1

Standing Committee on Legislation Hearings on Bill 55, An Act to Amend the Property Assessment and Taxation Act Iqaluit, Nunavut
June 24, 2021

Members Present:
Tony Akoak
Pat Angnakak
Pauloosie Keyootak
Adam Lightstone
John Main, Chair
Calvin Pedersen
David Qamaniq
Emiliano Qirngnuq
Allan Rumbolt
Craig Simailak

Staff Members:
Michael Chandler
Stephen Innuksuk
Siobhan Moss

Interpreters:
Andrew Dialla
Philip Paneak
Jacopoosie Peter
Blandina Tulugarjuk

Witnesses:
Thomas Ahlfors, Acting Director, Legislation Division, Department of Justice
Ken Armstrong, President, Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of
Mines

Alex Baltov, Senior Consultant, Ryan LLC for Agnico Eagle Mines
Dan Carlson, Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance

Terry Dobbin, General Manager, Nunavut Office, Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of Mines
Jeannie Ehaloak, Minister of Community and Government Services
Carson Gillis, Director of Lands and

ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ
ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ 55, ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᖁᑎᓪᓚᕇᑦ
ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖓ ᐃᖃᓗᐃᑦ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ
ᔫᓂ 24, 2021

ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏᑦ ᐅᐸᒃᑐᑦ:
ᑑᓂ ᐋᖁᐊᖅ
ᐸᑎᑯᓗᒃ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ
ᐸᐅᓗᓯ ᕿᔪᒃᑖᖅ
ᐋᑕᒻ ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ
ᐋᕐᓗᒃ ᒪᐃᓐ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ
ᑳᓪᕕᓐ ᐲᑐᓴᓐ
ᑕᐃᕕᑎ ᖃᒪᓂᖅ
ᐃᒥᓕᐊᓄ ᕿᓐᖑᖅ
ᐋᓚᓐ ᕋᒻᐴᑦ
ᑯᕆᒡ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ

ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑏᑦ:
ᒪᐃᑯᓪ ᓵᓐᑐᓗ
ᓯᑏᕙᓐ ᐃᓄᒃᓱᒃ
ᓯᕚᓐ ᒫᔅ

ᑐᓵᔩᑦ:
ᐋᓐᑐᓘ ᑎᐊᓚ
ᐱᓕᑉ ᐸᓂᐊᖅ
ᔭᐃᑯᐴᓯ ᐲᑕ
ᐸᓚᓐᑏᓇ ᑐᓗᒑᕐᔪᒃ

ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ:

ᑖᒪᔅ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ, ᑐᑭᒧᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔨᐅᑲᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ, ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ, ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ
ᑭᐊᓐ ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ, ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ, ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᒥ ᓄᓇᕗᒥᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᑦ
ᐋᓕᒃᔅ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ, ᐅᖃᐅᔾᔪᐃᔨᒻᒪᕆᒃ, ᕋᐃᔭᓐ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᓪ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑖᓐ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ, ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᑉ ᑐᓪᓕᐊᑕ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑎᖓ

ᑎᐊᕆ ᑖᐱᓐ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨ, ᓄᓇᕗᒥ ᐊᓪᓚᕝᕕᒃ, ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᒥ ᓄᓇᕗᒥᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᑦ
ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ, ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓄᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᓪᓗ
ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ

ᑖᓴᓪ ᒋᓕᔅ, ᑐᑭᒧᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔨ ᓄᓇᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ,

2

Resources, Nunavut Tunngavik
Incorporated
Tom Hoefer, Executive Director, Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of
Mines
Kilikvak Kabloona, Chief Executive Officer, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
Aluki Kotierk, President, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
Pat McNamara, Vice-president, Taxation, Agnico Eagle Mines
Andrew Moore, Manager of Government Relations and Public Affairs, Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation
Martin Plante, Vice-president, Nunavut, Agnico Eagle Mines
Kyle Seeley, Deputy Minister of Community and Government Services

>>Committee commenced at 9:01

Chairman (Mr. Main)(interpretation): Good morning. Welcome to the meeting of the Standing Committee on Legislation. First of all, Mr. Qirngnuq, can you say the opening prayer, please. Thank you.

>>Prayer

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Qirngnuq. The purpose of our meeting is on Bill 55. Someone wants to clarify what was said yesterday. Minister Ehaloak, I now give you the floor to make clarifications.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Members and invited guests.

Before we start today, I want to acknowledge the benefits of discussing Bill 55 in this format and thank the Committee for inviting us here.

As a government we have been consulting on this bill for quite some time and appreciate it

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ

ᑖᒻ Hᐅᐃᕗ, ᑐᑭᒧᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔨᒻᒪᕆᒃ, ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᒥ ᓄᓇᕗᒥᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᑦ ᑭᓕᒃᕙᒃ ᖃᑉᓗᓈᖅ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨᒻᒪᕆᒃ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ

ᐊᓗᑭ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ, ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ
ᐹᑦ ᒫᒃᓇᒫᕋ, ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᑉ ᑐᓪᓕᐊ, ᑖᒃᓯᓕᕆᓂᖅ, ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᓪ
ᐋᓐᑐᕉ ᒧᐊ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ
ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓂᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᑦᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᓄᓘᔮᓐᓂ ᓴᕕᕋᔭᒃᓴᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᒫᑎᓐ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ, ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᑉ ᑐᓪᓕᐊ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ, ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐃᒍᓪ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ
ᑲᐃᔪᓪ ᓰᓕ, ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓄᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᓪᓗ
ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᑉ ᑐᓪᓕᐊ

>>ᑲᑎᒪᓯᒋᐊᖅᑐᑦ 9:01ᒧᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᒪᐃᓐ): ᐅᑉᓛᑦᓯᐊᖅ. ᑐᓐᖓᓱᒋᑦᑎ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐊᓛᖑᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᓕᕆᓂᐅᑉ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖃᕐᓂᐊᓕᖅᑎᖦᖢᒋᑦ. ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᒥᒃ ᒥᔅᑕ ᕿᓐᖑᖅ ᑐᒃᓯᐊᕐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔫᓪᓗᐊᕐᓂᕈᕕᑦ. ᒪ’ᓇ.

>>ᑐᒃᓯᐊᖅᑐᑦ

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ ᒥᔅᑕ ᕿᓐᖑᖅ. ᐃᑉᐸᒃᓴᖅ ᑕᐃᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᓴᖅ 55 ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᖦᖢᒍ ᑲᑎᒪᒐᑉᑕ. ᐃᑉᐸᒃᓴᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᕈᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᖃᕐᒪᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ ᐃᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᑐᓂᓕᖅᐸᕋ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᓂᐊᕋᕕᑦ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᐅᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ, ᖃᐃᖁᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᐃᓪᓗ.

ᐱᒋᐊᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᑎᓐᓂ ᐅᓪᓛᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕈᒪᓂᐊᕋᒪ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᒋᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᖅᑐᒋᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᖃᐃᖁᔨᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ.

ᒐᕙᒪᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᖃᓄᖅ
ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᖕᒪᖔᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ
ᐊᑯᓂᑲᓪᓚᐅᓕᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒍᑦ

3

is important for Committee Members to also hear directly from the organizations most impacted by this legislation. This is true when issues are sensitive and complex; landownership and taxes certainly are. This is especially true when stakeholders bring very different perspectives to the issues, like who should pay taxes.

Much of yesterday’s dialogue was consistent with what we heard during our consultations while preparing Bill 55. This makes me feel good, not because there are concerns, but because it reinforces to me that Inuit organizations have had the opportunity to engage and contribute their views, including their concerns. As a result, there were no big surprises with the arguments and messages raised to the Committee yesterday, no surprises, but a few inaccuracies. I would like to correct a few of the more significant inaccuracies for the benefit of the Committee.

It is important that Members as well as others listening today better understand a few more very important takeaways about Bill 55.

First, one of the ideas suggested yesterday is that Bill 55 proposes to transfer tax liabilities and risks away from mining firms and plans to move these risks over to Inuit organizations. As presented to the Committee, it came across as Bill 55 is trying to shift responsibility of paying taxes away from those leasing the land and over to the landowners. It was presented as if responsibility as a landowner is something new in Nunavut. This is not the case. The responsibility for landowners to pay taxes is not new. It has existed since the beginning of Nunavut and it existed in the Northwest Territories when the Nunavut Agreement was signed.

Article 22 of the Nunavut Agreement establishes that Inuit-owned lands are taxable

ᖃᓄᖅ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᒻᒪᑦ, ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑐᓴᕈᓐᓇᖅᑲᑕ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᒥᐅᔪᓂᓂᓛᒃ
ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐅᓴᓪᓚᕆᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖑᓇᓱᑦᑐᒧᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇᐃᓛᒃ ᓱᓕᓲᖑᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᕐᓂᑎᓐᓇᒋᑦ ᓄᓇᐃᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᓪᓗ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᕐᓂᖏᒻᒪᑕᐃᓛᒃ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓱᓕᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᑦᑐᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨᕈᓘᔭᐃᑦ ᓇᑭᖔᖅᑐᕈᓘᔭᐃᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᐊᑭᓖᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ.

ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖅᑐᐃᑦ
ᐊᔾᔨᖃᐸᓗᑐᐃᓐᓇᓚᐅᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᑐᓴᖃᑦᑕᔪᔭᑦᑎᓐᓂᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᒻᒪᖔᖅ ᑐᓴᕋᓱᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐱᐅᒋᔭᕋ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᖃᕐᕕᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓇᒍ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᕙᓐᓄᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ
ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᖃᑦᑕᕈᓐᓇᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᖃᓄᖅ
ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕐᒪᖔᕐᒥᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᒥᓂᕐᒥᓂᓪᓗ. ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᖁᐊᖅᓵᓇᖅᑐᖃᓗᐊᔾᔮᓚᐅᓐᖏᓚᖅ ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᓯᓐᓂᒃ, ᖁᐊᖅᓵᕐᓇᖅᑐᖃᕋᓗᐊᕋᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓱᓕᑦᑎᐊᖏᑦᑐᖅᑕᖃᓚᐅᕐᖓᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓱᓕᓪᓚᕆᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕈᒪᒐᒪ, ᓱᓕᑦᑎᐊᓚᐅᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ
ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ.

ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᓯᓯ ᓈᓚᑦᑐᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᑦᑎᐊᖃᑕ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐊᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᖓᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᒋᐊᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᔭᔅᓴᖅ 55ᒥᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ.

ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᖅ, ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55ᒎᖅ ᐊᐅᓪᓛᖅᓯᓂᐅᒐᓱᒻᒪᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᔅᓴᐅᔪᓂᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ
ᐊᐅᓪᓛᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᖔᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖑᓚᐅᕐᖓᓂᓛᒃ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᐅᓪᓛᖅᓯᒐᓱᑦᑑᔮᕐᖓᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑎᐅᔪᓄᖔᖅ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᖁᔭᐅᒐᓱᑦᑑᔮᖅᑐᑎᒃ. ᑕᐃᒫᓪᓕ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓄᑖᕌᓘᔭᖅᑐᒍ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᕐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᓖᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᓄᑖᖑᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᔪᓪᓗᓂ ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᒥ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓ ᐊᑎᓕᐅᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 22 ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᒥ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᓴᖅᑭᓯᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᓐᓇᑐᐃᒡᒎᖅ

4

in certain circumstances, including when they are outside municipalities and have commercial improvements on them, as mines do. While Inuit-owned lands are taxable under the Nunavut Agreement, they are taxed under the laws of general application, which must apply to everyone in the same way. When it comes to property tax, the current law of general application, the Property Assessment and Taxation Act, already says that landowners are the assessed owners for the purposes of taxation.

Bill 55 does not transfer any more risks to Inuit organizations than what already exist. Instead what Bill 55 does is to clarify that Inuit-owned lands will only be taxed if the circumstances allow for in the Nunavut Agreement. This was already happening in practise, but not having it in the Act makes these rules more difficult to administer.

Actually there is even a set of circumstances where Bill 55 proposes a change that could reduce the tax liabilities of Inuit organizations and other landowners, specifically in cases where they only own surface rights. We added this clause to Bill 55 after listening to Inuit organizations.

Bill 55 does not change any other existing legal and financial liabilities to Inuit organizations or other landowners.

Second, I would like to touch on one of the parts of the bill that raised questions yesterday, which was clause 48(10). One of the concerns we heard was that this clause might create retroactive tax liabilities back to 1999. I can assure Members that this is not the intent or the case. This clause will not only result in the government sending out new notices of assessments for past years nor does it allow us to change notices we have already sent out. This clause does not allow us to come up with new or different tax rates for

ᐃᓚᖓᒍᑦ, ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᓗᒋᑦ ᕼᐊᒪᓚᐃᑦ ᓯᓚᑖᓃᑉᐸᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᕝᕕᐅᔪᓂᑦ
ᐱᐅᓯᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᑉᐸᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᑦᑎᑐᑦ. ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑖᓰᔭᐃᔭᕐᕕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᑕ ᐊᑖᒍᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑕᐅᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᔪᓂᒃ. ᑖᓐᓇᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᔅᓴᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕆᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂ. ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᒃ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥᐅᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᔪᖅ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᑦᑕᐅᓲᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᑦᑕᐅᑎᒋᔪᖅ ᓄᓇᒥ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖅᑏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓲᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᐅᓪᓛᓯᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐊᑭᓕᔅᓴᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑕᓇᕐᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᓴᖅᑭᔮᕇᔪᒻᒪᑕᓕ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᑎᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᑦᑎᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕐᕕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᑕ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓂᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᕇᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᑦᑕᐅᒌᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒦᑎᓐᓇᒍ ᐊᐅᓚᒐᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᖅᓴᐅᓚᐅᕐᖓᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᕋᓛᖏᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓃᑦᑐᑦ.

ᐊᓪᓛᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓐᓂᖅᑕᖃᕈᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒐᓱᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᓯᒥᑦ
ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᓐᖏᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᒍᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᓗ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᓪᓗᒍ ᖄᖓᖏᓐᓇᖓ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᑉᐸᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᑎᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ
ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᓈᓚᒌᓚᐅᖅᑐᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᓯᔾᔩᖏᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᖅᐸᒌᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑎᒍᓪᓗ ᓵᓐᖓᔭᔅᓴᒫᖑᓂᐅᔪᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ.

ᐊᐃᑉᐹ, ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕈᒪᒻᒥᒐᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᐅᑉ ᐃᓚᖓᓂᑦ ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᒥ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 48(10) ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎ ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑖᓐᓇᒎᖅ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓂᐅᔪᖅ ᑖᕙᓐᖓᑦ
ᐱᒋᐊᕐᓂᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᖓᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᔅᓴᖏᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ 1999ᒥᓂᑦ. ᐅᖃᐅᑎᒍᓐᓇᑕᒃᑲ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒐᓱᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓐᓇᓂᓗ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓂᐅᔪᖅ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᑖᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᓯᒍᓐᓇᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓛᖅᑐᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᓂᐅᔭᕆᐊᓕᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒍᓐᓇᖏᑎᑦᑎᒻᒥᔪᖅ ᐅᕙᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓪᓚᖅᑎᑕᐅᑦᑕᐅᑦᑕᐅᑎᒋᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒃᑲᐃᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ. ᐅᓇ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᑦ ᖁᑦᑎᓕᕇᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᓕᓐᓂᒃ

5

years gone by.

Instead, it relates to another of the clauses we are proposing, which states that property tax revenues must go to support local government services and improvements, like funding Nunavut’s hamlets, district education authorities, and schools. This is a requirement of the Nunavut Agreement and is something the Government of Nunavut has been doing since 1999.

We are proposing in Bill 55 to make this requirement as clearly stated in law. This is an example of how Bill 55 better aligns with the Property Assessment and Taxation Act with the Nunavut Agreement. Subclause 48(10), the retroactive clause, confirms the proposed change to the law on paper going forward does not reflect a change in government practice to date. Together these clauses say the government has been using and must continue to use property taxes to collect for the purposes allowed under the Nunavut Agreement.

Third, we heard Bill 55 is illegal because it tries to amend the Nunavut Agreement. Bill 55 does not do this. Bill 55 does not try to do this. As an Assembly we cannot amend the Nunavut Agreement. What we are trying to do with this bill is to ensure our territorial legislation aligns with the Nunavut Agreement and to clarify certain aspects of the law as it relates to the Nunavut Agreement.

This bill also proposes other changes related to the administration of our property assessment process, like how we manage complaints. These are, perhaps, more boring issues but are important improvements to the existing Act nonetheless.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak this morning to some of the ideas we heard yesterday. These are complex issues

ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒍᑕᐅᔪᖅ.

ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᑦᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᒥᔪᖅ ᐊᓯᐊᓄᑦ
ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᑐᔅᓯᕌᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᐅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᕌᖅᑎᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑎᓄᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓂᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᕼᐊᒪᓚᓄᑦ, ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓕᓴᕕᓐᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒋᐊᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓂᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑕ ᒪᓕᔅᓯᒪᓪᓗᓂᐅᒃ 1999ᒥᓂᑦ.

ᑐᔅᓯᕋᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᑕᒪᓐᓇ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑕᕝᕙ ᐅᑦᑑᑎᐅᕗᖅ ᖃᓄᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᒪᓕᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᓂᐊᓕᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᓄᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓃᑦᑐᒥᒃ. ᐃᓗᓕᒃᑲᓐᓂᖓ 48(10) ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᒐᔭᖅᑐᖅ
ᐅᐊᑦᑎᐊᕈᐊᓗᓂᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᔪᖅ ᐸᐃᑉᐹᑎᒍᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᔭᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᕆᔭᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᓂᐅᒐᓱᖏᑦᑐᖅ. ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓃᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᖅᑐᑎᓪᓗ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓄᑦ ᓄᐊᑕᒥᓂᕐᒥᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᓗᓂᒋᑦ ᐊᑐᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒥ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᒥᒃ.

ᐱᖓᔪᐊᑦ, ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᒪᓕᒐᕐᓂᒃ ᓱᕋᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᒥᑦ. ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒐᓱᒻᒪᑦ. ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᖏᑦᑐᖅ. ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᕋᓱᖏᑦᑐᖅ. ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒍᓐᓇᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓂᑦ. ᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᕋᓱᑦᑐᒍᓪᓕ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐊᖑᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᒪᓕᑦᑎᐊᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ
ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᑦᑎᒋᐊᖅᑐᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᑉ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑦᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ
ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓄᑦ.

ᐅᓇ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒻᒥᔪᖅ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐸᐃᑉᐹᑦ ᐊᓪᓚᕕᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐱᖁᑎᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᕐᓗ ᐅᖃᐱᓗᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᑲᖅᓴᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᑲᒪᒋᒋᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊᖏᓛᒃ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐃᕿᐊᓇᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕐᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᒫᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᔪᒥᒃ.

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ, ᐱᕕᖃᖅᑎᒃᑲᕕᖓ ᐅᓪᓛᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑐᐃᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᑕ ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑐᑭᓯᔭᕐᓂᖏᒻᒪᑕᐃᓛᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒍᑦ

6

and it is important for the Committee Members to walk away from this appearance with an accurate understanding of key issues. I look forward to continuing this dialogue this morning. Koana, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Minister. (interpretation ends) Just for all the witnesses, it’s the Committee’s intention that at the end of this hearing, we will be inviting parties to submit supplemental submissions to the Committee, if they would like, in writing based on testimony at the hearing to clarify and/or rebuttal any arguments that have been made, so that opportunity will be provided.

(interpretation) Before we proceed to questions, perhaps we can get clarification. (interpretation ends) We have two items from yesterday’s proceedings that the Committee would like to get clarification on. The first one is for Agnico Eagle, so I’m looking at the computer screen.

The Member for Gjoa Haven asked witnesses from Agnico Eagle to clarify a statement made on page 3 of their submission. The statement indicated that “The issue of the payment of property taxes is not included in the leasing arrangements for our different properties.” Member Akoak asked why that is the case and I’ll now invite Agnico Eagle to provide their response to Mr. Akoak’s question. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The property taxes are additional to the other agreements with the Inuit associations, so it’s over and above the royalties and fees that we’re paying on those agreements. That was the intent of that statement.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Maybe just to clarify that, in the opinion of Agnico Eagle, I am interpreting that the current arrangement is

ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐊᓘᒻᒥᔪᖅ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᖓᑦ ᓈᓚᓐᓂᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐊᓂᒍᓐᓇᖅᑲᑕ ᑐᑭᓯᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᓕᕐᓗᑎᒃ

ᐃᓱᒫᓗᒋᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᐄ, ᐅᓪᓛᖅ
ᖁᕕᐊᓱᓐᓂᐊᖁᖓ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᑎᒋᓂᐊᕋᑦᑎᒍᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ)
ᐅᖃᕆᐊᖅᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᓈᓚᓐᓂᖅ ᐊᓂᒍᖃᑦ ᖃᐃᖁᔨᓂᐊᕐᒥᔪᒍᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᓱᑦᑎᑦᑎᓂᐊᕐᒥᔪᒍᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᐃᑦᑎᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᒍᔅᓯ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐅᕙᓂ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᓯ ᒪᓕᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᑦᑎᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᒍᔅᓯ ᑭᐅᒋᐊᕈᒪᒍᔅᓯᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐅᕙᓂ.

ᐱᕕᖃᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓯ. (ᑐᓵᔨᒃᑰᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ)

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᓯᒃᓴᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᒋᐊᖅᑳᖅᑎᓐᓇᑕ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᔪᖃᖅᑑᓪᓗᐊᖅᑰᕐᒪᑦ, ᐃᓛᒃ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐅᔪᖃᖅᑑᓪᓗᐊᖅᐸᑦ (we have 2 items) (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᒪᕐᕉᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᔅᓴᖃᕋᑦᑕ
ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᓂᖔᖅᑐᓂᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᖁᔭᐅᔪᓂᑦ, ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᖅ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᖅ ᑕᑯᓐᓈᕋᒃᑯ.

ᐅᖅᓱᖅᑑᑉ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᖓ ᐊᐱᕆᓚᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᑯᓐᓂᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑐᐃᖁᔨᓪᓗᓂ ᒪᒃᐱᒐᖓᓂ 3−ᖓᓂ ᑐᓂᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓂᒃ.

ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᖓᑦ ᐅᖃᓕᒫᕐᓗᒋᑦ, ᑖᓐᓇ
ᐃᓱᒫᓗᒋᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᑭᓖᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᕈᑎᓄᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓃᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᓕᒫᕇᕐᓗᖓ. ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐋᖁᐊᖅ ᐊᐱᕆᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᓱᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᑎᑕᐅᒻᒪᖔᖅ. ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᑯᑦ ᑭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑎᑲᐃᓐᓇᖑᓱᒃᑲᒃᑭᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᖁᐊᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖓᓂᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᑦ ᖄᖓᒍᒃᑲᓐᓂᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᒋᓯᒪᔭᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᖁᓛᒍᒃᑲᓐᓃᕐᒪᑕ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᔅᓴᖅᑖᖑᕙᑦᑐᐃᓪᓗ ᖄᖓᒍᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᑎᓂᐊᓴᒻᒪᑕ. ᑕᐃᒫᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕆᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᕕᐅᖃᐃ, ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᑯᓪᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖓᒍᑦ ᐃᓛᒃ ᐃᒫᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᒐᒃᑯ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐋᖅᑭᑦᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎ

7

satisfactory in your opinion in that there is no need or there hasn’t been a need to include the issue of the payment of property taxes in your leasing arrangements. I’m just looking for a confirmation that this is something that you’re satisfied with. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Thank you. The second item for clarification, when the Member for Tununiq asked for an update, this is for the Minister, the Member for Tununiq asked for an update on the status of the government’s request for proposals for property assessment services, the Deputy Minister indicated that the contract was awarded in February of this year to the Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, and as of last evening, the notice of award had not yet been publicly posted on the department’s tenders website. Can the Minister clarify when the formal notice of award will be publicly posted? Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Member for his question. The notice will be posted once the contract has been signed with the company. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Thank you. You have Committee Members who keep a close eye on that website and we were given the impression that it was public information, so thank you for clarifying that.

(interpretation) We will now proceed to Members’ questions and going first is Mr. Lightstone.

Mr. Lightstone: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My questions are for the Minister. One of the purposes of Bill 55 is to abolish the Territorial Board of Revision. In the Minister’s opening

ᓈᒻᒪᒋᔭᓯ, ᐃᕝᕕᓪᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖓᒍᑦ.
ᐱᑕᖃᕆᐊᖃᖅᓯᒪᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔨᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑭᓖᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑖᒃᓯᓄᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᔭᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᑎᒍᑦ. ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᔅᓯᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᓗᓂ, ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ
ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᖓᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᒋᔭᐃᒡᒎᖅ? ᐄᓛᒃ?

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐄ, ᓱᓕᔪᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐊᐃᑉᐹ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖁᔭᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᑐᓄᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᓚᐅᕐᖓᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓕᕐᒪᖔᖅ
ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑕᐅᒍᒪᓪᓗᓂ ᐅᓇ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᔪᖅ. ᑐᓄᓂᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᖓ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓕᕐᒪᖔᖅ
ᖃᐅᔨᔪᒪᓚᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᔅᓯᕌᕆᓯᒪᔭᖓ ᑲᓐᑐᕌᖅᑖᕋᓱᐊᕈᒪᔪᓂᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᓂᒃ
ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᐅᒐᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ, ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᑉ ᑐᖏᓕᖓᓂ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑳᓐᑐᕌᒃ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᒌᖅᑐᒥᓂᖅ ᕕᑉᕗᐊᕆᒥᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᕿᑭᖅᑖᓗᒃ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᓐᓄᒥᓂᑦ
ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓂᕆᓯᒪᔭᖓ ᑳᓐᑐᕌᒃ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᑭᐊᖅᑭᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᖅᑎᑕᐅᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᓱᓕ. ᖃᖓ ᑕᖅᑲᐅᖓ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᓛᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑳᓐᑐᕌᖅᑖᒥᓂᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒍᓐᓇᖃ? ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᔭᓕᔭᕋ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐊᐱᕆᓚᐅᕐᖓᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᓄᐃᒃᑲᐃᔾᔪᑎ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᓛᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᖅᑲᐅᖓ
ᐊᑎᓕᐅᖅᑕᐅᒌᖅᓯᒪᓕᖅᑲᑕ ᑳᓐᑐᓛᑦ
ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᓕᒻᒧᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᖑᑦ) ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᖅᓱᖅᑎᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᔾᔪᒃ ᑕᐃᒻᓇ ᐃᑭᐊᕐᕆᕕᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔾᔪᑎᒋᔫᔮᓚᐅᕋᑦᑎᒍ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᑐᓴᕋᔅᓴᐅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᔾᔪᑎᒋᔫᔮᓚᐅᕋᑉᑎᒍ.

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᕼᐃᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᓂ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ.

ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒐ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑉ 55 ᐲᖅᓯᓇᔭᕐᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔨᐅᔪᓂᒃ
ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᑉ

8

comments on page 8, she stated that this is to streamline review of initial complaints as the current process requires two layers of quasi-judicial administrative proceedings and each layer adds complexity, time, and costs for all parties. Efficiency-wise this does make a lot of sense, but as it exists, the consolidated Property Assessment and Taxation Act was grandfathered in from the Northwest Territories in 1999. I’m curious: has the NWT also abolished the dual-layered quasi-judicial administrative proceedings or do they still have the same process? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Community and Government Services is not aware of what the Government of the Northwest Territories is doing, but Community and Government Services feels that this is the best fit for our territory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Lightstone.

