newfoundland, I know that Nova Scotia or Quebec (indiscernible), most of the

time when you go in a community, you see a post office and an office of the Department of the Fisheries and Ocean. That's where you have two flags of Canada in the village. And we don't have an office here, I understand the difficulty to have a permanent presence for DFO, and you don't have DFO officer.

So this is a real challenge. But for the benefit of the implementation of a plan, a future plan, whatever it is, how -- what kind of -- when you refer to a communication strategy, what kind of tools you could use to better support the local partners, better work with the local partners to have a common approach to work together, to have better collaboration from you, from other partners and to achieve the objective that everyone wants to -- are sharing? So this is my question.

MR. DIONNE: Okay. Well, first of all, I cannot say if there's an intention of having a physical facility from DFO in Nunavik. I'm not aware of any intentions towards this. In our proposition, well, the tools that we would have envisaged at first would be maybe, well, trying first to have the proper workshop that would address this important consideration to discuss what's best. Maybe we don't -- we have ideas of who we should make communications

to into every community. But maybe we are wrong and we would like to have the discussion to see what is the good persons to be in touch with. So this might be a first tool having that discussion together. And other than that, well, there's common practices that seems to be implemented anyway as we can see the high importance of radio stations across north. It seems like a good reliable tool. And well, sometimes we need to circulate also some announcement in the shape of a paper. Well, where the best place to put that out and make sure that the community obtain it. So this is some of those tools, trying to reaching the communities.

But also, we have in mind what are the means for the community to get some feedback to us as well. So taking the example of the Umajuit wardens' network, we have made a weekly call, a weekly teleconference with them that ensures that we have regular feedback and conversation and, well, dialogue, open the questions and precisions. So whatever the means is actually, well, having that frequent component, like the weekly calls for Umajuit is one of our other ideas.

MR. CARON: Thank you. I would like to know how many, if you can guesstimate at how many days

DFO representatives are spending in the region. And the comment I would say, and I don't want that you do like Donald Trump with Twitter, but I think we are in the age of communication that (indiscernible) could be put in place for hunters to call you if they have something to report, video conferences, a Facebook page, there's so many communication tools now. It's all (indiscernible) and black books here and it's -- so I think we should go a little bit, again, to use the expression that was used yesterday, outside the box and be bit more proactive in terms of communication. It's a main, like main problem I believe that we are now facing here. Thank you, very much.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you for this. And I don't know the exact number of days that we spend in Nunavik. I don't have that information. And, yeah, thank you for this suggestion of using social media and other technologies.

MS. ROBINSON: We're going to go into lunch. I just want to make one small comment to have on the record. The Nunavik Marine Region Wildlife Board has struggled to have their appointments maintained and have had to wait a considerably long time for re-appointments and for designations of

chairpersons. And as a result of that, we -- the Board has struggled at times to ensure they have quorum. So in the sentiment of your submissions and response to questions that you're committed to the process, we'd ask that these issues around reappointment and appointments and the lack of them being expedited, to meet the needs and the processes in place, be addressed immediately so that the Board can do their work. We'll go to lunch, we will back at 1:30.

--- LUNCHEON RECESS

MS. ROBINSON: Welcome back from lunch. We have quite a lengthy afternoon planned. The Board has -- I've spoken with both chairperson and in light of how late we went last night and the night before, and there are some health issues that are coming up. I think it's important that tonight we end at 6:00 and not come back after dinner. We'll get through what we can get through this afternoon and what we don't finish this afternoon, we'll resume tomorrow at that point. So we have from now until 6:00 this evening for the LNUK to present and then for questions for each group as we go.

Again, this is your chance to tell the Board what decision you want them to make, why you want them to make the decision. You can tell us — and you can tell the Board what information you think is relevant, what is reliable and then you'll have an opportunity — the Board and others will have an opportunity to ask you questions. We've developed a list of the groups following the coast. So starting from Chisasibi, Kuujjuaraapik, moving up the Hudson coast. And then we'll finish with the RNUK. NTI is going to present with Sanikiluaq during their presentation, NTI might have some comments to make as well, but will also be available during that time for questions of NTI and Sanikiluaq.

I have talked to the representatives from Chisasibi who do not wish to make a presentation, as long as there aren't any questions for Chisasibi, we can proceed now with the presentation from the Kuujjuaraapik LNUK. If we could make sure there's always a spot available. Can Kuujjuaraapik LNUK please raise your hand and introduce yourselves and you can begin. There are no time limits but we ask you to respect that other people want to speak, too. Please don't repeat yourself and stick to what's relevant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SALAMIVA: We are looking for your proposal how you would want us to decide. So then NMRWB will be listening to your needs because they are the one who will decide for you and lobby for you. So it's your chance now to be -- to do your presentation and I would want the people of Kuujjuaraapik to comment. You are now ready, Jimmy-Paul? Please state your name. That's better.

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: My name is Jimmy-Paul Angatookalook, from Kuujjuaraapik, LNUK's president. That's how -- this is our proposal. community of Kuujjuaraapik, we have never reached our quota limit for a very long time. And we don't go out hunting for Beluga because we are designated to go very far while the weather is not always nice. hunters we would like to be able to harvest close by, even at the Little Whale River. This August 1 to 31, we would want that back. Because some communities have mentioned that they just don't want to see a Beluga anymore without hunting them. They wish to We don't mind to have a quota because we hunt them. are also thinking about descendants. We will still want them to eat muktuk, Beluga meat, I mean Beluga So we are requesting for you to reopen Little skin. Whale River from August 1 to August 31. Am I

1 understandable? That's it. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SALAMIVA: (indiscernible), so you wish to comment? No.

MS. WEETALTUK: My name is Salamiva Weetaltuk. I also have to represent my hunters so that's why I'm going to comment speaking for Kuujjuaraapik. For many, many years, we haven't been able to harvest nearby Kuujjuaraapik, even last year we did not harvest anything even though we were allocated two because they were not -- the weather was on the way and our children have never seen us butchering anymore and many people are not drying meat anymore. And when we brought back small piece of meat people fight for it. So they go make dry meat because we are asked to go down to Long Island and then if we cannot have harvest to -- from King George Island and then we go to Seal River. Usually, we hunt with Umiujaq because if we try to go down alone, it's harder to harvest.

But if we get help from Umiujaq, and for one canoe, it costs \$750 and you have to have sufficient food available, gasoline, and you need to go to other area to get fresh water because at the King George Island there is no fresh water. So we have to go to other area to get fresh water. And we -

have to bring fresh water and be very careful not to run out of water because that island is a migratory area for the birds such as Canada Goose and others, and it's full of manure. So it's not drinkable. And also there are -- if we harvested one Beluga, a polar bear will be there right away because they smell it. And as soon as we -- when we harvested one Beluga we tried to go back home right away before it spoiled and we ran out of food also sometimes.

The reason why we are able to go down is because we -- I do funding requests from the local organizations, Land Holding Corporation, Hunter

Support Coop, Coffee Shop, MV, and the rest of the organizations and that's how I get my fundings. Every year I do funding request. That's how we can have more hunters going down but some are able to go only during the weekend. And we always wish, hope for weekend weather to be nice. Although people of

Nunavik are tired of having quotas, but us, we are in Eastern Hudson Bay and those considered endangered are nearby. So we don't mind having quotas.

But if we see enough Belugas, that is same numbers as our quota, we want to be able to harvest them all at once. So that all the people

would get their share more and we would be able to teach our children how to butcher. Although one time we -- the Beluga was landed here so that students can watch people butchering. Nobody really got share although they got one bite each because there were so many.

Kuujjuaraapik area is also a close area just like Nastapoka River and Little Whale River so we don't really have -- we don't harvest from here. But even though they migrate through Kuujjuaraapik, hunters don't harvest them because they respect what is been implemented for them. We make sure that they listen to what is being asked from them. So I want the request to be accepted. If we get 15 quotas, we would want to harvest those all at the same time. And then we would stop when we reach 15.

I want you to believe me because the hunters here respects. And the people that used to be in the Little Whale River for two months to make dry meat, those elders have passed away. So we really want to be let free. Respect what the hunters are requesting because for many, many years they've been respecting DFO. If I forgot something, my colleagues will have a say. But that's what I really wanted to say that we really, really want to be able to harvest

from near whole Kuujjuaraapik. And if we will be designated to go to a certain area this time give us some funds for that. You are now -- would you like to say something?

MS. ROBINSON: Are they any questions for Kuujjuaraapik from the floor, from the parties? Johnny (indiscernible), wait, Billy raised his hand first. I just want to make sure we have the list, because once I get this list, we're not adding more people. Putulik. Anyone else? Not Johnny Oovaut, Johnny (indiscernible). Billy Palliser, Johnny Oovaut, Putulik Papigattuk, Adamie Kaitak, Adamie Tayara, Mike Hammill and Johnny Arnaituk. Yes, you can start now, Billy Palliser.

MR. PALLISER: To the LNUKs of
Kuujjuaraapik, thank you. I have a question to JimmyPaul. He was talking about what the used to do in
August. He requested for it to be reopened. In case
Kuujjuaraapik community is allowed to go down to
Little Whale River, what is your plan to -- in case
Little Whale River was opened what is your plan, how
are you going to take care of it? What is your plan
for that area if you were allowed to hunt there again?
That's my first question and when we were shown the
results, the samples, Kuujjuaraapik community had a

very high sample because -- so would you still
continue to do your sample kits if the Little Whale
River was opened? And how are you plan to conserve and
properly look after that area in case if it was

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

opened?

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: My name is Jimmy from Kuujjuaraapik. This is how it used to be starting from August 1 to 31. It was -- it used to be opened. But because of the weather conditions we were not even able to reach our quotas because other people were already using the quotas. Because of the bad weather, we were not able to go there. And in the past, before the quotas were implemented, hunters used to try and get enough for the community; it could be the same today. And I'm sure they will not try and overkill because one canoe can carry so much. when the two canoes were travelling, they would harvest one and they take everything they can. how it used to be. We will treat it very seriously. Am I clear?

MS. WEETALTUK: Billy, I want to say something before. In case Little Whale River is reopened for sure people will be camping and people who usually go out to teach their children and for sure if the community of Umiujaq brings their students

there, we would try to go at the same time because we don't try to go there while we cannot harvest. So we want to be given an opportunity to go there again so that we can pass on our knowledge to our children and grandchildren.

MR. PALLISER: Second question, we've been shown about the results and looking at the results and community of Kuujjuaraapik are doing very well with their sampling kit. Will you still be doing the sample kits?

MS. WEETALTUK: Yes, of course, we have no choice but to continue that. We try very hard, I even myself personally go down to the beach to see if the canoes that are about to leave are carrying those kits.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you. That's it.

MS. SALAMIVA: Johnny Oovaut.

MR. OOVAUT: Thank you. It's not for document of Kuujjuaraapik (indiscernible), I just want to ask you because the Board member who is supposed to deciding also is also speaking for Kuujjuaraapik.

MS. WEETALTUK: The comments are not from me so I don't feel I'm conflicting because this information are from the hunters. And I thought I was going to be the only one speaking. They came here so

they're talking now. I'm asking Qajaq, she's a lawyer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBINSON: I don't want to slow down the afternoon. If it is the position of parties that Salamiva is in a conflict and can't be part of the decision, then raise that. I think that in Nunavik and in many situations with small communities and many people wearing different hats, we have to think about these things in like a reasonable way. She's provided information that's also included in the submissions and I understand that that was done with all of her fellow LNUK members. So I think that there was nothing wrong with her reiterating what has been shared with her by the -- her LNUK fellow members. And if there's issues with her being part of the decision when the time comes -- oh, sorry, she's the manager, not the member, then we can address that issue after this part.

Okay, next person with questions. Putulik Papigatuk.

MR. PAPIGATUK: We heard that people were planning about the Long Island to go down my plane, build a shack for hunters. I wonder if you are also planning to go down that way because the Eeyou, the Cree are working on that -- working on overlapping

area. I'm also asking -- I'm also wondering if the

Cree would be supporting that and I'm asking

Kuujjuaraapik community what are their plan about the

Long Island? Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBINSON: Is Kuujjuaraapik able to answer?

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: Yes, the plan is still going and they are seeking some funds. Although they have found some funds but there are not enough yet. But the plan is still going. But I don't know the situation about the Cree, they also have a cabin in that area. But I don't know their plan. the migratory birds are coming in such as Canada Goose, everybody will be able to wait for the goose in that area. But when it's time to hunt for Beluga, it's a complete different story. We are planning to build a cabin with solar panels so that we could have freezers there to keep the Beluga meat skin there fresh. For Mr. Blackned from Eeyou the same question is for you.

MR. BLACKNED: Good afternoon. To tell you the truth, I -- we don't have any plans up to this point for Long Island or any section of the joints zone with the Inuit. As far as I know, and I learned that through some friends I have on Facebook, they do

come as far north at Long Island to do some hunting, not for Beluga, but for other animals, and also for waterfowl. But apart from that, and as far as I know and I'm not sure if the member from Chisasibi there would be able to confirm anything. I'm not even certain if the Inuit in Chisasibi harvest any Beluga any more. So with that, it's hard to respond but I guess in future from here on in, we may have discussions regarding the joints zone, but as it stands now, we're not discussing for the time being.

