

## Nunavut Planning Commission

Paula Kigjugalik Hughson  
Nunavut Beneficiary  
Baker Lake, NU  
XOC 0A0

Feb. 9, 2023

### Comments/Concerns regarding 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

- 1) My submission 2021-11-04 regarding the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan: “21-049E-2021-10-20 WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE 2021 DNLUP - Paula Kigjugalik Hughson.pdf” still applies and has not changed regarding Uranium and Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan Term 3.5 & 3.6. Please refer to this submission for this important issue.
- 2) APPENDIX of 2021 DNLUP - EXISTING RIGHTS - This has NOT been properly or clearly explained by the signatories of this important document – 2021 DNLUP (Government of Canada, Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Regional Inuit Associations of Nunavut Agreement) to Nunavut beneficiaries of the Nunavut Agreement, Nunavummiut - residents of Nunavut or Canadians of the implications of these decisions made usually behind closed doors or special meetings with mineral exploration companies who DO NOT have any ties to the Land which is not only rocks to Inuit. Mineral Exploration Agreements are made with non-renewable resource extraction companies on federal and Inuit Owned Land with no transparent, clear communication, consultation with communities who are not on boards, ie general public who make these decisions on their behalf.
- 3) NUPPAA – Nunavut Project Planning and Assessment Act, is a piece of legislation that was not properly communicated to each community in Nunavut where Inuit of the Nunavut Agreement, Nunavummiut who live in the territory who are directly affected by this legislation. More time was spent with non-renewable resource extraction companies as it was felt this is their land but they are visitors to our Land. No time was given in communities to properly explain, have discussions, and time for the community to truly understand the implications of this document and respond to this document where Inuit who have actual ancestral, historical, current and cultural use to the Land. Decision makers made decisions for Inuit who had no ancestral historical, current and cultural use of the Land. In this document it gives “grandfathering” term and gives the non renewable resource extraction companies rights to land which Inuit have ancestral, historical, current and cultural use of the Land. Projects should not be broken up into pieces and treated separately when it is basically one large project that impacts the same area but over time.
- 4) Indigenous rights – United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples must be implemented for this document. This could end up being the residential school version but for the Land and this must stop. Meaningful, consistent, transparent, discussions, input at the community level in Nunavut needs to be conducted with Inuit who have ancestral, historical, current and cultural ties to the Land and not just with different levels of government or organizations or those with deep pockets to buy their views of the land. The communities may

or may not agree but it is not known for both the 2021 DNLUP or NUPPAA. The governments and organizations that represent Inuit or people of Nunavut need to be more transparent and come to the communities to learn if they agree or not with the possible decisions to be made.

- 5) duty to consult at the community level – submissions made on behalf of Inuit by the signatories of 2021 DNLUP should make their submissions known at the community level including the general public who are not tied to boards etc and learn if the communities agree or disagree with the document prior to submission. The Inuit at the community level are the closest to the Land and have ancestral, historical, current and cultural use to the Land. Land is managed by signatories mainly for mineral potential and Inuit see the Land more than minerals. This mineral viewpoint cannot be the top priority viewpoint and other viewpoints need to be properly and transparently communicated at the community level. If the signatories came to the community to learn what they would like to see the Land be used or seen then this would be a stronger document. More time and money was spent with non-renewable resource companies to ensure they were accommodated in a Land that they have no ancestral, historical, current or cultural ties. Have the signatories come to the communities to learn what the communities want or don't want? Have they educated the communities about this process and what the implications are for the future regarding their submissions? The general public should be properly engaged and educated about this document as it directly affects them and their future generations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important document.

Sincerely  
Paula Kigjugalik Hughson  
Nunavut Beneficiary