Mr. Lightstone: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. Moving on to my next question on the same topic, clause 48 of Bill 55 provides a number of transitional matters and one of which is that any matter that is currently before the Territorial Board of Revision under the previous Act is transferred on the coming into force of this Act to the director to be dealt with in accordance with

the new Act. My next question: as of today, how many matters are currently before the Territorial Board of Revision? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

ᒪᑉᐱᒐᖓᓂ 8 ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖏᓐᓂ ᑖᒻᓇ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᔫᒥᖁᑉᓗᒍ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᖅᑕᐅᕙᑦᑐᓄᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑕᖏᑦ
ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᕈᓯᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᒪᕐᕈᐃᓕᖃᖓᒋᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᓂᓪᓚᖓᓂᖏᑦ. ᐱᐅᓯᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᐱᔭᕆᑐᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᓲᖑᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᑭᑐᓪᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ. ᐃᖏᕐᕋᑦᓯᐊᕐᓂᐊᕈᑦᑕ ᑐᑭᖃᑦᓯᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᑖᒻᓇ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓇᓖᕌᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓂᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ 1999-ᒥᑦ ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᒥ. ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕈᒪᔪᖓ ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᒥᓪᓕ ᐲᖅᓯᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒋᕙᑦ ᒪᕐᕈᐃᓕᖅᑲᖓᓂᖓᓂ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᕐᕕᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ. ᐊᓪᓛᒃ ᐱᐅᓯᐅᔭᕆᐊᓕᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓗ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓐᓇᓴᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᑎᓐᓂ ᐊᑐᕆᕙᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓂᓪᓗ
ᐱᔨᑦᓯᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓐᖏᓚᑦ ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓘᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᓯᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓛᖑᓐᓇᓱᒋᒻᒪᔾᔪᒃ ᑖᒻᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ.

ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒻᒪ ᐊᐃᑉᐹᓄᑦ
ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓᔅᓴᐃᓐᓇᐅᒐᓗᐊᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᓇᓴ ᐅᑎᖓ 48 ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᒥᒃ 55 ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᓯᓐᖏᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖏᑦ ᑭᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᕙᑦᑐᓂᒃ
ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᓯᕗᓂᐊᓂ ᐊᑐᓕᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᑦᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᓪᓗᒍ. ᖃᑦᓯᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᕕᓐᓄᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᕙᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ.

9

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We’re just trying to find those numbers; just one moment.

We will find the information and get back to the Member. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Lightstone.

Mr. Lightstone: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister, for making that commitment. My last question is: what is the Minister’s expected timeline for bringing this legislation into force? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) That’s if it were to be passed. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It will be subject to approval by this Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Maybe I’ll rephrase that question. It’s subject to approval by the Assembly. The next sitting of the Assembly is in the fall, September, and so starting the date at which the bill is passed, how long would it take the department to bring it into force? A year? Two years? Two weeks? I’m looking for an estimation of how long it would take the government to act on this or to bring it into force. Mr. Ahlfors.

Mr. Ahlfors: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The amended Act does provide for some regulations that would have to be drafted. Usually these would take, perhaps, two to three months following assent. However, due to the election and only having a caretaker government during the election period, those timelines would be pushed by a few months because of the election. Once the government

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖃᐅᔨᓇᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᖃᑦᓯᐅᓂᖏᑦ.

ᖃᐅᔨᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋᓗᐊᕗᑦ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᒋᓂᐊᖅᐸᕋ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ.

ᓚᐃᑦᓯᑑᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕋᕋᕕᑦ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒪᑦ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅᐹᖅ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᓪᓕ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓂᕆᐅᖅᐸ ᖃᖓᒃᑯ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᒫᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐄ,
ᑲᔪᓯᓇᔭᖅᐸᐃᓛᒃ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᒪᓕᒃᑲᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᐃᒡᓗᒥ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐃᒻᒪᖃᖃᐃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᐅᔪᖅ ᐅᖃᑦᑎᐊᑲᓐᓂᕐᓗᒍ. ᒪᓕᒐᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒻᒥ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᐅᑭᐊᔅᓵᖅ ᑲᑎᒪᓛᖅᓱᑕ ᓰᑏᑉᐱᕆᒥ ᑕᕝᕙ ᐅᓪᓗ ᐱᒋᐊᕐᕕᒋᓇᔭᖅᑕᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑉ ᑲᔪᓯᑉᐸᑦ, ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓇᓱᒐᔭᖅᐸ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᓯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓕᒫᖅ? ᐱᓇᓱᐊᕈᓯᑦ ᖃᑦᑎᑦ? ᒥᔅᓴᐅᓯᖁᔨᓪᓗᖓ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᖓᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᒐᔭᕐᒪᖔᑕ
ᐱᓇᓱᒋᐊᕐᓗᑎᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ.

ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᕈᓰᑦ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᑕᒫᓂᖃᐃ ᑕᖅᑭ ᒪᕐᕉᒃ ᐱᖓᓱᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᓇᔭᖅᐳᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓂᕈᐊᕐᓂᖃᓛᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓂᕈᐊᕐᓇᐅᓂᖓᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐱᒐᔭᕐᒪᑕ ᑕᖅᑭᓄᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᒐᓚᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᖓᕝᕙᕆᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕋᔭᖅᑐᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓕᕋᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᐅᓕᓵᖅᑐᑦ

10

has been formed after the election, two to three months would be the expected time to draft the regulations and bring this into force. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Lightstone indicates that he is done. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to everybody.

What I want to ask a little bit more is about the board of revision. This morning the Minister said that some of Bill 55 is boring, but actually I find this quite interesting, it’s quite complex. There are lots to think about and the implications to different parties, but I want to ask a question about the rationale for the proposal to abolish the board of revision, if the Minister can explain a little bit more why the department is going in that direction. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask Mr. Seeley to give the Member an answer to her question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Seeley.

Mr. Seeley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. I thank the Member for her question and interest in this aspect of the legislation. The Territorial Board of Revision is an appointed board and the number of meetings and the scheduling of… . It’s a complaint-driven process wherein any assessed owner submits what’s literally called or referred to as a complaint to the board. In order to vet the complaint, the board must convene with its appointed members as well

ᑕᖅᑮᒃ ᒪᕐᕉᒃ ᐱᖓᓱᑦ ᐅᖓᕝᕙᕆᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓂᖓ ᓂᕆᐅᓇᕋᔭᓐᖑᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓᓂ.

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓚᐃᓯᑑᓐ ᑕᐃᒫᕐᓂᕋᕐᒪᑦ. ᒥᔅ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐅᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᔅᓯ.

ᐅᓇᓕ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᓪᓛᖅ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᐅᑉ 55 ᐃᕿᐊᓇᕐᒪᑕᒎᖅ. ᐅᕙᖓᓕ ᐱᒋᐊᒋᓪᓚᕆᓱᑎᑦ ᐱᔭᕆᑐᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᒋᐊᓖᑦ ᐅᓄᖅᑑᓪᓗᑎᒃ. ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑦᑐᓄᓪᓗ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑕᑯᔭᐅᔪᒪᔪᑦ ᑎᒥᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐲᖅᑕᐅᖁᔭᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐅᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᓱᒻᒪᑦ
ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᓇᓱᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᐱᕆᕙᕋ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᑎᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᒧᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᐅᔪᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ.

ᓰᓕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᖅᐸᕋ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨ ᑐᑭᓯᒍᒪᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᒪᑐᒪᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᒥᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓲᖑᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖃᐅᓲᖑᓪᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᐅᓪᓗᖅᓯᐅᑎᖃᖅᑐᑎᒃ. ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᖃᕌᖓᑦ ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᓯᓲᖑᔪᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᖃᖅᑐᖏᓛᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᓲᖑᔪᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓂᐊᕌᖓᑕ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᑲᑎᒋᐊᖃᓲᖑᕙᒻᒥᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ

11

as the representatives of the complainant. That exercise takes time to get the complaints fully compiled to review whether they’re relevant and appropriate under the Act, if it is something that is eligible for complaint, and I guess the rigours of getting the board to convene to review property assessment complaints just lead to some delays in the vetting of the complaints issued by the people receiving the assessments. The direction is meant to improve the efficiency of dealing with these complaints when they do come in with the subject matter experts who are employed within the department.

The second objective in addition to the efficiencies and having subject matter experts dealing with the actual complaints is to maintain the tribunal and access to the tribunal by anybody lodging a complaint. This will lead to any complaints on an administrative level that are an interpretation issue that might be resolved at the officials’ level will be resolved at that level. Any complainant may still escalate and appeal the decision of the director to the tribunal. We see a couple of different benefits to this: one, it will refine the requests and the appeals that are actually being brought forward to the tribunal, and it will actually increase the exposure of the tribunal members to the different interpretations under the Act on the matter of property assessment and it will also refine the number of meetings the tribunal is actually holding to vet these complaints that are indeed appealed after they have been vetted through the staff at the officials’ level that would replace the Territorial Board of Revision.

Our strategy is in two pieces: one is to increase the efficiency to get a more timely response to the complainant and the second piece is to mobilize the tribunal to ensure that they’re getting more exposure to the complaints that are appealed and escalated to

ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᖅ ᑭᒡᒐᑐᖅᑎᖓᓂ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐱᐅᓯᕆᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᓲᖑᔪᖅ. ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎ ᐊᓪᓚᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᓂᖏᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᒋᐊᖃᑦᑎᐊᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᓈᒻᒪᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᑉ ᐊᑖᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ
ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᑦᑕᕌᖓᑕᓗ. ᐅᓇᖃᐃ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᑲᔪᓯᒍᓐᓇᖅᑕᕌᖓᑕ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᔪᒧᓪᓗ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ.
ᑭᖑᕙᕆᐊᕈᑎᐅᓲᖑᒻᒥᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᐅᔪᒧᓪᓗ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑕᐅᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔪᓄᑦ. ᑕᕝᕙ ᑐᑭᒧᐊᕈᑎᐅᓇᓱᑦᑐᖅ
ᐃᖏᕐᕋᓂᖃᑦᑎᐊᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᓕᕌᖓᑕ ᐊᔪᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᕕᑦᑎᓐᓂ.

ᐊᐃᑉᐹᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᔅᓴᖃᓲᖑᒻᒥᔪᒍᑦ
ᐃᖏᕐᕋᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᑦᑕ ᖄᒃᑲᓐᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑏᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓪᓚᑖᓕᕋᒥᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᕝᕖᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᑲᔪᓰᓐᓇᕋᓱᔅᓱᑎᑦ. ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᖃᖅᐸᑦ ᐊᓪᓚᕝᕕᓕᕆᓂᕐᒨᖓᔪᒥᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑉᐸᑎ ᐋᖅᑭᑦᑕᐅᔭᐅᒋᐊᕋᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᖁᑦᑎᓂᖅᓴᒃᑯᑦ. ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᖅ ᖁᑦᑎᓂᖅᓴᒧᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨᒧᖔᖅ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᖅ. ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᒥ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ. ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕋᔭᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕋᔭᖅᓱᑎᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᖅᐸᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᕝᕕᐅᔪᒥ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᐅᑉ ᐃᓚᖏᓐᓃᑦᑐᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐊᓐᖏᔅᓱᑎ ᑲᑎᒪᓕᕌᖓᒥ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᒻᒪᕆᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᖁᑦᑎᓂᖅᓴᒥᒃ ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑲᐅᑎᓄᑦ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑭᖑᕝᕖᒐᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓇᓐᖓᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᑦ. ᐃᖏᕐᕋᑦᑎᐊᖃᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᑭᖑᕙᖃᑦᑕᖁᓐᖏᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑭᐅᑦᑎᐊᖃᑦᑕᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑕᑯᔭᔅᓴᖃᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙᓕᕐᓗᑎᒃ

12

that level. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you. I’m curious to know, when this part of the legislation was presented to or through your consultations with others, if there were any concerns raised over the fact that a director, for example, will have a lot of power, that you’re getting away from a board situation because in hindsight when you look back and you wish that the hospital board was still in place and that you wish that the education board was still in place, where people had a chance to put some input in. I’m wondering if you’ve had any concerns raised over this issue and how you will appease people who may have concerns that the government is trying to hold so much power to itself. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, through you, I will ask Mr. Seeley to respond. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Seeley.

Mr. Seeley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. The notion of replacing any appointed board with staff or officials dealing with it is something that does raise questions and for that reason, throughout the consultation, we have emphasized the objective of replacing the Territorial Board of Revision with the staff review.

Complainants under the Act are complaining, literally, about the assessed value or some of the specifics within their tax assessment. In most cases they’re interested in getting these dealt with effectively and quickly to resolve it

ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᕌᖓᑕ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᐱᕆᖅᓱᕈᒪᓪᓗᖓ ᑐᑭᓯᒍᒪᓪᓗᖓ ᖃᖓᒃᑯᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᑉ ᐃᓚᖓ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᒐᒥ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᓐᓂᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᓯᔅᓯᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑎᑕᖃᖅᑐᖃᐅᓚᐅᖅᐹ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨ ᓲᕐᓗ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᓪᓚᕆᒃᑲᔭᓕᕐᒪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐅᔪᓐᓃᕐᓗᑎᒃ. ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᓲᕐᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒻᒪᕆᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᓱᓕ
ᐃᓕᓯᒪᒍᒪᐃᓐᓇᕐᒪᑕ. ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑎᖃᕐᕕᐅᓯᒪᕕᓰ ᑕᒪᑐᒪᐅᑉ ᒥᔅᓵᓄᑦ? ᖃᓄᕐᓗ ᖁᕕᐊᓱᔾᔫᒥᒍᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑎᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ
ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᕋᓱᒻᒪᕆᖅᑰᔨᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᓱᓕ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᒃᑲᓂᕐᓗᑎᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ.

ᓰᓕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᑭᖑᕝᕕᖅᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᒻᒪᕆᓐᓄᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᒥᒻᒪᐃᓛᒃ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓐᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᑕ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᒻᒪᕆᑉᐸᓚᐅᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᑐᑭᒧᐊᕈᑎᒋᒐᓱᑦᑕᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᑭᖑᕝᕕᖅᑕᐅᒐᔭᖅᐸᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ
ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᖅ.

ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑕᐅᓚᑦᑖᕈᑏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕈᑎᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᓯ ᑭᓱᓪᓚᑦᑖᒥᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᒥᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐋᖅᑭᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖃᑦᑕᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᕿᓚᒥᐅᔾᔫᒥᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑭᓖᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᓄᑦ

13

so that the invoice can be moved forward and processed.

From a transparency perspective, the staff, meaning the CGS staff, would be reviewing those. These are subject matter experts that work in planning and lands. A lot of the complaints that do come in are very often of a technical or an interpretation nature, and our staff have been and will continue to provide that subject matter expertise in the vetting of the complaints that they did do and provide for the Territorial Board of Revision.

As far as the transparency question, we believe that has been addressed by maintaining the option to escalate any issue that is not addressed effectively or to the satisfaction of the complainant can and should in fact be escalated via an appeal to the appointed board that deals with the tribunal board. We do believe we have maintained a level of transparency and increased the efficiency, and hopefully the effectiveness of dealing with complaints on assessments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you. The next question I would like to ask is for the chamber of mines. On page 11 of its submission, the chamber indicated that Nunavut and the Northwest Territories are the only two jurisdictions in Canada that charge property taxes to remote mines. What types of taxes do other Canadian jurisdictions impose on remote mines? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Member, for that statement. In other jurisdictions, most property taxes aren’t

ᓇᓕᖅᑲᐃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᖃᑦᑕᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ.

ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑏᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᖃᑦᑕᕋᔭᖅᑐᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓇᓐᖓᑦ ᐊᔪᓐᖏᓐᓂᖃᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓇᓐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᓄᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᓱᓄᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᖃᑎᒌᓐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓂᖃᓲᖑᓂᖅᓴᐅᒻᒪᑕ. ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᕗᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓇᓐᖓᑦ ᐊᔪᓐᖏᓐᓂᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᖃᐃᓐᓇᓚᖓᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖃᑦᑕᓲᒥᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ.

ᐊᓚᒃᑲᐃᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒍ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑭᐅᖅᑰᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐱᓯᒪᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᕋᑦᑎᒍ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᓐᓂᖃᓐᖏᑉᐸᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᒋᔭᐅᕌᓂᓐᖏᑉᐸᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᒧᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᑦᑐᑦ ᐊᔪᓐᖏᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᑲᒪᓲᖑᕙᒌᖅᑐᓂᒃ.
ᐊᓚᒃᑲᐃᓯᒪᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᓲᖑᔪᒍᑦ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᑦᑐᑕᓗ ᑲᒪᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᑕ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑎᓂᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒪ ᐊᐃᑉᐹ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔪᒪᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᒪᒃᐱᒐᖓᓂ 11, ᑐᓂᔭᔅᓯᓐᓂ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓂ, ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᓄᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᕐᕉᒎᖅ ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᑦᑕᐃᓕᑎᑦᑎᓲᑦ ᐅᖓᓯᑦᑐᒥ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᒥᒃ. ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᓲᖑᕙᓪᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂᒃ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᕐᓄᑦ. ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂᑦ, ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ

14

charged on mines because most of the infrastructure is already in place by the provincial governments, whereas here in Nunavut, the [entire] infrastructure has to be paid for directly by the mines themselves. They get taxes from other sources like payroll taxes, corporate taxes, and that sort of thing, so they don’t really need to charge that property tax and it’s not really a high cost anyhow because all of the infrastructures are put in place.

Maybe our president can elaborate on that if it is okay, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Go to Zoom, Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks for the question. I think that Mr. Dobbin touched well on that. The property tax that’s payable on mines in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut is really just an extra tax. It’s an additional cost that mining operators in the territories pay, that if they were operating in a different jurisdiction in Canada, they would not have to pay for the reasons that Mr. Dobbin outlined in terms of services and so on. The other variety of taxes and so on that are payable in the two territories are very similar to what would be payable for a mine in one of the provinces in terms of corporate taxes, fuel taxes, and royalties as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you. Thank you for your responses. Just along the same lines, the chamber also indicated on page 12 of its submission that “Property taxes are generally meant to help pay for government/community services, but in Nunavut, mines must provide their own municipal and community

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓃᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᒧᑦ. ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᕙᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓂᓪᓚᖓᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᓴᓇᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᑭᓱᓕᒫᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓴᓇᐅᕙᒌᖅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒻᒪᑦ, ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕆᐊᖃᓯᓲᖑᑉᓗᑎᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ, ᓲᕐᓗ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᓄᑦ, ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᖏᓐᓄᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ, ᐃᒫᒃ ᐊᖏᔪᐊᓘᖏᖦᖢᓂᓗ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓂᓪᓚᖓᐅᑎᐅᕙᒌᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᒡᓗᐃᑦ, ᑭᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᕙᒌᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᐃᒻᒪᖄ, ᐊᖏᔪᖅᑳᕗᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒧᖓ
ᐅᖃᕆᐊᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ, ᖃᓄᐃᑦᓴᖏᒃᑯᕕᑦ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖃᕆᑕᐅᔭᒃᑯᕐᓗᑕ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ.

ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓐᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ
ᐅᖃᕋᑖᖅᑰᒻᒥᔭᖓ, ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᓲᓐᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂᑦ, ᖄᒃᑲᓐᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᑎᐅᔪᑦ. ᖄᒃᑲᓐᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᕐᓱᓂᔾᔪᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᑏᑦ. ᐊᐅᓚᓇᔭᕈᑎ ᐊᓯᐊᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ, ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒃᑲᔭᓐᖏᖦᖢᑎᒃ ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᑐᒐᔭᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ ᐅᖃᕋᑖᕐᒪᒋᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᔨᑦᓯᕋᐅᑏᑦ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᕙᒌᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ. ᐊᓯᐊᑉᑕᐅᖅ, ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᕙᒻᒥᔪᖅ ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᖅᓱᓂ ᓄᓇᑦᑎᐊᒥ. ᐊᔾᔨᑐᐃᓐᓇᐸᓗᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒥᔭᖏᓪᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓇᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ, ᑖᒃᓰᓄᑦ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑎᓄᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ

ᓂᖏᑕᕕᖕᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᓯᓐᓇᖅᖢᑎᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ, ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᓗ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᖕᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᐅᓇᑦᑕᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓱᓕ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᒪᒃᐱᒐᖅ 12−ᒥ ᑐᓂᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂ, ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑕᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐱᓇᓱᐊᕆᐊᖃᖅᐸᖕᒪᑕ

15

services.” Can you describe some specific examples of municipal and community services that mines are currently providing in Nunavut? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that question. First of all, mines usually provide communities with, first and foremost, employment, jobs, scholarships, and training. Most of the mines are responsible to do their own training.

Just as an example, even ourselves in 2017, we engaged in a public awareness campaign because most Nunavummiut know very little about our industry, so most of our chamber executives realized that we need to have a public awareness campaign.

Mines pay for monitoring, mines pay for a lot of community…even like during pandemic there was major relief from AEM and relief from Baffinland as well, so there are a vast majority of things that mines do to help communities. Again, maybe our president can elaborate on that as well, Mr. Chairman, if that’s okay.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) The question, I believe, was about municipal and community services and I don’t believe the question was whether mines provide benefits to Nunavut residents, specifically around municipal and community services. Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think, to that point, what we’re trying to just get across to the Members is the fact that at mine sites, they’re responsible for their own water supply, their own fuel, power usage, and so on. The typical services that I would say a community member or a business

ᐱᔨᑦᓯᕋᐅᑎᑎᒍᑦ. ᑐᑭᓕᐅᔾᔨᓚᑦᑖᕈᓐᓇᖅᐱᒌᑦ ᓄᓇᓖ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᑦᑕ ᓄᓇᓖᓪᓗ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᖃᕆᑕᐅᔭᒃᑯᕐᓗᑕ ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖕᓄᑦ. ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᐱᑕᖃᖅᑎᑦᑎᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᒃᓴᓂᒃ, ᒪᑯᐊᓗ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓂᕐᓂᖅ, ᓇᖕᒥᓂᕐᓗ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᒃᓴᐃᔭᕆᐊᖃᖅᐸᒃᖢᑎᒃ.

ᑐᑭᓕᐅᑎᓗᒍ, ᐅᕙᒍᑦ ᐊᒡᓛᑦ 2017-ᖑᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐅᔾᔨᕈᓱᑦᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᓚᐅᕋᑦᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᒥᓂᖅᓴᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓗᐊᖏᖕᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑕ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᒃᑲᐃᓇᓱᓚᐅᑦᒪᑕ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓂᖓ.

ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᓇᐅᑦᑎᖅᓱᖅᑎᐅᓲᖑᖕᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓲᖑᖕᒥᖕᒪᑕ ᓇᐅᑦᑎᖅᑐᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᒥᓱᓂᒡᓗ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓖᓲᖑᖕᒥᔪᑦ ᓲᕐᓗ ᓄᕙᖕᓇᕐᔪᐊᖅᑕᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐹᕙᓐ ᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᕐᒪᕆᐅᓚᐅᕐᒥᖕᒪᑕ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂᒃ. ᐊᖏᔪᖅᑳᕗᖃᐃ, ᐃᓚᒋᐊᕆᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᓱᖁᑕᐅᖏᑉᐸᑦ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᐅᕙᓪᓚᐃᔪᖅ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓲᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒧ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓯᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ, ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᓐᓂ
ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᓐ.

ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐄ, ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓᓕ, ᑕᐃᒪ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᓐᓇᓱᑦᑕᕗᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᖕᒥᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᑕᖅᐸᒃᖢᑎᒃ, ᓇᖕᒥᓂᓗ
ᓱᑲᓐᓇᖅᑐᖃᖅᑐᑎᒃ, ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑕᐅᒐᔪᑦᑑᒐᓗᐊᓂᑦ

16

within a community would benefit from, the municipality itself is delivering, and those sorts of services are not available at the mine sites and they are the services that the mines must take care of themselves. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you. I think my question was to describe some specific examples of municipal and community services that the mines are currently providing in Nunavut, but to go on, my last question for the mine. The chamber on page 13 of its submission, it recommended that the territorial government provide property tax rebate to mines for the municipal and community services they must provide themselves. I’m wondering if we can get an understanding in how the chamber feels this rebate is envisioned to operate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for that question. Basically what the chamber is suggesting, like the royalty payments, possibly the GN can consider when commodity prices drop that could be a reason for a drop in property taxes. When commodity prices are good, royalty prices are great and when commodity prices go down, the royalty payments sometimes go down, but for property taxes, they remain the same throughout.

If the mines are having a tough time, the chamber would ask that the Ministers would

consider dropping the price of property taxes because, if the mines are struggling, then there is a potential for disaster there. We’re just asking maybe if the property tax rate could be

ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ. ᐃᑲᔫᑕᐅᒐᔭᖅᑐᑦ, ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒥ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᓕᖕᒧᓪᓘᓐᓂᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᒋᔭᒥᓂ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᖕᓂ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᖏᒻᒪᑕ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᓪᓕ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᕆᐊᖃᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᒋᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ, ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᖅᑰᒃᑲᐅᔭᕋ, ᑐᑭᓕᐅᔾᔨᓂᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᒐᔪᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ

ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑲᔪᓯᒋᐊᕐᓗᖓ, ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅᐹᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒐ. ᒪᒃᐱᖓᖅ 13−ᖓᓂ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑦ, ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᖁᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ

ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕕᐅᑉ, ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᓯᕋᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ
ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᔭᕆᐊᖃᖅᑕᖏᓪᓗ.

ᑐᑭᓯᑎᑕᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᐳᒍᖅᑲᐃ, ᖃᓄᖅ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᕕᓂᕐᓄᑦ ᑕᑯᓐᓇᓐᖑᐊᖅᑕᐅᒻᒪᖔᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖕᓄᑦ. ᐃᓚᖏᑦ
ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒨᖓᔪᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒪᔭᖓᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓂᖏᖅᑕᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᑭᖏᑦ

ᑲᑕᑦᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ, ᑲᑕᒋᐊᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᓂᖓᓗ ᒥᒃᖠᕚᓪᓕᕋᔭᕐᖓᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᑦᑎᐊᖅᑎᒡᓗᒋᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐊᑭᑭᓪᓕᒋᐊᖅᐸᑕ ᓂᖏᖅᑕᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᑲᑕᒋᐊᓲᖑᖕᒪᑕ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓕ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓕᒧᑦ
ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᐃᓐᓇᓲᖑᖕᒪᑕ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕈᓐᓇᖏᒻᒪᑕ.

ᑕᐃᒪᓕ, ᐅᔭᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᕕᓂᐅᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᑭᑭᓪᓕᐊᖅᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᑦ. ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ, ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᒃᓱᕈᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᒃᐸᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎ, ᑕᐃᒪ ᐃᓗᐊᖏᑦᑐᒻᒪᕆᖕᒧᑦ ᑎᑭᐅᑎᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ

17

flexible rather than just a set tax rate, regardless of whether the mines are doing really great or whether the mines are not doing so great.

Again, maybe our president can add to that as well, if possible, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I would just add in terms of a mechanism, this is just an idea on how the property tax might be dealt with for mines to take care of situations like Mr. Dobbin just said. The tax itself is paid regardless of whether the mine and the business itself are profitable or not.

I think, to implement such a rebate, it would require doing an assessment of what are the value of the services that we’re talking about, things like power and water and waste disposal, those sorts of things that normally a business would benefit from the municipality delivering that the mine is having to take care of itself and coming up with a formula. I don’t think the mechanism itself has been thought though any more than that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Ms. Angnakak, I’ll give you one more and then we will move to the next person. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you. That was going to be my last question, but then I was thinking: I wonder how the Minister feels about this topic and whether or not the topic has been raised to her at any time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Members are aware that

ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓲᑕᐅᔾᔫᒥᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑦ, ᑕᐅᕗᖓᓕᒫᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᓐᓇᖏᑑᔪᐃᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᒃᐸᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᒃᐸᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᖏᔪᖅᑳᕗᖅᑲᐃ ᐃᓚᒋᐊᕆᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ, ᐊᔪᕐᓇᖏᑉᐸᑦ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ.

ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐃᓚᔪᓐᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕋᖃᐃ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᒃᓴᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ, ᖃᓄᖅ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑦ, ᒥᔅᑐ ᑖᐱᓐᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᕋᑖᖅᑕᖓ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑖᒃᓰᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ. ᐃᒪᓐᓇ, ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᔾᔮᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ,
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᐸᓪᓗ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓱᑲᓐᓇᖅᑐᒧᑦ, ᐃᒥᕐᒧᓪᓗ, ᑭᓈᓗᖕᓂᒡᓗ ᐊᑦᑕᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᕋᔪᒃᑲᔭᖅᑑᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᕼᐊᒻᓚᐅᑉ ᐃᓗᐊᓃᑉᐸᑦ. ᓇᖕᒥᓂᕐᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᑉ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᕆᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂᒋᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ
ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᖏᓗᐊᖅᑰᕐᒪᑦ, ᑖᔅᓱᒪ ᓯᓚᑖᒍᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᒥᔅ, ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᓯᐊᓅᖔᕐᓂᐊᕐᒥᒐᑦᑕ. ᒥᔅ,
ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᑖᓐᓇ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅᐹᕆᓂᐊᓕᕋᑖᖅᑕᕋᓗᐊᕋ. ᐃᓱᒪᓕᑳᓪᓚᖕᒥᒐᒪ. ᒥᓂᔅᑑᓪᓕ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᕙᐅᒃ? ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᕗᑦ, ᐱᓕᕝᕕᖓᖃᐃ ᑕᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᖔᑦ, ᓂᓪᓕᐅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᖔᑦ ᑖᔅᓱᒥᖓ ᒥᓂᔅᓱᒧᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᑕᐃᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᖕᒪᑎᒃ

18

the government did, until recently, have a fuel tax rebate program that was applicable to operating mines. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because the mill rate and the property tax assessment rates are administered by the Department of Finance, through you, I’ll ask Mr. Carlson to answer the Member’s question. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Carlson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Member, for the question. A few thoughts are going through my head. When the chamber of mines mentions that some of the payments they make are tied to their profits, they are right. Corporate income tax, for example, when the business is doing well, they profit and they pay more in tax. When they are not doing well or when they are still early on, they don’t pay any tax. The other one would be the royalties. That’s not a GN thing, but same idea.

There are some taxes like property where they are fixed based on the assessed value. If we were to treat everyone the same way, if families are doing well, if families make more money, we would charge them more; if they lose their job, we would charge them less. If businesses in town or in the municipalities are profitable, do we charge them more? The whole system is set up to be taxed on the assessed value of the property itself. When a property owner or those with improvements own property and improvements that are valued high, we tax more and the same difference.

I would also like to point out to the mines that our system actually does allow for some adjustment for when a mine is producing or not. The assessed value is based on, partly,

ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᒫᓐᓇᕋᑖᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᖕᒧᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᓚᐅᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᖕᓄᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑐ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᓲᖃᐃ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᑦᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅ, ᐱᖁᑏᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᔨᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ, ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᑉ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖓᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ.

ᑳᓪᓴᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ, ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᒻᒧᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪ, ᒫᓐᓇ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᒐᒃᑭ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ
ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᔾᔪᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᑦᑐᐊᖕᒪᑕ ᖄᖏᓐᓂᑯᓕᐅᕈᑎᓄᑦ. ᓲᕐᓗ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᖏᑦ
ᖄᖏᕐᓂᑯᓕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᑖᒃᓯᓖᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐱᖏᐊᕐᓂᖓᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᓐᖏᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᑦᓱᑎᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓂᖏᖅᑕᕈᑏᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓅᖓᖏᑦᑐᑦ.

ᓲᕐᓗ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ
ᐋᖅᑭᑦᓯᒪᑲᐅᑎᒋᖕᒪᑕ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕈᓐᓇᕋᑎᒡᓗ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐃᓚᔭᕇᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᑦᑎᐊᓂᖅᓴᐅᕗᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓇᖅᓱᓂᓗ, ᑕᐃᒪ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᖏᓐᓂᖅᓴᐅᑉᐸᑕ ᑕᐃᒪ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᑦᑎᐊᓕᕌᖓᑕ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅᓴᐅᓗᑎᒃ, ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖏᕈᑎᑉᐸᑕ ᐊᑭᑭᓪᓕᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐊᑭᓕᕆᐊᓕᖓ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᖁᑎᖏᑦᑕ
ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦᑕ ᐊᑭᖏᓐᓄᑦ,
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᕈᑎᕕᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᒪᑕ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᔪᓂᒃ

ᐊᑭᑐᓂᖅᓴᐅᔭᕋᖔᑕ, ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙᑉᐳᖑᑦ.

ᐊᖕᒪᓗ ᐅᖃᕈᒪᒋᓪᓗᖓ, ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᑎᑦ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᓂᖓ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕐᒪᖔᕐᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐋᒃᑲᓘᓐᓃᑦ.
ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᑖᓐᓇ

19

it’s very complicated, but production. When a mine is not producing, so if they were to close their doors or lose their production value, then the assessed value goes down and they would pay less tax. As the GN, we actually suggested that too for the Jericho Mine and Tahera years ago. They were trying to figure out what to do and we pointed out that actually there is a mechanism already in PATA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) For the interpreters, make sure not to use acronyms; Property Assessment and Taxation Act.

For the chamber, just to follow up on that question from Ms. Angnakak, to what extent do mining companies that are currently active in Nunavut pay territorial corporate income taxes to the Government of Nunavut? Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Again, as the chamber of mines, we don’t really go into that detail with regard to actual figures. You would have to specifically talk to the mines themselves for that. We advocate for the industry as a whole, so maybe some personnel from AEM or Baffinland could answer that question more accurately.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) We will go first to Baffinland. Mr. Moore, to what extent does Baffinland pay territorial corporate income taxes to the Government of Nunavut? Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the question. Unfortunately I don’t have that information readily available. I can follow up with one of my finance colleagues and try to get the Committee a response before we close today. Thank you.

ᐃᓗᓕᖃᐅᑯᓘᔭᖅᑐᐊᓘᒐᓗᐊᖅ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᔪᒥᓂᐅᑉᐸᑕ, ᓄᖅᑲᖅᑐᕕᓂᕐᓗ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᒥᓂᐅᑉᐸᑕ, ᐊᑭᖏᑦ
ᐊᑦᑎᑦᓯᕚᓪᓕᖅᐸᑕ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑕᐃᒪ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖅᑳᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᔨᐅᕆᕕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒎᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅ.
ᖃᓄᖅᑑᕋᓱᑦᑎᒡᓗᒋᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐋᖅᑭᑦᓯᒪᔪᖃᖅᐸᒌᖅᑐᖅ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᑐᓵᔨᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓗᒋᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᖏᑦ ᓇᐃᓈᖅᓯᒪᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᖏᓪᓗᒍ.

ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᑦ ᖃᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᓄᑦ ᒥᔅ, ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᐅᑉ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᕋᑖᖅᑕᖓᓄᑦ. ᖃᓄᑎᒋᖑᑯᐊ
ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ
ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᒃᑭᐊ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐅᓪᓗᒥᐅᔪᖅ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᑕᐃᒪ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖑᓪᓗᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᐃᓗᓕᑯᓘᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᓗᐊᖃᑦᑕᓐᖏᓐᓇᑦᑕ, ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖏᓪᓕ
ᐅᖃᒡᓚᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᓪᓕ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐅᔭᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᐃᒻᒪᖄ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐸᕙᓐᓛᒃᑯᓐᓂ, ᐊᓂᒡᒎ ᐄᒍᒡᑯᓐᓂᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑭᐅᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᐹᕙᓐᓛᒃᑯᓐᓅᕐᓗᑕ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᒧᐊ ᖃᓄᑎᒋᖑᑯᐊ ᐹᕙᓐᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᒃᑯᑦ
ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᓅᖅᑲᐃᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒧᑦ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᒧᐊ.

ᒧᐊ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖕᓄᑦ. ᐊᐃᑦᑖᖑᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓈᓴᐅᑏᑦ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᑲᐅᑎᒋᓐᖏᓐᓇᒃᑭᑦ.
ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑕᒃᑲ ᑮᓇᐅᓕᕆᔨᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᒪᑐᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

20

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Yes, the Committee would appreciate that. We’re just trying to, I think, get to the bottom of the situation in terms of understanding where or in which jurisdiction your company pays corporate income taxes. I’ll turn that same question over to Agnico Eagle. Mr. Plante, to what extent does Agnico Eagle pay territorial corporate income taxes to the Government of Nunavut? Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will ask Alex Baltov to provide the exact figures.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Baltov.

Mr. Baltov: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can give you more specific information about the property taxes, about the corporate taxes and the other information in this regard, it will be probably given by written later, but that’s what I can say now. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Mr. McNamara, is there something you wanted to add?

Mr. McNamara: Yes, I would just like to say that Agnico pays very minimal corporate territorial income tax. We don’t pay income tax in any of the provinces currently just because of our tax pools. I believe, in a couple of years, we paid like a minimal amount, maybe it is $60,000 or something, but it’s not that it’s any different in Quebec; it just happens to be how our corporate income tax is right now.

As I think we have stated before, we have paid $92 million directly or indirectly to NTI for mining royalties and such. We are paying our tax up there, but currently we aren’t paying any federal corporate income tax either. Just to make it clear, it has nothing to

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃᑕᐅᖅ. ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᖁᔭᓕᒐᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᑖᔅᓱᒥᖓ. ᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑰᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓂᖓᓂᒃ, ᒪᑯᓄᖓ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᓱᒃᑐᑕ ᓇᐅᒃᑯᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂ ᓇᓕᐊᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑉᐸᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᐅᓪᓗᓯ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᓂᒡᒎ ᐄᒍᒡᑯᓐᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ ᖃᓄᑎᒋᖑᑯᐊ ᐊᓂᒡᒎ ᐄᒍᒡᑯᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᑦ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐄ, ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓂᑦ ᐱᓂᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ.

ᐹᓪᑖᕝ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᑦ, ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᓪᓗ
ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᓅᖓᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᐅᐊᑦᑎᐊᕈᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᑐᓂᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᒃᓯ. ᒫᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑕᑐᐊᕋ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᒥᔅᑕ ᒪᒃᓇᒫᕋ ᐃᓚᒋᐊᕈᒪᕋᑖᖅᐱᐅᒃ?

ᒪᒃᓇᒫᕋ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐄ. ᐅᖃᕈᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐊᓃᒡᒍ ᐊᑭᓕᕙ`ᒪᑦ ᖃᔅᓰᓐᓇᑯᓗᖕᓂᒃ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᔭᒃᓴᒧᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ. ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖏᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᒃᑲᑦᑕᓕ, ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᑦᑎᓄᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓂᒃ ᒪᕐᕉᓕᖅᑐᒃ $60,000−ᓂᖃᐃ ᐊᑭᓖᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ, ᓄᓇᖓᓂ ᑯᐸᐃᒃᒥ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᖏᓪᓗᓂᐅᖏᑦᑑᒐᓗᐊᖅ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᖑᔪᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᒃᓴᐅᔪᒃᓴᒧᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᓂᖏᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖅᑰᕐᒪ $92 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᓯᒪᓂᖏ ᓂᖏᖅᑎᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᓇᖔᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓪᓕ ᒐᕙᒪᑐᖃᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓐᑲᒻ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖏᑦᑐᑦ, ᑐᑭᓯᓇᑦᑎᐊᐃᒻᒪᑦ

21

do with Nunavut; it just has to do with corporate income tax, period.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Just for all the witnesses, just a reminder if you can end your statements with a “thank you” and it’s mostly for the camera operators or technical staff, so they know when to switch the audio feed. Mr. Qirngnuq.

Mr. Qirngnuq (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to welcome our guests once again today, as it is a brand-new day.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one question to pose today. The issue I want to query you upon relates to the previous question as I am unsure if I heard a response or not, but if you already answered it, please inform me. I will ask my question on this same issue, specifically to (interpretation ends) the Nunavut Chamber of Mines (interpretation) regarding their submission. In order to be completely clear, I will ask my question in English, Mr. Chairman.

(interpretation ends) To what extent was the chamber’s submission to the Standing Committee reviewed by mining companies that are currently active in Nunavut, including Agnico Eagle Mines and Baffinland Iron Mines? (interpretation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Member, for that question. I’ll divert that question on to our chamber president, if you don’t mind, Member.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Armstrong.

ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒧᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᖏᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᒃᑐᖅ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓐᑲᒻ ᑖᒃᓯᖏᓐᓄᑐᐊᖅ ᑐᕌᖓᔪᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐊᓯᕗᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᓱᓕᒋᐊᕌᖓᔅᓯ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᑦᑕᕐᓗᓯ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐊᔾᔨᓕᐅᕈᑎᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨᕗᑦ ᓇᕿᑦᑕᐃᔨᓄᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᓕᐊᓐᓂᒃ ᓇᕿᑦᑎᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᕐᒥᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᕿᓐᖑᖅ.

ᕿᓐᖑᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᓖᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᓐᖓᓱᕝᕕᓕᑦ ᐅᑉᓗᒥ ᓄᑖᑉᑎᐊᕙᖕᒥᑦ
ᐅᑉᓗᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᒐᑉᑕ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᐊᑕᐅᓯᕐᓄᐊᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᖃᕋᒪ, ᐅᓇ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋ ᑐᓵᕆᐊᖅᑰᖏ’ᓇᒃᑯ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑭᐅᔭᐅᓐᓂᖅᐸᑦ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᑎᓐᓂᐊᕋᒪ ᐊᐱᕆᓂᐊᖅᑯᖓ. ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᓱᓕ ᐅᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ chamber of mines ᑕᑕᑎᖅᑕᕕᓂᐊᑕ

ᐃᓗᐊᓂ, ᑐᑭᓯᓐᓇᑦᓯᐊᕐᓂᐊᕋᒪ ᖃᑉᓗᓈᑑᕐᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓂᐊᖅᐸᕋ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖃᓄᑎᒋᓄᑯᐊ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᑐᓂᓚᐅᖅᑕᖓ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᒧᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᐹᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᐅᓚᔪᓂᒃ, ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔪᓂ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍ, ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᓪᓗ? (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖓᓄᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑐᓂᖔᕈᒪᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᖏᔪᖅᑳᒧᑦ ᓱᖁᑎᒃᓴᖏᒃᑯᕕᑦ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ.

22

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually I’m not 100 percent sure. The submission was prepared by our executive director, Tom Hoefer, who was not able to make the hearing today. I would expect that it would have been shared with both Agnico Eagle and Baffinland Iron Mines for information purposes. I don’t know whether there were comments shared. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: I just wanted to add that yes, the submission was submitted to Mr. Baldwin and copies were distributed to the board in both official languages and there are copies available for everyone. Anybody that would like extra copies of our submission, I can certainly email copies of that submission to you as well. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Qirngnuq.

Mr. Qirngnuq (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, the earlier response to the question did not identify that amount, or at least that was conveyed in the response albeit it was already provided earlier. I would like to understand when this announcement would be made public, and since my question I wanted to raise is already provided, then, Mr. Chairman, that is fine and I have no further questions. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. Mr. Main touched on it for a second there. The Government of Nunavut once upon a time used to offer a fuel tax rebate, but it was removed in one of the past Assemblies.

ᐋᒻᓯᑐᕌᖕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓪᓚᑦᑖᖏᑦᑕᕋ ᑖᓐᓇ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᑖᒻ ᕉᕗ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᕐᒪᑦ.
ᓂᕆᐅᒋᒐᔭᖅᑕᕋᓕ ᐊᒥᖅᑳᖅᑕᐅᒐᔭᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᒪᕐᒥᒃ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ, ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᓐᓄᓪᓗ
ᑐᓴᐅᒪᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖏᑦ

ᐊᒥᖅᑳᕐᓂᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᖏᑦᑐᖓ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐃᓚᒋᐊᕈᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕋ. ᐄ, ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᒥᔅᑕ ᕚᑦᕆᓐ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᖏᑦ ᑐᓂᐅᖅᑲᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᓴᕆᔭᐅᓯᔪᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᓂᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᖃᐅᖅᑐᖁᖅ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ. ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᔪᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᒃᓯᐅᑎᔪᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᖅᑕᒃᑲ ᐃᓕᓐᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᕿᓐᖑᖅ.

ᕿᓐᖑᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᓖᒃ. ᐅᐊᑦᑎᐊ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᖏᓐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒐᓗᐊᕐᒪᑦ ᓱᓇᐅᕝᕙ

ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔫᒐᓗᐊᖅ, ᑐᑭᓯᔪᒪᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᑯᒍᑦ ᑐᓴᖅᓴᐅᓂᐊᕆᐊᒃᓵᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋᓗᐊᕋ ᑭᐅᔭᐅᑐᐊᕐᒪᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᖏᑦᑐᖅ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᓯᐊᓂᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᖃᕇᖅᑐᖓ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓘᓐᓇᓯ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᒪᐃᓐ
ᓂᓪᓕᐅᑎᒋᒐᓛᖅᑲᐅᔭᕋᓗᐊᖓ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᐅᑎᕕᓂᕐᓂᒃ
ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᑭᖑᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ.

23

Thinking back, using Agnico Eagle as an example, they had to build everything; the road, the mine site itself, municipal infrastructure, and whatnot and they also had to pay payroll tax and royalties on top as that as well. Thinking more and more, at what point is too much is what I’m worried about. There is no infrastructure. The mines have to do everything all on their own. The Government of Nunavut, I believe, was supposed to set up a different program after they removed the fuel tax rebates. I believe that we should be more welcoming, I think, for the industry. There is nothing out there for the smaller communities for employment.

I’m wondering: does the Minister have any… ? What’s her perspective on this whole situation? I’m afraid that we’re going too far. I’m just wondering what the Minister’s perspective is on the whole situation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is just for existing taxes on properties. Through you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Seeley can elaborate more on my comment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Seeley.

Mr. Seeley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister and the Member, for his question. Just to elaborate a wee bit on the Minister’s comment, the matter regarding the Property Assessment and Taxation Act and the bill that’s sitting with the Committee right now is in relation to existing property assessment taxes. These are the same taxes that have been levied through the existing legislation for some years now and have been paid by the mining operation in Baker Lake

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍ ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᑭᓱᓕᒫᑦᑎᐊᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᓯᐅᖅᖢᑎᒃ ᑭᓱᓕᒫᑦᑎᐊᓂᒃ ᓴᓇᔭᕆᐊᖃᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᒪᑯᐊᓗ ᐃᒥᖃᐅᑎᖃᕐᕖᑦ, ᑭᓈᓗᖃᕐᕖᑦ, ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᒃᓵᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᔮᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᓂᖏᖅᑕᐅᑎᓂᒡᓗ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᖓᓕ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑦᑎᓗᐊᓕᖅᑐᒎᓚᓇᔭᖅᐱᓯ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐃᒻᒥᒃᑯᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᐅᓚᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᔭᕆᐊᖃᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᖕᓂᒃ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓘᑉ ᐊᑭᖏᓐᓂᒃ
ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑦᑎᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕆᐊᓖᑦ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᑐᓐᖓᓱᑦᑎᓐᓂᖅᓴᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕋᓗᐊᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ. ᑭᓱᑕᔮᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᐊᓛᖑᓂᖅᓴᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᑯᖓ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕆᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᓗᑎᐅᖕᒪᑕ.

ᒥᓂᔅᑕᖃᐃ ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᕚᒃ? ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᑎᑦᑎᓗᐊᖅᑖᓗᒋᖅᑰᓕᕋᑦᑎᒃᑯᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᒪᑖᒻ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᒫᓐᓇ ᐱᖁᑎᓪᓚᕆᖕᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᔭᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᒍᑦ, ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ, ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐅᐃᒍᓗᓂᒋᑦ

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᑲ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ.

ᓰᓕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᒻᒪᒍ ᐃᓚᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᒍ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖓᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᓵᔅᓯᓐᓃᑦᑐᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓᔅᓴᐃᓐᓇᖅ
ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᑎᑦᑎᓯᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᖢᒍᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᒐᓴᖕᓄᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᖃᒪᓂᑦᑐᐊᖅ ᖃᓂᖏᔮᓂ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᖏᓐᓇᖅᖢᓂ,

24

throughout that time. This does not constitute an escalation or the introduction of a new tax or revenue stream for the Government of Nunavut.

To the Member’s question, this not an escalation of the situation. This is, I guess, a revision to the existing taxation plan. I hope that helps answer the Member’s question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister Ehaloak and Mr. Seeley, for the response. Moving on, looking at the submissions from Baffinland and Agnico Eagle, I find it interesting that Agnico Eagle is fine with its property tax and Baffinland isn’t; they’re both operating mines. I’m wondering if I can get the chamber’s perspective, I guess, on that. They’re both operating mines, but one mining company is willing to pay the property tax and the other isn’t, and that’s kind of concerning for me because, again, there is no employment in the smaller communities and if one shuts down, that’s a lot of lost jobs. I’m wondering if I can get the chamber’s perspective on the two different mining companies. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Member, for that question. I guess the difference is Baffinland is involved in a tribunal with the GN and AEM is not, so that’s the short version of the question, and you’re right; if there are some issues, again, it would really be difficult to deal with, but as far as employment is concerned itself, like I said, the chamber usually advocates for the industry as a whole on anything direct like employment figures. You would have to go

ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕆᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᓄᑖᓂᒡᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖏᖦᖢᑕ.

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕆᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᓂᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᑯᐊ ᐅᑐᖅᑐᑦ, ᑭᐅᕗᖓᖃᐃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ ᑭᐅᖕᒪᑎᒃ. ᐊᓯᐊᓅᕐᓗᖓ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᑦ ᐅᑯᐊ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᕕᓃᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᓂᑦ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒻᒥᓪᓗ ᑎᑎᕋᓚᐅᖅᑕᖏᑦ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓴᕈᒥᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍ ᖃᓄᐃᒃᓴᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑕᐅᓂᕐᒥᓂᒃ, ᓄᓘᔮᑦ ᖁᕕᐊᓲᑎᖃᕐᓇᑎᒃ. ᑕᒪᒃᑮᓄᑯᐊ ᒪᑐᐃᖓᔪᒃ ᐃᒻᒪᖄ ᐅᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᒍᑦᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᒻᒪᖔᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑕᒪᒃᑮᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᖅᕖᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᖕᒪᑎ, ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖅ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᔪᒪᓪᓗᓂ ᐱᖃᑖ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᔪᒪᖏᖦᖢᓂ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᒋᔭᕋ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᓕᐊᓛᒃ, ᓄᓇᓕᐊᓛᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖅᑕᖃᖏᒻᒪᑦ. ᓇᓕᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᒪᑐᒃᐸᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᑦ ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑲᓪᓚᐃᑦ ᔭᒐᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ. ᖃᓄᕐᓕᑭᐊᖅ ᐅᑯᓄᖓ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᕙᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔭᖕᓂ.
ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᓐᓂᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᓂᒃᑯᐊ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊᓕ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᖏᒃᖢᑎᒃ. ᐄ, ᐊᑕᐅᖏᓕᐅᕈᑎᖃᖅᑐᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᔭᕐᓂᖏᑦᑑᓇᔭᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᒃᓱᕉᑎᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᓇᐅᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇ
ᐃᑲᔪᒃᑲᓐᓂᕋᓱᒃᖢᒋᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖅᑎᒍᑦ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᐱᕆᖔᕆᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑕᓯ

25

specifically to the mines for that, so if I can get my colleagues at BIM or AEM to respond to the Member’s question, it would be great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Member.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I’ll leave it to Mr. Simailak if he wants to direct his questions to either of the mining companies present. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was going to ask the two mining companies for their thoughts or for their answers. I was going to direct the question to them next. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Mr. Simailak, do you want to maybe rephrase your question or just restate it for their benefit? Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In both their submissions, Baffinland and Agnico Eagle, one mining company was fine with paying property tax and the other wasn’t. Agnico is fine with paying property tax; Baffinland isn’t, and I’m wondering why. What was their perspective on that? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) We will go to Agnico Eagle first. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the question. As stated earlier, our intent is not to fight or to contest the tax rate. Obviously, operating in remote operations is costly and as you know, operations don’t last forever and Meadowbank or Amaruq operation right now has a pretty short life of a mine and anything we can do with controlling the costs would help extending the life of mines, but at this

ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖓ, ᑕᐃᒪ ᓄᓘᔮᓂ ᓴᕕᕋᔭᒃᓴᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᓪᑯᑦ ᑭᐅᒍᓐᓇᖅᐸᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᑉ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖓᓄᑦ

ᐱᐅᒐᔭᖅᑐᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ ᓇᓕᐊᖕᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᒃᐸᐅᒃ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᑎᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐄ, ᐊᐱᕆᓂᐊᖅᑲᐅᔭᒃᑲ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᖅᕖᒃ ᒪᕐᕉᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᖕᒪᖔᖏᑦ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᑐᕌᖅᑎᓐᓂᐊᓕᖅᑲᐅᔭᒃᑲ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᐊᑏ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔭᐃᑦ ᐅᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓗᒍᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑐᕌᖅᑎᖔᓕᕐᓗᒍ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓘᔮᓐᓂ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒥᓪᓗ ᐱᖃᑖ ᖃᓄᐃᒃᓴᕋᓂ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᒋᐊᒃᓴᖅ, ᐱᖃᑖ ᓄᓘᔮᒃ ᐊᑲᖅᓴᖏᖦᖢᑎᒃ. ᑭᓱᒥᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᖃᖅᖢᑎᒃ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᕙᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᓗᒍ, ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔭᖕᓂ. ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒐᒪ ᑭᓱᒥ

ᐊᑭᕋᖅᑐᕐᓗᑕᐅᓇᓱᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ, ᐃᓄᐃᓪᓚᒥ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓪᓗᓂ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅᑐᕐᔪᐊᒻᒪᕆᐊᓘᖕᒪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑕᐃᒪᖓᓕᒫᖅ ᒪᑭᑕᐃᓐᓇᓕᕐᓗᓂᐅᔾᔮᖏᖦᖢᑎᒃ ᐃᓚᖏᓪᓗ ᕿᓚᒥᑯᓗᒃ ᒪᑭᑕᓚᐅᑲᖃᑦᑕᖅᖢᑎᒃ. ᒫᓐᓇᐅᔪᖅ

26

point there is no point for us to contest the actual tax with the GN.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Over to Baffinland, Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Simailak, for the question. I think, as I said in my opening statement yesterday, Baffinland has paid payroll tax and fuel tax, well over $15 million for a fairly young operation.

Unlike Agnico Eagle, Baffinland is a single mine, single operator. We have one project. We don’t have multiple mining projects globally like Agnico Eagle does or other miners, for that matter, that operate in remote jurisdictions. For us, if our project is doing poorly, that is, to say if commodity prices fall and as we have seen with the iron ore price market recently, prices stood very good, but the same month that the project was approved to proceed, the price of iron ore fell dramatically in 2013 to a historical low, which wasn’t expected to happen. Baffinland has been very open and clear about its financial struggles. Trying to operate a bulk commodity mine in the High Arctic, we have learned a lot in the seven or eight years that we have been in operation.

To your direct question, I don’t think that Baffinland has ever said that it has a problem paying property tax. What Baffinland has said, in my submission at the beginning, is that we would suggest to the Committee that section 48(10) of the bill does require some further amendment or explaining.

As the Minister discussed this morning and as many other witnesses have said this morning and yesterday, the tribunal hearing that’s going on, Baffinland is in support of the appellant, in that case being the Qikiqtani

ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᓂᕆᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᕗᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᒋᓐᖏᑕᕗᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᓄᓘᔮᖕᓄᑦ ᒥᔅ ᒧᐊ.