Nation Government also was supposed to send a representative here for this hearing but nobody has shown up and neither have we received any word as to whether someone will be coming. So that is all I know. I see a hand going up over there. Are you responding to anything there? Isaac, do you have anything to say. Maybe Isaac is familiar with -- he comes from here. But not from Kuujjuaraapik, from Whapmagoostui.

MR. MASTY: Thank you very much. I cannot speak too much on that. I cannot speak on that question in respect to regulations and so forth. But I can tell you -- all I can tell you is that -- oh, I'm sorry. Isaac Masty, from Whapmagoostui. I'm also

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the chair of the EMR Impact Review Board. I cannot speak to the regulations in respect to the Beluga All I can tell you -- sorry, it's hard to listen to the translator and speak at the same time. All I can tell you is that traditionally, the Cree and the Cree of Whapmagoostui and the Inuit of Whapmagoostui, have lived together and harvested together. And for a long period of time, now that the Cree has never -- have not harvested Beluga anymore. But that's -- we don't know what's going to happen in the future as our elders have told us that we do have quaranteed levels that were secured under the agreement, a certain number of Beluga. And we're going to keep that because we never know what's going to happen that the Cree might decide to harvest Beluga again in the future.

Most of Cree have harvested many years ago Beluga during the summer months. And during that harvest they will always shared the harvest with the Inuit. And something happened that I'm not exactly sure why the Crees were told one day that they -- that it was not safe to consume Beluga. That there was something like a boat or something within the bay that sank that might affect -- have contaminated the Beluga. That's the story that we got. And since that

time, the Crees have stopped harvesting Beluga and they don't harvest as much as they used to.

So then the question about the Cree having a concern with the harvests of Kuujjuaraapik, I'm not aware of any. And I don't think there will be, at least for the most of Cree, have never complained about the harvest, the Beluga harvest. So I think that's speaking purely as a Cree and as just a person, not speaking to regulations. That's all I can tell you that the Cree do not have a problem with the Inuit harvesting. But we're also aware that there are certain regulations in regards to Beluga and we expect that those regulations to be respected. That's it. Thank you.

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: Just to say, to add, even if we do get a cheque, we'll have -- we'll set up a freezer, using a generator. Do you understand?

MR. PAPIGATUK: Is there an airstrip there? Are you planning to set up an airstrip?

There's one ready. There are three airstrips.

MS. ROBINSON: Next speaker. Adamie
Kaitak. Sorry, Adamie Tayara. No questions? Mike
Hammill, so you have a question? Mike Hammill?

MR. HAMMILL: We're hearing a lot of interest to harvest in estuaries. This occurred many,

1 many years ago and some of the science advice that we provided was that people tended to harvest more than 2 3 they normally would and there was a lot of wastage. 4 guess the question is how would the hunters put in 5 place a system to ensure that large numbers of animals 6 from the same family groups are not taken or that the 7 system would not be abused? I know most hunters take 8 what they want and what they need, but sometimes when 9 you get many hunters together, people forget to share 10 and become more greedy. I say this because in 11 Nastapoka one time we had 30 canoes, over 100 people. 12 And it was, at that time, on the days when I was 13 there, there was some wastage. So how could the 14 hunters think about putting in a place to minimize the 15 wastage and to ensure that large numbers of animals 16 wouldn't be taken? Just some thoughts. It's a 17 question coming out of the blue, so just some thoughts 18 on it.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: In Kuujjuaraapik, I don't know how many canoes. There's not many canoes, only 30, five, six who did (indiscernible). And we try to take everything that we can to fit in our canoe and bring back home. Those 30 canoes that you saw, they were joint hunters from each community.

MR. HAMMILL: We saw 30 canoes and -- I

don't want to get into naming people. It's an example and it's -- I mean, how would we put something in place to make sure everybody's comfortable that there's not too many animals being taken, and there's not wastage. I don't want to blame people, this is -- because communities talk and they say, well, that village took too many, that village took too many. How do we put something in place so there's not too many animals taken at one time and that we don't see wastage, and everybody's confident that it's being respected?

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: We have to consider the weather, too. It's not always calm out there.

The only time we went was when the weather was permitting and we never try to take too much. Okay?

MS. ROBINSON: I think those are all the questions for Kuujjuaraapik. Thank you for sharing. Right now, next to speak Umiujaq LNUK. Those from Umiujaq -- sorry, I did something wrong. Our board, even the staff, they were supposed to ask questions, too. I don't have a question. Members of the Board. Okay, we have questions from Jean-Pierre and Sandy Akavak.

MR. SAVARD: Just a simple question. What's your feeling about abundance of Beluga in

Little Whale River now after? Have you been there or do ---

MS. ROBINSON: Can you repeat it?

MR. SAVARD: What's your feeling about
the abundance of Beluga in Little Whale River now
these days? Have you been there or do your community
have been there recently?

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: When we pass by there, there's usually lots of whales. We've passed by there not too often, but every time there's lots of whales. Every summer I used to be there. And I haven't been there since 20 years. We used to go there to dry meat. We used to saw whales every day at the time especially in the morning when we were checking nets but they would swim away. There's still lots of whales when we pass by. I don't how they say their numbers are diminishing. Do you understand?

MS. ROBINSON: Sandy, do you have a question?

MR. AKAVAK: Thank you, chair. I'm from (indiscernible). I'm a member of the Board. I have a short question. I just heard there is from Kuujjuaraapik they wanted to harvest everything they'd see and to have a quota like up to 15. I just want something clear as to what you really want. And if it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were ever fixed and if the regulation was changed, with the new -- will you be able to follow new regulations that are -- that we could come up with. And we're hearing different things that like students teaching children about butchering. So if you make regulations -- I'm not trying to tell you what to do because it's usually better when there's a bit of a regulation for the LNUK for their hunters that they work on their own regulations. And this is the best method that people can work with. So I would -- I'm not trying to tell you what to do, you're free to do as you please, whether there's a quota or not, would you be able to come up with some sort of regulation? Whether it's traditional because we try to make it strong just to mention that. Thank you.

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: I hear from Kuujjuaraapik ever since the quota started, we are the ones who follow the regulations the most. We never reach our quota. It's been like that for a long time. And we -- our hunters try to respect and they seem to be the only ones that follow this regulation. You understand?

MS. ROBINSON: Qajaq Robinson, legal counsel, Nunavik Marine Wildlife Board. The question from Sandy. Coming with some regulation from LNUK,

would you be able to have make up your own regulation?

I wonder if you can respond to that?

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: For the LNUK, if we make our regulations for our hunters, I believe our hunters would respect that from what we ask of them, they follow respectfully. So I would expect the same respect because they've been respectfully following all this time.

MS. ROBINSON: I don't believe there are any more questions. Hopefully I'm not wrong this time in our process. We thank you very much. Umiujaq is next.

MR. TOOKALOOK: I'm sorry. My name is Simon.

MS. ROBINSON: Excuse me, Simon. I forgot someone who wanted to ask a question. Luccassie Nappaaluk, do you have a question to Kuujjuaraapik?

MR. NAPPAALUK: I heard Isaac saying that in the past, Cree used to harvest Beluga but after they got the information that they were contaminated, maybe we heard that information at the same time in the 60s. The -- we were informed that the Beluga whales had too many mercury in the 60s. That was the first time we were told not to eat too much anymore because they were not good for your

health anymore. And we were even told not to eat oil anymore, so after that information we got, we would feed our dog first and if they didn't die or get sick, we would eat after, after the dogs. So we started to continue to eat them again. And this anthropologist

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

named Bernard -- what's his name? I'll remember it.

So he was in Kangirsuk and he felt bad for the Inuit so he decided to send the meat and the fat to the universities in the south. And the response was Inuit already have mercuries because they've been consuming Belugas since the beginning. So it's better for their health. But those non-Inuit would get sick because they did not get the mercury from their body. That's what we heard. But later on, the ring seals were also -- we were also told not eat ring seal anymore. How would we live? We don't want So we decided to eat seal meat to die and starve. even though we were told it was full of mercury. up to date, nobody has been killed by that or by the Beluga mercuries. Maybe the government's idea was to use this information to come up with regulations. Beluga meat is very good food. You can dry it, you can ferment it, you can eat it cold. So as an Inuk, if you want to be healthy, eat Beluga. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TOOKALOOK: We used to live here also even though we're living now in Umiujaq. (indiscernible) with them. We also wish -- we were also shown the results right now before they decide and we were told that we are given an opportunity to make changes and the changes will be looked into by To me, this was very good the DFO and us. information. There was a proposal to make changes so as a community of Umiujaq, I thought after listening to what was mentioned because I'm also agreeing with the community of Kuujjuaraapik to reopen Little Whale River. We would also -- I was agreeing with them, what they wish to harvest. I think it would be good to create a steering committee for Eastern Hudson Bay stock so that everything would be properly implemented or created. Maybe that's another possibility for the changes as if we have a steering committee for the Eastern Hudson Bay stock, Ungava Bay and Hudson Strait.

MADAM INTERPRETER: I'll let him finish his sentence.

MR. TOOKALOOK: By doing that maybe the needs of communities would be increased once we have the steering committee. I've been talking about this to the community of Umiujaq and so it would be good to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

come up with this work with the DFO. Hunters has been saying that we are not trying to eliminate Beluga. It's true, so we are here to go further with a new step. This public hearing is a very good place to have a discussion and some ideas that we need to consider on. This is a very, major important step. After looking at the numbers that we saw yesterday and what we have heard from the people of Kuujjuaraapik, we would also want to be able to go down to Little Whale River and also at the Long Island.

It seems that once the Cree Government is created because we usually don't want to go down to Cape Jones. We were told not to be around by the people of Mailasikkut. We were told it's Mailasii-Chisasibi? We were asked to move. Our grandparents, Cree grandparents were not fighting and today, the Cree of Kuujjuaraapik still go down to the north of Umiujag. We don't mind that because that is their They're just continuing on their tradition. tradition. So once the Cree Government is created, maybe we will be prevented to go down to the Long Island. And we need to remember that we have an agreement. So we don't want to be prevented to hunt in any way.

And I would want this to be considered

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to create a steering committee; I'm repeating that. As when the allocation are distributed, that would increase a little bit. The DFO and the Canadian Government and Makivik and RNUK to work together and into this because Inuttitut and Cree have rights. They are still there; they were never changed or renewed so they're still there. I just wanted to mention that. As people, Umiujag hunters, we go very far down to Long Island. For example, if I travel on my own, I spend \$1,600, not less. And also during the night at 2:30, if I would have to travel very late at night before the Beluga is spoiled. That's how we do because as soon as we harvest, we try to go back home before the Beluga spoils and sometimes we travel very late at night, during the night. So don't prevent us.

And the Beluga that are allocated to harvest around Umiujaq I would want to see them to be increased because what we have been hearing here are good to brainstorm on good information. But we would want to be able to harvest 15 nearby and at the Little Whale River, 15 if we are not allowed to harvest in — around Umiujaq and what's been happening in Long Island, I would — don't make changes how we do it down there.

MS. SALAMIVA: Questions for Umiujaq?

Please raise your hand. You too, Billy. James May and Billy Palliser are the only ones who wish to ask questions. Umiujaq, please listen.

MR. MAY: I don't really want to ask question; I just want to assist him. Because I'm representing people of Nunavik in my position. I mentioned about the conflicts between the Cree and Inuit. It's written now that we need to correct it, we need to make changes on that. Eeyou Marine Wildlife Board, Nunavut Marine Wildlife Board, Makavik, RNUK, and LNUKs has to come up with a solution before there are another public hearing is happening because we might have to do the similar again.

Someone also mentioned that guaranteed level of harvest belongs to the Cree. Maybe those three communities can -- can they borrow from them? Because they are being mistreated a lot by DFO so I would want this to be tried. Eeyou Marine Board and Nunavik Board and the Cree Government should really have to look into this and try and find reasons to maximize.

And what Johnny also mention it will as an executive Board, we are not here to represent our community. We are here to represent all the

communities. So it would be better for you not to
mention the problems of your community because there
are LNUKs representative. For example, I'm sitting
here; I haven't mentioned anything about Tasiujaq
because of my position. So I want you to do the same.

Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Billy Palliser.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you. I'm just going to kind of ask him, it's good to hear your proposal concerning Eastern Hudson Bay steering community.

Although there are Beluga management group but their work didn't really bring us anywhere. So the steering committee that you mentioned, who will be the steering committee, where would they come from? Would they be sitting with them, too, Simon? That's my question, Simon.

MR. TOOKALOOK: Thank you, Billy.

Concerning the EHB as a community of Kuujjuaraapik,

Umiujaq, Inukjuak, Puvirnituq and Akulivik, we are

connected to EHB, so the steering committee that would

be created, same thing for Ungava and Hudson Strait to

have a steering committee. That way I think would be

better. This was also mentioned by someone from

Inukjuak and I agreed with that person. And I decided

that I would try to make it real, realized. You also

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mentioned that at the Little Whale River, you said if it was reopened you would support that and you wish to practice your tradition that you used to have in the past. So how would you have a plan for this to manage the wildlife, the Beluga? What are your plans for this in case it was opened again at the Little Whale River?

MR. PALLISER: Thank you, Billy. would want to use our tradition and still continue what we usually do but open the Little Whale River and create a steering committee who would make proposals. Even I feel that my response to you is not directed to your question but this area has been used by my I have used it; my dad has used it. ancestors. it had stopped to me. I would want to see to be used again for my children and grandchildren. Because I know that we will still have to follow regulations but we would have to follow the proposal that was proposed to us. That's my answer, Billy.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you, Simon. Second last question, that Little Whale River in case it was opened, is the community of Umiujaq would want to harvest Beluga, how much they wish to harvest from that Little Whale River because Kuujjuaraapik mentioned 15.

1 MADAM INTERPRETER: He's

He's repeating.

MR. TOOKALOOK: Thank you, Billy. I also mentioned 15 if it's possible to increase, yes, to increase but the number is 15. The population of Umiujaq is growing and I can give you an example. We harvest nine or ten Beluga. We are able to give out to all the households but if we harvest less than nine, not everybody gets their share. That's why I was requesting to be able to harvest 15 nearby Umiujaq. Same amount if we were allowed to go Little Whale River and the Long Island.

MR. PALLISER: My last question, if the request was accepted to reopen the Little Whale River, would you also have a plan in your community to make sure that to continue to -- would you still treat the sampling kit seriously?

MR. TOOKALOOK: Yes, we would still we will be more serious. We would be more serious after seeing the numbers and those sampling kits are very useful, so we would have no choice but to continue using them. Because we have no choice but to follow through what has been asked or regulated. So we would still continue to follow through what is being regulated by DFO. Thank you.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you, Simon.

MS. ROBINSON: That is all the questions from the floor. I understand, Kaitlin, you have a question? And then we'll go to questions from the Boards. Do any of the board members have questions for Umiujag?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$ ROBINSON: No, there are no questions from the Board from -- and one question from Kaitlin.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: I appreciate the clarification in the change you made in your -- in your written submission, you talked about wanting to keep Little Whale River. And we understand, welcome your oral presentation that you would like to follow what Kuujjuaraapik proposed in terms of opening Little Whale River. Kuujjuaraapik's proposal for Little Whale River is a seasonal, not like an all-year thing but to have it open from August 1st to August 31st, if I understand well. Is that your same vision or do you have a different idea for what the opening would be for Little Whale River?

MR. TOOKALOOK: I will respond this. My priority is for the steering committee to be created so that that needs to be fixed would be treated faster. So it will be better to accept our request, the needs of Inuit individuals, our hunters needs and

use their rights. The only way we will be succeeding is to collaborate together. But I wanted to mention this so that people can think about it because there will be no other choice but to negotiate and if we agreeing amongst us, that will be the only time to realize. So I would want the steering committee to be created right away so that we would go faster. Thank you, Kaitlin.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: I certainly appreciate the importance of the steering committee for guiding harvesting in the Hudson Bay arc. Could you confirm, is it that you would want Little Whale River open all summer long while Beluga are there or only for the period during August?

MR. TOOKALOOK: Kuujjuaraapik mentioned about August. Same thing for us in Umiujaq, the month of August. It will be wonderful and hunters would be more at peace and the individual who have rights would be more at peace because we are also looking for the solutions. So Jimmy-Paul (indiscernible) from Kuujjuaraapik mentioned and I am agreeing with him and also with Salamiva of their plan. Because as people of Umiujaq, we were living here before.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: As the community who sits between the two closed areas in Hudson Bay,

Nastapoka and Little Whale River, do you have any similar ideas about Nastapoka? Would you like it to remain closed, is that an area where you would also like to see something like what you're talking about for Little Whale River?

MR. TOOKALOOK: I myself, personally, I would not really fight for the Nastapoka River due to the numbers that we saw and to my knowledge, there are more Beluga in the Little Whale River. We will not consider the Nastapoka River for now. So we have a same request as Kuujjuaraapik. Thank you, Kaitlin.

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you, right now, Inukjuak LNUK.

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Thank you. Jobie
Oweetaluktuk, I am the president of the LNUK. Our
other members who were not able to come so Pauloosie
will help me. I'm thankful for him being here. In
the same way, our hunting area has been taken away for
40 years by DFO. At the time, when they closed
(indiscernible) and that time when it was about to
close, there were many canoes at the time. I think
you know about that time (indiscernible) government
(indiscernible) ---

MADAM INTERPRETER: Please speak with one language.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: For 40 years -- 40 years have passed and one-year pilot project has lasted 40 years. (indiscernible). And since that time, people of Inukjuak whenever they want to speak, they're asked to go a certain place, Long Island and up to Hudson Strait. Kangirsuk, Salluit, Ivujivik, we are thankful that they were able to harvest from We can only harvest only five from area and we have a population of over 1,800, lots of hunters. Lots of people don't have jobs, lots more people are hunting, surviving from hunting. There are widows and people with handicaps that need to be fed and we have to travel far. We're able to harvest up to 25 and we have to find our own funding for travelling.

And I'm thinking for Hudson Strait, take off that quota from Hudson Strait to be shared by Ungava and Hudson. Those from Hudson Strait, they can harvest from the Western Hudson Bay stock. They know them and they -- among the 25 that we are allowed to harvest from far away, we want to harvest them from nearby. It wouldn't be as expensive from having to travel far and it's important to me that Inuit traditional knowledge, it's knowledge -- it's a bit more (indiscernible) collegial knowledge. There wouldn't have to be quotas because they try to respect

everything they take, only what they need. That way they will survive over the winter, that's the way it has been for Inuit tradition. But this closing has really affected our tradition and we would want you to hear because it's even painful to keep repeating it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Twenty-five, 30, no, 40, no, 50 -- I want 50 for one season because they're over 1,000 in In the same way, we will respect any Inukjuak, right? regulation and we are not as respectful for the -from that time, there were problems at the time with the result of closing our nearby hunting grounds so I thought it was a good idea for Hudson Strait that they would give to Hudson Bay and Ungava using traditional knowledge and to be -- and to make their own regulations for closing and opening seasons for harvesting. And for the barrels at Nastapoka River, that's been buried in -- on the shore, they're probably buried by DFO, they're probably dangerous. And fresh water, the current is not as strong because of the damming of the James Bay area. It's affecting that -- those rivers way up north. And when the current is not as strong, the Beluga has moved away.

When we were in Timmins, we were told by the Cree, the (indiscernible) are starting to go over to -- Beluga. And I want to mention about the pilot

project by DFO and I'm fully in support because it will help Hudson Bay and James Bay because it's mentioned it would be 50/50 for Long Island to be shared by Cree and Inuit. It's written down, I would want this to continue. And Pauloosie will add something.

MR. KASUDLUAK: Thank you, Jobie.

Pauloosie Kasudluak, Inukjuak. With the quota system, they're still from Little Whale River and researchers or -- and from the samples nobody's ever caught any from that area, from EHB, and the quota is not being followed. For the next three years for Inukjuak, I would want them to be shared by Inukjuak. From Tasiujaq when they did their research, they never caught anything from EHB and they still have -- and there's still this quota and this restriction. So something needs to be done about that. And maybe I should ask DFO what happens from the quota that are not caught, that are not harvested?

MS. ROBINSON: Who has a question for Inukjuak LNUK? Maybe only two? Johnny and Billy, just two of you.

MR. ARNAITUK: Johnny Arnaituk. You've seen my hat and in support of Inukjuak and Kangirsuk where there's lots of Beluga and people from Inukjuak,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they're usually the first ones to tell us that the Beluga are on their way to our area. So we hear that within two weeks -- within two weeks, then they arrive. And they are allowed to harvest only so much and it's big, bit population and they have to travel Even people have died from those hunts. For the far. next three years, couldn't we try to harvest -- have them harvested nearby their communities because we see a high number of -- from EHB stock that pass by our area. So I would want this to be looked into again because they're in a very bad state with this regulation, and they're allowed only three. Maybe you should open for a while and for three years see what And if there would be changes of the amount happens. of Beluga that pass by our area ---

MS. ROBINSON: That was more a comment. Billy Dan right after. Billy?

MR. PALLISER: Just to support and question. I go hunting there. What Johnny mentioned was true. As soon as the ice opens in May, we see Belugas passing by and it's getting to be more and more. For the last 15 years, we've been going there and today, it's every day now. I want to mention that. And in May they're already available and when they move and they pass by Inukjuak and the next day,

they go to Sanikiluaq. In the springtime, it's good - it would be good to harvest Beluga near the shores
in the spring.

My question is, from you with Jobie mentioned, if I said up to 50 -- to be allowed to take 50, I just wonder if there are LNUK in Inukjuak with their hunters if they would work with their hunters for research purposes to be more in control, would they be open to that? That's my first question.

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Yes. Yes, they're starting to use back the kit, not all of them because they were -- they felt they were deceived. But today, as we get more information, using the sample kits throughout the region, so we received the research kits and they are known by the community. Thank you.

MR. PALLISER: And the next question, for Inukjuak, since a long time they've been hunting from the Little Whale River area since forever. How would you feel about if that area was opened to be given an opportunity to harvest from there, like Kuujjuaraapik, Umiujaq mentioned? How would you think about this?

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: For Inukjuak, they can go there, they can harvest from there, too. Even from historically, that was their harvesting ground.

_ -

MR. PALLISER: Last question, do you think it's important for -- from Umiujaq for the steering committee for each Eastern Hudson Bay, do you feel that it's important?

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Yes, very much.

Because I know there is (indiscernible) working

committee if we do get that for Beluga on Hudson Bay,

we could do similar things, same things.

MS. SALAMIVA: Billy Dan May?

MR. MAY: Thank you. I have more than one question. If your quota was increased and would you be able to use the research kits more because they could help? At the time it was closed we can go into a worse situation because it would be better to use the sample kits. Do you ever have non-indigenous (indiscernible) stock pass by your community?

MR. KASUDLUAK: You be well to respond to the second question. People of community has been designated to a certain area from Kangirsuk, Ivujivik. I think the sample kits are -- were considered to be from Kangirsuk or Ivujivik because hunters are ordered to go to designated -- to go to those communities. Because of that, there are not many sample kits coming from Inukjuak because they harvest the Beluga there in those two communities where it is designated. That's

1 my response.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jobie, I want to respond MR. PALLISER: because I know. I lived there and I'm a user. know the Beluga very well that in the spring when they are arriving, migrating in the spring, there are different stocks because they're migrating through the Then during the summer, we used to open waters. harvest same stock and you can see them with your -with the sample kits, EHB. So in the fall, Western Hudson Bay stock are also migrating all around the Hudson Bay so we used to harvest big Beluga in the fall. But what you just mentioned, we were tricked with those sample kits because there were basis coming out of those sample kits. Because of that, we were not happy with those sample kits because of that, we decided not to the sampling as hunters. The Western Hudson Bay in the fall usually migrate through our Thank you. area.

MS. ROBINSON: Did you get your response, Billy Dan? Mike Hammill.

MR. HAMMILL: A couple of questions. Do you -- are there other types of samples or science that you think could be done by sampling from the harvest, is the first question?

MR. OOWEETALUKTUK: There was some

sample last year from the springtime about maybe three.

MR. HAMILL: Yeah, what I was thinking is we collect only skin and a tooth.

MR. OOWEETALUKTUK: Yeah.

MR. HAMILL: But there's a lot, as you know, that can be learned from the animals. So is there any opening to collecting more samples? Fat, for example, we can use to see if the animals are pregnant or contaminants, length is something that provides information on growth. And this is just two examples and, of course, discussions have to occur but is there any opening and it's just not for -- it's not just for Inukjuak, it's for other communities as well, but opening for more science to be done with the animals that are caught by the hunters.

MS. ROBINSON: Very good question. I'm not too sure how relevant it is for this decision, so I encourage very much conversations during the coffee hour about that.

MR. HAMMILL: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay? I don't mean to disrupt it but future science, although very important, but not help with the Board this week. To be fair.

1 MR. HAMMILL: Okay. The other is we're 2 looking towards everybody wants to increase the 3 harvest. So -- and there's always the -- everybody 4 says, well, DFO comes in with the police and then 5 everybody gets angry. Are there other ways that we could think of to ensure that people respect the 6 7 quota, and if they don't, what could be actions to either reduce repeats, you know, repeat infractions or 8 9 to reduce the chances that the quota would not be 10 respected? How do the RNUKs and LNUKs view ways of 11 trying to control or make sure that harvesting is 12 respected? 13 MS. ROBINSON: And just to be clear, 14 this is a question just to the Inukjuak LNUK? 15 MR. HAMILL: Yes, for the moment, yeah. 16 So it's a question of how MS. ROBINSON: 17 would the Inukjuak LNUK sort of regulate and enforce? 18 MR. HAMILL: Yeah. 19 MS. ROBINSON: You can respond now, 20 Inukjuak. 21 MR. OOWEETALUKTUK: The LNUK -- we can 22 talk to the hunters. If we can get a little from RNUK 23 or, you know, we can try to follow the sampling to 24 inform the hunters that they need to sample more. 25 I think what I'm trying to MR. HAMMILL:

get at is -- I don't want to get into an argument on quota. But if the community decides that they will only harvest a certain number of whales, how do they -- what are their suggestions on how this harvesting could be monitored and if people did not respect what the community decided, what actions could be carried out to either make sure it doesn't happen again, or to discourage bad behaviour occurring again. So what -- how does the community view that they could make sure there's support for the regulations they develop by the community, yeah, for the LNUK of Inukjuak but it could apply to other LNUKs later? But for Inukjuak.