ᒧᐊ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔭᖕᓂ. ᒪᑐᐃᖅᓯᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ ᐃᑉᐸᒃᓴᖅ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᕋᒪ ᓄᓘᔮᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᓐᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᓯᔪᑦ $15 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ ᐅᖓᑖᓃᓕᖅᑐᑦ. ᐱᒋᐊᓕᓵᖅᑰᔨᖅᑲᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᓪᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᓪᓗᑎᒃ, ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖏᑦᑑᖏᒻᒪᑕ. ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᓕ ᐅᓄᕈᓘᔭᖅᖢᑎᒃ
ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᓇᓂᕈᓘᔭᖅ. ᐅᕙᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᒪᑭᑦᑎᐊᖏᒃᑯᑦᑕ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᒪᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓴᐃᑦ

ᐊᑭᒡᓕᒋᐊᕐᓂᖅᐸᑕ, ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᑭᑐᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ 2013 ᑲᑕᑲᓪᓚᒃᑐᐊᓘᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓴᐃᑦ. ᓄᓘᔮᑦ ᒪᑐᐃᖓᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᒻᒪᖔᖏᑦ ᑕᒫᓂ ᐅᑭᐅᖅᑕᖅᑐᒥ ᐃᓕᑉᐹᓕᐅᑎᒋᓪᓚᕆᒃᖢᑎᒃᑯᓪᓗ. ᐊᕐᕌᒍᒐᓴᖕᓄᑦ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᓕᕋᑦᑕ.

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᑭᐅᒋᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅ ᐱᐅᒋᓐᖏᑕᕘᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᓐᒃᓂ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᐃᓚᖓ 48, ᐃᓚᒃᑲᓐᓂᖓ 10, ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᕆᐊᓖᑦ
ᐅᓂᒃᑳᐅᓯᕆᔭᐅᓗᓂᓗ.

ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᖕᒪᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒡᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ

ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᖃᐃᖁᓯᒪᔭᕗᑦ, ᒫᓐᓇ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑎᒎᖅᑎᑕᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᓄᓘᔮᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᖓ. ᕿᑭᖅᑕᓂ

27

Inuit Association, Baffinland is the leasehold owner, so we are supportive of the arguments that have been made before that tribunal, but it isn’t to say that Baffinland is not in favour of paying property taxes; that’s to say we want to make sure that it’s being done in a way that is consistent with the Nunavut Agreement and consistent with the Property Tax Assessment Act.

That’s where we are now. Baffinland continues to employ Nunavummiut. We have over 227 Inuit working at Mary River as of May. This was a dramatic drop from the over 400 Inuit employed at the Mary River project in 2019, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. We have provided tens of millions of dollars of wages to each community annually since we began operations.

When you take the whole package together, Baffinland, just like other miners, is just doing as much as they can to support communities, create opportunities, while working with our partner and the government in order to make sure that the property tax assessments are done fairly and in line with the intent of Bill 55 and the Property Tax Assessment Act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you to Agnico and Baffinland for their responses. Moving on, my next question is for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. In your submission to the Standing Committee of December 9, 2020, you describe Inuit-owned lands as having “unique and public characteristics.” However, other publications issued by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association describe the organizations as being private landowners. Can you clearly explain Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated’s position regarding the status of Inuit-owned

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᒌᖑᓪᓗᑎᒃ, ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑎᐅᖕᒪᑕ. ᓄᓘᔮᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᓪᓚᕆᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᔪᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᖁᔭᕗᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᕈᑏᑦ ᐃᓗᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᒫᓐᓇ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑕᒫᓃᑉᐳᒍᑦ, ᓄᓘᔮᑦ 227 ᐃᓄᖕᓂᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᒍᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᓐᓂ, ᒪᐃᒧᑦ ᑎᑭᖦᖢᒍ
ᐅᓄᕈᓐᓃᑲᓪᓚᒃᑐᐊᓗᐃᑦ 400-
ᖏᓐᓃᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᑕ. 2019 400ᖏᓐᓃᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᕙᒡᔪᐊᕐᓇᖅ ᑎᑭᓚᐅᖅᑎᓐᓇᒍ. ᖃᔅᓯ ᒥᓕᐊᕌᓗᖕᓂᒃ ᑮᓐᓇᐅᔾᔭᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᖓᓂᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓘᓐᓇᖏᑦ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᒃ ᑕᐃᒫᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᒥᑐᑦ ᐱᕚᓪᓕᐅᑎᓪᓚᕆᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᐱᖁᑎᓪᓚᕆᖕᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ
ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55ᒥ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕖᒃ. ᐅᓇ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓕᕐᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ

ᑐᕌᖅᑎᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋ, ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᓚᐅᖅᑕᖏᑦ ᑎᓴᒻᐸ 9, 2020ᒥ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᑎᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᖏᒻᒪᑕᒎᖅ, ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᓂᒃᑯᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊᒎᖅ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᕆᔭᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᐃᑦ. ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᔪᓐᓇᖅᐲᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ

28

lands in Nunavut? Are they private or are they public? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Kotierk.

Ms. Kotierk (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (interpretation ends)
Qujannamiiglu, Member Simailak. Thank you for raising that question about the differences between private landowner and public landowner. I think Inuit take great pride in the accomplishments that we were able to achieve through negotiators to create Nunavut, and we take great pride in being the largest private landowner as indigenous peoples across this globe. That does not change.

All the work we do is to implement fully and effectively the Nunavut Agreement, the 42 articles in our agreement, and we work hard to advocate that governments uphold and implement the agreement and all the obligations outlined in there.

Having said that, there are circumstances where, and as organizations advocating for the collective Inuit population of Nunavut, we take a public approach and we are assessed as public entities. This is described in our joint submission, as you indicated, December 9, 2020. On page 5 we provide examples where, under the Canada Income Tax Act, we are assessed as a public body. Through the Nunavut Court of Justice, for the circumstances of elections, we are also given the legal status of a public body. I appreciate that the comments have been repeatedly that this is a complex issue, and I don’t think it is a matter of whether or not we are private landowners or public landowners. Under different circumstances, we are assessed in different ways.

The other example we provide are public partnership approaches. We are also assessed

ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᕆᔭᐅᕙᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᐸ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ.

ᑰᑦᑎᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᓗ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᒐᖕᓂ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᕆᔭᐅᖕᒪᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᑦ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐅᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐋᔩᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒥ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᐱᒋᓪᓚᕆᒃᑐᒍᑦ ᐊᖏᓂᖅᐹᓂᒃ ᐊᖏᓂᖅᐹᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᑖᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑳᖅᓯᒪᔪᓕᒫᓂᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓱᕐᕋᐃᖏᑦᑐᖅ.

ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᓕᒫᕗᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᖢᑎᒍᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ 42 ᐊᖏᕈᑏᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᔭᐃᓐᓇᕆᔭᕗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᖁᔨᕗᒍᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᓂᒡᓗ ᐃᓕᐅᖃᐃᖁᔨᕗᒍᑦ ᑭᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᑎᓪᓗᖓ, ᑎᒥᐅᔪᖅ ᑭᒡᒐᖅᑐᖅᑎᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᐃᓄᓕᒫᓂᒃ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓂᖓᓕᒫᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᓪᓗᑕ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᓲᖑᔪᒍᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᐅᓯᕆᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᓚᐅᖅᑕᑦᑎᓐᓂᑦ ᑎᓴᒻᐸ 9, 2020ᒥ ᒪᒃᐱᖅᑐᒐᖅ 5ᒥ ᐆᒃᑑᓯᐅᖅᓯᒪᕗᒍᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓄᓇᕗᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖓᓐᓂᒃ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓄᖓᓕᒫᖅ
ᑎᒥᖑᖅᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒐᑦᑕ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔨᑦᑎᒍᓪᓗ

ᐄᑦᑕᐅᖅ, ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑎᒥᓐᖑᖅᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᓂᕋᖅᑐᒍᑦ. ᐃ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓂᓪᓕᐅᑎᒋᔭᐅᖏᓐᓇᕐᒪᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᔭᕐᓂᖅᑐᑯᓘᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᖅᑎᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᖓᓕᒫᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᑕᑯᓐᓇᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᒍᑦ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑰᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑎᒥᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᐊᔭᐅᖅᑐᐃᓂᐊᕐᓗᑕ

29

as and we have been added as a public entity to advocate for the public collective of Inuit. I think it’s important in when we’re discussing Bill 55 what we’re advocating for as Inuit organizations is that similar to the way in which the Crown is assessed and similar to the way in which the real property taxation definition is included, that Nunavut Inuit organizations are not assessed as private landowners but given the same footing as government landowners.

We recognize that landowners pay taxes, but we also think that it doesn’t make any sense for the landowner to be paying for the mining improvements on the land that they’re leasing, and we are very concerned that that is the approach that the Government of Nunavut wants to take and I would like to point out to date, in the Kitikmeot and the Kivalliq, for the mines that are currently existing in those regions, mining companies are directly taxed by the Government of Nunavut, and this occurred in the Qikiqtaaluk with Baffinland until 2014. We know that the Government of Nunavut can choose to continue in that process and collect the property taxes directly from the mining companies. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Back to you, Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, President Kotierk, for your response. My next question is the same to Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. It appears that although Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated wants to have certain benefits of landownership, including the ability to receive royalties from mining activities on Inuit-owned lands, it also appears reluctant to assume some of the risks of landownership, including the risk of mining companies going bankrupt and owing property taxes to the government. Is this a fair description of

ᐃᓘᓐᓇᖏᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓗᒋᑦ. ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓱᒋᔭᕋᐃᓛᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᑎᓪᓗᑎᒍᑦ ᑭᓱᓂᒃ ᑐᔅᓯᕋᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᐊᔭᐅᕆᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑕ. ᐊᔾᔨᐸᓗᖓᓂᒃ ᑯᐃᓐ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖓ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᖓᑦ. ᐊᔾᔨᐸᓗᖓᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᐃᑦ ᐃᓪᓗᓕᐅᕐᕕᐅᓲᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᑎᔭᐅᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᕙᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᖅᑎᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ. ᒐᕙᒪᑎᑐᑦ ᑕᑯᓐᓈᖅᑕᐅᓲᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᒥ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ.

ᑕᐃᒫᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᑐᒋᖏᓐᓇᑦᑎᒍᑦ
ᑐᑭᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᒋᖏᓐᓇᑦᑎᒍᓪᓕ ᓄᓇᒥ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖁᑎᓖᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓄᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒐᐃᑉᐸᑕ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᓕᒃ ᐊᑭᓖᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓗᓂ ᑖᒃᓯᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᒃ ᑖᓐᓇ ᑕᕝᕙ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᒐᓱᐊᕐᖓᑦ. ᐅᓪᓗᒥᒧᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᕿᑎᕐᒥᐅᓂ ᑭᕙᓪᓕᕐᒥᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂᓕ ᐊᐅᓚᔪᓂᒃ ᑕᐅᓇᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᔭᐃᔭᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᓄᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪ ᕿᑭᖅᑖᓗᒻᒥ
ᑕᐃᒪᐃᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ 2014ᕈᕋᓱᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂ ᓄᓘᔮᖕᓂ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᖓ ᑲᔪᓯᒍᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᐸᓚᐅᖅᑕᒥᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ ᑖᒃᓯᔭᐃᔭᐃᖅᑎᑦᑎᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓗᓂ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᓚᐃᒪᒃ ᐃᓕᓐᓄᑲᓐᓂᖅ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ ᑭᐅᒐᕕᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ. ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒐ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ. ᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᔪᕐᔫᔮᕐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᓇᒥᓂᒃ ᐃᑲᔫᓯᐊᖑᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐱᒍᒪᑦᑕᖁᐃᑦ
ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕈᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᒪᐃᑦᑐᕐᔫᔮᕐᒥᔪᖅ
ᐊᑦᑕᓇᖅᑐᒦᒍᓐᓇᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᒥ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖅᑎᐅᓗᓂ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᕈᒪᔫᔮᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᑲᑕᓐᓂᖃᑕ ᐊᑭᓕᔅᓴᓂᑦᑕᐱᐊᕐᖓᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐅᕐᕖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ.

30

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated’s position? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Kotierk.

Ms. Kotierk (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also thank Member Simailak for his question. (interpretation ends) If I have given the impression that it is an appearance, I need to apologize for that. I want to be clear that we do have real concerns that our mineral title for subsurface will be the difference between whether or not Inuit organizations would be liable for the property assessment tax for that parcel of land.

As Inuit organizations, as designated Inuit organizations, we are responsible and the constituents that we have are the collective Inuit who are also the constituents of the Government of Nunavut, and as such, we have great concern that Inuit would be put on the hook of having to pay taxes.

I would like to point out that yesterday I talked a little bit about how, as Inuit negotiating the Nunavut Agreement, we gave up aboriginal title and, in lieu of that, got the obligations outlined in the Nunavut Agreement, which also include the discussion and the benefits of having Inuit-owned lands, of which 18 percent of the Nunavut Settlement Area is collectively owned by Inuit. It is true that we expect to receive royalties. It is an obligation that Inuit impact and benefit agreements are in place before major projects occur in the Nunavut Settlement Area, and we will maintain that because it is outlined in our Nunavut Agreement.

It is also true that we will advocate strongly that Inuit are not held liable for the costs incurred due to improvements on the parcels of Inuit-owned land that we own. I hope that

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᓪᓚᕆᑉᐹᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ.

ᑰᑦᑎᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᓗ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᒪᑦ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᑕᐃᒪ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓐᓂᕈᒪᐃᓛᒃ ᒪᒥᐊᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᖓ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓐᓂᕈᒪ. ᑐᑭᓯᓇᑦᑎᐊᕈᒪᔪᖓ.
ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᓪᓚᕆᖃᕋᑦᑕ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓃᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐱᖃᕐᓂᕗᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᔾᔪᑎᐅᓂᐊᕐᖓᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕆᐊᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᐊᖃᑕᓘᓐᓃᑦ, ᐄᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐋᒡᒐᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑕᐃᔅᓱᒪ ᓄᓇᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᔪᒧᑦ.

ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓪᓗᑕ ᐃᓕᓴᕆᔭᐅᓯᒪᓪᓗᑕ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᑲᒪᒋᐊᖃᕋᑦᑕ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒋᓯᒪᔭᕗᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒋᔭᐅᓯᓐᓈᒥᒻᒪᑕᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᓄᓇᕘᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᑦᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᖃᓪᓚᕆᑉᐳᒍᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᐊᑭᓖᒋᐊᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᖓᑕ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ.

ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐅᖃᕈᒪᔪᖓ, ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᕋᒪ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ, ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑳᖅᑐᒥᓂᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᑐᓂᕐᕈᑎᖃᓚᐅᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐱᖃᕐᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑕᕝᕘᓇ ᐱᓂᐊᖅᑕᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᔪᖃᕈᓐᓇᔪᔪᖅ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐃᑲᔫᓯᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ 18 ᐳᓴᓐᑎᖓᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᓪᓕ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᕆᔭᐅᒻᒪᑦ. ᓱᓕᔪᖅ ᓂᕆᐅᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᒋᓪᓗᑕ. ᐅᑎᖅᑐᓴᖅᑖᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᒋᓪᓗᑕ. ᐃᓄᐃᓪᓗ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᓯᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓕᐅᖅᑳᖅᓯᒪᖃᑦᑕᕐᖓᑕ
ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᖅᑎᑦᑏᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᓂᐊᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᒻᒪᑦ.

ᓱᓕᒻᒥᔪᖅᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᔭᐅᕆᖃᑦᑕᓂᐊᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᖁᓇᒋᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᕆᐊᓕᓐᓄᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᐅᒐᓗᐊᖅ.

31

is clear and that there is no appearance of that. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Mr. Simailak indicates that he’s done. (interpretation ends) Maybe just to follow up on that question, Ms. Kotierk, if you don’t mind, when we compare surface parcels of land and subsurface, I wonder if you can describe, in terms of royalties or other financial benefits that flow to Inuit organization, what the difference is between surface parcels and subsurface parcels. Ms. Kotierk.

Ms. Kotierk (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (interpretation ends) I will provide a broad statement and then, if you don’t mind, I will ask Carson Gillis, who is very intimately aware of the details in our mineral exploration agreements, to speak to this.

First, I want to state that the parcels of land, the Inuit-owned land across the territory, many of them are different. For instance, we have been using the Baffinland Mary River project as an example and that is a grandfathered parcel of land. Although the expectation is that one day, Inuit organizations will receive royalties from that project, because it is a grandfathered parcel of land, which means that the Government of Canada is the one who administers royalties, only after operational and capital costs have been deducted, the expectation is that Inuit organizations will not be receiving any royalties until 2030.

I wanted to highlight that, but I also want to highlight, because I think often there are discussions broadly about royalties, so that is in terms of royalties and then there are also benefits that are borne out of the Inuit impact and benefit agreements, and I think sometimes the monetary benefits outlined in the Inuit impact and benefit agreements are culminated together and in the general public mind,

ᑐᑭᓯᓇᑦᑎᐊᕋᓗᐊᖁᖓᖃᐃ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᑕᐃᒫᕐᓂᕋᕐᒪᑦ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᐊᐱᕆᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓗᖓ ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᔅᓴᖏᒃᑯᔅᓯ. ᓴᓂᓕᕇᑦᑎᑯᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᐃᑦ ᖄᖏᓐᓇᖏᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᑭᐊᖏᓪᓗ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᐃᑦ, ᐅᓂᒃᑳᕆᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᕿᐅᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᓴᖅᑖᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᓐᓂᖃᖃᑦ? ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᖄᖏᓐᓇᖏᓐᓂ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖃᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖃᑕ? ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ.

ᑰᑦᑎᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᓇᓗᓇᐃᑐᐃᓐᓇᖑᓱᑉᐸᕋ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑳᓴᓐ ᒋᓕᔅᒧᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᔭᕋ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑦᑎᐊᓪᓚᕆᒻᒪᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᓄᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓂᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ.

ᐅᖃᖅᑳᕈᒪᔪᖓᓕ ᓄᓇᑕᖃᕐᖓᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑑᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᒐᓛᓗᐃᑦ. ᐊᑐᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᑖᕙᓐᓇ ᓄᓘᔮᓕᕆᕕᒃ ᐆᑦᑑᑎᒋᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑖᓐᓇᓗ ᓄᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᑦᑎᒍᑦ. ᓂᕆᐅᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᖃᖓᑭᐊᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ

ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓛᖁᓪᓗᑎᒍᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ, ᑖᓐᓇᓕ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂᑦ
ᓂᐅᕕᐊᖑᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᑐᑭᖃᖁᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑦᑕ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᑦᓴᖏᑦ ᐱᔭᑐᐊᕆᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᐃᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᑭᑐᔪᑦ ᐃᓕᐅᖅᑲᐃᔾᔪᑎᒥᓃᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑕᐅᑉᐸᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓕᕈᒫᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ. ᒫᓐᓇᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᔾᔮᖏᑦᑐᑦ. 2030ᒥ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓕᕈᒫᖅᑐᑦ.

ᑖᓐᓇ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᓪᓚᕆᖁᔭᕋ ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ
ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᓪᓚᕆᖁᒻᒥᔭᕋ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᓲᖑᒻᒪᑦ, ᒪᑯᐊ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᔅᓴᐃᑦ (ᓂᖏᖅᑕᕈᑏᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂ) ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐊᒥᓂᕐᓂᖔᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᓯᐊᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᖃᑦᑕᓲᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓂ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᕆᒐᔭᖅᑕᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓂᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪ ᑲᑎᕈᓘᔭᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓄᖓ

32

they’re seen as one. I think it’s important that there is clarity about the difference sources of funds and where they come from.

If you’re okay with it, Mr. Chairman, I would ask Carson Gillis to talk a little bit in response to your question. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Going to Cambridge Bay, Mr. Gillis.

Mr. Gillis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the Nunavut Agreement, NTI was granted title to minerals and petroleum on 158 parcels of Inuit-owned lands on behalf of Inuit of Nunavut. Those 158 parcels of mineral title lands make up about 1.8 percent of the mineral title in Nunavut, but the Government of Canada holds 98.2 percent of the mineral title in Nunavut. NTI refers to these lands as subsurface IOL. It receives various fees, rentals, and other payments from companies that carry out exploration for minerals.

If the companies are successful and proceed to build and operate a mine, NTI receives royalties from these operations. NTI enters into two types of agreements with companies that wish to explore for or mine minerals on subsurface Inuit-owned lands: the Inuit-owned lands mineral exploration agreement and the Inuit-owned lands mineral production lease. NTI receives various types of revenue from each of these subsurface rights, ranging from annual rents, administrative fees, bonus payments, and of course the royalties.

There are areas that are subject to mineral rights that were in place before the Nunavut Agreement came into effect. These lands are referred to as grandfathered rights. Although NTI holds the mineral title to these lands, these 158 mineral leases are administered by Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada in accordance with the Nunavut Mining Regulations. Indigenous and Northern Affairs

ᑕᑯᓐᓈᖅᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᑎᑕᐅᔮᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᐃᓱᒪᖏᑎᒍᑦ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᐊ. ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᓕᐅᒐᓗᐊᑦ.

ᖃᓄᐃᔅᓴᖏᒃᑯᕕᑦ ᑳᓴᓐ ᒋᓕᔅᒧᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑎᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᒐᓗᐊᕋᒃᑯ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑏᓂᓛᒃ ᑭᐅᒐᓱᓪᓗᒍ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ, ᐃᖃᓗᒃᑑᑦᓯᐊᕐᒧᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᒋᓕᔅ.

ᒋᓕᔅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᐅᑉ ᐊᑖᒍᑦ, ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᐊᑎᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᓂᒃ
ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᓂᒃ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᓂᓪᓗ 158ᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑕᐃᑦ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ 158 ᓄᓇᐃᑦ
ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᐅᔪᐃᑦ 1.8%ᒋᔭᖏᑦ
ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᓕᒫᑦ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᒐᕙᒪᖓ 98.2%ᒥᑦ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᖅᑐᐃᑦ
ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ.

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓪᓕ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑐᐃᑦ, ᓄᓇᓂ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᑐᓂᑦ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᖃᖃᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑕᒪᐅᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖅᑕᐅᑎᑦᑎᒍᓐᓇᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᕿᓂᕐᕕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᓖᑦ ᓇᓂᓯᑉᐸᑕ ᓴᓇᓕᕐᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᒻᒥᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓲᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖏᓐᓂᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᒪᕐᕉᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑑᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓕᐅᓲᑦ ᐅᔭᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᕿᓂᕈᒪᒐᐃᑉᐸᑕ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐲᔭᐃᒍᒪᒐᐃᑉᐸᑕ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᕐᕕᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ. ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᑎᒍᑦ ᕿᓂᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐲᔭᐃᓂᐊᕐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᑎᒍᑦ. ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕐᕕᖃᓲᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᖓᑦ ᐃᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᖃᕐᕕᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᒍᑎᔅᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᖄᖓᒍᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᑎᖅᑐᔅᓴᓂᒃ.

ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓃᑦᑐᑦ
ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᒋᔭᐅᒌᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ
ᓄᓇᕗᑕᖃᓚᐅᖅᑎᓐᓇᒍ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ
ᐅᐊᑦᑎᐊᕈᕐᓂᓴᐅᑎᑦᑐᑎᒍᑦ

(ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑕᐅᒋᐊᓐᖓᖅᑐᕕᓃᑦ) ᐃᒫᒃ ᐃᑦᑐᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᒥᓂᐅᑎᑕᐅᖑᐊᖅᑐᐃᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ 158 ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᐃᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᑭᐅᖅᑕᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᑐᖃᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒪᓕᑦᑐᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

33

Canada transfers to Nunavut Tunngavik all rents and royalties it receives from these leases. Deposit no. 1 at Mary River is one of these grandfathered mineral leases. We don’t have a production lease or a mineral exploration agreement for Deposit No. 1 because there is a grandfathered federal or Crown mineral lease there, No. 2484.

Regarding the RIAs, or regional Inuit associations, there are also 944 parcels of Inuit-owned lands where Inuit hold surface title only, referred to as surface IOL. The land is owned by Inuit through the regional Inuit associations, but the minerals and petroleum are owned by the Crown and administered by Indian and Northern Affairs Canada in the same way as Crown land. These Inuit-owned surface lands owned by the RIA make up about 18 percent of the surface lands in Nunavut, so much larger landholding than the mineral title that NTI holds.

The regional Inuit associations, or RIAs, administer access to all Inuit-owned lands in their region through the issuance of land use licences, commercial leases, quarry rights, and other types of authorization, each of which is referred to as a surface right. The RIAs are also the designated Inuit organizations to negotiate and enter into compensation agreements with respect to water use and impacts on wildlife and an Inuit impact and benefits agreement. For a project that is approaching and at the production stage, these compensation agreements are to compensate Inuit for the negative impacts that a mine has to the land and to the people and to the environment in the immediate area. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Gillis. (interpretation ends) We’re just about to go for a break here. I would like to put a question to the Minister.

ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑳᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓪᓛᖅᓯᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᐃᑦ
ᐅᑎᖅᑐᓴᖅᑖᒥᓂᓕᒫᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᑎᑦᑎᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᔭᒥᓂᐅᔪᓂᑦ. ᑕᐃᑲᓂ ᓄᓘᔮᓕᕆᕕᒻᒥ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᖅᑳᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᒥᓂᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖃᓐᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 1-ᒧᑦ ᓇᓂᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᓯᐊᓄᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᑎᒍᔭᒥᓂᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐃᓚᖓ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑕᖅ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 2484.

ᒪᑯᐊ ᐃᓄᐃᓪᓖ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦ 944-ᖑᒻᒥᔪᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᐃᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᒋᔭᖏᑦ

ᖄᖏᓐᓇᖓᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ, ᖄᖏᓐᓇᖓᓂ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ. ᓄᓇ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᑦᑕᖅᑯ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓃᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᑐᖃᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᑭᐅᖅᑕᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᒫᔅᓴᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᑯᐃᓐ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖓ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᕙᒻᒪᑕ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᖄᖏᓐᓇᖏᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᐃᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ 18%−ᐸᓗᒋᔭᖏᑦ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᖄᖓᓃᑦᑐᑦ ᐱᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ. ᐊᖏᖅᓂᖅᓴᐅᔪᐃᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂ ᐲᔭᕋᔅᓴᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ.

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒥᐅᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ.
ᓚᐃᓴᑖᖅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑎᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᕝᕕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᓄᓪᓗ
ᓚᐃᓴᑖᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᖏᖅᐸᑦᑐᑎᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᖄᖓᓂ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖅᑎᐅᒻᒪᑕ. ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᐃᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᓛᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᒧᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐃᒥᐅᑉ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐆᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᓪᓗ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᓕᐅᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᐃᑦ. ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑖᑎᑦᓛᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᐅᓲᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑖᕈᓐᓇᓛᕐᖓᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ
ᐊᑦᑐᐃᑲᒻᒪᔅᓯᒪᓂᖓᓂᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᖓᓂ ᓱᕈᐃᓯᒪᓂᖓᓂᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᔾᔪᑎᖃᖅᑐᑎᑦ.

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ, ᒥᔅᑕ ᒋᓕᔅ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᓄᖅᑲᖓᐃᓐᓇᓐᖑᓱᓕᕋᑦᑕ. ᐊᐱᖅᓱᑲᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᒍ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

34

The chamber of mines has raised concerns regarding the competitive environment in Nunavut or the operating environment for mines in terms of their viability. This is a matter that the Committee has raised previously in writing to the department and specifically the Committee had asked the Minister regarding Economic Development and Transportation, the department, in terms of how they were consulted on this bill. You indicate on page 4 of a letter to the Committee on December 21, 2020, it states that “The department did not formally organize in engagement sessions solely with the Department of Economic Development and Transportation, but the department supports further opportunities to continue any form of engagement” with that said department.

Minister, I would like to get your comments or your response to the concerns that property taxes or levying property taxes is something that negatively impacts or makes Nunavut less of an appealing jurisdiction for mining companies. Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask Dan Carlson to answer your question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Carlson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. That’s a very important issue is the competitiveness of all industries, mining in particular, but of all industries here in Nunavut, and we know that Nunavut is a high-cost jurisdiction to operate a mine. That won’t surprise anyone in this room or anyone listening.