MR. OOWEETALUKTUK: Okay. The regulations, yeah, I think it would be good to have a regulation to inform the hunters and try to come up with the steering committee that would regulate. I think that would be good.

MS. ROBINSON: Do you want me to translate?

MR. HAMILL: This is good.

MS. ROBINSON: I think that's the rest of the questions from the floor on our list. We have questions from Kaitlin Breton-Honeyman and then we have questions from three of the Board members.

MS. BRETON-HONEYMAN: Just the same

question that I asked to Simon about Nastapoka. We understood that you want to follow what Kuujjuaraapik and Umiujaq are talking about for Little Whale River. For Nastapoka, what is the wishes of the Inukjuak hunters regarding that estuary? Do you want it to stay closed, do you want it open, you want it open a little bit?

MR. OOWEETALUKTUK: It would be good to have a certain month like in late August or to have a season opening like they used to. They usually used to go there in the fall time when the heat passed the summer. In the fall time it's better to keep the food in good condition because they rotten in the summertime faster than the fall.

MS. WEETALTUK: My name is Salamiva
Weetaltuk, maybe I'm forgotten. I would like to ask
the community of Inukjuak and I wish to receive a
response. I'm the one who is pushing for the sample
kit because I know that we would have more freedom,
and slowly, we are. It's becoming visible now because
some communities respects to do the sampling. How
come when you know that these sampling kits would well
affect all the hunters, how come you don't respect
them? They're the only tool that we can have to have
more opening. And my second question, even though

it's not documented we already have a voluntary
agreement. We cannot go down to Little Whale River or
Nastapoka River in July.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

How come you -- without respecting their regulations -- how come you just go down and go ahead without ever thinking us who has quota? So I always wonder how you are able to go there without any problem because when you try to work hard, when people are not respecting it, it becomes very difficult and becomes very stressful. And for a long time, we've been trying to tell Inuit (indiscernible) every RNUK in our general meeting, we always try to tell you to use the samples. And because we would want the people of Nunavik have more freedom to harvest because if we use the sampling kit, it will be easier. So like you mentioned earlier that you were tricked because of the sampling kits. But it's been a long time and you haven't used the sampling kits anymore and we've been told by our parents not to be angry all day and not fight over the wildlife.

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Yes, LNUKs always inform their hunters that there are sampling kits available at their office. And we cannot tell any hunter not to go out hunting because they use their own money to harvest Beluga, too, at the Little Whale

River but never inform us. So I want you to understand that even if we try to tell our hunters not to go to a certain area, there's always a problem. So they use their money and go very far because they work hard to catch a whale so that the people of Inukjuak would get meat. And the ones responsible for the quotas creation are the one who are causing this problem now. And there are some sample kits at LNUKs if you -- because we always inform the community hunters that there are some sample kits available at the office. Although some use them. Did I answer your question?

MR. PALLISER: I can respond to that because I'm part of Inukjuak hunters. So I'm going to respond to Salamiva to assist Jobie. She asked how come you don't use the sample kits while other communities are using it? And she also mentioned by using those sample kits, there are more opening. I'm going to mention this again that we were tricked. And the sample kits that we sent, every time we send them, they become data information for -- 100 percent data information.

The reason why we did not want to use the sampling kits anymore because they were basing from those from harvesting data, sampling data. For

example, there were two Beluga that were caught in Umiujaq, Western Hudson Bay and Eastern Hudson Bay, but at the end, they were treated as if they were all Eastern Hudson Bay. Because of that, if the DFO will be the only one to conduct the research and test, we did not want to do that anymore.

But we have to work and collaborate and today we are starting to recognize. And we wish to reconciliate with DFO in the future. And if you ask - you said you just go down to Little Whale River even if it's closed up. That I cannot answer. And I don't think nobody will be able to answer that. And to you, please respond. I want to remove that if Jobie is agreeing with me because we cannot respond to that question. Do you agree, Jobie?

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Yes.

MS. WEETALTUK: So the sample kits are being used by the hunters of Nunavik so that they will get more freedom. And the community of Inukjuak is the most reluctant. So if we are able to harvest nearby, they wish to over-harvest, is that why they don't accept? Or will they be able to respect because I feel that LNUKs of Kuujjuaraapik will respect so the hunters of Inukjuak, will they be able to respect the regulations that are created by their LNUKs?

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: Yes, if they are able to increase then maybe we can find solutions.

MS. WEETALTUK: There's a lot of conditions.

MS. SALAMIVA: Sandy? Sandy Akavak.

MR. AKAVAK: I'm about to forget my questions.

MS. SALAMIVA: Jean-Pierre, tell him to put the microphone close to his mouth.

MR. AKAVAK: I had questions. There are two. I don't have much awareness and Inukjuak is allowed to harvest four, is that true? And if they go to a designated area, looking at the results, I think they harvested 25. Those 25 Belugas that you harvested, were they sampled? That's my question. Thank you. Trying to briefly ask my question.

MR. OWEETALUKTUK: That are nearby, we were allocated three Beluga for many, many years but because of the population growth of Inukjuak, we were given five. That's the only -- those are the only Beluga that were allocated to us were sampled because that's the only amount we got. And for the other 25 that we harvested at the designated area, for sure they were sampled, too, at that area while they were still in that area.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

~ *1*

2425

MS. SALAMIVA: Luccassie, do you have a question? Is it a question that you wish ask? After that we'll go for a break. Harry? If it's a question, if not ---

MR. ARRAGUTAINAQ: It's not a question. The reason why I raised my hand is because some people don't know how to deal with the Beluga meat anymore.

MS. SALAMIVA: It would be good if you talk about it tomorrow instead because elders will have an opportunity to talk about your experience from the past. Harry?

MR. OKPIK: Thank you, Salamiva. has been talking about the sample kits. I'm one of the people who pushed for the sample kits to be done. So I would like to make a clarification. If a Beluga whale be sampled, even the hunters are not from the same community. So where the Beluga is killed, we identify that and the person who killed a Beluga, they have a lot of butchering to do. If they are not the one are going to do the sampling kit, we allow the students to do the sample and the person responsible in my community for that. This way, it's better for us and students are anxious to do it because they wish to make money. And we increase the amount to pay for them and they are able to get it in the community they

are able to get paid in it, Quaqtaq now. When we deal with sampling and according to the hunters, hunters that are there, if they are going to use the sampling. And if they are too busy to care of what they caught, we ask them if they don't mind to have our person to do the sampling kit because they are harvested in Quaqtaq. And then if they are harvested in Quaqtaq, even harvester is not from Quaqtaq, we make sure to identify where the hunter is coming from. And because of the harvest was done in Quaqtaq, it's put under Quaqtaq, that's why other communities usually have less sample in numbers because they are designated to our area.

The person responsible to deal with the sampling kit will not just do the sampling without asking the harvester. And if they accept for it to be done, they do it. It's done very rapidly by our students. For about ten years, we've been working hard on sampling because for the past ten years, not only the Umajuit warden, LNUKs and some students are very anxious to work -- to take samples. So this is -- must be a good -- therefore the communities who doesn't really do the sampling kit. I just wanted to explain that while we are at it.

MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Harry. Thank

you. He's not asking Jobie, so we'll go for a break,

15 minutes-break. Look at your watch first and then

come back in 15 minutes.

--- A BRIEF RECESS

MS. SALAMIVA: Right now, we go to Sanikiluaq and we hear now from Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and there will be a question period after.

--- TECHNICAL PAUSE

MR. ARRAGUTAINAQ: Thank you for inviting us. We weren't sure what we had to say but I'm here with Eli (indiscernible), from local HEOS president. We'll just share what we've been doing concerning the Beluga, Killiniq Beluga. At the time in May 1998, there was a meeting with Nunavut Wildlife Board (indiscernible), Nunavut Tunngavik (indiscernible) and with Nunavut Tunngavik there was some concern about the Killiniq stock. So as we heard their concerns, we tried to find solutions Western Hudson Bay stock, what could we do to support their conservation efforts -- oh, Eastern Hudson Bay. We

were told right away from Nunavut Wildlife Board that if we're going to do something about Beluga, we will have to come up with our own regulations and that's when we were able to do something.

And in the following fall, with the land claim agreement, we came up with hunting rules and this would be for -- with the Sanikiluaq people. With the Nunavut Land Claim, each community they are part of the Wildlife Board. And after that, if we're going to support for the concern of the Hudson Bay stock and there was a resolution and we came up with our own regulations dealing with Beluga for the following year. I took good notes so I took hurry with my notes, I'm still hurrying with them. And as we were trying to find solutions concerning the Hudson Bay stock how we would be able to support that, and we make our own regulations for Belcher Islands, Ottawa and Sleeper Islands, we made our own regulations.

And after that, the regulations were fixed, we would make an agreement with the Nunavut Board. And then, after that -- after another meeting and after that resolution, and then we were able to apply and get an agreement with the DFO to abide by them. At the time, for all the harvested whales, that they would all be used for sampling and then we would

give each hunter their sample kits. We each give them sample kits and after that, and we would pay for those sample kits and we hired someone to watch over this to make sure that all the regulations, all the things have to be done were properly applied concerning the Hudson Bay stock and not for other. Like I mentioned, for the Hudson Bay stock in terms of what we wanted to do to support. And we asked DFO and Nunavut Board and after that, we decided that they would be closure of harvesting for three months. And the first time, from July 15 to October 15, we fixed that. And after that, we met with our people and we had an agreement with the m and we were able to apply the regulations.

And after about five years, for three-months closure from July 15 to October 15, but we all know at the end of September there's usually a lot more Beluga. And at the time, if we could shorten the three-months closure and we had an agreement with DFO and Nunavut Board that we were having problems with the three-month closure, we wanted to change it concerning the whales that were evident in end of September concerning the Hudson Bay coast stock. I'm almost finished.

I think it would be good to share that we wrote down to share when Belugas are iced-in, last

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time they were iced-in it was 2011. At the time I've been in school, there was 75 of them on the south of Belcher Islands and they were all male, even the calves were male that were iced-in. And they were harvested by people and polar bears. But we used the sample kits are only 12. And we heard after that from sample kits that were iced-in, they were not of the They -- we were told that they were Hudson Bay coast. probably James Bay stock that the south of Belcher's the stock could probably be from the James Bay. in the spring when they travel north, probably from that stock. And we've been cooperating with Nunavut Board and with the DFO and NTI, we cooperate with them, collaborate with them concerning the Hudson Bay coast. So we will continue that for the following Maybe David could add something. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Luccassie.

MR. LEE: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is David Lee with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. I work for the Department of Wildlife and Environment. Firstly, I wanted to thank the Nunavik Marin Regional Wildlife Board and the Eeyou Marine Regional Wildlife Board to participate in this process. And, personally, I wanted to thank the Inuit of Nunavik for their hospitality and also because about 19 years ago,

I visited a number of communities and interviewed hunters and elders, many of whom have passed away, and expressed many of the comments that we heard today. So thank you very much.

I have a few general comments and -- but I've tried to listen to -- but are also included the Nunavut Tunngavik submission. As you know, the Nunavut Agreement and the Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement recognize Inuit harvesting rights and the rights to participate in wildlife management decisions. As an advocate of Inuit harvesting rights, NTI supports the needs of Inuit and the principles of conservation. Inuit have always understood that a sustainable harvest depends on the maintenance of vital and healthy wildlife populations.

As Luccassie mentioned, Killiniq community and HTO Sanikiluaq have taken their own measures so that a total allowable harvest would not be imposed upon them. In Nunavut as was explained, we do have quotas in place, or TAH's, Total Allowable Harvest, and our department takes the imposition of them very seriously. They should be the measure of last resort. They should not be the first option that is proposed to be placed on Inuit. And that's why we work as hard as we can with Inuit in Nunavut to come

up with solutions. And we take no credit at all for the solution that Sanikiluaq developed. This is their community-based management plan.

In this regard, Inuit consider it important and NIT consider vitally essential that Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is adequately considered and that the inclusion is an essential part of all decision-making. It should not just be an afterthought or even integrated. Meaningful inclusion of IQ in comanagement is essential to ensure the Inuit harvesting rights are respected and conservation goals are met. I'll just reiterate the point that the legal counsel for the Nunavik Marine Regional Wildlife Board mentioned, that similar to the NILCA, the Nunavut Agreement clearly states that:

"... There needs to be a recognition of

Inuit systems of wildlife management and
that contribute to the conservation of
wildlife and protection of wildlife
habitat and that there is a need for an
effective role for Inuit in all aspects
of wildlife management including
research ..."

In this regard, the community of Sanikiluaq through information provided by them and

DFO, our department submitted an analysis for the period of 2010 to 2018. The estimated annual number of Beluga landed from the Eastern Hudson Bay stock as defined by DFO is approximately two. NTI is making no decision recommendation about the management plan in Nunavik. NTI supports all Inuit and their needs. (indiscernible).

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you. Any questions for Luccassie and NTI? James, Makivic. I think they are the only one. Billy Palliser. Billy Dan is the first one to raise his hand.

MR. MAY: Thank you. My name is Billy Dan May, LNUK of Tasiujaq. My question will be like this: EHB was just mentioned about that they estimate with two. I think they know but they mentioned the estimate only and the hunters I think know the exact date with a -- I would like to hear how much is exact -- how many do you harvest from them. Not just the estimate. And when you harvest EHB stock because you can tell where the Beluga is coming from just by seeing them. I wonder if you do the sample when you harvested EHB?

MR. ARRAGUTAINAQ: Like I mentioned, all the sample kits we are responsible for that. We make sure that a hunter do the sample kits so that we would

know where the stocks is coming from. We also know that there are different stocks and the way of -Inuit way of hunting has changed also, but we also include them and also we include science. That way we have no problem because we're not good at math just like everyone else here.

MR. LEE: Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you, Billy Dan, for the question. Actually, you're quite right. This is an estimate, it's an average taken from all of the samples that the Sanikiluaq HTO hunters provide to DFO. So every year, they provide the samples from their hunts and then DFO uses their own models from the genetic analyses to determine which are EHB whales and which are not EHB whales. Depending on each year, that number can vary but typically, on average from 2010 to 2018, it came out to less than two. But to give you an example, last year, not -- I'm not saying this is the exact number but it could have been more than two.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: We get the table every year from the DFO. This explains where the Beluga have been harvested. Based on that, we estimate, to estimate which stock they are.

MR. LEE: And I'm sorry for going on but I think this is important. Sanikiluag is fortunate

they're in a location as Mike mentioned, where after fall, it appears they harvest no EHB. Again, using DFO modeling and their genetic analyses, the reason I mention this is because I don't want to indicate that if other communities provide genetic samples, that they may have the same opportunities that Sanikiluaq has. I want to be completely transparent. In fact, you may provide information and as Mike said, that may reduce your hunting opportunities if they find more EHB in those samples. I make no judgment; I just want to be transparent.

MR. (BILLY DAN) MAY: It's not a question. I'm not trying to argue but looking at the picture, I was able to tell that they were EHB. So I don't really believe your report, I'm sorry.

MS. ROBINSON: James May.

MR. (JAMES) MAY: James May, thank you. James May, RNUK president. Before I ask question, I just want to thank you that you were able to come here because what you just presented are very good examples for the people of Nunavik. Yes, we know that we need something to operate so I thank you for your presentation and these are my questions. The Sanikiluaq hunters when you started to produce those regulations, what was the thought of the people of

Sanikiluaq; that's my first question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: At the time, when we started we were not happy but our hunters are following through because we explained that it will be a pilot project and if we don't like it, we'll do some modifications. That's how we explained to the hunters, even DFO gave the same information that if they don't like it, they would change it, make changes on it. The DFO and the NTI have an understanding of our situation in Sanikiluaq.

MR. (JAMES) MAY: Thank you, Luccassie. I want to also ask you this, people of Nunavik and Sanikiluag there is an agreement, a sharing agreement This agreement was a good idea but with Inukjuak. unfortunately, it was broken by the people not from Inukjuak. Although I tried to -- at the time, I tried to support Inukjuak but it didn't go far, so if we submit modified sharing agreement and have people of Nunavik a better understanding, if we submit our proposal again to Nunavut and Sanikiluag, HTA and NTI, would you be able to still consider that? Or is it that agreement that was cancelled, will it be forever or can we still work together with the people of Inukjuak so that they can try to go and hunt there again near Sanikiluaq?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: Thank you. The sharing agreement was for one year and NTI, Makivik should have a discussion about this and then inform us and I think it would be possible to resume that. But NTI would have to accept that and Inukjuak make a request to Makivik and then Makivik would do the request to NTI. Finally, get to us to Sanikiluaq and see if we like it. That's the only way. That's how we can — that's the only way we can resume that agreement. Thank you.

MR. (JAMES) MAY: The reason why I ask this question is it's because I want to know if your community would be willing to accept it or the community of Sanikiluag if they can consider before we do something, before we send our request to Makivic If the community of Sanikiluag does not want and NTI. to try this again or should we try again? So I would want to hear from the people of Sanikiluag first because in case they did not want to have this agreement again, shared agreement again, we would not just want to ask Makivic and NTI to do something about it while the community already have deny. So I would want to know in advance before we do those request. If Sanikiluag is accepting or not.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: According to my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

understanding with our land claim agreement, in our agreement it says after you discuss and decide to do something, you go through Makivic and Makivic go through NTI and then together they would come to meet us and then we would decide if we would accept it or not. We cannot just go directly to the community because the organizations has to be involved to it.

MR. (JAMES) MAY: We're not trying to go directly to the community. But we want to know if the community of Sanikiluaq still have this interest. not trying to go directly to you. I just want to know if you know what the thoughts are of Sanikiluag people. Would they accept the sharing agreement or have they decided to never to see other hunters around their area anymore. After we understand that, the situation of Sanikiluag people, then we would go to Makivic and then NTI. But not knowing if Sanikiluag people is willing or not willing, that's why we wanted to know before we move on because it was the community of Sanikiluag decided to stop this agreement. because it was not over the community of Sanikiluaq and if so, and if they don't want other hunters to be around anymore completely, we're not going to try to ask them because we don't want to go through Makivic for no reason, for nothing.

1 MR. ARRAGURAINAO: We would have to inform other communities that are also on the same 2 3 agreement, land claims, same agreement and inform them 4 that there has been a request. And then after hearing 5 from them, we would work on it through Makivic and 6 NTI. So this shared agreement would have to be created 7 also. So Makivic, NTI would have to sign an agreement. 8 9 MR. (JAMES) MAY: Thank you. 10 MS. ROBINSON: Are you done? Makivic. 11 Thank you, Luccassie. I'm MR. GILBERT: wondering if you can give me an idea of how many 12 13 times, say a year, Sanikiluag meets with DFO on 14 management issues? 15 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: About yearly. 16 just had a -- we just finished a meeting last week 17 with them in Sanikiluag. About yearly. 18 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Thank you. 19 have one more question. Considering -- I'm just 20 wondering if you have any insights or thoughts on why 21 Sanikiluaq is managed to avoid a total allowable 22 harvest being imposed on the community while there is a total allowable take that Nunavik Inuit have to put 23

David Lee with Nunavut

MR. LEE:

24

25

up with?

1 Tunngavik Incorporated. The technical or official reason is because that request for a total allowable 2 3 harvest would need to be submitted to the Nunavut 4 Wildlife Management Board and the decision to the --5 would then need to be made by the Minster of Fisheries 6 and Oceans. Because Sanikiluag has demonstrated they 7 are able to decrease or at least demonstrate what 8 their impact on the Eastern Hudson Bay stock is and 9 it's been taken into consideration in previous 10 decisions of this Board that has never been submitted 11 to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. I know that's the answer to that question. But very briefly, 12 13 the closure is a restriction. It is a non-quota 14 limitation. This is also a hardship on the Inuit 15 Sanikiluaq but it's one that they've decided to take 16 on themselves. If they were to come to NTI or Nunavut 17 Tunngavik and ask us to challenge that or change their 18 decision, then we would equally follow the Nunavut Agreement to ensure that there were no other measures 19 20 that could be taken to lessen the impact of that non-21 quota limitation. Thank you.

MR. GILBERT: Nakurmiik, David. I will be very brief. I was actually looking for more an impression from Luccassie on this. Not necessarily a technical response. I understand the technical

22

23

24

25

reasons why it exists but I'm more interested in the community perspective on the difference.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: It's a very broad question. We're not really concerned about that because we are more or less based on the Inuit Wildlife Management Plan. Although we might use the numbers but we use that as a base because that's where we came in from. And for statistics and things like that, we let the NTI and DFO to do that for us. But technically, the overall -- the management plan, Belugas or any wildlife in Sanikiluaq, we are based on Inuit knowledge wildlife management.

MS. ROBINSON: Billy Palliser. Mark, are you -- okay. Makivic, you're done? Okay. Billy Palliser next on the list.

MR. PALLISER: I just want to ask first

-- I want to ask this question to Luccassie. When the

DFO came in for the first time, did they arrive

without any other information? Did they come just

because they were -- they had a concern of EHB without

any basis? Nunavut Wildlife Board informed us first

how it will be done. To explain about this table,

these are from 1990 and last week a table was produced

last week based on those. DFO came with that along

with the Wildlife board of Nunavut to try to come up

with what we can do and we wanted it to come from the community because the DFO came with a table at the time not with numbers in it.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you. What was their reason when they decided to come to your community? I want to see that in numbers if it's possible. I understand they base themselves with the research because we ---

MR. ARRAGURINAQ: Genetic and contamination levels of Sanikiluaq and other related Beluga population.

MR. PALLISER: I know that they came in for the first time because of EHB. I think someone informed them that how much they harvest from EHB, yes. At the time, we were harvesting EHB, yes, that was the reason.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: And at the time the closure for three month began because we were informed not to harvest too much of EHB.

MR. PALLISER: How many did you harvest at the time?

MR. LEE: Sorry for the delay. So what Luccassie has passed to me is what he just mentioned which is in May of 1998, Bridget G.E. DeMarche from the Fresh Water Institute provided results about some

of the sample that they had tested for the first time or at the time from the samples that they had received.

And in it they describe the genetic haplotypes that we've been discussing for the past two -- day-and-a-half. The main focus is on contaminants but she also mentions that there are potential problems with the data and that -- I'll quote here to answer your question, Billy.

"... We are still concerned that there are not enough samples from Eastern Hudson Bay that we can be certain about exactly how different these animals are from Sanikiluaq animals. We prefer to have recent samples from Nastapoka, both for genetic and contaminant analyses ..."

So back to your original questions, the

source population, which is the Nastapoka, was obviously used and developed and that was used to compare with the samples from Sanikiluaq, and that's why this came into being. The concern and then the Sanikiluaq HTO response to that concern. The HTO was fortunate that Bridget had been doing this work so that they were able to develop this plan well ahead of when all these concerns about EHB became so prominent

1 in Nunavik. MR. PALLISER: Thank you, David. 2 3 DFO approached Sanikiluag the first time, how many 4 percentage of mortality of Eastern Hudson Bay stock 5 was? MS. ROBINSON: Is your question how much 6 7 of their harvest at that time was from the EHB? 8 MR. PALLISER: (indiscernible). 9 MS. ROBINSON: Okay. 10 MR. LEE: Yeah, sorry, Billy. I was not That information is not provided in this 11 clear. It just describes their concern that some 12 document. 13 of the harvest may be from the EHB stock. 14 MS. ROBINSON: Do any of your colleagues 15 have the answer? MR. LEE: Did they tell you at the time 16 17 how many of your harvest is EHB? 18 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: It was really -- it 19 was a very small percentage from Eastern Hudson Bay. 20 MR. PALLISER: How many percentage? 21 MS. ROBINSON: Was this -- if this 22 information -- because I want to make sure that if the 23 answer is not in Sanikiluaq's ability to answer, if 24 you can't answer a question, you can't answer a 25 question. Right? You don't have the information.

1 Mike Hammill just raised his hand and indicates that he may have that information. Is this relevant to the 2 3 Board's decision? 4 MR. PALLISER: No, I don't think so but 5 I think it is important that to -- in -- I think it is 6 important to know how much mortality on the Eastern 7 Hudson Bay had Sanikiluaq had. 8 MS. ROBINSON: How they contributed to 9 the takes from there? 10 MR. PALLISER: Because for sure before 11 they implemented the local management there were I want to know because in here it's only 12 samples. 13 based on 2010 to 2018 which is 4.4 percent. Because I 14 want to know in reality it's not 4.4 percent. 15 MS. ROBINSON: Because of previous 16 years? 17 MR. PALLISER: Yes, exactly. 18 MS. ROBINSON: Mr. Hammill, are you able 19 to answer that in a quick and concise way or would you 20 undertake to answer it after in writing. 21 MR. HAMMILL: Probably better I do it in 22 writing. 23 MS. ROBINSON: Is that acceptable? 24 MR. HAMILL: Because I can't access my 25 data right now.