When it comes to Bill 55, it’s not increasing the tax rates, it’s not changing the tax rates, it’s not adding new tax, so just to reinforce

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᖏᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑎᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᓂᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᒐᓱᑦᑐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ
ᓵᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᔅᓴᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᓯᕗᓂᐊᓂ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᑎᒍᑦ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓯᒪᓪᓗᓂᔾᔪᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᑎᓐᓄ. ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒥ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᒪ ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖓᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᓯᒪᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᑖᔅᓱᒪᖓᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᒥᒃ. ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒐᕕᑦ ᑎᓴᒪᖓᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᒃᐱᒐᕐᒥ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᑎᓯᐱᕆ 21, 2020-ᖑᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᓯ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᖃᑦᑎᓯᐊᑦᓴᐃᓐᓇᓚᐅᓐᖏᒻᒪᑕ
ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖓᓐᓂᒃ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᐃᒐᓗᐊᖅᓱᑎ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᒃᑲᓂᕐᓂᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᕕᓯ?

ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᔅᓴᓂ ᑐᓴᕈᒪᓪᓗᖓ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓂ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑦᑎᑦᑎᕙᓐᓂᕐᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᐊᓐᖏᑦᑐᒥ ᐊᑦᑐᐃᓂᓪᓘᓯᕙᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᓪᓗ
ᐱᒃᑯᒥᓗᐊᓐᖏᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᑐᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᑎᑦ ᑖᓐ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓐᓄ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ.

ᑳᓪᓴᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᓪᓚᕆᐊᓘᒻᒪᑦ
ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᒍᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᓴᓇᕝᕕᐅᓕᒫᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᓪᓗ. ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᑦᑎᒍ ᐊᑭᑐᔫᒻᒪᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᑎᒋᐊᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᒻᒥ. ᑲᒪᓇᓐᖏᓚᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑕᕝᕙᓃᑦᑐᓂ ᓈᓚᑦᑐᓄᓪᓘᓐᓂᑦ.

ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᖅ 55 ᐱᓪᓗᒍ, ᐅᓄᖅᓯᒋᐊᖅᓯᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᓄᑖᒥᓪᓕ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑦᑎᒋᐊᕈᑎᐅᔾᔭᖏᒻᒪᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᕆᐊᓪᓚᕈᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᓱᒍ.

35

that point for the Committee, but to your question about tax rates generally and how we decide on them, then I can assure that we do keep the competitiveness of Nunavut and the reasonableness of tax rates in mind. Member Simailak asked a question earlier related to this and the property tax rate in Nunavut has changed once in 20 years and that was about four or five years ago. Other than that, that rate for mineral properties has stayed consistent.

The other question is related to the cost of property tax and whether it’s prohibitive. We have heard today about how long it takes to plan a mine and all the work that goes into it. Our job as a tax authority is to make sure that when investors, businesses, and shareholders make those decisions, they’re doing it with a clear foundation and understand what it is that they are choosing to get into. One of the things that Bill 55 is doing is trying to create or improve that clarity of the property assessment and taxation system so that if people choose to do business here, they understand what’s going on.

When many of these mines began their thinking, we heard about the cost of operating and the commodity prices that was mentioned earlier, they’re far higher now than they were 10 or 15 years ago, so the commodity prices and other costs are increasing in a much different way than taxes. The Fraser Institute, which is a think tank in Canada, surveys mining firms and mining industry about mining around the world, so it’s not just in Canada; it’s globally. One of the things they ask about, they ask a bunch of questions about jurisdictions and what makes them competitive. They ask about taxes. They ask about processes. They ask about the fear of revolt. Nunavut does not have that.

When it comes to Nunavut, what mining industry is saying is that the level of tax rate is

ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᑭᒡᓕᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᕐᓗ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑎᒋᓲᕆᒻᒪᖔᑦᑎᒍᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᔅᓯ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᒋᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᑉᐸᑦᑕᕗᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑏᓪᓗ ᓈᒻᒪᑦᑐᒥ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓ ᐊᑦᑐᐊᔪᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖅᑲᐅᒥᒻᒪᑦ ᑭᓪᓕᖓ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᓲᖑᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᑦ ᐅᑭᐅᑦ ᓈᕋᖓᑕ ᓯᑕᒪᑦ ᑕᓪᓕᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᓂᒍᖅᐳᑦ ᑖᒃᓰ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᐋᑭᖏᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᖃᕆᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᒋᐊᖃᓐᖏᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᑕ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐸᕐᓇᒋᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ
ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᖃᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖁᑎᖃᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᖃᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕌᖓᒥ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᑦᓱᑎᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᒐᓱᑦᓱᑎᓪᓗ ᑭᓱᒧᑦ ᐱᓇᓱᓕᕐᒪᖔᕐᒥ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᓴᖅᑮᓇᓱᑦᑐᖅ ᐊᓚᒃᑲᐃᑦᑎᐊᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᕐᓗᓂ ᑐᑭᓯᖓ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᖅ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ. ᑕᕝᕘᓇ ᑕᒫᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᐅᒪᑦᑎᐊᖃᑦᑕᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ.

ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᒥᒍᑦᑕᐅᖅ, ᑐᓴᓚᐅᕐᒥᒐᑦᑕ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓇᓱᒋᐊᒥ ᐊᑭᑐᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᖁᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᕙᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᓂᖅᓴᒻᒪᕆᐅᕙᓕᕐᒪᑕ ᐅᑭᐅᑦ 50 ᐊᓂᒍᖅᑐᓄᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑏᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᓴᓂᐊᓐᓂ. ᕗᕋᐃᓱᒥ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᖅᐸᑦᑐᑦ ᓈᓚᑉᐳᑎᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᐸᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᑑᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᓄᓇᖅᔪᐊᕐᒥᓗ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖃᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᒐᕙᒪᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᖃᕐᕕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑖᒃᓰᓂ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖃᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᖃᓄᕐᓗ
ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᓂᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᑭᓪᓕᖓ

36

not top of their mind, and we have heard that from the mining firms here today. The actual level of taxes, I don’t want to say, is not a concern but it is not the aspect of operations in Nunavut that is impacting competitiveness. There is whole bunch of other things, including the un-clarity of the systems, the flip-flopping, the changing back and forth, and Bill 55 is trying to address one of those issues in our way. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Thank you. I do know that Committee Members have further questions, but before we go to that, I’m going to call a 15-minute break. (interpretation) We will take a short break and we will be back.

>>Committee recessed at 10:23 and resumed at 10:44

Chairman (interpretation): We’re now back as the meeting reconvenes for questions from Members regarding Bill 55. Mr. Akoak.

Mr. Akoak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues and visitors.

My question is for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. The Chair mentioned this morning that he indicated that all parties will be invited to provide supplementary briefs to the Committee. I look forward to reviewing them with care. All the information given to the Committee is always important.

In her statement this morning, the Minister of Community and Government Services directly referred to Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated’s arguments. My question for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is: did the Minister’s statement satisfy her concerns? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Kotierk.

ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᔾᔪᒃ. ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓂ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ
ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑕᐅᖏᑦᑑᓚᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑐᖓ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᑦᑐᐃᓪᓗᐊᔾᔭᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᑭᑦᑐᕋᐅᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᖏᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐱᒻᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᓇᓗᓇᕐᓂᖓᓂ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᐸᓪᓕᐊᕈᑎᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᔭᕐᓂᖏᓪᓗ ᓇᓕᐊᓐᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᑕᒪᑐᒪᓐᖓᑦ ᑭᐅᓇᓱᓐᓂᖓᓄᑦ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᓇᓱᑉᐳᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᖓ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᔅᓴᖃᒃᑲᓂᕐᒥᔫᒐᓗᐊᑦ
ᑕᐃᑯᓐᖓᓚᐅᓐᖏᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ 15 ᒥᓂᑦᓯᒥᒃ

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᓄᖅᑲᖔᑲᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᕋᑦᑕ ᐅᐊᑦᓯᐊᕈ ᐅᑎᕆᐊᓂᐊᕋᑦᑕ.

>>ᓄᖅᑲᖓᑲᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ 10:23ᒧᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅᑐᑎᒃ 10:44ᒧᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐅᑎᖅᓯᒪᓕᕋᑉᑕ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖏᖅ ᐱᒋᐊᒃᑲᓂᕐᓂᐊᓕᕐᒥᒻᒪᑦ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᓯᔅᓴᓕᓐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᒥᔅᓵᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᖁᐊᖅ.

ᐋᖁᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ,
ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐅᖃᑎᒃᑲ ᐳᓛᕆᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᓪᓗ.

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒐ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ. ᐅᓪᓛᒃ

ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑎᒥᐅᔪᓕᒫᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᒍᓐᓇᕐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᖃᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᒃᑲᓂᖅᑕᒥᓂᒃ ᓂᕆᐅᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᓴᕋᔅᓴᑦ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᖏᓐᓇᓱᑉᐸᒻᒪᑕ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ.

ᐅᖃᖅᑕᒥᓂᒃ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᓯᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕐᒥᓂᒃ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒐ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᓇᐅᕗᖅ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᔫᑉ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖏᑦ ᓈᒻᒫᓂᖅᑲᐅᕙᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᒋᔭᖏᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ.

37

Ms. Kotierk (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Member Akoak. (interpretation ends) The Minister this morning spoke to some inaccuracies that they wanted to point out to the Standing Committee. As I was listening, I was thinking that I’m sure; I know for me as a witness, I was thinking about the inaccuracies that I could have pointed out as well. Our intention will be to provide a written supplementary following this Standing Committee appearance.

I guess some of the things that were said in terms of general application, we don’t dispute that, but I guess what we’re saying is that as Inuit landowners of Inuit-owned land, and I want to say there was a question earlier about whether we’re private landowners, yet we’re trying to get exemptions as though we were public landowners. I really appreciated the Deputy Minister of Finance talking about the very different ways of collecting taxes and the different types of land, and I think that kind of highlighted the diversity, that it doesn’t have to be a cookie-cutter approach for all types of land.

I think, yesterday, the Minister talked a little bit about residential leases and tried to compare that to mining improvements, and in my mind, aware of some of the taxation laws, I recognize that residential leases are treated differently than mining companies. I think that it will be very important, as Members of the Standing Committee, and I have heard over and over how complex this is, but it will be very important to pay to attention to all the details that are being expressed and being brought forward to this Standing Committee.

I think also, when I talked a little bit about being dishonourable and illegal, I just want to point out that the reason I state that it’s dishonourable is currently in front of the Nunavut Assessment Appeal Tribunal, there

ᑰᑦᑎᖅ: ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐋᖁᐊᖅ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᐅᑉᓛᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᓱᓕᓪᓗᐊᓐᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ.
ᐅᖃᕈᒪᖅᑲᐅᔭᖏᓐᓂ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᓈᓚᑦᑎᓪᓗᖓ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᖅᑲᐅᕙᕋ ᓇᓗᓇᓐᖏᓚᖅ ᓇᒻᒥᓃᓛᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᓪᓗᖓ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᓯᐊᖏᓐᓂᖅ ᐅᖃᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ

ᐅᖃᓕᒫᖅᑲᐅᒻᒥᒐᒃᑭᑦ. ᐃᒪᐃᒐᓱᓐᓂᐊᖅᐳᒍᓪᓕ, ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᐊᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐱᔭᕇᑐᐊᕈᑦᑕ.

ᐃᓚᖏᖅᑲᐃ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒡᒍᔪᑦᑐᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᑭᕋᖅᑐᓐᖏᑕᕋᓗᐊᕗᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᐅᖃᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᐃᓅᑉᓗᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖃᖁᑎᖃᖅᓱᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂ ᐅᖃᕈᒪᓪᓗᖓ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖃᕐᕕᐅᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖅᓱᑕ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᕝᕙ
ᐊᑭᓖᑦᑕᐃᓕᒪᖁᔨᒻᒪᖔᑉᑕ ᓲᕐᓗ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᑎᒥᐅᔪᑎᑐᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᐅᑉ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᑦᑎᐊᖏᑕᖓᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒪᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᓐᖏᑕᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᓂᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᐊᖅᑲᐅᔭᕗᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᐃᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᓄᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᓂᐊᖅᑐᓂᒃ
ᐊᑕᐅᓯᕐᒨᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ.

ᒥᓂᔅᑐᖃᐃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᖏᕐᕋᖃᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᑎᓇᓱᑦᑐᒍ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓂᔅᓴᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᔪᐃᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᒡᓗᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᓐᖏᑕᖏᑦ ᑕᐅᑐᑦᑕᐅᓲᖑᒻᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᓴᓂᐊᓂ. ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓇᔭᖅᑰᕐᒪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑐᓴᐃᓐᓇᖅᐸᒃᖢᖓ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐱᔭᕆᑐᓂᖓᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᐊᖅᑰᕐᒪᑦ ᐃᑉᐱᒋᑦᓯᐊᕋᔭᕈᑦᑎᒍ ᐃᓗᓕᓕᒻᒪᕆᖏᑦ.
ᓂᕆᐅᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᒧᐊᕐᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ.

ᐅᓇᖃᐃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᒻᒥᔭᕋ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᖓ ᐅᐱᓐᓇᑦᓯᐊᖏᑦᑐᒥᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ
ᓯᖁᒥᑦᓯᓂᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐅᐱᓐᓇᑑᓗᓂᓚᕿᕙᕋ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓘᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᑕᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᑐᑭᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ.

38

is an interpretive dispute occurring in terms of the definition of real property taxation. I think, as part of the interpretive disputes, in my mind, the Government of Nunavut is using this process to fix that interpretive dispute rather than addressing it through the proper channels of the tribunal.

And then I heard the Minister talk about how

they were not moving forward on trying to change the Nunavut Agreement, but in the comment I have made about the changing of the definition of real property taxation, that in itself is attempting to make changes to the Nunavut Agreement, and an honourable government, in my view, would approach us as the Inuit organization responsible for the Nunavut Agreement and clearly let us know that they were trying to go forward on making amendments to the Nunavut Agreement.

The illegality of it, in my mind, is that we know that the Nunavut Agreement is a constitutionally protected modern treaty, and to work towards trying to make amendments, to work towards minimizing Inuit rights, those are things that cannot be done without Inuit being involved and without Inuit agreement to moving forward on those.

I just highlight those broadly and I will ask, if you don’t mind, Kilikvak Kabloona to add a little bit about some of the inaccuracies that we have heard and, like I will reiterate, our intention is to write something so that all Members can have an opportunity to review what we submit. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Ms. Kabloona.

Ms. Kabloona: Ma’na, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of Article 22 is to ensure that an Inuit-owned land parcel is not taxable except in limited circumstances: first, outside municipalities, it is developed for commercial

ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓂᖓᖃᐃ ᑐᑭᓯᓂᕐᓗᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᕋᓱᒻᒪᔾᔪᒃ ᑖᑉᓇ ᐱᖅᑯᓯᐅᔪᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓇᓱᒃᑐᑎᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᓐᖏᑕᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᐅᑐᑦᑕᐅᕙᓐᓂᖓ
ᐊᖅᑯᑎᐅᓪᓗᐊᖅᑑᒐᓗᐊᖅ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᕐᕕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᖃᖔᖅᓱᑎᒃ.

ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑐᖓ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᓇᓱᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᑐᑭᓪᓚᑦᑖᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔪᒥᑦ ᑐᑭᖃᕐᒪᖔᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᓇᓱᓐᓂᐅᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖓᓂ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᐱᓐᓇᖏᑦᑑᕗᖅ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓛᒃ ᐅᐱᓐᓇᕈᑎᒃ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖓᓂ ᐸᐸᑦᓯᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑎᑦᓯᒋᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖓᓂ.

ᓯᖁᒥᑦᓯᓂᖓᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᑎᒍᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᑯᓪᓕ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᐅᔪᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᔾᔪᐊᖓᓂ ᓴᐳᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᐅᑉᓗᒥ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᖢᓂ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᖓ ᒥᑭᓪᓕᑎᑕᐅᓇᓱᑉᐸᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᔾᔮᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓐᖏᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᐊᖏᖃᑕᐅᓐᖏᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᒧᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ.

ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᑦᓯᐊᕈᒪᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᔪᒪᓪᓗᖓ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᓴᖏᒃᑯᑦᑕ ᐃᒻᒪᖃ ᑐᓴᖅᑲᐅᔭᕗᑦ
ᓱᓕᓪᓗᐊᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᑐᓴᖅᑲᐅᔭᕗᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕈᒫᕋᑉᐸᑕᓕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᓕᒫᑦ
ᕿᒥᕐᕈᑦᓯᐊᕈᓐᓇᓛᒻᒪᔾᔪᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᒥᑦ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅ ᖃᑉᓗᓈᖅ.

ᖃᑉᓗᓈᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓃᑦᑐᖅ 22 ᐊᖏᕈᑎᒥ ᓄᓇᑖᕈᑎᒧᑦ. ᐃᒪᐃᒍᑕᐅᓇᓱᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᕕᐅᒋᐊᖃᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ
ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᖏᓐᓂᖅᑲᐃ, ᓯᕗᓕᕐᒥ. ᓄᓇᓕᐅᑉ ᓯᓚᑖᓂ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑎᖃᕋᓱᕝᕕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑲᑦ

39

purposes such as mining, and two, inside municipalities, it is developed for commercial purposes or is part of an approved development plan.

I would note that where an Inuit-owned land

parcel is taxable, Inuit shouldn’t be responsible for property tax for the land value only. Responsibility for property tax on improvements is based on laws of general application. Inuit are not automatically responsible for taxes on improvements on Inuit-owned lands.

I would also note that the definition of real property taxation under Article 22 is narrower than that of Bill 55, which is one of the main disputes between Inuit organizations and the Government of Nunavut. This change would effectively amend and broaden the definition of “property tax” from territorial purposes to that of funding local government services and improvements within the general taxation area. This change is aimed directly at undercutting provisions of the Nunavut Agreement, a constitutionally protected document, in the midst of an interpretive dispute.

I will also reiterate that with Bill 55, the Government of Nunavut is essentially attempting to redefine the definition of real property taxation in Article 22 of the Nunavut Agreement, and Inuit did not enter into an agreement giving permission to the Government of Nunavut to unilaterally change the Nunavut Agreement.

Finally, there was a comment regarding the reclamation costs. As the landowner, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the regional Inuit organizations not only have the burden and costs related to land administration, but also reclamation risks if a mining company becomes insolvent. Regional Inuit associations do not require mining companies

ᓲᕐᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᓗᓂ ᓄᓇᓕᐅᓪᓗ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᒐᓱᓐᓂᐊᕈᓂ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᒧᑦ ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᒍᑎᓄᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᓂᒃ.

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᒪᔨᐅᓪᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᓯᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐊᑭᖓᓄᑐᐊᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇᓕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᒐᔪᑦᑐᓂᓪᓕ ᐱᔫᒐᓗᐊᑦ. ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖏᓐᓂ.

ᖃᐅᔨᖅᑲᐅᑉᓗᖓᓗ ᑐᑭᒋᑎᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᓯᓂᖅ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ 22-ᒥ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᒥ ᐃᒫᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑉ 55 ᓴᓂᐊᓂ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᓐᖏᑦᓯᐊᕐᒪᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ

ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓗᐊᖅᖢᓂ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᐅᑉᐸᑦ ᐋᖅᑮᒐᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᒍᓂᓗ ᐱᖁᑎᒥᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᒥᒃ. ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐊᑭᓖᒍᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕈᑎᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖓᓐᓂ ᐲᖅᓯᓪᓗᐊᕐᒪᑦ. ᓱᐳᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᔪᐊᖓᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓄ
ᑐᑭᓯᐅᒪᖃᑎᒌᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᓗᖅᓯᒪᐅᑎᐅᒻᒪᑦ.

ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᑦ ᐃᒪᐃᓐᓇᓱᑉᐳᑦ: ᑐᑭᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᓇᓱᑦᑐᑎᒃ ᐱᖁᑎᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᖅᑎᑦᓯᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᐅᑉ 22 ᓄᓇᑖᕈᑎᐅᑉ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᓕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᑎᑦᓯᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᑎᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᐊᓂ.

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖅᑲᐅᒥᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑭᒋᔭᐅᕙᑦᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᒥᑦ ᐱᐅᓯᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑑᓪᓗᑕ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᑦ. ᐃᒫᒃ
ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓲᖑᒻᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᓪᓚᕕᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓲᕐᓗ ᓄᖅᑲᐃᓐᓇᓂᖅᐸᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ. ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦ ᑲᒻᐸᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ

40

to pay reclamation security. I’m sorry; we do. However, the security is often inadequate and sometimes not fully paid up.

As some of you recall, a few years ago, double security was a hot topic, as mining companies complained that the total security they pay to governments and Inuit organizations for reclamation was, in their view, too high and became an unreasonable burden for operating in Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Ms. Kabloona. (interpretation ends) Before we proceed, just in terms of issues of illegality for the witnesses, this Committee is not in a position to decide on issues of illegality. We’re not set up as a jury. It’s not a judicial setting.

Minister, in correspondence between the Committee and your department, we have raised issues around legal opinions with this bill. I wonder if you can, as briefly as possible, summarize your department’s position as to the legality of this bill that you have sponsored and brought forward into the House. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask our legal director to respond to your question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Ahlfors.

Mr. Ahlfors: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As is the case with any bill that the government brings before the Legislative Assembly, the Department of Justice does a legal analysis of any pertinent questions that might be raised by the legislation. Sometimes that’s in the form of written legal opinion, a formally written legal opinion. Sometimes those take

ᓇᓪᓕᐅᒃᑯᒫᖅᓱᓂᒃ ᐋᒡᒐ ᑕᒻᒪᕋᒪ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ
ᓈᒻᒫᓂᖃᑦᑕᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᑦᓴᐃᓐᓇᖏᖦᖢᑎᒃ ᐊᑭᓕᐅᑕᐅᔪᒫᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔪᑎᔅᓴᓂᒃ.

ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑦ ᐊᓂᒍᓵᖅᑐᓂ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒻᒪᕆᐅᕙᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᑦ ᐅᓐᓂᕐᓗᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓇᓪᓕᐅᒃᑯᒫᕈᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᐅᑎᒋᕙᑦᑕᖏᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐱᐅᓯᐅᒋᐊᕈᑎᔅᓴᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᖏᓗᐊᕐᒪᑕᒎᖅ. ᐊᒻᒪ ᓈᒻᒪᖏᑦᑐᒥᑦ
ᐊᔅᓱᕈᕈᑕᐅᓗᐊᖅᖢᓂ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᓯᓇᓱᒋᐊᕐᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᒥᔅ ᖃᑉᓗᓈᖅ. ᑲᔪᓯᑲᓐᓂᓚᐅᓐᖏᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᑦ ᓯᖁᒥᑦᓯᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᓐᖏᓇᑦᑕ ᓱᓕᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᐅᕝᕙᓘ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᓯᖁᒥᑦᓯᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᐋᒡᒐᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᕙᒍᑦ ᓈᓚᑦᑎᐅᖏᓐᓇᑦᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒻᒥ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᓇᔭᒦᓐᓂᕈᑉᑕ.

ᒥᓂᔅᑐ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐃᓕᔅᓯᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᖓᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᓯᒪᒐᑉᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᓯᒪᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ. ᐃᒻᒪᖃ ᓇᐃᓈᕐᓗᑎᒍ

ᐅᖄᒋᐊᓪᓚᒍᓐᓇᕈᕕᐅᒃ, ᓇᐃᓈᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᑉᓯᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᓯ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᒻᒪᖔᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᓄᐃᓚᐅᖅᑕᐃᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᓪᓗᒧᑦ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᑎᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᕗᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔨ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ.

ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᑭᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑮᕌᖓᑦᑕ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒻᒧᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔪᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᓲᖑᔪᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᐅᒐᔭᓐᖑᐊᖅᑐᓂᒃ

ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒻᒥ. ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᓛᓐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕙᒃᖢᑕ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᓂᒃ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᒋᓪᓗᓂᐅᒃ

41

place as part of a lawyer doing their research and then in discussions with the department raising issues and modifications being done as a consequence of that.

I can assure you that with this bill, particularly thanks to the consultations that were done

during the drafting of the bill and prior to the drafting of the bill, this bill has had a more thorough legal vetting than most bills because of the purported legal issues with it, the Department of Justice is confident that this bill is within the authority of the Legislative Assembly to pass in its current form and that it does not unduly interfere with any rights of Inuit under the Nunavut Agreement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I had assumed that just based on the fact that the bill was brought forward by the government, but thank you for confirming the legal opinion. Ms. Angnakak.

Ms. Angnakak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to do a follow-up on my question to the Minister about the board of revision. The Minister and her staff were saying why some of the reasons or what some of the problems were when it came to the board’s operations. I’m wondering if the Minister can tell us if the present board members were consulted and if they had any suggested ways in how to address some of the problems that were stated this morning, and also, what were their thoughts. I’m sure they have spoken with them, but did the present board members want to be abolished? Is this something that they thought was a good thing as well? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) That’s kind of an existential question, asking a board if they would prefer to be abolished, but Minister.

ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕌᖓᒥ ᓴᖅᑮᒑᖓᒥᒃ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᕗᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᓲᖑᔪᖅ ᑕᕝᕘᓇ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ.

ᐅᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᐳᖓ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᖃᓚᐅᕐᓂᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᓯᕗᓂᐊᓂᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓐᓇᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓂᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐃᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᑕ ᓴᓂᐊᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᑦ.
ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔪᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᖁᓚᓐᖏᓚᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᖓᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒻᒥ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᓂ

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑐᓗᖅᓯᒪᐅᑎᑦᑎᖃᕋᓱᓐᖏᖦᖢᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᑖᕈᑎ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒍ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᖅᑲᐅᒐᒃᑯ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒋᓪᓗᒍᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᒃᑲᕕᐅᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔅᓴᐃᓐᓇᕐᖓᑦ. ᒥᔅ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ.

ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᐃᓚᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕋ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᖏᓪᓗ ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᒻᒪᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᕐᓗ ᐃᓗᐊᓐᖏᓕᕈᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔾᔪᓯᖏᑦᑎᒍᑦ. ᐃᓱᒪᔪᖓ ᒥᓂᔅᑑᖅᑲᐃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᔪᓐᓇᖅᐱᑎᒍᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᕕᐅᓚᐅᖅᐸᑦ? ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᓚᐅᖅᐸᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓗᐊᓐᖏᓕᐅᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒍᑎᑕᖃᕈᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᐅᓪᓛᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖅᑲᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ, ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖃᓚᐅᖅᐱᑦ
ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᔅᓴᐅᕗᐃᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᒫᓐᓇ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᖑᑎᖅᑕᐅᒍᑎᒃ ᓱᖁᑎᒃᓴᓐᖏᓛᑦ ᐱᐅᒋᔭᐅᒋᕚᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᖏᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᓄᖑᑎᕆᔭᐅᔪᒪᒻᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᐱᕆᓪᓗᓂ ᑖᓐᓇ ᓱᕙᓕᑭᐊᕈᔫᖅᑰᔨᔫᒐᓗᐊᖅ. ᒥᔅ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

42

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Member for her question. Yes, the tribunal board was a part of the process from the very beginning and we have been consulting with them and they have agreed with what we plan to do in Bill 55. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Minister, I’m hoping you can clarify something for the Committee and this is regarding clause 31 within the bill. Clause 31 amends section 75 of the Property Assessment and Taxation Act to provide that the Minister of Finance shall establish mill rates “for the purpose of raising a property tax to fund local government services and improvements within the general taxation area.” The current section of the legislation refers to “raising a property tax for territorial purposes.” What’s the rationale for these changes, and will future property tax revenues be allocated to a special purpose fund under the Financial Administration Act? Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask Mr. Seeley to answer your question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Seeley.