	113			
1	MR. PALLISER: Yes, I think so. I think			
2	it is important to know how much mortality that the			
3	Belcher Island had on the Eastern Hudson Bay stock.			
4	MS. ROBINSON: Which years do you want			
5	to know?			
6	MR. PALLISER: 1980s to today.			
7	MS. ROBINSON: Is that possible?			
8	MR. HAMILL: No, the information would			
9	only be from about 1990 to today.			
10	MS. ROBINSON: That's all that they can			
11	provide.			
12	MR. HAMMILL: Okay. That's great, at			
13	least. Thank you.			
14	MS. ROBINSON: Nakurmiik. Billy, do you			
15	have any other questions?			
16	MR. PALLISER: No, thank you, Dave.			
17	MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Putulik Papigatuk.			
18	MR. PAPIGATUK: Question to Sanikiluaq.			
19	When we have a discussion on Beluga with Sanikiluaq,			
20	when we talk about Beluga, we usually say that people			
21	of Sanikiluaq can harvest whatever amount they want			
22	while we have a quota here. So Luccassie, do you have			
23	quota or do you have TAT or do you have limitation			
24	even if you don't have a quota to harvest Beluga?			
25	That's my question.			

1 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: Thank you, Putulik. 2 We don't really talk about this. The Board never 3 really talk about it because we don't have a concern. MR. PAPIGATUK: So do you allow your 4 5 hunters to kill Beluga every time they see one? 6 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: No, not all the time. 7 When we feel that we have enough, we stop hunting. 8 MR. PAPIGATUK: Thank you, I understand. 9 Under the Nunavut Agreement, in some 10 islands we have rights, we have overlapping rights. 11 They are recognized under Nunavut -- or agreement that 12 we have a right to have 50/50 on the overlap near 13 Sanikiluag at the islands that are near Sanikiluag. 14 Our hunters from Nunavik, would they be allowed around 15 your islands where we have overlapping area? 16 Makivic knows or Nunavut knows about it, please ---17 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: According to my 18 understanding at the Hudson Bay -- according to my understanding, if they are in our waters, 19 20 (indiscernible), Killiniq, Sanikiluaq Island, Sleepers 21 Island and some other islands, Long Island, King 22 George Island and according to my understand, the 23 environmental people are responsible for the land 24 mammals and the DFO are responsible for the sea

They are two different, they're two

25

mammals.

- 151 -1 different. So we have to go through them when there's something to deal with according to the Land Claim 2 3 Agreements. 4 MR. PAPIGATUK: What is the position of 5 Makivic to this? 6 I appreciate that this of MS. ROBINSON: 7 interest but those areas are under the jurisdiction of the Nunavut Wildlife Board, and I don't think it's --8 9 hunting in that part is of the Nunavik Marine Region 10 Wildlife Board's jurisdiction. Unless you think that 11 that information will help them make decisions for the parts of the NMR that they do have to make a decision 12 13 Otherwise, I suggest we go onto another question 14 because I'm not sure how it's going to help the Board

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wrong?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ PAPIGATUK: You're asking the same question as mine.

make their decision. Is there a connection between

harvest management in the Nunavik Marine Region which

is their jurisdiction and the overlapping areas which

this Board doesn't get to make decisions on? Am I

MS. ROBINSON: Maybe Luccassie again answer.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: So that you will know according to my understanding, yes, we can -- Nunavik

Agreement.

can come down to the island to hunt according to the overlapping agreement following the Environment Canada regulations. But DFO regulations are also different.

DFO are responsible for the sea mammals so we would have to be informed if they are people who wish to hunt so that we would be able to consider it, what they should do. Although we still base ourselves that we are same people, Inuit people. But we also have to follow through the regulations of the Land Claims

MR. PAPIGATUK: Just a comment.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

MR. PAPIGATUK: To those overlapping area and to the agreement of the NILCA, it mention there that we are recognized 50/50 sharing. So if people of Sanikiluaq from Nunavut have a freedom to go down to hunt, as same thing for Nunavik because we have 50 percent overlapping agreement. I think that's how it should be. It's just a comment.

MS. ROBINSON: I think we have some questions from the staff and the Board. For my part, I have a couple of questions. I'll try and keep it quick. David you indicated it's Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated position that TAHs which is exactly the same legally as a TAT, the two land claims are a cut

and paste of each other in a large degree, that the use of a TAH is the measure of last resort. Is this also the case in circumstances where a stock is considered to have been depleted and in need of replenishment and -- what's the word, replenishment and revitalization? In those -- so many adjectives to this. Let me make sure I have it right (indiscernible). To revitalize and restore in circumstances where a population or a stock are under those circumstances, is it NTI's position that TAHs continue to be the measure of last resort?

MR. LEE: Yes.

MS. ROBINSON: In circumstances where you have a depleted population and the objectives are restoration and replenishment or revitalization and replenishment, what measures or approaches are used in Nunavut or are supported by NTI that could meet the objectives but not impose a TAH? You don't need to be exhaustive; some examples would assist in understanding.

MR. LEE: Sure. The challenge is that, firstly, each situation will be different. Each dock in population as some or as most of you may know, for Baffin Island caribou, there is a TAH. For what is termed, the "Bluenose East" caribou, there is a TAH,

but the community of Kugluktuk does not support that TAH. They have developed their own community-based management plan, which NTI supports, where they have established "no hunting" zones, and other types of non-quota limitations that they feel would be more effective, similar to what Sanikiluaq has established for Beluga which is what NTI supports.

The last example I will provide is from the communities of Grise Fjord and Resolute who have conducted their -- have their own practices and guidelines with respect to Peary caribou. And NTI has opposed the establishment or recommendation of TAHs of Peary caribou even though they are also considered endangered by the federal government because Inuit have demonstrated that they are capable of managing that population. And in the most recent assessment by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, Peary Caribou was down-listed from endangered to threatened.

MS. ROBINSON: Okay. So to be clear, you're talking about it varies between stock and population of animal, but it also varies based on the Inuit community and their practices?

MR. LEE: (non-verbal response).

MS. ROBINSON: He's nodding for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

record. Finally, in between the time when concerns became raised about harvesting of Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga within the Sanikiluaq waters and the time where Sanikiluaq's measures were developed, what management was in place within the region? What was the stop-gap or the interim measure, if there was at all, while Sanikiluag was doing their self-determining work?

MR. ARRAGURAINAO: With that we started to document the information when we started (indiscernible) Canadian (indiscernible), we documented Inuit Wildlife Management Plan. Although there wasn't really anything written down at that time, but the (indiscernible) Inuit Wildlife Management we jot them down just what it is and we showed DFO, NTI this kind of approach that we're going to use. And if you want to tap into it, you can tap into it, too. Because we keep saying that (indiscernible) in terms of science and that kind of thing, we want to work with you in parallel. dominating one or the other. That's the only way. There is no other way if you dominate one, the other one will go down (indiscernible). So ---

MS. ROBINSON: Maybe ---

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: --- there wasn't really (indiscernible) at that time. But the

1 community, we talked about -- we really started to talk about the Inuit Wildlife Management Plan. 2 3 MS. ROBINSON: Okay. So there wasn't a 4 quota in place? Okay, thank you. 5 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: Although that time it wasn't really recognized but the -- but we said we 6 7 stand firmly, stand with it because that's where we came in from. 8 9 MS. ROBINSON: So you continue to manage 10 it your ways and the other managing partners respected 11 you and trusted you in that process? 12 MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: (non-verbal 13 response). 14 MS. ROBINSON: He's nodding for the 15 Those are my questions, I think. Mark, Jean-16 Pierre and Daniel have some questions. MR. SAVARD: Just a small clarification. 17 18 I understand that a shared zone is for both Nunavut My question is, whose regulation applies 19 and Nunavik. 20 when Nunavik Inuit are in the shared zone, are they 21 under the DFO Quebec and when Nunavut is under DFO 22 Nunavut, are -- you see? I don't know, I'm asking 23 because you have a different way of managing in the 24 two.

If you can't answer, it's

MS. ROBINSON:

25

1 fine.

MR. LEE: David Lee, for Nunavut

Tunngavik and I am unable to answer that question

because I'm not legal counsel. I'm aware of some of

the discussion that's occurred but I would be speaking

beyond my ability going there.

MS. SALAMIVA: He's finished? Daniel.

MR. CARON: Daniel Caron with the Eeyou Board. Thank you very much for being with us. It's very interesting. Mr. Lee said that inclusion was essential in your management approach and its application. Could you elaborate briefly for my education, my information on how the successful inclusion operates in practice and maybe in terms of communication? Consultation you referred to one meeting a year with DFO and with other partners. How -- inclusion is essential, I understand the principle but in practice, how do you operate that?

MR. LEE: I'll start and I'll turn it

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: Great, great.

MR. LEE: Since I mentioned it and it's in our submission, I will be specific and then turn it over to Luccassie. Sorry, David Lee with Nunavut Tunngavik. What I said specifically was meaningful

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inclusion of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in co-management is essential to ensure that Inuit harvesting rights are respected and conservation goals are met. We hold a high standard in the *Nunavut Wildlife Act*. There are Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit principles that -- and to my knowledge, have been -- are the first time have been enacted or even proposed and approved by the Legislative Assembly of Nunavut. And I'll turn to Luccassie to discuss these IQ principles.

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: Like I was saying, earlier I got the (indiscernible) traditional knowledge today and wildlife and environment back in 1990s working with Nunavik, Hudson Bay, Cree, Eastern Hudson Bay, Western Hudson Bay, James Bay, eastern up to Naujaat, Coral Harbour. We had over 20 communities that wasn't well with that one. Because the people were telling us that the decisions -- the only way it can work -- even though there might be the Wildlife Act that kind of thing. Yes, there is a Wildlife Act and that Wildlife Act is primarily based on Inuit knowledge. And from that work that we did in community, from that work that really the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board a couple of years ago, I think it was that they started to ask questions to us, "Okay, give me something in the way of Nunavut and

Inuit wildlife management." So I think they took part of that into Wildlife Act, I think at that time.

It works really well that way because we worked parallel together. It seems to be working very well because that's what we know how. Because sometimes it get complicated where the Wildlife Act or whatever they might be, if we don't know anything about it, it's very -- it's very simple for us to make an argument about it. But if we understand it, then we feel comfortable with it, and we don't have no comments on it because they are working towards the way we know how.

MR. LEE: Just very briefly to give you a specific example, there are IQ principles about respecting wildlife which I don't want to speak on behalf of Inuit for, and also working together. And why I take those so seriously is because this was why the Nunavut Agreement was established.

I'm sorry, I'm going to maybe divert here, but I've been in -- one of my first public hearings with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board was hearing Inuit upset that they had to hide their catch from the federal government because it was against the law. And now, the Nunavut Agreement had been established so that they could work together as

equal co-management partners and not have to live in that type of fear that they're fathers and themselves had to experience.

MR. CARON: Thank you very much.

MR. CARON: Thank you very much.

MS. SALAMIVA: Mark Basterfield. State your name.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Mark Basterfield,

NMRWB staff. I think this is going to be a very quick
question. There is talk from the other Eastern Hudson
Bay, Nunavik communities about the formation of a
steering committee. If this were to come into
practice, would the Sanikiluaq HTO be willing to work
with the committee? And I'm not getting into any kind
of designation about how they would work with it or
what role they would play. Maybe it would just be
expert opinion or advice in a system that doesn't
involve a quota. But I'm just wondering if the SaniHTO would be willing to work with those communities if
the that committee was informed?

MR. ARRAGURAINAQ: If we can see a draft document or something like that, we can look at it. That's the only way. So that's about it.

MR. BASTERFIELD: Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: After a presentation, we ask questions from the floor, and then we ask

questions from the Boards. And we don't want to go back to the floor and because you raise your arms after. So I would ask Johnny to speak with his question, ask his question.

MR. AKPAHATEK: Thank you. There's a lot of work to do. Some are taking long and it's a good example of what Sanikiluaq is doing on wildlife. With a lot of questions that are being asked, will they be helpful for coming up with a new regulation. Please try to make them short.

MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you very much.

It's only that we are searching things that would help the work. All the topics have been -- comments have been to work together. NTI and Sanikiluaq are finished. I'm thanking Sanikiluaq because you are in support of the EHB stock because you have your own regulations. We're happy that you have a heart for Nunavik people. We're now in (indiscernible). After their presentation, for questions please raise your hand. We reserve the last questions to the Boards and organizations.

MR. ITTUKALLAK: Jackusie Ittukallak from Puvirnituq from LNUK; I'm a member. We're representing people of Puvirnituq; it's a big population. We're always concerned about animal

stocks. I will mention something about Beluga on Hudson Bay. All along the coast I would want this to be open. As an example, they use samples, last year we were able to harvest from nearby and there was quite a number that were coming from non-concerned species, the ones that arrived by our area.

So if the whole Hudson Bay was open, we would be able to use sample kits for the whole area. We would like to see that opening from Akulivik and they would want to make limits. They want to go back to being it opened for harvesting Beluga. Anywhere in the world, animals don't belong to anyone and it's been told from Inuit knowledge that if you harvest from certain places, if you harvest from them and not do away with them, they will always come back. So that's the way we've been conserving historically in Inuit way and with Inuit knowledge concerning animals.

Even if we will have quota until we come out with something that we could be satisfied with.