Mr. Seeley: Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The rationale for the changeover from the reference to the territorial purposes to the local government programs and services, that phrase is taken directly from the Nunavut Agreement and that’s an exercise of aligning the language in Bill 55 with the agreement itself.

To the Chair’s question regarding the establishment of a special fund, subject to the approval of Bill 55, the establishment of any special fund based on a revenue stream is

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᖅᑎ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖓᓐᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᕕᒋᑲᑕᖃᒃᑭᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᖃᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55-ᒥᑦ ᐱᓇᓱᑦᑕᑎᓐᓂ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᓂᔅᑐ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᑕᒃᓴᕆᔭᕋᓗᐊᖅᐸᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓛᓄᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖓ 31 ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑉ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖓ 31 ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕆᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓗᓕᖓ 75-ᒥ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᓂᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᓂᕆᓂᐊᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖏᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑕᒧᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᐅᓯᕚᓪᓕᑎᑦᑎᖁᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑐᐃᓐᓇᐃᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ. ᒪᓕᒐᐅᕙᒌᖅᑐᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑭᓱᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᒐᔅᓯᐅᒃ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᓯᕗᓂᒃᓴᒧᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᓴᓂᕐᕙᒃᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐹᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᑎᑦ ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ.

ᓰᓕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᓪᓗ
ᒥᓂᔅᑕ. ᐱᔾᔪᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕐᓂᖓ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓅᖅᑕᐅᖔᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᓯᕋᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ. ᓄᓇᕗᑦ
ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᖏᓐᓃᖔᓪᓚᒃᑖᖅᑐᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓕᒧᓕᖅᑎᔾᔫᒥᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑕᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑦ, ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑦ.

ᑖᓐᓇᓕ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ ᓴᓂᕐᕙᒃᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᖃᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᒃᑎᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᓇᓕᐊᓐᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᖃᐃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᖃᕐᓗᓂ

43

something that can be considered. However, there would need to be a number of programs put in place in order to make that happen, subject to the approval of the bill itself.

Currently our department and the government more broadly does contribute substantially more to local government programs and services and other services like education within communities than the existing revenues that are earned through the assessment of property taxes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) One of the matters that were raised earlier was in terms of how many matters were currently before the board of revision and I believe, when that was asked, we got a commitment or the Committee didn’t get an answer on that matter. Minister, are you prepared to answer that question, how many matters are currently before the board of revision? Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the past three years we’ve got six complaints in total, basically two per year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Clause 48, which has been raised a number of times in this hearing, provides for a number of transitional matters, including a provision which states that all property tax raised in the general taxation area under the previous Act since April 1, 1999 is deemed to have been raised to fund local government services and improvements within the general taxation area. What’s the rationale for this provision and what is the total amount of property tax raised by the territorial government since April 1, 1999? Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the best person to answer

ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᐃᓯᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᑦ ᑕᑯᓗᒋᑦ.
ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᔪᖃᕆᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᑦᑎᓐᓂᐊᕈᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᒪᓕᒡᓗᒍ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑉ.

ᒫᓐᓇᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᒃᐳᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐊᑕᖏᓐᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᑦᑕ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᓂᖅᓴᖅ. ᓲᕐᓗ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᐃᓯᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᕈᖅᑎᑕᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᖁᑏᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑲᐅᖕᒥᔪᖅ ᐃᓚ ᖃᔅᓯᑦ ᐱᔭᒃᓴᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᖅᑕᐅᕗᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑕᐅᖅᑰᖅᑲᐅᔪᖅ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒥᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᑭᐅᔭᐅᖅᑲᐅᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᑖᔅᓱᒪ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ, ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᑭᐅᔪᓐᓇᐱᐅᒃ ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᔅᓯ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᖅᑕᐅᕙᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓂᒃ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᖅᑕᐅᕙᒌᖅᑐᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓂᒃ ᐱᖓᓲᕋᑖᖅᑐᓂᒃ 6-ᓂ ᓈᒻᒪᒃᓴᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒎᑉ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᒪᕐᕉᖃᑦᑕᖅᑑᒃ ᓈᒻᒪᒃᓴᖏᑦᑑᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖓ 48. ᖃᔅᓯᐊᑦᑎᑲᓪᓚᒃᑐᓂ ᒫᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᓕᖅᑐᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᒃᑎᑦᑎᕆᕙᓪᓕᐊᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᔭᒃᓴᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᑕᒫᓂ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᑕᐅ ᐄᐳᓘ 1, 1999-ᒥᓂ
ᒪᓕᒐᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᖕᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑏᑦ ᐱᐅᓯᕚᓪᓕᕈᑕᐅᓗᑎᓪᓗ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᕝᕕᐅᔪᒥᒃ. ᖃᓄᕐᖑᓇ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑲᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖏᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᑦ ᑲᑎᓐᓂᖃᖅᐸ ᐄᐳᓘ 1, 1999-ᓂ ᖃᔅᓯᐅᓯᒪᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᑲᑎᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ. ᒥᔅ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᑭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᓴᐅᕗᖅ

44

this question would be Dan Seeley, Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you.

>>Laughter

Mr. Carlson, go ahead.

Mr. Carlson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ehaloak. I’ll answer your second question first related to property tax. The GN has collected $72 million since 1999 based on my notes here. These are all published in the Public Accounts.

For your second question in terms of the retroactivity, I will defer it to my colleague at Justice to address this particular clause. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Ahlfors.

Mr. Ahlfors: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To explain this clause, I first have to refer to clause 31, which you referred to just before, which is the one that changes the term “territorial purposes” to “local government services and improvements.”

To understand that, that’s really aligning with the reality of what has been going on in Nunavut since Nunavut was created, particularly in the beginning when there was minimal mining infrastructure. Property taxes that were collected were collected in the communities from people who have private homes and businesses and that same money was then used in the planning for funding municipalities and other local authorities. That’s something that has always been going
on.

The fact that the Act was saying that it’s for

ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᓐ ᓰᓕ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐅᖓᓕᖓᑕ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑎᖓ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ.

>>ᐃᒡᓚᖅᑐᑦ

ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ, ᑲᔪᓯᒋᑦ.

ᑳᓪᓴᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅ ᑭᐅᖅᑳᕐᓗᒍ ᐱᖁᑏᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑦ $72 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᓂᒃ ᓄᐊᑦᑎᓯᒪᓕᖅᑐᑦ 1999-ᒥᓂ ᑐᖓᕕᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᖁᑎᒃᑲ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑕᖅᑯᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᓴᖅᑭᔮᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᕈᒥᓃᑦ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ

ᑭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᔅᓱᒥᖓ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ.

ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᒋᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖓ 31 ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑲᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᔪᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ, ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑎᕐᒧᑦ ᓄᑦᑎᖅᑕᐅᖔᕐᓗᓂ.

ᑐᑭᓯᓇᓱᒡᓗᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ, ᑖᓐᓇ
ᓇᓕᒧᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᑐᓪᓚᑦᑖᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᓄᓇᕘᑦ ᐱᓐᖑᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᒋᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᐃᔅᓱᒪᓂᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᒃᑕᖃᓗᐊᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᐊᑕᐅᔪᓪᓕ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓃᖔᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐊᖏᖃᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᖅᑐᓂᓪᓗ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᓗᐊᖅ ᑕᐃᒪ

ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓕᕆᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᓄᑦ, ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᑦ ᕼᐋᒻᒪᓚᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᔪᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᑲᔪᓯᖃᑦᑕᐃᓐᓇᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᑲᓐᖓᓂᑦ.

45

territorial purposes was really not being followed in a sense. It was used for a much more limited purpose, which was to fund these local governments. As the tax revenues grew because of certain mining operations starting up and becoming more viable and larger and therefore bringing in more revenues, those revenues were put into the same use. However, the Act was never changed until now and so we are simply correcting that sort of historical inaccuracy.

The idea here is that when we change one provision of the Act, which is section 75 through clause 31, at first glance, it would appear as if we are changing something. We’re changing what we used to use the money and then now we’re going to be using it for something else. It was used for territorial purposes; now it will be used for local government services and improvements, but that’s not the case. That is not the change that’s happening here. It’s simply a change in wording because that’s already what has been going on and 48(10) is there to confirm that no, we are not really changing where we’re putting this money. We have always been putting that money into that place because that’s what the Nunavut Agreement requires us to do.

It’s simply there to confirm that no, this is….clause 31 isn’t really a change in practice or a change in where we’re putting the money; it’s what we have always been doing and much like the rest of the Act, basically it’s confirming much of what we have been doing. It’s simply to align the Act with the reality of the Nunavut Agreement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Thank you. I would like to turn to Agnico Eagle. On page 4 of your submission you mention a number of issues for the Committee’s consideration and one is

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᐅᓚᖅᑐᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓱᓕᒃᑕᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑎᑐᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᕈᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᒍᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐊᖏᓪᓕᕙᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ
ᐃᓯᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓄᖓᑦᑕᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖏᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ

ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᒫᓐᓇᒧᑦ ᑎᑭᓪᓗᒍ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕋᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐊᑐᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᒌᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᐃᓱᒪᒋᒐᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑖᓐᓇᓕ ᓈᓴᐅᑎᖓ 75, ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓ ᐃᓗᓕᖓ 31-ᒧᑦ ᑕᑯᓕᓵᖅᖢᒍ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᖅᑰᔨᔪᑦ, ᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᐊᓄᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ ᐊᑐᖔᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓕᕐᒪᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ

ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖔᕐᓂᐊᓕᕆᓪᓗᓂ, ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᑑᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔩᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑕᖓ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᖅᑲᑦᑕᖅᐸᒌᖅᑐᑦ 48 ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ ᓇᒧᖓᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕋᓱᓐᖏᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᐃᑯᖓᑦᑕᐃᓐᓇᖅᑑᒐᓗᐊᑦ. ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖓ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑦ
ᑕᐃᒪᐃᖁᔨᓯᒪᖕᒪᑦ.

ᐅᖃᕋᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᓈᓴᐅᓴᑎᖓ 31, ᐊᓯᔾᔩᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐊᑐᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᓇᒧᓐᖓᐊᑦᑕᓂᑦᑎᓂᓪᓗ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᑉ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᒌᖅᑕᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᓇᓕᒧᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᓇᓕᒧᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ

ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᒻᒧᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓵᖔᕈᒪᓕᕐᒥᒐᒪ, ᒪᒃᐱᒐᖅ 4−ᒥ ᑐᓂᓚᐅᖅᑕᔅᓯᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓂᖅ.

46

on the topic of roads. It states on page 4 that your company “observed that based on the current legislation, a significant portion of property taxes must be paid during the closure and reclamation period of an operation. For example, road liabilities at closure are currently taxable. We would suggest that it would be interesting to consider this infrastructure as a legacy to the communities.” What specific changes to the Property Assessment and Taxation Act does Agnico Eagle recommend to address this issue around roads? Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will turn it to Mr. Baltov. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Baltov.

Mr. Baltov: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, so Agnico Eagle invested massively in building roads in Nunavut. Some examples are Agnico Eagle Amaruq road, which is a 64-kilometre all-weather road, completed in 2017; there is another road between Meadowbank and Baker Lake, it’s a 110-kilometre all-weather road with many bridges on it; there is also the Meliadine to Rankin Inlet road, about 25 kilometres all-weather road, also with a big number of bridges, I think, it’s more than 30.

In total it’s around 200 kilometres of roads infrastructure. The investment supplies more than $200 million since 2008. Most of them, all of them in fact are for public use and they are part of the territory infrastructure, along with other parts like electrical supply, telecommunication, water supply, and everything else, which definitely contribute to the local economy.

Our point here is just to see if there is an opportunity to treat these specific categories in a different way in terms of what portion of

ᒪᑯᓄᖓ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᖓᑦ. ᒪᑉᐱᒐᖅ 4−ᒥᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑦ ᑲᒻᐸᓂ ᐅᔾᔨᕈᓱᖕᒪᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ
ᒪᓕᒐᐅᕙᒌᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑏᑦ ᒪᑐᕙᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᕙᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒥᓂᕐᓂᒃ. ᑐᑭᓕᐅᑎᓗᒍ ᐊᖅᑯᒻᒧᑦ ᒪᑐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᒥᓇᕋᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᖅ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᖔᕐᓗᓂ. ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐊᑐᓕᖁᔭᕗᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝᒧᑦ ᑐᓂᓂᐊᕋᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ.

ᐹᓪᑖᕝ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᒻᒪᕆᐅᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐊᖅᑯᓯᐅᕈᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ, ᐊᖅᑯᓯᐅᕈᑎᖏᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒧᑦ ᑐᑭᓕᐅᑎᓗᒍᑦ ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᒪᕈᖅ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᖓ 64 ᑭᓚᒦᑕᒥᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓕᒫᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᖏᑦ 2017-ᒥᑦ ᐱᔭᕇᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ. ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᑎᕆᓂᖅ ᐊᐳᖅᑎᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᖃᒪᓂᑦᑐᐊᕐᒧᓪᓗ 110 ᑭᓚᒦᑕᒥ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓕᒫᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ
ᐃᑳᕈᑎᑕᖃᐅᖅᑐᓂ ᖃᔅᓯᑲᓪᓚᓐᓂ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒥᓚᑏᓐ ᑲᖏᖅᓯᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑕᐅᔪᖅ 25 ᑭᓚᒦᑕᒧᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓕᒫᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ,
ᐃᑳᕈᑎᑕᖃᐅᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᒋᓪᓗᓂ 30-ᓗᐊᒻᒪᕆᑦᑐᓂᒃ.

ᑲᑎᓕᒫᖅᑐᒋᑦ 200 ᑭᓛᒥᑕᒦᑦᑐᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᓴᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ. ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᒫᓃᑦᑐᖅ $200 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ ᐅᖓᑖᓃᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᐃᑲᓐᖓᓂ 2008-ᒥᓂᑦ. ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᓴᐃᑦ ᐊᑕᖏᖅᑐᒋᖅᑲᐃ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᖕᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᓲᕐᓗ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᔾᔪᑎᓄᑦ ᓱᑲᓐᓇᖅᑐᓄᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᓐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ.

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓇᓱᒃᑕᕗᓪᓕ ᐃᒪᓐᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ,
ᐱᕕᖃᕈᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᖏᑕᖓᓂᒃ

47

the CapEx (capital expenditures) will be included in the assessment value and when, again, because it’s for public use, this is also heritage for the communities and I think it’s important to highlight this point.

The second point is when it will be added to the assessment value and when it would be excluded from the assessment value for taxation purposes. That’s our explication on that subject. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I wonder if you could just walk the Committee through this statement where it states “Road liabilities at closure are currently taxable.” Using, let’s say, the Meadowbank operation as an example, at closure, once the life of the mine has completed and you have shifted off of operations phase into remediation or closure, maybe walk us through the issue that you have with road liabilities being taxable. If it’s okay with you, Mr. Plante, I’ll go back to Mr. Baltov. Mr. Baltov.

Mr. Baltov: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, exactly, our point of view is that once the operation of the mine is close to the end, the roads should be excluded from the assessable value of the complex. All the operation during the closure of the mine is another phase when a profit is not generated and one of the specific items or elements that are supposed to be not any more included in the assessment value is supposed to be the roads and these kinds of infrastructure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question to Agnico Eagle, continuing on about the mine closure and the road reclamation, during the final Nunavut Impact Review

ᐊᐅᓚᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᒪᑐᒧᖓ ᑭᓱᑦᑎᐊᒍ
ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᓇᓕᐊᒃ
ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑭᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅᑐᑦ ᖃᖓᒃᑯᓪᓗ. ᓱᓕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᒪᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ,
ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᖅᑰᕐᒪᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓗᒍ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑐᒡᓕᐊ ᖃᖓ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᑐᕐᓂᓗ
ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔭᐅᖏᓪᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᑕᕝᕙ ᑕᒪᑯᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᕗᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᐃᒻᒪᖄ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᐅᓯᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᐳᑎᑦ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅᑕᖃᕐᒪᑦ, ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᒪᑐᔭᐅᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᕕᐅᒍᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ. ᓲᕐᓗᖃᐃ ᒪᑐᕚᓐᒃ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᒪᑐᔭᐅᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᒃᐸᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔪᓐᓃᖅᐸᑦ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔫᓐᓂᖅᐸᑦ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᖅᑕᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᒪᑐᔭᐅᓕᕙᓪᓕᐊᓕᖅᐸᓪᓗ. ᐃᒻᒪᖄ
ᐅᓂᒃᑲᐅᓯᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᐲᑦ ᒪᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᖅᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᑦᑕ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᒃᓴᖏᑉᐸ, ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ ᑭᐅᑎᖕᓂᐊᕋᒃᑯ.

ᐹᓪᑖᕝ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐄ, ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᐃᒪᓐᓇᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᓪᓗᐊᖏᑕ ᐊᑭᓪᓗᐊᖏᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᖏᑦᑐᑦ

ᒪᑐᕙᓪᓕᐊᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ, ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᓐᓃᕈᑦᑕᓗ ᒪᑐᓂᖓ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ. ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᓪᓗᖏᑦᑕᖅ ᐊᑭᓪᓗᐊᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᓯᒪᔭᖃᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᔪᒍᑦ.

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐋᒡᓂᒍ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᒥᐊᓇᖅ. ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ

ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᖅᑕᐅᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍᓗ, ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ

48

Board hearings in Baker Lake, before Meadowbank was approved, we had learned that the road would have to be removed once the mine shuts down. We as a community did not agree with the road having to be removed.

Many of my constituents grew up in that area along the road and for them to finally have access to those lands that they grew up on was great to see and then later on, like I said, during the final hearings, we were advised that it would have to be removed completely under a decision that all the lands must be put back to the way it was before the mine opened. I’m wondering if that has changed. Agnico, can you answer? Sorry, I haven’t been keeping up before I became MLA. Is the road staying now? First question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: No, I think the point there is until the reclamation is completed, we will continue to pay taxes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Maybe if you can just repeat that answer, Mr. Plante. We had a little bit of an audio issue here with the earpieces. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Sorry. Thank you. The point there is until the road is fully “reclamated,” then we will continue to pay taxes. There would be a period after the production ends until we get to the sites and roads fully “reclamated.” Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Simailak.

Mr. Simailak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Plante, for your response. To

ᓈᓚᓐᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᒪᓂᖅᑐᐊᒥ ᑖᓐᓇ ᒪᑐᐹᒃ ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᓐᖏᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᐊᖅᑯᒡᒎᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᒍᑦᑎᖅᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓕᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᖃᒪᓂᑦᑐᐊᕐᓕᐅᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᒻᒥ ᑕᐃᑲᓃᖏᓐᓇᖁᔨᔪᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒃᑲ ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑦ ᑖᕙᓂ ᐊᐳᑎᓈᖅᑐᖅ ᒥᒃᓵᓂ ᑕᑉᐹᓂ ᐃᓅᓯᑰᒐᒥ. ᐱᕈᖅᓴᓂᑰᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᓄᓇᒥᖕᓄᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑕᕋᐅᔭᕈᓐᓇᖅᓯᖕᒪᑕ ᖁᕕᐊᒋᔭᐅᔪᖅ. ᐅᖃᐅᔾᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕᐃᓛᒃ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᐃᒍᖅᑎᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᓪᓗᑎᒃ
ᑕᐃᑲᓃᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᑎᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᖓ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᑕᐅᓗᓂ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇᖃᐃ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓕᖅᐸ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᖁᔭᐅᓚᐅᕐᓂᖓ, ᒪᒥᐊᓇᕐᓗ
ᐊᓐᖑᑎᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᐊᓘᓕᕋᒪ ᑕᒪᑐᒧᖓ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᑕᐃᑲᓂ ᐃᒍᖅᑎᖅᑕᐅᔾᔮᕈᓐᓃᕐᒪᑦ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᐱᔭᕇᖅᐸᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᓱᖅᑕᐅᓚᖓᔪᑦ, ᕼᐃᓛᖃᐃᕋ? ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᖃᓄᑭᐊᖅ ᑖᓐᓇᖃᐃ ᑭᒡᒍᑏᑦ ᐅᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᖕᓂ
ᑐᓴᖅᓴᐅᑦᑎᐊᓵᖏᒻᒪᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐊᒃᑯᑦ. ᐲᔭᖅᑕᐅᒃᐸᑦ, ᐲᔭᖅᑕᐅᖅᐸᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᓐᓃᕋᔭᖅᑐᒍᑦ. ᓲᕐᓗ ᐱᐅᓯᖓᓄᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ.

ᓯᒪᐃᓚᒃ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒡᓗ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

49

the government, to the Minister, it does say in their statement that property taxes must be paid during the closure and reclamation period, a significant portion of it. Can that be done prior to that or does it have to be during the closure? The way I read it there, they’re concerned that a significant portion of the property taxes must be paid during the closure and reclamation period. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask Thomas Ahlfors to answer the Member’s question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Mr. Ahlfors.

Mr. Ahlfors: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To be clear, Nunavut’s property taxation regime is one where property is assessed on a year-by-year basis and taxed on a year-by-year basis.

When it comes to the reclamation period or the closure period, the only taxes that would be payable at that time, as long as taxes have been paid up during the life of the mine, the only taxes that would be payable at that time are those that are assessed on a year-to-year basis during the closure. It’s not that there would be some kind of huge tax bill at the end for things that happened before. No, it’s only for that specific year that taxes would be payable. A closure is still part of a commercial operation. A mine has to consider the cost of closing the mine as part of the operation of the mine, so that’s really still a commercial exercise.

Once the mine is closed, then you’re looking at another question of what’s happening and at the end of the day, the road will be used for

ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓕᕐᓗᒍ ᐅᕙᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕐᓂᒃ ᒪᑐᓯᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᓕᒫᕋᒃᑯ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖅᓴᐃᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ

ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᑎᑦ ᑖᒪᔅ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ ᑭᐅᖁᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒥᔅᑕ ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ.

ᐋᓪᕗᐊᔅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦᑎᐊᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓲᖑᒻᒪᑦ.

ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᐊᖑᒻᒪᑎᔭᐅᑐᐊᖅᐸᑕ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᑐᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐋᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ
ᖃᔅᓯᑐᓐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒧᖓ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᔅᓯᓐᓇᔭᖅᑐᒍᑦ. ᒪᑐᓯᓂᖅ ᓱᓕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ
ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖃᓯᐅᑎᖃᑦᑕᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᑐᓐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᒪᑐᓯᓕᕐᓗᓂ.

ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᐃᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᓕᑦᑕᐅᓕᕋᔭᖅᑐᑦ. ᐊᖅᑯᑦ ᐃᓛᒃ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ

50

the purpose of the mine site during that reclamation period and whoever is doing the reclamation will be using that road and so there’s a value to that road because, if there was no road, it would cost a lot more to do the reclamation of the mine site. There’s value to using that road and that’s partly why it’s being taxed during that period, but it’s only being taxed on a year-to-year basis as opposed to having some significant tax from a previous year coming there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Going back to Agnico Eagle where you mention the infrastructure, the road being a legacy to the communities, I realize it’s not really within the scope of this bill, but I know that you do have a memorandum of understanding with the Government of Nunavut and specifically transferring ownership or dealing with that piece of infrastructure and setting it up as a legacy road or piece of infrastructure for the communities, for Nunavut, is that something that’s currently being explored or have you discussed with the government in terms of how that infrastructure could be dealt with? Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, it would be our wish to do so. However, nothing has been confirmed. There would be discussions held in the coming years. Our goal for now is not to start doing reclamation work but more extending the life of the mine, but in the longer term that would be our objective to achieve. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) A final question for Agnico Eagle: what specific amendments to Bill 55 are you suggesting? Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will turn the question to Mr. Baltov. Thank you.

ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᖅᑕᐅᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᒪᑐᔭᐅᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍᓗ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ
ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᖃᓐᖏᑉᐸᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᓂᖅᓴᒻᒪᕆᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᖅ. ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᓂᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᕝᕗᓐᖓᑐᐊᑯᓗᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᕋᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᑕᐃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᒋᓗᒋᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᓲᕐᓗ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓅᓐᖓᐅᖕᒪᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᓇᓂᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᓂᒃ

ᐃᓗᐊᓃᓐᖏᖦᖢᓂ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᖓ ᑐᑭᓯᐅᒪᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ ᓅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖏᓐᓇᓕᕐᓗᓂ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓄᓪᓗ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇᖃᐃ ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᕙ ᐊᒻᒪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᖃᑎᒋᓯᒪᕕᒋᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐄ, ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓘᕈᒪᒐᔭᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᖃᑎᒋᔪᒪᒐᔭᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒪᓂ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᒥ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔪᒪᓂᐊᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᕙᓪᓕᐊᓂᐊᓕᕈᑦᑕ.

ᐄ, ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᑐᒥ ᑐᕌᒐᖃᕈᒪᒐᔭᖅᑐᖓ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.
ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅᐹᖑᓕᕐᓗᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ. ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᓂᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑎᓂᒃ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᓇᑉᐱᓯ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᐱᓪᓗᒍ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᓯᓐᓄᑦ ᑐᓐᓂᖅᑯᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᕋ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑦ.

51

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Baltov.

Mr. Baltov: …(no audio)…a factor regarding the CapEx of roads, for example, 25 percent or similar to that or less or a little bit more. In terms of treating this kind of investment in what proportion or weight, as mentioned before, because it’s a legacy for the community, because it’s for public use and it contributes importantly to the local economic development for employment of the people who live there, that’s part of the reasons why we simply suggest to think about applying a different multiplier for this specific element. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Baltov. (interpretation ends) We had a little bit of an audio issue here, so if you mind repeating the first part of your response for the record. Mr. Baltov.

Mr. Baltov: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My point is just to say the opportunity to see if there is a possibility to apply a specific multiplier for road CapEx, for example, 25 percent of the total CapEx for the offsite roads, and here we’re not talking about our own site roads, the internal industrial paths. This is definitely a restricted area, controlled area, where simply the mining operation is happening. We’re just talking about offsite roads or the public roads which are accessible for everybody there. That was the first part of the explanation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I would like to turn to the department. Minister, in their submission, the chamber of mines suggested that or stated, “Tell the public how much the GN is collecting in property taxes and what the money is used for.” Minister, I would like to give you a chance to respond to that. Is the government currently, in your opinion,

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᑦᑐ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ.

ᐹᓪᑖᕝ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ...(ᑐᓴᖅᓴᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᖅ)... ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐆᑦᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, 25-ᐳᓴᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᓄᓐᖏᓂᖅᓴᐃᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᓂᓪᓕᐅᑎᒋᔭᐅᖅᑲᐅᓂᖓ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ
ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᑑᖕᒪᑦ ᐱᕐᔪᐊᖑᔪᖅ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᓄᓪᓗ ᑕᐃᑲᓂᕐᒥᐅᑕᓄᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᒋᔭᐅᖁᔭᕗᑦ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ

ᐊᖅᑯᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ. ᐅᖃᓪᓚᓕᓵᖅᑎᓪᓗᑎᑦ ᑐᓴᖅᓴᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑲᐅᖏᓐᓇᕕᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇᖃᐃ ᓂᓪᓕᐅᑎᒋᕐᖓᖅᑲᐅᔭᐃᑦ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᖕᓂ ᓂᐱᓕᐅᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᒐᕕᑦ? ᒥᔅᑕ ᐹᓪᑖᕝ.