We're thinking of that approach. We would be open to using all sample kits from -- if we were able to harvest from nearby. My partners will add some more. So thank you for this opportunity for me to speak.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you. I'm not a member in Puvirnituq. I've been asked to support

1 their presentation. For people of Puvirnitug, they harvest -- they hunt Beluga in Akulivik up to Hudson 2 3 Strait and in the spring down by the floe edge. we're allowed from our allowable catch (indiscernible) 4 5 nearby is very few. Right now, we have population of 6 1,800 and what we're able to take, we don't reach our 7 quota. Sometimes we reach it and as much as we can we 8 use the sample kits, to my knowledge. I've been with them with their hunts. We want to have a bit more 9 10 opening to be able to hope of a harvest of nearby 11 places as they've been doing. And right now, there's getting to be more Belugas passing by Puvirnituq. 12 13 an example, 45 -- up to 45 to be able to harvest from 14 nearby and whether it be from Hudson Bay coast, if 15 they want to have some luck or from right in front of 16 us, or a little bit south of us. Because south of Puvirnitug in (indiscernible) area, we're getting to 17 18 see more whales in that area because we'll be harvesting them all this time. Adamie will add 19 20 something. So I'll give it to him. But from what we 21 know, this is what I'm sharing.

MR. ANGIYOU: Thank you. I'm a member of the LNUK, Adamie Angiyou. For the three-year plan, with this new plan in the spring, we call spring, we want to be able to harvest from nearby while there's

22

23

24

25

24

25

still ice. I would want this to be considered, and in the summer, to be able to harvest from nearby. looking at the numbers whether it would be the same amount of what we want because of the high population in Puvirnitug, they go hunting. They hunt for the community and with the numbers that's been given to us are very low. And they don't get their fair share for the community. So we've been thinking more than once every time we go whale hunting. I wouldn't be able to catch all I want even if they were shared. able to get our share even if we don't hunt and with the numbers that we're -- that we want to come up with, we would be able to share more with the population of Puvirnituq. So when the numbers are being fixed, it seems that we'll have no choice but to go with quota from what we're hearing from management and others, authorities. And from what we hear, we shall expecting quota so we want to be fully considered and to be given a number that is more to our -- what we want. We want more, yes, we want more. Because whale meat is the best for us and the white man best meat is T-Bone steak, so it's' the same with us, we want the best food that there is just like the other people with their favourite food. So we want a sufficient number for us.

MR. PALLISER: I want to add that all
the time from what I know, they tried to follow the
quota in Puvirnituq wherever they go harvesting.

There was always somebody who looks over them. And in
the community, there is always somebody pushing to
apply the quota because disciplining from elders is

Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Any questions for Puvirnituq? I think you're very clear, no, it's -- Jimmy? Jimmy Johannes.

always there. It never stops, it's our tradition.

MR. JOHANNES: I would like to ask the people of Puvirnituq, would be comfortable as a Puvirniturmiut -- Puvirnituq LNUKs if you were able to come up with your own regulation to be able to accept or deny if someone wished to do a research? That's my first question.

MR. PALLISER: I'm not clear about your question, which -- please reiterate your question, Jimmy.

MR. JOHANNES: Unfortunately, I don't have NILCA with me. There's a lot in there. A lot of rights are written in there to be able to create regulation. We have that right, too, as LNUKs. But we haven't really -- we haven't tried to use that so

that's why I'm asking you this question. Would you be comfortable if you were able to make your own regulations, for example, if somebody is requesting to conduct research, for example, test your water, would you be comfortable to be able to say, yes or no.

Maybe Jackusie or Adamie can respond.

MR. PALLISER: Yes, I can respond to that, Jimmy. To your question, as LNUKs we cannot just respond because we are representing our community. We cannot just give our personal opinion because there are other Board members and we need to think of the community. Because we cannot respond to this question right away, right now. But as Inuit, according to our knowledge, all the disciplinary measures are still there. So I just wanted to mention that again.

MR. JOHANNES: This is for Makivic, my last question. Unfortunately, I don't have the NILCA in front of me. Do LNUKs have a right to be able to create regulations, that's my question. If there's a lawyer that could respond. It's not a hard question.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, I can respond, rapidly. I'll switch to English there. Under the Nunavik Inuit Land Claim Agreement, under Article 5, S. 7(2), the powers and functions of LNUKs is

1 outlined:

"... And it shall include the following including, (c) the regulation of harvesting practices and techniques amongst its members including the use of non-quota limitation ..."

It goes on. There are a number of other provisions that speak to the powers and responsibility of the LNUK. I think this is a conversation about roles and responsibilities that it's not up for Puvirnituq to break down, but that is the relevant section. And I hope you guys talk amongst yourselves about what that means. Do you have another question?

MR. JOHANNES: Thank you. I feel that my question is for all the LNUKs, although I asked the question to Puvirnituq LNUKs, concerning the rights to be able to accept or deny if the LNUKs could be the first one to deny or accept. That was my question, my only question.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you, Jimmy. Yes, we know the rules and responsibilities of LNUKs. Yes, they can create regulations but we would have to consult the community first. So I cannot respond further.

MS. ROBINSON: Do any of the Board

	- 168 -				
1	members have questions for Puvirnituq?				
2	MR. SAVARD: Jean-Pierre Savard, NMRWB				
3	Board member. You mentioned you'd like Puvirnituq to				
4	be to have its fair share of harvests. What do you				
5	consider as a fair share?				
6	MS. SALAMIVA: His question is what are				
7	your thoughts about fair share?				
8	MS. ROBINSON: You said you want your				
9	fair share, what does that look like?				
10	MR. PALLISER: Fair share?				
11	MS. ROBINSON: The fair share of the				
12	harvest.				
13	MR. PALLISER: By numbers?				
14	MS. SALAMIVA: By what you consider fair				
15	share? Jean-Pierre, he wants you to repeat your				
16	question in a more understandable manner.				
17	MR. SAVARD: It's to try to I wanted				
18	to know how big a harvest would you consider adequate				
19	for Puvirnituq?				
20	MR. ANGIYOU: We mentioned the number				
21	because the population is growing, that's why we				
22	increased the number. And to your missed question, I				
23	don't understand your question, which researcher were				
24	you talking about? Please clarify yourself.				
25	MR. JOHANNES: Can I respond to him; I'm				

asking the chairpersons? LNUK has a right to do what they wish to do in their (indiscernible) with anything, whether it be regulations, so that you would have an authority. That's it?

MR. SAVARD: Yes.

MR. ANGIYOU: Yes, we would want because usually we get our share from hunters following the DFO's regulation. So it would be good for someone to do a research, I don't know what, he didn't mention what it is, because we want to work with our fellow Arctic people. We wanted to be treated same.

MS. SALAMIVA: Any other questions for Puvirnituq? You still can respond, there are no more other questions. Adamie will answer to Jean-Pierre.

MR. ANGIYOU: We mentioned 45 for three-year term -- oh, every year for three years we want to be able to harvest 45 in the summer. Year-round to be able to harvest 45 and with a new year, another 45 and then the other third year, 45. Every year, 45 for three years. This is our request.

MR. PALLISER: This 45 seems to be high because of the growing of the population; we are now 1,800 so the number 45 is a reasonable number that was given to us. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: There's no more questions

1 for Puvirnitug. Now Akulivik. Did you raise your Please raise your hand when we ask to do --2 3 when we ask you to do it. Charlie Angutinguak. 4 MR. ANGUTINGUAK: Thank you. Just to 5 clarify the total allowable take on the EHB, is it 58 6 percent? I'm I correct, for one year? Mike? Is it 7 58 percent for one-year EHB total allowable take, what 8 you were presenting? 9 MR. HAMMILL: In what I presented, if 10 the Board keeps the same management objective, then to 11 respect that objective, the TAT would be 58 EHB animals per year. That's assuming the same as the --12 13 the same objective that they've had in the last plan. 14 MR. ANGUTINGUAK: Okay. 15 MR. HAMILL: So that ---MR. ANGUTINGUAK: Because they're 16 17 requesting ---18 MR. HAMILL: That's 58 EHB animals per year for the next -- I've built it with the idea of a 19 20 two-year roll-over. 21 MR. ANGUTINGUAK: I think you will still 22 use the percentage, so I'm asking if Puvirnituq is 23 asking 4.5 percent or are they asking 45 total? MR. PALLISER: I have a hard time to 24

understand your basis when you talk about percentage

25

1 but Adamie mentioned 45 Beluga.

MR. ANGUTINGUAK: According to my understanding 58 percent is to be distributed to all the communities. And if you are trying to ask for 45 percent to harvest in front of your community, the rest would be only 13 percent for the whole other communities.

MR. PALLISER: I think we don't have the same understanding. The one we saw are not the recommendation. It doesn't say it will have to be 58. This is a hearing; nothing has been decided. After we do our submission, then the decision will be taken. So I cannot answer that question.

MR. ANGUTINGUAK: If you are asking for 45 percent to harvest nearby, 13 percent will be for the rest of the Nunavik.

MR. ANGIYOU: I will respond. Every year we wish to harvest 45 Beluga, not 45%. We're not trying to use the percentages. We want to be able to harvest 45 total every year. I think you understand, eh? Am I clear?

MR. PALLISER: Charlie, sorry, I understand now your question. Those 45, base yourself the hunting areas Puvirnituq, if we were harvesting at Hudson Strait it would be (indiscernible) EHB percent

-- it would be (indiscernible) Beluga if they were caught in Hudson Strait. But where the basis are where the Beluga is being harvested. Like we in in Hudson Strait usually they go hunting down by the floe edge. And other communities goes to their hunting area, so it would be hard to be able to come up with percentages because it's based on where the Beluga was actually killed, and that's how you come up with percentages. So if those 45 were harvested in Hudson Strait, it would consider to be 45.

MS. SALAMIVA: Now we're going to move onto Akulivik.

MR. ALIQU: Simon Aliqu from Akulivik. Myself, I took some notes so I will mention them. I will do my notes first and then I will talk about the thoughts of people of Akulivik. As soon as the ice breaks, we go to Ivujivik to hunt, three canoes, sometimes five and we are not able to carry heavy loads. Because as soon as the ice leaves, we go to Ivujivik to hunt for Beluga so that is still the same wish of the people of Akulivik and be able to harvest nearby.

And usually we wait for the Beluga to arrive down at the (indiscernible) in English. But we want to be able to harvest nearby. We had 25 quotas

but sometimes we over-harvested. We always try to use the sample properly so we don't mind not having quotas in Akulivik because we will never going to try to harvest as much as possible. We will only harvest enough, sufficient enough to feed the people. And this fall, we were harvesting Belugas so that we will have food this winter. We did not over-harvest.

If I was on my own, I would still have a lot of muktuk, Beluga skin. But we would want to eliminate quotas even though we will have some regulations to have a limit, we were able to harvest 25. Even if we are not going to get -- even if we are still going to get 25 or less, but we would want to eliminate the quota. Since people have been announcing numbers, in Akulivik, 35 would be sufficient for Akulivik. Although 25 is almost enough, but it's a little too -- not enough.

MADAM INTERPRETER: While he's looking for his notes, anthropologist's name was Bernard (indiscernible), that I was going to remember earlier.

MR. ALIQU: Markusie, would you like to comment while I go through my papers? I will repeat that in Akulivik we don't want to be imposed with quotas anymore. Even though people have been saying that we still want to use the quotas because of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I, myself, as a hunter, I'm not going to try to harvest as much as I can. Since the people are listening in Nunavik and when you go home for sure you will go through your local radio to explain what's happening. Even though they are listening through the community (indiscernible) incorporated regional radio, but we will have to make sure that -- we will have to make sure to explain to our community. And as people of Akulivik (indiscernible) to Beluga hearing to NMRWB re community of Akulivik concerns on matters of Beluga harvesting, whereas harvest on Belugas restriction have gone long enough which compromise cultural exchange between younger generation of hunters, whereas this have been shown to be beneficial in terms of safer harvest when harvesting, included the youth better manners, better (indiscernible) and better sharing. It is all good. Whereas, HBC harvested Beluga blubber in the past for commercial purposes, and communities today are under restrictions due to this cause. Whereas, Hudson Bay communities currently are under heavy restrictions as consequence expending huge amounts of money following and abiding the current management plan and this have been the norm for far too long.

Therefore, the Wildlife Committee of

Akulivik with support of the community and its hunters hereby resolve, that the hunters will no longer follow any restrictions and any management plan or any imposement relating to all Beluga harvesting.

(indiscernible) the community and hunters will follow the traditional and cultural as for -- as quote follows. Forefathers which have already proven to be effective conservation. Re sampling, sampling Belugas and research are supported in any terms for Beluga.

(indiscernible) are supported by the local RNUK, those are coming from LNUKs of Akulivik and we send the copies to NMRWB. Markusie will comment. I'm lost; I'm kind of lost now.