ᐹᓪᑖᕝ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.
ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᖁᔨᔪᒍᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐊᖅᑯᑦ
ᐃᓕᓯᒪᐃᓐᓇᕈᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ
ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᒋᔭᐅᖁᔭᕗᑦ ᒪᑯᐊ ᐊᖅᑯᑏᑦ ᑭᓇᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᒪᑯᐊᓗ ᐃᓪᓕᓂᒐᓛᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᑎᒎᓈᖅᑐᑦ. ᑕᕝᕙ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᐅᓯᕆᓇᓱᖅᑲᐅᔭᕋ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᑖᓚᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐱᖁᑎᓪᓚᕆᓐᓃᓐᖔᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑎᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑭᓱᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑦ. ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᕝᕕᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖓᒍᑦ

52

providing the public with information about property tax collection and what the taxes are used for? Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When it comes to government collecting property taxes, it is public information and how the government uses these property taxes is set out in different ways. The money collected from property taxes is used for… . I’ll give an example of what we have used the public funds for. For the 2020-21 fiscal year, we have provided $45 million to municipalities for operations; we have provided $6.76 million to Iqaluit for their water for outside of Iqaluit; and we have provided $30.2 million to municipalities for infrastructure; and we have also provided the Department of Education $1,254,000 to schools within our municipalities.

To give a little bit more detail of information, I’ll ask Mr. Carlson to elaborate more for me. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Carlson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When it comes to communicating revenues, we’ve got the public budget that has a line item for the property tax and we’ve got the financial statements that show exactly how much we earned in property tax.

In your opening comments you noted that last year we reported about $8.5 million in property tax for the entire territory, so that’s all communities and in the hinterland, so all mine sites, but we are hearing that there is more interest in a detailed breakdown of kind of exactly where we are getting the property taxes from and that is information that my team and I can look at better communicating to those who are interested. We pulled out some numbers just to provide examples and

ᑐᓴᐅᒪᑎᑦᑎᒐᓗᐊᖅᐹᑦ ᑕᖅᑲᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑭᓱᓄᓪᓗ ᐊᑐᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᖏᑦ? ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᑎᑦᑎᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑎᖏᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓗᒋᑦ.
ᑕᖅᑲᐅᖓᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᔾᔪᑏᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑦᑐᒃᑯᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓱᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐊᖑᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑎᑎᒍᑦ ᐆᒃᑑᑎᖃᕐᓗᖓᖃᐃ ᑭᓱᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑦᑎᒃᑯ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐅᑏᑦ 2020-2021-ᒥ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᑎᒋᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ. $45 ᒥᓕᐊᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᕈᐃᓯᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔾᔪᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᒃᓴᑦ $6.7 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ ᐃᖃᓗᖕᓄᑦ ᒪᑯᓄᖓ ᐃᒥᖅᑕᐅᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖃᖅᑎᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᖃᓗᐃᑦ

ᓯᓚᑖᓂ ᐃᒥᖅᑕᕆᐊᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪ $30.2 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ ᑐᓐᓂᖅᑯᑎᒋᓚᐅᕐᒥᔭᕗᑦ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᔅᓴᐅᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ. ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓪᓗᑦ $1.25 ᒥᓕᐊᓂᑦ ᑐᓂᓚᐅᕐᒥᔭᕗᑦ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᒃᓴᑦ.

ᐅᐃᒍᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᕐᒪᒍ ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ ᐃᓚᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᔭᕋ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓐᓂᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ.

ᑳᓪᓴᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᓪᓗᒍ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐊᖑᔪᓂᒃ ᑕᖅᑲᐅᖓ ᓴᖅᑭᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᕐᕕᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᖄᑦᑎᓐᑖᓚᓂᒃ ᓄᐊᑦᑎᓂᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᑦ.

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖅᑲᐅᔭᐃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒍ, ᐊᕐᕌᓂ $8 ᒥᓕᐊᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᕝᕙᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᔪᔪᒍᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᔅᓰᓪᓗᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᓕᒫᓃᓐᖔᖅᑐᓄᓪᓗ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᔪᐃᑦ. ᑐᓴᖃᑦᑕᕐᒥᔪᒍᑦ ᑐᓴᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᒻᒪᑕᒎᖅ
ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓇᒧᓪᓚᑦᑖᖅ ᓇᑭᓪᓚᑦᑖᖅ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑎᒥᓂᕐᓂᑦ ᐱᕙᒻᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᒍᒪᔪᖃᕐᖓᒎ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᓚᐅᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᑕᑯᔅᓴᕈᖅᑎᑦᑎᐊᕈᓐᓇᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᑯᔪᒪᔪᓄᑦ. ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ ᐆᑦᑑᑎᖃᑲᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᖓ

53

so Arctic Bay, we can look at exactly how much is coming from them. Last year it was about $93,000 from that community. We can look at different sites and we can communicate that.

The Minister spoke about how we are using this money to support local services. There are different ways that we do this; she mentioned a few of them. A big one is the Municipal Funding Program. It’s a stream of payments that comes through CGS straight to municipalities so that they can support their local services, so this is the money that hamlets use to run. That was about, as the Minister said, $45 million last year. As a sense of scope, we collected $8 million across the territory from property tax and we have already spent $45 million directly to municipalities for their operations.

The Minister mentioned a few other streams. We, through CGS, support water and sewage delivery at another $6 million or $7 million a year. We build and pay for municipal infrastructure, so these are the sewage lagoons, the water treatment plants, access roads, municipal hamlet offices. That was $30 million or so alone last year in just municipal infrastructure.

The Nunavut Agreement talks about schools as part of local services. Schools are expensive. There are many different ways that you could look at their costs, but even looking at just a couple of them like school salaries or contributions to local DEAs, there is another several million dollars. I’ve got some of the numbers around here that the Minister mentioned.

Those are examples of where we take property tax from and how we spend it on local services. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you.

ᐃᑉᐱᐊᕐᔪᒻᒥ ᑕᑯᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᐃᑲᓐᖔᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᑦᑎᐅᕙᒻᒪᖔᑕ $93,000-ᔪᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᑲᓐᖔᖅᑐᐃ ᐃᑉᐱᐊᔪᒻᒥ.

ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᐸᒻᒪᖔᑦᑎᒍ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᒥᓃᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑎᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ ᑐᓂᕙᑦᑐᑎᒍ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖅᑲᐅᔭᖏᑦ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐊᖏᔪᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᐃᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑖᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᕆᕙᑦᑕᖓ. ᑕᕝᕙᓐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑎᑯᓐᓃᓐᖔᖅᑐᓂ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᓅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᑐᕌᖅᑕᐅᑎᒋᓪᓗᓂ
ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᖓᑦ. ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᒍᑎᒋᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᖏᑦ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ. $45 ᒥᓕᐊᓂᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓂᒃ ᑐᓂᓯᓯᔪᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᓄᑎᒋᐅᓂᖓ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓗᒍ $8 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᒥᒃ ᓄᐊᑦᑎᓯᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᓕᒫᒥ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ $45 ᒥᓕᐊᓂᒃ ᑐᓂᓯᓯᒪᓕᕇᖅᑐᑕ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᐃᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑐ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕋᑖᕐᒥᔪᖅ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓂᑦ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᒥᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐅᐊᑦᑕᑯᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᐸᒻᒥᔪᒍᑦ $6 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ $7 ᒥᓕᐊᓄᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂᑦ
ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᖅᑖᖑᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᐅᐊᑦᑕᑯᓕᕆᕖᑦ, ᐃᒥᑦᑕᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᑐᕆᐊᑦ, ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᓪᓚᕕᖏᑦ, $30 ᒥᓕᐊᖑᑐᐊᖑᔪᔪᐃᑦ $30 ᒥᓕᐊᖑᔪᔪᐃᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓄᖓᑐᐊᖅ ᕼᐊᒻᒪᓚᐃᑦ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᖏᓐᓅᖅᑕᕗᑦ.

ᐃᓕᓴᕕᓐᓂᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒥᔪᖅ

ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᕙᒻᒥᒻᒪᑕ ᐃᓕᓴᕖᑦ ᐊᑭᑐᔪᐊᓗᐃᑦ, ᐊᑭᑐᔪᐊᓘᒻᒪᑕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᕈᓘᔮᓗᒃ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᐊᕋᔅᓴᐃᑦ. ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᔅᓵᑐᐊᖏᓪᓗ
ᑕᑯᓐᓈᕋᔅᓴᐅᒋᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᐅᓲᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᑦ $7
ᒥᓕᐊᒦᑉᐸᓪᓚᐃᕋᑖᖅᑐᖑᑯᐊ.

ᑕᕝᕙ ᐆᑦᑑᑎᒋᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᕗᑦ, ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᒥᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᒋᕙᒻᒪᖔᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᐱᔨᑦᑎᕋᐅᑎᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ.

54

(interpretation ends) Also in the chamber’s submission, they mention on page 9, “Governments can take actions to help the industry with costs like taxes.” Minister, does the government have the resources to help the industry with costs in terms of their operations currently? Minister.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, I’ll ask Mr. Seeley to answer your question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Seeley.

Mr. Seeley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Minister. Just to frame out that proposal or that idea, if it’s within our department, as Mr. Carlson and the Minister articulated, we do significant cash contributions to municipalities for their basic operations in the delivery of programs and services in addition to the development of their core
infrastructure.

As far as the next layers to that question, I think Mr. Carlson from the Department of Finance would be better positioned to respond to any kind of supports outside of the municipal sector, with your permission, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Carlson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Your question was whether the GN has the resources to reduce taxes on mining in particular, and I would respectfully suggest that that’s the decision of those in this room during the Assembly. We have been in many appearances before in my role, supporting budget bills and appropriations, and we have discussed over the past few years the importance of looking at either increasing or

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᒪᔭᖓᓂᑦ ᒪᑉᐱᒐᖓᓂ 9−ᒥ, ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓱᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᕆᐊᓕᐊᓗᖏᓐᓄᑦ

ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓗᑎᒃ, ᐱᖃᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᑦ. ᒥᓂᔅᑐ, ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓄᑯᐊ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑳᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᕈᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖏᑕ
ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᕆᐊᖃᖅᐸᑦᑕᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᕈᑎᔅᓴᓂᒃ? ᒥᓂᔅᑐ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕᒧᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᑭᐅᔭᐅᖔᖁᔭᕋᓗᐊᕋ, ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᒻᒥᓗᑎᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᓰᓕ.

ᓰᓕ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑐ, ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕋᓱᓪᓗᒍ, ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᓕᕐᓂᕐᒪᖔᖅ. ᖃᓄᖅ
ᐊᑦᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᕕᑦᑎᓐᓂ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ ᒥᓂᔅᑐᓄᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᕋᑖᕐᖓᑦ. ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓪᓗᐊᑲᓪᓚᓐᓂᒃ ᑐᓂᐅᖅᑲᐃᕙᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᕼᐊᒻᓚᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᓛᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᐊᐅᓚᒍᑎᔅᓴᕆᓂᐊᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᑎᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᒍᓐᓇᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗᑦᑕᐅᖅ
ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᖅᐸᑭᓪᓗᑕ.

ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᒃ
ᑭᐅᑦᑎᐊᓂᖅᓴᐅᒍᓐᓇᕋᔭᖅᕋᐸᓪᓚᐃᔪᖅ,
ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓰᒍᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᕼᐊᒻᓚᓄᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑳᓪᓴᓐ.

ᑳᓪᓴᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᕋᑖᕋᕕᐅᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ, ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖏᑦ ᓈᖕᒪᒻᒪᖔᑕ
ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᓂ
ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᓐᖏᓐᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ. ᐃᓕᔅᓯ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᔪᓯ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐋᖅᑭᒍᓐᓇᖅᑕᔅᓯ, ᐃᓱᒪᑖᕈᑎᒋᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᓯ. ᐅᕙᖓᓕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖓᓂ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓰᔨᐅᓪᓗᖓ, ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᓕᐊᖑᒐᓱᑦᑐᓂ. ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓂ ᖃᑦᑎᓂᒃᑭᐊᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓯᒪᓕᕋᑦᑎᒍ,
ᐊᖏᓪᓕᒋᐊᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ

55

at least maintaining the GN’s own source revenue. We have talked about that many times.

In terms of whether this Assembly or the next one chooses to give tax breaks to particular industries, it would be up to the Members. As I had mentioned earlier, in a mining survey, the taxes in Nunavut have not been identified as a significant concern of the mining industry. I fully appreciate that if I were industry, the fewer taxes I pay, the better. That’s a very fair stance, but from our government perspective, I would suggest that our taxes are low, they’re reasonable, they’re relatively stable, and we do consider them with that type of stuff in mind. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I would like to turn to the chamber now. In the very last line of your submission, you mention that if the government is “looking for new tax revenues, work to increase Nunavummiut employment.” It goes on and says, if the government helped to “get another 800 Nunavummiut into mining jobs, it would return tens of millions per year in income taxes alone.”

I represent a constituency with very high unemployment, chronically high unemployment and poverty. When you reference 800 Nunavummiut getting into jobs, it’s something that’s of interest. What would that initiative entail? What are we talking about? Increasing employment for 800 Nunavummiut and getting them into the mining industry, how long would that take? How much training would be needed? What’s the time frame for achieving something like that? Mr. Dobbin.

Mr. Dobbin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that question. In reference to that statement, it was basically saying that instead of property

ᐊᖏᓪᓕᒋᐊᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕘᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑕ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑖᕐᓂᕆᕙᑦᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐃᓯᖅᑎᐸᑦᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐅᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᐅᓛᖅᑐᓘᓐᓃᑦ

ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃ, ᑖᒃᓯᓂᒃ
ᐊᑭᓖᖏᓂᖅᓴᐅᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕈᒪᑉᐸᑕ, ᓇᓕᐊᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᕐᔪᐊᓕᓐᓂᒃ, ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓲᑎᒋᓛᕐᒥᒐᔅᓯᐅᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᐅᓪᓗᓯ. ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕕᓐᓂᓪᓕ

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑐᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕐᓂᐊᓯᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᒋᔭᐅᓗᐊᖅᓯᒪᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᓐᓂᕈᒪ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕆᖃᓐᖏᓂᖅᓴᐅᒍᒪ ᖁᕕᐊᓱᓪᓚᕆᒃᑲᔭᕐᒥᔪᖓ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᒐᕙᒪᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᑕᑯᓐᓈᖅᑐᑎᒍ

ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕗᑦ ᐊᑦᑎᑦᑐᒋᔭᕗᑦ, ᓈᖕᒪᑦᑐᒋᔭᕗᑦ, ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᓗᐊᖅᑐᒋᖏᑕᕗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑕᐃᓛᒃ

ᐃᓱᒪᒋᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᕗᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᔅᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ: ᒪ’ᓇ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ) ᓵᖔᕈᒪᓕᕐᒥᔪᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖓᓄᑦ. ᑭᖑᓪᓕᐹᑦᑎᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᑐᓂᓯᒪᔭᔅᓯᓐᓂᒃ, ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕋᔅᓯ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᑖᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕈᒪᒧᑦ ᕿᓂᖅᑲᑕ, ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒥᓱᕈᕆᐊᖅᑎᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ. ᐃᓕᔅᓯ ᒐᕙᒪᐅᓗᓯ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᕈᔅᓯ 800 ᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓂᒃ

ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕕᒻᒥ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖅᑖᑎᑦᑎᒍᓐᓇᓕᕐᓂᕈᔅᓯ, ᐅᑎᖅᑎᒐᕙᖅᑐᖅ $10 ᒥᓕᐊᒐᓚᒻᒪᕆᐊᓗᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᑎᒍᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᕈᑎᒥᓂᕐᓂᒃ.

ᑭᒡᒐᖅᑐᐃᒐᒪᓕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓐᖏᑦᑐᒐᓛᓗᓐᓂᒃ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒋᓯᒪᔭᓐᓂᒃ.
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓐᖏᑦᑐᒐᓚᔾᔪᐊᕌᓗᓐᖏᓐᓇᕐᖓᑕᐃᓛᒃ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᓯ 800 ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᑲᑕ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᑐᓴᕈᒥᓇᖅᑐᖅ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᒐᓱᒃᑲᔭᖅᑲ, ᓱᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑭᑕ?
ᐊᒥᓱᕈᕆᐊᖅᓯᓂᐊᕈᑦᑕ 800−ᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒻᒥ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓗᑕ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑯᓂ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᒐᓱᒃᑲᔭᖅᑲ, ᖃᓄᑎᒋᓗ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᖅᑕᐅᖅᑳᕆᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑲᑦ, ᖃᓄ ᐊᑯᓂᓗ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᓴᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᑲ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᑖᐱᓐ.

ᑖᐱᓐ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᕋᑖᖅᑕᓰᓛᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᖁᑎᓄᑦ

56

taxes, payroll taxes would probably be another alternative. Because right now industry does most of the training itself, we would like to ask the GN for some help with training because most of the local Inuit are in unskilled labour at Baffinland and AEM and we need more Inuit in semi-skilled positions and skilled positions, so we’re asking for some help with training from the GN.

I know for a fact that the chamber of mines itself took on a public awareness initiative back in 2017 because we were aware that mines want to hire more Inuit. That’s not the point. The point is just that you have to be skilled in order…like if you bring your car to a garage, you want a qualified mechanic to repair your car. That is the point. We need to get more Nunavummiut involved in the industry and industry can’t do it alone. We need help from the government.

I know Inuit youth know very little about the mining industry. At the Nunavut Mining Symposium last year there was a youth symposium and they know a cousin that works at the mine, but that’s the extent to it.

I keep referring to Yvonne Jones’ statement with regard to Voisey’s Bay in Labrador. The Voisey’s Bay nickel mine, in the ‘90s, their Inuit employment figures were very low, but now they’ve got like their Inuit hire is like 55 percent at Voisey’s Bay in Labrador.

I make reference to my statement earlier that in 2009 there was virtually no mining in Nunavut whatsoever, so we have come a long way in a short period of time, but again, like infrastructure, the mines can’t do it alone. We need government help and we need government support to get more
Nunavummiut trained and ready for industry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you.

ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᓐᖏᖔᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑏᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᔅᓵᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᐃᔭᖁᔨᓂᖓ ᐊᓯᐊᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᖁᑎᐅᒍᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᖅ. ᓇᒻᒥᓂᕐᓕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖏᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖁᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᔭᕗᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐊᑕᖏᐸᓗᑦᑐᑎᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᒫᓂᒥᐅᑕᐃᑦ
ᓴᓇᑐᓕᖅᓴᔭᐅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖃᑦᑕᕐᖓᑕ. ᐃᒫᒃ ᓴᓇᒋᐅᖅᓴᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᕈᔪᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑖᕈᒪᒐᓗᐊᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓪᓗ.

ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒻᒥᔭᕗᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖑᓪᓗᑕ 2017-ᖑᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᖅᑲᐅᖓ ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᒋᐊᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒐᑦᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᖁᔨᒐᓗᐊᕐᖓᑕ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᑕᕝᕙᑑᒻᒥᓇᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓕᓐᖓᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᓇᒍᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕈᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕋᕕᑦ ᓄᓇᓯᐅᑎᖃᕐᕕᓕᕆᔨᐅᓐᓂᕈᕕᑦ
ᐊᐅᓚᐅᓯᕆᔨᓪᓚᕆᐅᒍᕕᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓴᓇᒍᓐᓇᕋᔭᕋᕕᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐆᑦᑑᑎᒋᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᕋ. ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑦ ᐱᖃᑕᐅᓕᖅᑎᒍᒪᔭᕋᓗᐊᕗᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓄᑑᔾᔨᒍᓐᓇᓐᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ.

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᒪᒃᑯᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᖃᑦᑎᐊᓐᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᒐᒪ. ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᓗ
ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᖅ ᑲᑎᒪᕐᔪᐊᕈᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᐃᒪᑐᐊᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᔫᔮᔪᖅ ᐃᓪᓗᐊᕐᔪᖃᕋᒥᒎᖅ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕕᒻᒥ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓲᒥᒃ ᑕᕝᕘᓇᑐᐊᖅ.

ᐊᒻᒪ ᔫᓐᔅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖅᑲᐅᔭᖓ ᕗᐃᓯ ᐸᐃᒥ, ᓛᐸᑐᐊᕆᒥ. ᕙᐃᓯ ᐸᐃᒥ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃ 1990-ᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᖏᑦ
ᐊᑦᑎᑦᑐᕕᔾᔪᐊᕌᓗᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ. ᒫᓐᓇᓕ 55%- ᒦᒻᒪᕆᑉᐸᓕᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᕗᐃᓯ ᐸᐃ, ᓚᐸᑐᐊᕆᒥ.

ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖅᑲᐅᔭᕋ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᒃᑲᓂᕐᓗᒍ 2009-ᖑᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ
ᐅᔭᖃᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖃᓐᖏᓪᓚᕆᑦᑐᑯᓘᔪᔪᖅ ᐊᕗᖔᓗᒃ ᐱᕙᓪᓕᐊᓯᒪᓕᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᕿᓚᒥᕈᓗᒃ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐃᓄᑑᔾᔨᒍᓐᓇᓐᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᓖᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓯᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᓖᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑦ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᓴᐃᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕈᓐᓇᖅᓯᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ.

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.

57

(interpretation ends) I would like to turn this topic to Nunavut Tunngavik. I realize that it is peripheral to this bill. This bill doesn’t specifically address Inuit employment within mining operations, but we have been discussing benefits from mining, whether it’s taxes, whether it’s royalties, and I think it’s another potential benefit for constituents that, as it has been mentioned by Nunavut Tunngavik, are represented in this legislature as well as represented by your organization, Ms. Kotierk. In a general sense, is your organization satisfied with the current levels of Inuit employment within the mining sector? Ms. Kotierk.

Ms. Kotierk (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (interpretation ends) I don’t know if you caught it, but yesterday in my opening remarks in reference to Article 22, I slipped in Article 23 by mistake, so I’m very pleased for the question. It is one of the things that I absolutely love discussing because I really do think that investments in Inuit will make a transformation of a long-term positive impact on our lives.

I recognize your statement about the chronic unemployment in your constituency and the high rates of poverty, and I would say that so much of that is across all Nunavut communities and it creates a fire in oneself to advocate for investments in Inuit building capacity and training, when you’re related to so many people and you love so many people and you know that they’re living in poverty and you know that they are capable and it’s due to a lack of opportunity or due to a lack of belief in the ability of Inuit.

I think Article 23 specifically talks about Inuit employment plans and pre-employment plans in Parts 4 and 5, very specifically to government, but I think we recognize and I know the report we released through PricewaterhouseCoopers talked about how not

ᒫᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓵᖔᕆᐊᕈᒪᓕᕐᒥᒐᒪ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇᐃᓛᒃ ᐊᑦᑐᐊᓂᖃᕈᔪᒻᒪᑦ ᑖᔅᓱᒥᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᔅᓴᕐᓗ ᑲᒪᓗᐊᕋᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕖᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖏᑕ ᐃᓗᐊᓂ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖃᑦᑕᕋᑦᑕ ᐃᑲᔫᓯᐊᖑᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᓂᕐᒥ ᑖᒃᓰᑎᒋᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᓴᑦᑖᕐᓂᑯᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᕐᖓᓂᓛᒃ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒋᓯᒪᔭᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᕙᓂ ᑭᒡᒐᑐᖅᑕᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ. ᐃᓱᒪᒋᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᒍᓕ ᑖᓐᓇ ᑎᒥᖁᑎᒋᔭᓯ ᓈᒻᒪᓴᖅᑳ ᐅᓪᓗᒥᐅᔪᖅ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᖃᑦᑎᐅᓂᕆᕙᑦᑕᖏᓐᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᓂᕐᒥᒃ? ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ.

ᑰᑦᑎᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ
ᑕᐃᒪ ᓱᖅᑯᐃᓱᒃᑯᕕᐅᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᖓ

ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 22-ᒥ 22-ᓚᐅᕋᒪᐃᓛᒃ, ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᒋᐊᖓ ᖁᕕᐊᒋᓪᓚᕆᑦᑕᕋ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᒪ ᐃᓕᐅᖅᑲᐃᓂᖅ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒥᓱᕈᕆᐊᖅᓯᒐᓱᓪᓗᓂ ᓯᕗᓂᑐᖃᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᓯᓂᐊᕐᖓᑦ ᐅᕙᑦᑎᓐᓂ.

ᐊᒻᒪ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓐᖏᑦᑐᒐᓛᓗᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᓂᕈᐊᖅᑎᒋᓯᒪᔭᔅᓯᓐᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᖅᑲᐅᒐᕕᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑳᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᒥᓲᒻᒪᑕ
ᓄᓇᓕᓕᒫᖏᓐᓂ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒻᒪᑕ.
ᐱᓕᕆᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᓕᕐᓇᕕᐅᑎᑦᑐᖅ
ᐊᔭᐅᕆᒍᒪᓕᕐᓇᓪᓚᕆᑦᑐᖅ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ
ᐃᓕᐅᖅᑲᐃᖁᔨᒃᑲᓂᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᐱᓕᒻᒪᓴᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᔅᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᒥᓱᐊᓗᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓪᓗᓂ ᐊᔪᖅᓴᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ
ᐊᔪᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓪᓗᑎᒍ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕈᓐᓇᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑕᖃᓐᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖃᖅᐸᓐᖏᒻᒪᑕ.

ᓈᓴᐅᑎᓕᒃ 23 ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᓪᓚᕆᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᓕᐅᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ 4 ᐊᒻᒪ 5-ᒥ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᓪᓗᓂ ᒐᕙᒪᓄᑦ. ᐃᓕᓴᖅᓯᔪᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔭᕗᑦ PricewaterhouseCoopers−ᑯᑎᒍᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᖓᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ

58

achieving a representative workforce in the public service, and it could be the same in the private sector, is a great loss to Inuit households, not only in terms of salaries lost but in terms of pride, in terms of role models, in terms of the ability to buy further and expensive hunting equipment.

We recognize and I think the great, wonderful thing about being human is that we all have very different, varied interests. I was at the Agnico Eagle mine in Rankin Inlet when it was opened and I had the opportunity to go underground and going underground is not something I enjoy and I shared that in my comments when I had the opportunity to address the crowd and I said, “This is something I would never do,” but I am so happy that others, including Inuit, are comfortable and enjoy and have the passion to go underground to collect the important resources we need to help us in other different
areas.

I think that what we need to do as a territory is recognize the strengths and diversity in strengths that we have in our population, and I think this has been very clearly highlighted and underscored with our COVID-19 pandemic, where we have an overreliance on non-Nunavut residents for trades, for construction, for things that non-skilled or very low skilled individuals could take on, which means that they would be open for Inuit to take on if there were investments so that Inuit were able to take that on.

Through Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, as you know, we have the Makigiaqta Inuit Training Corporation. We continue to have lots of discussions about how to build capacity and we would be very open to partnering with organizations that build capacity for Inuit in the private sector as well as the public sector. We recognize that there are general skill sets that need to be developed

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᖃᓐᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᓯᐅᔨᓂᓪᓚᕆᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᒍᓐᓇᕋᓗᐊᖅᑐᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᓂᒃ
ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᔅᓵᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᐱᒍᓱᒍᓐᓇᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᒪᑭᒪᑦᑎᐊᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑭᓱᑖᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᓂᕐᒥᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐊᖑᓇᓲᑎᔅᓴᓂᒃ ᐊᑭᑐᔪᓂᒃ.

ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓕᓴᕆᓯᒪᓪᓚᕆᒃᑲᑦᑎᒍ ᐱᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᖃᓄᖅᑑᕈᓐᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᒐᑦᑕ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑦᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᒐᑦᑕ ᑭᓱᕈᓘᔭᕐᓂᒃ ᑕᑯᔪᒪᔭᖃᖅᑐᑕ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ. ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᖏᖅᓯᓂᕐᒥ ᒪᑐᐃᖅᑕᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓅᖃᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᔪᒐᒪ. ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓅᖃᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂᓕ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐊᓕᐊᓇᐃᒋᔪᓐᖏᑕᕋ. ᐅᓂᒃᑳᕆᓯᒪᓪᓗᒍᓗ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᕆᒍᓐᓇᖅᓯᒐᒃᑯ ᐃᓄᒋᐊᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᖓ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑦᑐᒥᒃ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᖃᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔾᔮᓐᖏᓪᓚᕆᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕋᖅᑐᖓ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᓴᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᓕᐊᓇᐃᒍᓱᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐃᑭᐊᖓᓂ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕆᐊᕆᐊᔅᓴᖅ ᐲᔭᐃᖃᑕᐅᒋᐊᔅᓴᖅ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕋᔅᓴᓂᒃ.

ᑕᐃᒪᐃᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᒍᓂᓛᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᖑᓪᓗᑕ
ᐃᓕᓴᖅᓯᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ,
ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᑦᑑᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐃᓄᖁᑎᑦᑕ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᓪᓚᕆᑦᑕᕗᑦ
ᖃᐅᔨᓯᒪᑦᑎᐊᓪᓚᕆᑦᑕᕗᑦ
ᓄᕙᓐᓇᕐᔪᐊᑕᓕᐊᓘᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᑕᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᐃᑦ ᑐᕚᕆᕙᒃᑲᑦᑎᒍ ᓴᓇᔨᒋᓪᓗᑎᒍ ᐃᓕᓐᖓᑎᐊᓐᖏᓪᓚᕆᑦᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᔭᐅᒍᓐᓇᕋᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐃᓕᐅᖅᑲᐃᔪᖃᕐᓂᖅᑲᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᔭᐅᖔᕈᓐᓇᕋᔭᕋᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ.

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓪᓗᑎᒍ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᒪᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᒥ ᐃᓕᓴᑎᑦᑎᕕᖃᕋᑦᑕ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕈᓘᔭᖅᓯᒪᔪᖃᕐᖓᑦ ᐃᓄᒋᐊᔅᓯᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ. ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖃᐅᑎᓕᓐᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓄᓪᓗ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᓴᖅᓯᔪᒍᑦ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᖓᑦ

59

through embedded literacy programs, for instance, that build cultural pride but have an embedded literacy component so that Inuit start having a positive relationship with formal education.

As you and many people here will recognize, there has been a historical experience with residential schools that has provided a negative experience for many of our parents, and so it is very conceivable and I know for myself, my late grandmother was very surprised that I was continuing to go to university, and the communication that I received as a young Inuk woman, I did not know if it was valuable, if it was going to add value to my life because the people who came before me did not experience that.

I think, over time, we will start creating a pool of Inuit who value formal education and continue to explain how it’s important for the collective benefit of ourselves as Inuit. We’re currently working on…I’m going all over the place, but I love talking about Inuit employment.

One of the things we are currently working on is a mine training strategy. I would hope that through that, we will be able to build capacity amongst Inuit so Inuit can participate in the mining sector if that’s the area that brings them passion. Thank you so much.

Chairman: Thank you, Ms. Kotierk. I remember that trip underground and it was something to see at the Meliadine mine there.

I would like to turn to Agnico Eagle, unless the Chair is going to rule me out of order for asking this question. The submission from Agnico Eagle, on page 2, mentions that the company is the largest private sector employer in Nunavut and it mentions that in 2020, out of 2,940 full-time positions for employees and contractors, 378 were filled by

ᐅᖃᓕᒫᕆᐅᖅᓴᑎᑦᑎᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓐᖏᓐᓇᕐᖓᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᓕᒫᕈᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ. ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᕙᓂ ᐃᓕᔅᓯ ᐃᓕᓴᖅᓯᓗᓯ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕆᐊᖅᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐱᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᑦᑐᐃᓯᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᐊᓈᓇᒃᑯᒋᔭᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒥᓱᓂᒃ.

ᖃᐅᔨᔭᔅᓴᖅᔫᔮᖅᑐᖏᓛᖅ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᒪᓕ
ᓂᖏᐅᕆᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᔭᕋ ᖁᐊᖅᓵᓪᓚᕆᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᓯᓚᑦᑐᓴᕐᕕᒻᒧᑦ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕆᐊᕐᓂᐅᓴᔪᐊᓘᒐᒪ. ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᒐᒪ ᐊᕐᓇᐅᓪᓗᖓ ᐃᓅᓪᓗᖓ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᖓ ᐊᑑᑎᖃᓛᕐᒪᖔᖅ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕆᐊᕆᐊᔅᓴᖅ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᑕᐃᒃᑯᐊ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᔪᔪᐃᑦ ᐅᕙᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᐅᔪᒃᑰᕐᓂᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᓐᖏᒻᒪᑕ.

ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᑕᕝᕙ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᐸᓪᓕᐊᓕᖅᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᑑᑎᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᐅᑉ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᒋᒍᓐᓇᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᓇᒧᕈᓘᔮᓗᖏᓛᒃ ᓂᓪᓕᐊᓕᕋᓗᐊᖅᑐᖓ ᖃᓄᕈᓘᔮᓗᒃ.

ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓚᖓᑦ ᑕᕝᕙ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᒻᒥᔭᕗᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑐᑭᒧᐊᒍᑎᔅᓴᓕᐅᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᒋᓗᒍ
ᐊᒥᓱᕈᕆᐊᖅᓯᒍᓐᓇᓂᐊᖅᑐᒋᔪᒍᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᖃᑕᐅᒍᓐᓇᓂᐊᕐᖓᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒻᒥ ᐱᖃᑕᐅᒍᒪᑉᐸᑕᐃᓛᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᕌᓗᒃ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᒥᔅ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ. ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᐃᖅᑲᐅᒪᔭᕋ ᓄᓇᐅᑉ ᐊᑖᓅᕐᓂᕆᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑕᐃᓐᓇ ᒪᓚᑏᓐ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒻᒥ.

ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯ ᓵᖔᕐᓗᖓ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ
ᐊᐱᕆᖁᓐᖏᑉᐸᖓ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ. ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᒪᒃᐱᒐᖅ 2-ᒥ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅᐹᖑᒻᒪᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᓂ ᐊᒻᒪ 2020-ᒥ 2,940 ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔮᑦ ᑳᓐᑐᕌᖃᖅᑐᓪᓗ 378

60

Inuit. I am aware, actually we all are, that 2020 was the year when the pandemic affected operations at Agnico’s mines in Nunavut.

In terms of your company’s activities to date and future plans around increasing Inuit employment, Mr. Plante, I would like to give you an opportunity to comment as to how important that is for your operations. Mr. Plante.

Mr. Plante: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Inuit employment and development has been, I would say, a subject in which we are also passionate. As you may know, we are investing every year between $7 million and $9 million just for Inuit training, which represents about 24 or 25 percent of our Inuit workforce costs, I would say. This is something we’re committed to continue.

We’re pretty pleased with the entry-level positions that we have, but the challenge we’re facing and it has been touched by the chamber of mines and this concern, when we enter the skilled positions and management positions, that’s where it will demand much more efforts… . The needs go much beyond, the Inuit needs, of the short capacity of a mining company.

Obviously this is something where we need to work collectively and continue improving. Our goal is to fill those jobs and we know that there are people out there that can perform those, but again, just by ourselves, there’s just so much we can do. We need to work with the GN and the organizations that can contribute, bringing more and more people to the mining industry in Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) I could ask so many more questions on this topic, but to be fair, I’ll

ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓐᓄᑦᑕᐅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ.
ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᐃᓐᓇᐅᖅᑰᕋᑦᑕ 2020 ᑖᓐᓇ ᓄᕙᓐᓇᕐᔪᐊᖅ ᐊᑦᑐᖅᓯᓯᒪᓕᕐᒪᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖏᓐᓂ ᐊᑦᓃᑯ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓐᖏᓐᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ.

ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᑲᒻᐸᓂᓯ ᐅᓪᓗᒥᒧᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᑦ ᓯᕗᓂᒃᓴᒧᓪᓗ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᓯᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ ᐱᕕᓂᖃᑦᑐᒪᒐᒃᑭᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᕕᒋᔪᒪᒍᕕᐅᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᑎᒋᒻᒪᖔᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᔅᓯᓐᓄᑦ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ.

ᐸᓛᓐᑦ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᑎᑦᑎ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᑉᐱᒋᔭᒻᒪᕆᒐᑦᑎᒍ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᐅᑎᑦᑕ ᐊᕐᕌᖑᑕᒫᑦ $7 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ $9 ᒥᓕᐊᓐ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᒃᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ 25-ᐳᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᑦ.
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᑖᓐᓇᓕ
ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᓯᒪᒍᒪᑦᑎᐊᖅᐸᕗᑦ.

ᖁᕕᐊᒋᓪᓗᑎᒍᓪᓗ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓯᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᔅᓱᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᒋᒐᑦᑎᒍᓪᓕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᖏᑦ ᑰᑦᓯᐅᓪᓗ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᒃᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᖏᖅᑲᐅᑎᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᓂᖏᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ
ᐊᔅᓱᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖅᓴᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᖓᑖᓅᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖓᑖᓅᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᕆᑦᑐᖅ.

ᐅᖃᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖓ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᑦᑐᑕ
ᐱᐅᓯᕚᓪᓕᖅᑎᓐᓇᓱᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᕗᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᑕᐃᒪᓗ ᐃᓐᓄᒐᓱᓐᓂᐊᕋᑦᑎᒍ ᑐᕌᒐᕆᒐᑦᑎᒍ ᖃᐃᒪᒐᑦᑎᒍ ᐃᓄᑦᑕᖃᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᑕᖅᑳᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᔪᒍᑦ ᓱᓕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᑎᒥᐅᔪᓂᓪᓗ
ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᒻᒧᑦ
ᐃᓐᓄᔅᓯᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᖅ ᐊᐱᕆᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᒪᕆᐅᒐᓗᐊᖅᑐᖓ ᑕᒪᑐᒪ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓈᒻᒪᒋᐊᓇᓱᓪᓗᒍ

61

give Baffinland a chance to comment on the same issue in terms of Inuit employment and how important it is to your operations in Nunavut. Mr. Moore.

Mr. Moore: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could take this opportunity, I did have a deferred response as well to a question you had asked earlier. I can provide that now, if you wish.

Thank you. You had asked a question: to what extent does Baffinland pay corporate taxes to the Government of Nunavut? I did receive a response from my colleagues at the finance department at Baffinland. Baffinland has not paid corporate taxes to the Government of Nunavut to date as we are still in the phase of deducting applicable costs of project development outlined in relevant legislation.

However, as Baffinland is currently undergoing the Nunavut Impact Review Board assessment of its phase 2 project proposal, I can say that over the life of Deposit 1 of the Mary River project, Baffinland expects to pay the Government of Nunavut approximately $321 million in corporate tax over the life of Deposit 1 and a total of $679 million in corporate, fuel, payroll and other fiscal revenues over the life of Deposit 1. Thank you for giving me that opportunity.

One further clarification, if I may, to a question from Ms. Angnakak yesterday about Baffinland’s 2020 Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act report, the Member pointed out that payments to the Government of Nunavut were not listed. While not a deferred response, I just wanted to indicate to the Member that there are certain exemptions outlined in the Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act. One of
those exemptions is the reporting of consumptive taxes, such as a fuel tax, a

ᐹᕕᓐᓛᒃᑯᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐅᖃᕐᕕᖃᖅᑎᑦᑐᒪᒻᒥᒐᒃᑭᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒪ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᖃᓄᖅ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᑎᒋᒻᒪᖔᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᔅᓯᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ. ᒥᔅᑕ ᒧᐊ.

ᒧᐊ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ. ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᕕᖃᕐᓂᓐᓂᑦ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᔅᓴᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒥᒐᒪ
ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᖅᑲᐅᔭᕐᓄᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᑭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᒍᕕᑦ?

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᖃᖅᑲᐅᒐᕕᑦ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐹᐱᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒧᑦ ᑭᐅᔭᐅᕋᑖᕋᒪ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖃᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᐹᐱᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ. ᐹᐱᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᑯᐊᐳᕇᓴᓐ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥᒧᑦ. ᓲᖃᐃᒻᒪ ᓱᓕ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖅᑐᕈᑎᕕᓂᖏᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᓕᐅᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᒪᓕᑦᑐᒋᑦ.

ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐸᐱᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ
ᐊᖏᓪᓕᕚᓪᓕᕈᒪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖓ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᖅ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ ᐹᐱᓪᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᓐᓇᐃᕆᐊᔅᓴᖅ $321 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᓯᓄᑦ ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᒧᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑲᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ $679 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᒻᒧᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᔅᓵᕆᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᒫᓐᓇ ᓄᖑᓐᓇᓱᓐᓂᖅ ᐊᑐᖅᑐᖅ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐱᕕᖃᖅᑎᒃᑲᕕᓐᖓ.

ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᓐᓇᕈᒃᑯ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑕᐅᖅᑲᐅᔪᒧᑦ, ᒥᔅ ᐊᕐᓇᒃᑲᖅ ᐃᑉᐸᔅᓴᖅ ᐹᐱᓛᒃᑯᑦ 2020 ᑖᓐᓇ ᑕᑯᔅᓴᐅᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᓐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᕆᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎ ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᐃᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᑕᖃᓚᐅᓐᖏᒻᒪᑕᒎᖅ ᐅᖃᕈᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᕋᑖᖅᑐᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᓂᖅ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᑭᓖᓐᖏᔾᔪᑎᔅᓴᖃᕐᒪᑦ. ᐄ, ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑭᓖᖏᑦᑐᓐᓇᐅᑕᐅᔪᑦ
ᐅᓂᒃᑳᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᖅᓱᐊᓗᒻᒧᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ

62

consumptive tax, as well as certain payroll taxes. That’s why those are not listed in Baffinland’s Extractive Sector Transparency Measures Act filing in 2020. However, Baffinland does report those annually in its annual socio-economic monitoring reports to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, which I would be happy to provide to the Member or to the Committee, if so desired.

To the question you asked, as stated by Mr. Plante from Agnico Eagle, I think the mining industry in Nunavut as a whole is fully committed to doing its utmost to increase Inuit employment across the communities we work with day in and day out. Baffinland has seen immense growth in its Inuit workforce since 2017, hitting well over 400 individuals and their families benefiting from employment at the Mary River project in 2019.

With the COVID-19 pandemic, we saw those numbers fall greatly, at no fault of our own, but Baffinland was the first company in Nunavut to send home its Inuit workforce as well as the first company to announce that it was continuing to pay its Inuit workforce or Nunavut residents to stay home based on guidance from the chief public health officer.

Baffinland already has committed through the recently signed Inuit Certainty Agreement the expenditure of $1.5 million for annual Inuit-specific training programs each and every year. We have committed to work with our partners at the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and others to establish a regional training facility in Pond Inlet. It will be a state-of-the-art facility that we are working on now. No, it has not been constructed yet, but these things take time, as everyone knows.

We have also committed to build in-community facilities in Arctic Bay, Clyde River, Igloolik, and Sanirajak, all for the

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑮᓇᐅᔾᔭᔅᓵᕆᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ. ᑕᐃᒫᖑᑯᐊ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᓐᖏᓚᑦ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᑖᔅᓱᒧᖓ ᑲᓐᖑᓇᖅᑕᐃᓕᒪᓂᕐᒧᑦ 2020−ᒧᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐊᕐᕌᒎᑕᒫᑦ ᐃᓅᓯᕐᒧᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᓐᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓕᐊᕆᖃᑦᑕᖅᑕᖏᑦ. ᖁᕕᐊᓱᒃᑲᔭᖅᐳᖓ ᐱᑕᖃᖅᑎᑦᑎᑐᓐᓇᕈᒃᑯᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᒍᔅᓯ.

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᕋᑖᖅᑕᓐᓄᓪᓕ ᒥᔅᑕ ᐸᓛᓐᑦ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐅᓇ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᓂᖃᑦᑎᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᐊᖏᓪᓕᒋᐊᖅᓯᔪᒪᒻᒪᑕ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᓕᒫᓄᑦ
ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐅᓪᓗᑕᒫᑦ. ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᖏᑦ ᐱᕈᖅᐹᓪᓕᖅᓯᒪᔪᒻᒪ 2017-ᒥ 400-ᖑᓗᐊᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓚᔮᕇᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓕᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓄᓘᔮᓂ. 2019.

ᓄᕙᓐᓇᕐᔪᐊᖅ 19 ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑉᐸᕆᐊᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐅᕙᒍᓪᓕ ᐱᔭᕆᓇᑎᒍ ᑲᒻᐸᓂ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᖑᓚᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐊᖏᕐᕋᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᖑᓪᓗᓂ ᐊᑭᓕᖅᓱᐃᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᖏᕐᕋᖅᓯᒪᒐᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᓘᒃᑖᒻᒪᕆᐅᑉ ᒪᓕᒋᐊᖁᔭᖓ ᒪᓕᓪᓗᒍ.

ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᑎᓕᐅᕋᑖᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ $1.5 ᒥᓕᐊᓐᓂ ᐊᕐᕌᒎᑕᒫᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᓴᔾᔭᐅᓗᑎ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᑕᒫᑦ. ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᓯᒪᔪᒍᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ ᐊᕕᑦᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂ ᒥᑦᑎᒪᑕᓕᒻᒥ
ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᓕᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᖅ. ᓱᓕ
ᓇᑉᐸᑎᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᓐᖏᑦᑑᒐᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᓯᒪᒻᒥᒐᑦᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᓐᓂ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᓂ

ᐃᒃᐱᐊᕐᔪᒻᒥ, ᑲᖏᖅᑐᒑᐱᒻᒥ, ᐃᒡᓗᓕᒻᒥ, ᓴᓂᕋᔭᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ

63

purpose of training. These are facilities that will be fully funded by Baffinland, unless of course we’re able to work with partners who wish to work with us, but training remains one of the key components to up-skilling Baffinland’s workforce and it is a priority, as I just mentioned, through all those commitments that we have made and are working towards.

One of the big differences with the Mary River project is we don’t have a large unskilled workforce at the project. Our skilled workforce is very small. The largest portion of our operation is in the semi-skilled and skilled categories, so that is machine operators, dozer drivers, truck operators, maintainers, and tradespeople. That is where the bulk of Baffinland’s workforce resides and that is why training for Baffinland is a huge component of what we do for our Inuit employees today and for our prospective Inuit employees.

Through the COVID-19 pandemic, we had to put a lot of our training on hold, but recently we have restarted some of our training programs virtually and we’re very excited about that and it has gone really well.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I think training continues to be a huge priority. Baffinland would welcome partnership from Nunavut Tunngavik, as President Kotierk stated, or the continued partnership with the Government of Nunavut for investments in training. These are things that, by working together, I think each and every one of us has a role to play and can certainly make that much more impact. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you, Mr. Moore. (interpretation ends) At this point the Committee no longer has any questions for the witnesses and so we’re going to wrap up the hearing. I would like to give the

ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᖁᑎᕐᔪᐊᑦ
ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕋᔭᖅᑐᑦ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᓐᓂᑦ. ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᔾᔮᖏᒃᑯᑦᑕ ᐊᓯᖓ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᖅ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᓯᒪᓂᖅᐳᑦ ᑐᕌᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᔭᕗᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓐᖏᒻᒪᕆᒻᒪᒍᓕ ᓄᓘᔮᓐᓂ ᑕᐃᒫᒃ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓯᒪᓐᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᖃᔅᓰᓐᓇᑯᓗᒻᒪᑕ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓕ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᐹᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓯᒪᔪᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓯᒪᐸᓗ ᒪᑯᐊ ᐊᖁᑏᑦ ᐅᖁᒪᐃᑦᑐᓂᒃ, ᐊᖁᑏᓪᓗ ᐅᓯᑲᖅᑕᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᓴᓇᔨᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐸᐃᑉᐹᑦ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓕ ᑕᕝᕙ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖅᓴᐅᒻᒪᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᓐᓂ. ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᓂᖅ ᐊᖏᔪᒻᒪᕆᐅᕗᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ
ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᒋᔪᓐᓇᓛᖅᑕᕗᑦ.

ᓄᕙᓐᓇᕐᔪᐊᖅ 19-ᖑᑎ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᖅ
ᓄᖅᑲᖓᑲᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ
ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᒃᑲᓐᓂᓛᕆᐊᖃᕈᑦᑎᒍ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᖁᕕᐊᒋᔭᐅᒻᒪᕆᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ
ᐱᒋᐊᑦᑎᐊᒻᒪᕆᑦᑑᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂ.

ᑕᐃᒪᓕ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ, ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᖅ ᑲᔪᓰᓐᓇᕐᒪᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᑎᓯᒪᐃᓐᓇᕋᑦᑎᒍ ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ
ᑐᓐᖓᓱᑦᑎᑦᑎᐊᕋᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᖏᔪᖅᑳᖓᑦ ᑰᑦᑎᖅ ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒻᒪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐃᒫᒃ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᖃᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᓕᒻᒪᔅᓴᐃᓂᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᒃᑯᑦᑕ ᐊᑕᖏᕐᓗᑕ ᐱᔭᒃᓴᓖᓐᓇᖃᕐᕕᒌᓐᓇᖅᑰᕋᑦᑎᒍ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐱᕕᖃᖅᑎᒃᑲᕕᓐᖓ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᒥᔅᑕ ᒧᐊ. ᒫᓐᓇᐅᔪᕐᓕ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᑕᖃᕈᓐᓃᕐᒪᑦ
ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓄᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐃᓱᓕᓐᓂᐊᓕᖅᑐᒍᑦ.

64

sponsoring Minister a chance for some very brief closing comments. Minister Ehaloak.

Hon. Jeannie Ehaloak: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the Standing Committee and also the witnesses who came

to speak before us: Nunavut Tunngavik, Baffinland Iron Mines, Agnico Eagle Mines, and the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines.

I especially want to thank my officials who have been able to be with me here today. I am grateful to them for the support they have provided throughout these proceedings.

As well, I want to thank the witnesses for their contributions to the discussions over the past two days. It has helped improve our collective understanding of these complex issues.

Our goal as a department is to ensure that the management of property assessment and taxation measures in Nunavut is fair and responsive, and it is my hope that this hearing can help identify a common path forward.

I look forward to further engagement with Members and of the Standing Committee in its continued consideration of these complex issues and the proposed amendments to the Property Assessment and Taxation Act. Koana, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman (interpretation): Thank you. (interpretation ends) Again thank you to all the witnesses. I’m looking at the computer screen. Thank you to all the witnesses who appeared in person and through Zoom.

There were some commitments made by witnesses to get back to the Committee with detailed information. We do look forward to receiving that information as soon as possible.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐱᕕᖃᖅᑎᑦᑐᒪᕙᒋᑦ ᓇᐃᓈᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᑐᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕐᓂᖅ. ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖓᔪᖅᑳᖅ ᔩᓂ ᐃᖃᓪᓗᐊᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ. ᖁᔭᒋᔪᒪᕙᒃᑲ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᒋᐊᖅᑐᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᑯᑦ, ᐹᕕᓐᓛᓐᑯᑦ ᐊᒡᓃᑯ ᐄᒍ ᐅᔭᕋᓐᓂᐊᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᓄᓇᑦᑎᐊᕐᒥᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᖕᓂᐊᖅᑏᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᑲᑎᒌᖏᑦ.

ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᓪᓗ ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᕈᒪᕙᒃᑲ
ᐅᕙᓃᖃᑎᒋᒍᓐᓇᖅᑲᐅᒐᒃᑭᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ. ᖁᔭᒋᕙᒃᑲ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓱᐃᖕᒪᑕ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖅ ᑲᔪᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖁᔭᒋᔪᒪᕙᒃᑲ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔭᖅᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᖃᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐅᓪᓘᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᕐᕉᕋᑖᖅᑑᖕᓂᒃ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᑭᓯᕚᓪᓕᕈᑎᒋᓯᒪᒐᑦᑎᒍ ᐱᔭᕆᑐᔪᒻᒪᕆᖕᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᐅᓪᓗᑕ ᑐᕌᒐᕆᒐᑦᑎᒍ.

ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᖁᑎᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᕙᒻ ᓈᒻᒪᑦᑎᐊᖁᓪᓗᒍ ᑭᐅᖃᑦᑕᕈᓐᓇᑎᐊ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓱᒪᒐᓗᐊᖅᐳᖓ ᓈᓚᑦᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ
ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕈᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᐸᕗᑦ ᐊᖅᑯᑎᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᑕᒪᐅᓇ.

ᓂᕆᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᐳᖓ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᓂᒃ. ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓪᓕ
ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᖃᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐃᓗᓕᑯᓘᔭᖏᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓂᓪᓗ ᐱᖁᑏᑦ ᑖᒃᓰᔭᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ, ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑖᖅ.

ᐃᒃᓯᕙᐅᑕᖅ (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒍᑦ): ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ.
ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᖅ ᑕᑯᓐᓈᖅᑐᒍ ᑖᒃᑯᐊᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᐅᐸᒃᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᖃᕋᓴᐅᔭᑎᒍᑦ.

ᑕᐃᒪ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᓂᖅᓯᒪᓂᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓗᒍ ᐅᑎᕐᕕᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕋᖅᑐᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᓕᑯᓘᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᓂᕆᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᑎᒍᓯᓛᕐᓂᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᖅᓯᑐᐊᕈᔅᓯ.

65

As I mentioned earlier, we do invite all parties to feel welcome to provide follow-up submissions to the Committee. Now, these can be responses to other parties’ statements, clarifications, etcetera. Please provide these follow-up submissions by mid-July.

Finally, the Committee does anticipate sending additional correspondence to the sponsoring Minister in the coming weeks.

(interpretation) I have no more comments to make at this time, so I thank our staff and interpreters. They work nonstop and they allow us to understand each other, so we thank them very much.

We will be considering Bill 55 as Committee Members. We know that it will be complex, but I’m sure that we will give careful consideration. I thank you for providing your submissions for us to consider.

(interpretation ends) Thank you, everybody, and have a good day. (interpretation) Thank you.

>>Committee adjourned at 11:57

ᐅᖃᖅᑲᐅᒐᒪ ᑕᐃᒪ ᐅᐊᑦᑎᐊᕈ ᑐᓐᖓᓱᒃᑎᑦᑎᐊᖅᐸᕗᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᓱᖃᑦᕐᑕᓂᐊᖅᐳᓯ
ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᔅᓯ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑏᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᓯᑎᒋᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᐱᑕᖃᖅᑎᓐᓂᐊᖅᐸᔅᓯ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᔪᓚᐃ ᕿᑎᖓ ᑎᑭᓚᐅᓐᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ.

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᑦ ᑕᐃᒪ ᑭᖑᓪᓕᖅᐹᒥᒃ ᓂᕆᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖃᑎᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕆᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒥᒃ ᑲᒪᔨᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᓇᓱᐊᕈᓯᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᓂ.

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖃᕈᓐᓃᕋᒪ ᒫᓐᓇᐅᔪᖅ ᒪ’ᓈᕈᐊᖅᓯᓐᓇᓕᖅᐸᒃᑲ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᒋᔭᕗᑦ ᑐᓵᔨᒋᔭᕗᓪᓗ ᓄᖅᑲᓱᐃᑦᑑᖕᒪᑕ ᑐᑭᓯᐊᑐᕋᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑑᓪᓗᐊᕋᑦᑕᓗ ᒪ’ᓈᖅᓯᒪᕐᔪᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᐃᓕᔅᓯᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᒋᓂᐊᒃᑲᕗᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᖅ 55 ᑲᑎᒪᔨᐅᓪᓗᑕ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒐᑦᑕ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ

ᐱᔭᕆᐊᑐᔫᓂᐊᕋᓗᐊᖅᖢᓂ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᖁᓚᓐᖏᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕌᓂᑦᑎᐊᖅᑑᓪᓗᐊᕐᓂᐊᕋᑉᑕ.
ᑲᑎᒪᖃᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓯ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᖃᐃᑦᑎᕇᓚᐅᕋᑉᓯ ᒪ’ᓈᐸᔅᓯ.

(ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᓕᖅᑐᖅ) ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐃᓘᓐᓇᓯ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᓪᓗᖃᑦᑎᐊᓂᐊᖅᑯᓯ. (ᑐᓵᔨᑎᒎᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ) ᒪ’ᓇ.

>>ᓄᖅᑲᖅᑐᑦ 11:57ᒧᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