MR. ANNAUTAQ: Thank you. Using nets we we've been using them for the last three years. We're not using them all the time but it's only in the fall when the Beluga from the south are being seen we don't use the net all the time. I want that to be known. And we try to abide by regulations whenever we reach out quota, we stop using the nets. And we want to continue using nets. We used to travel far and freight canoes, there's not a lot of them available to hunt in the springtime. They go a bit beyond Ivujivik.

There's not a lot of hunters from

Akulivik and canoe can't carry a lot of freight, and it's very expensive for supplies, for gas, everything expensive for supplies. So some people are not able to travel even if they were able before. We want to continue using nets because we will be careful. And for the Cape Smith Island, where we wait for Beluga is not a good place to wait for Belugas because of the waves, big waves. So sometimes we have no choice but to use nets. So we would like to continue and would be thankful for DFO, if we were able to. If there are any questions, we're open now.

MR. ALIQU: Just to give support. We want to give support to other communities like
Puvirnituq, Inukjuak, Umiujaq, Kuujjuaraapik. We would really want them to be able to harvest from nearby because they are the same stock and they are asked to travel very, very far. So if we are doing away with the quota, as an example, I would like to see those communities to be able to harvest from nearby. And from Akulivik, I am in support of that.

Because now we're able to harvest from nearby, it's a lot easier for us.

And for the students they were also helping out with the harvesting and providing food for the community, and participating in butchering and

dealing with the carcasses. So I would like this to continue for the same -- for the other communities that are no longer practicing that in their communities.

We were asked to say anything we want.

Now I wasn't able to ask questions when they were giving their presentations, and about Long Island.

They were talking about setting up a shack, trying to find funding for that. So Akulivik would like to be included in this. Just to mention that because we're -- Akulivik is interested in participating. That's all from us for now.

MS. SALAMIVA: Any questions for Akulivik? From what I wrote, Luccassie Nappaaluk, Adamie, James May, Billy Palliser, Jimmy-Paul. Did I miss anybody? Okay, Luccassie.

MR. NAPPAALUK: I wasn't expecting to hear something, it touched my heart. My father and I, we took in our nets and never used them again so I feel more now open to using them again.

MS. SALAMIVA: Akulivik, they were able to use nets with the letter request to the minister. That's the way -- that's how they were able to use nets. It's not a question?

MR. ANGIYOU: Akulivik is right next to

Puvirnituq. In the fall, we don't have Beluga passing by us in the fall so we are thankful for (indiscernible) to help us harvest from nearby their community in the fall. So I'm asking Akulivik if they would still be open for us to harvest from there.

MR. ALIQU: You are welcome to harvest as you have been doing.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ ANGIYOU: And that's my only question.

MS. SALAMIVA: James May?

MR. MAY: There was some questions about quota and they wanted to do away with quota and catch only what they need. Is it right for you, what is right amount for you, sufficient amount for you. And if you are going to your own regulations with agreement with your community, with your family, will your community be able to follow your regulations?

I'm asking that because last fall it was very difficult for me as a chairman of RNUK. Because we had to inform which community had left over from their quota. And we were airing them to regional radio and it was shared with the LNUKs.

So my question for Akulivik for people of (indiscernible), it's not pointing at them but it was very difficult for me that Akulivik had no more

And I wanted to support the other communities that still had to finish off their quota and they continued with their harvesting. So not to repeat this again, I'm asking now on your own and what is sufficient for you, now much would that be? How many would that be?

And would your hunters be able to listen to you and to RNUK? Because some communities were not abiding by the regulations and we were being caught in the middle when that happened. So I want this to be clear. What kind of plans for the quota -- if it was done by DFO, what would your foundation be? Will you be able to come up with written system where you have closing, opening seasons?

And how about the nets? I don't want to point my finger at Akulivik, but it was very difficult this fall. And when that happened it all came to me, letters came to me and we saw on Facebook that there were still using nets that were shown to me on Facebook. So it was very difficult for me. I want to give support but I want to hear something clear what - will you have a management plan that is written down and to be able to be followed?

MR. ALIQU: I can't answer it alone James, sorry. But from what my own thinking, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

mentioned 35. If we're going to continue with quota, we would like to have up to 35 because 25 is a bit small for the community. Do you understand?

MR. ANNAUTAQ: Just to add, using nets, some people were using nets and they didn't have And there was this big wind that came in at canoes. the time when the nets were about to be taken out, and I was aware that they were being told that their nets have to be taken out, but some didn't have canoes. That were using nets, they were using somebody -- they were going with somebody. And that was the reason why there was this difficulty because that's why they thought they were still using nets. And that's why we came up with this problem because someone with no canoe was using nets. And if they were able to tell somebody to take their net out for them, but there was this big wind at the time. So they had difficult time to collect the nets. So, we're sorry that we got into that situation. Because they were told to pull them all out and some of them abided by it. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Bill Palliser.

MR. PALLISER: Thank you. Thank you, Simon for welcoming us from Puvirnituq for harvesting Beluga. My question is, are we hearing different things? And from what I'm reading from submissions

and tools that would be used. They have written a letter to that effect and what I see and from what I hear:

"... The Wildlife Committee of Akulivik is satisfied with the current number of 25 Beluga annual harvest allocated for community and it's non-closure condition ..."

And from what I hear, I hear two points, two arguments from the same community.

MR. ALIQU: We mentioned 35.

MR. PALLISER: So as we are getting clearer, I have a question now. James asked a bit about it. For Akulivik people, if the quota was do away with and they would harvest what they need, how would you be able to support more the conservation using Inuit knowledge, how would you do that for our LNUK?

MR. ALIQU: We would watch over to make sure that they don't go harvest as they please. And because if you had no regulation, somebody would have to watch over what is happening. So we would be able to watch over what is happening, that was the idea behind this if we were able to do away with a quota that the LNUK would be able to control it.

MR. PALLISER: Last question. I wonder if you know that the ones that pass by Akulivik, how many and which stock are from that pass by Akulivik? Could you estimate us to how many pass by?

MR. ALIQU: I don't have an idea but those from bigger stocks is mostly from that stock that we harvest in the fall. But in the spring, they would understand more. We harvest from the smallest stock and we harvest from the bigger stock in the fall. And looking at what's being caught with nets. I believe that. Thank you.

MS. SALAMIVA: Jimmy-Paul.

MR. ANGATOOKALOOK: I would like to ask this question. Since you use the nets to hunt for Beluga, how long are they supposed -- do you know how long they're supposed to be or are you even allowed to harvest bearded seal, ring seal, are the sizes of the hole of nets indicated? Yes, we also have nets spread out for the ring seal nets while we hunt for the Beluga. Even the fish nets are able to catch a Beluga, a small Beluga.

MR. ALIQU: Since those fishing nets were starting to catch Beluga, we were able to know that there are more Belugas today. Because a lot of people use fishing nets in the summertime and their

1 nets have caught a Beluga when they are used for fish.

MR. ANNAUTUQ: There's a teacher from Newfoundland, he's an elder and he really wished to teach the students. So he usually teach students how to make Beluga nets. The younger people use the nets, as elders, we are not able to do that anymore. And the teachers usually make sure that they are taken care of their nets and if they harvest a Beluga, usually they share that Beluga with the whole community because they are being trained by someone from Newfoundland who is their teacher.

MR. ALIQU: Jimmy, I didn't respond you well concerning the nets. It could be short; it could be long for the length of the nets. For example, the holes are eight, nine inches that the students make.

MS. SALAMIVA: There are no more questions from this floor. My watch ran out of battery. It must be over 6:00. When we ask you to raise your hands, please do. Putulik.

MR. PAPIGATUK: I have a bit of concern myself. This matter concerning Beluga is very, very important. We heard that students are making nets and when their nets are completed they are able to put the net in the water. How many have they made up to date?

So that you'll have a better control in

your community, I think you should indicate how long and how big the holes are supposed to be for the Beluga hunt. Although it's very good to train and teach younger boys but this Beluga matter is very -- too serious. So we want you to do something about the sizes of the nets and how many nets should be in the water if there's nothing. There might be too many nets. And in Salluit, I think there are two or three that uses nets sometimes, but the boys are not the one to hunt for the Beluga with their nets that they made. So my concern is maybe there are too many nets now.

MADAM INTERPRETER: He is repeating now. If he says something new, I will say it.

MR. PAPIGATUK: Thank you.

MR. ALIQU: I'll respond. Although there are many, many people using nets, some people don't harvest Beluga. And this fall, some hunters did not catch a whale when the time was to pull out the nets. Although they caught ringed seal and bearded seal and this was very beneficial to the community. The nets that were made by the students and we were able to have muktuk. When I say muktuk, it's Beluga skin.

Since we have a quota we try to abide by all our quota. Following our quota when we feel that

we catch enough even if we didn't reach our quota, we would also say enough.

MS. SALAMIVA: Thank you, Simon. There are no more questions from this floor. One Board has a question. First of all, the students that are learning to make nets, that's very good and they're learning to butcher and the mothers are having tell with other women experience that for the first time. That was a very nice way to do, but the EHB Beluga and Western Hudson Bay Beluga are two different stocks.

I think students need to be taught about the difference of the population, not just how to make nets. They should be informed in the beginning that EHB is considered endangered by the government. And teach them -- wait for the EHB pass through Akulivik and then start hunting WHB. Don't teach them how to make nets only, teach them how to conserve also, that they are protected by the DFO even though we wish to hunt without a limit. But I feel this should be part of their learning. Education it's not because I'm not happy of what you do, it's because they should be part of the education.

It was -- someone mentioned that they did not know who those nets belonged to. It's because you're teaching students who don't own a canoe yet.

So that the person that was bringing students to set up the nets should also be bringing them back to take out the nets because those students have no canoes.

And some of my grandchildren are there and one of my grandchild was part of the harvesting students.

So I think it would be good for them to be informed about the states of the Beluga. And if they are going to use the nets, for sure they know who they bring to set up the nets if the owner doesn't go down, I think the one who brought them down to set up the nets, should also be responsible.

MR. ALIQU: The nets that you are talking about that the students made, their fathers already -- they already had a canoe.

MS. SALAMIVA: But this person, who can pull out his nets at the time was not a student.

Harry will be the last one to ask questions. And then we'll adjourn after this.

MR. OKPIK: While we are talking about using nets, I always want to say something when we talk about nets. As a Umajuit warden, every year we have training more than once by our employer. We also had a training about using nets. Yes, it's very good that students are learning how to make nets and how to take care of them. But I'm wondering if they are

1 following because they are supposed to pull out the 2 nets at the end of the day. The nets are not supposed 3 to be in water all night according to the regulations. 4 So do you inform students when they are using nets 5 that they're not supposed to leave their nets all night? 6 7 MR. ALIQU: Yes, we always -- we are 8 always very careful and make sure that we reach -- we 9 don't over-harvest. And we go and wait down at the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Cape Smith Island. I'm sorry, I don't know that name in English. Cape Smith Island.

MR. OKPIK: My question is you cannot watch the nets at night. There's a regulation to follow that you are supposed to pull out your net before it gets dark. Have you ever thought about that?

MR. ALIQU: No, we didn't think of it.

MR. OKPIK: This is part of our training as Umajuit warden and if Umajuit warden thinks that there are some nets at night, he's supposed to be able to talk to the regulators.

James knows, he was MS. SALAMIVA: there, too. James May.

James May from RNUK. MR. MAY: Because of that KRG was supposed -- should have been here but

they're not here. It's the first time I hear about that law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SALAMIVA: Me, too.

MR. MAY: I did not know that you were supposed to pull out the nets at night. I'm sorry. We have to be informed. Those are the jobs of Umajuit warden that we don't hear about. If we want to say to control ourselves, Kativik Regional Government will have to assist us properly. Because as RNUK, we are expect to enforce. This question wouldn't come out if the hunters were informed in advance and if we are going to operate on our own, KRG needs to respect that. But there is nobody from regional government, And it's only him who is representing Nunavik Marine Regional Wildlife Board who is also an Umajuit warden. Unfortunately, we were never informed.

MS. SALAMIVA: Yes, we invited the Umajuit warden and there -- we asked them to speak to you to see what you think of and we invited the minister. That minister didn't come because that minister had to be in Manitoba. I think the interpreters, they are tired, so we're going to do the closing prayer. I thank everyone that been here and respect the time even though you have a short lunch hour.

1 So we really appreciate that you respect 2 We will start again at 8:30. the time. I'm not 3 saying you're going to have to come in at 8:30; we're 4 starting at 8:30. That means see you at 8:15. 5 are wearing a hat, please remove your hat. I will do 6 the closing prayer. When I was going to bed, I 7 regretted that I did not pray, so I will do the

Father God, we thank you, we praise you, we are standing here and we pray for our relatives that we have left at home. Bless them, protect them and protect our people in our community. And bless Kuujjuaraapik because we are happy to be calling you Our Lord, that's we pray. So we pray that you protect us and from the night dangers. In the name of Jesus Love. Amen.

MADAM INTERPRETER: Sorry, I don't know how to pray that in English.

MS. SALAMIVA: Amen. Have a good evening.

21

22

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

closing prayer.

--- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

	α	

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

Bafollard

Barbara A. Pollard Certified Court Reporter