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Abstract
This paper examines initiatives to create an Aboriginal-oriented public service from the outset of the new Government of Nunavut. Analysing the numerical, institutional, cultural and linguistic initiatives that have been employed to achieve this goal, the paper examines the complexities of integrating Aboriginal cultural perspectives into bureaucratic models of public government. It argues that the multifaceted approach adopted in Nunavut encourages Aboriginal-sensitive innovation in public governance, particularly in the way it brings elders and public servants together to design an Aboriginal-inclusive territorial public service. Nonetheless, the chapter cautions that the creation of an Aboriginal-oriented public service cannot be achieved solely by initiatives that focus on bureaucratic innovation. Only, it argues, by linking a project of this nature with strategies to increase Aboriginal graduation rates and Indigenous language acquisition can the objective of creating an Aboriginal-oriented public service in Nunavut be realised in the longer term.
Aboriginal people in Canada have protracted histories of being administered by non-Aboriginal public servants who have overseen their communities using regulations defined elsewhere. Understandably, therefore, recent movements to increase Aboriginal control over the governance of their communities have generated demands for greater Aboriginal representation in the public sector organizations that service these areas. While initial efforts to achieve this objective focused on increasing levels of Aboriginal employment in public institutions, more recent initiatives have taken account of institutional, cultural and linguistic factors that shape Aboriginal participation in government employment.¹

The creation and development of a public service to support the new territorial government of Nunavut provides a key opportunity to consider how Aboriginal people in Canada have tried to rethink the administration of public government to increase Aboriginal representation in its employment and ensure that Aboriginal perspectives shape its operations. When Nunavut was carved out of the Northwest Territories in 1999, it was designed with the objective of establishing a population-reflective public service. Eighty-five percent of the territory’s population is Inuit. As a result Nunavut became the first Canadian jurisdiction established with the specific objective of building a public service that would be predominantly Aboriginal.

As the Government of Nunavut (GN) was envisaged to become the major employer of Nunavut’s burgeoning Inuit population, it was critical that its public service be culturally familiar to Inuit and provide an environment in which Inuit would want to work. Moreover, having been dragged through many dislocations driven by the religious, economic, military and welfare objectives of other organizations and governments, there was tremendous concern amongst Inuit that the new territorial government be informed by Inuit culture and not simply by approaches to governance developed in other Canadian jurisdictions.² As one trainee policy analyst in the GN reflected:

> My understanding from hearing my mother’s generation and other generations is that the past government, the Government of the Northwest Territories, wasn’t reflective. It was an imposed government. The workforce was Southern based. So really who was


working within the government and affecting Inuit lives and culture and policy didn’t understand the culture...In the long run in order to really have programs and policies that are reflective of what Inuit need you need Inuit working within the government that know the issues from the heart, that know them from experience.³

**Designing an Inuit Sensitive Public Service Infrastructure**

Institutional representation of Aboriginal interests in the design of the new government resulted from the work of the Inuit-led Nunavut Implementation Commission (NIC), established by the 1993 Nunavut Act to “advise the Government of Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories and Tungavik on the establishment of Nunavut [including]...the administrative design of the first Government of Nunavut.”⁴ After extensive consultation across the Nunavut Settlement Area the NIC produced a blueprint for the new territorial government which emphasized “the need to respect the unique culture, language and history of the aboriginal residents of Nunavut” in designing the bureaucratic infrastructure of the new government.⁵

The NIC sought to achieve this in the design of core and program departments in the GN. Its proposal that the Department of Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs “coordinate relations with aboriginal organizations” brought a new dimension to thinking about the way governments in Canada should conduct external relations. Similarly, its recommendation that the Department of Justice “provide a justice system relevant to the life style, customs and culture of Nunavut” marked a key stage in a much longer process of reconciling contemporary Canadian jurisprudence with traditional Inuit law.⁶

In designing the infrastructure of the new government, the NIC also recommended the creation of program departments that would sustain Inuit values in policy development. Of particular note, in this respect, was its design of the department of Sustainable Development (DSD), on the one hand, and that of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth (CLEY), on the other (Table 1). DSD was established to bring issues of the environment, economy and human development together to preserve Inuit knowledge of the land and encourage the use of traditional
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³ Author’s interview with Siobhan Anstaq-Murphy, Policy Analyst, Department of Justice, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, April 2001.


⁵ Nunavut Implementation Commission, *Footprints in New Snow*, 28

⁶ Ibid.
knowledge alongside scientific approaches to resource management. Initially, its mandate also included the management of social security payments in the territory – an indication of the importance of this source of income to many households in Nunavut. The importance of connecting elders and youth to preserve Inuit culture in a period of modernization was reflected in CLEY. This innovative department was created to “bring Inuit language and culture into the everyday lives and work of the residents of Nunavut,” preserve and promote Inuit culture and language and ensure that the youngest citizens of Nunavut acquire cultural wisdom from elders in the territory.

Although both these departments were central to creating Inuit sensitive institutions of government, only CLEY survived. The demands on officers in DSD, from within and outside the GN, became extensive and, as a result, the department could not be sustained. In 2004 DSD was split into the department of Environment, and that of Economic Development and Transportation (Table 1).

-Table 1 about here-

The experience of designing an Inuit sensitive infrastructure for the GN carries important messages for future initiatives. While the design of the GN reinforced the centrality of Inuit cultural priorities, the evolution of government infrastructure demonstrates how intergovernmental pressures can overwhelm departments created with Aboriginal cultural priorities in mind, particularly as senior officials in these units find themselves working on multiple intergovernmental files that in most other jurisdictions are serviced by separate departments. This suggests that when the departmental infrastructure of a government is designed to reflect Aboriginal priorities, consideration needs to be given not only to the cultural perspectives of the Aboriginal communities that the government is designed to serve but also to extraneous factors that may impact on the realization of these cultural objectives in the operation of governance.

**Strategies to Ensure Numeric Representation of Inuit within the GN**
The vision of building a population-reflective public service in Nunavut to ensure
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proportionate Inuit representation in government employment was encoded within the 1993 Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA). This was signed after some twenty-five years of negotiation by the federal government, the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut (the organization established by Inuit to negotiate the land claim and renamed Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) once the claim was settled).

Article 23 of the NLCA committed federal and territorial governments and NTI to “cooperate in the development and implementation of employment and training,” in order to “increase Inuit participation in government employment in the Nunavut Settlement Area to a representative level.” This obliged them to ensure, that the level of Inuit employment in the public sector in Nunavut reflected “the ratio of Inuit to the total population in the Nunavut Settlement Area…within all occupational groupings and grade levels.”

The first government of Nunavut committed itself to building “an effective, functional and skilled public service, which is responsible to the public it serves and increasingly representative of the population of Nunavut” and to initiating processes that would ensure the development of a “representative workforce in all sectors” by 2020. The GN’s Inuit Employment Plan envisaged training Inuit for public service employment, increasing awareness of Inuit culture in recruitment and personnel strategies, and monitoring the ethnic composition of the public service, on a quarterly basis, to assess how effectively its commitment to building a population-reflective public service in Nunavut was being met.

Training Inuit for public service employment in Nunavut was addressed, initially, by the creation of a $39.8 million Nunavut Unified Human Resources Development Strategy (NUHRDS), funded by the federal government as part of the $150 million start-up budget allocated for the creation of Nunavut. Designed to expand the pool of educated and skilled Inuit, this strategy developed training opportunities for unemployed Inuit wishing to enter the public service in Nunavut and provided in-service training for Inuit public servants who wished to increase their responsibilities and remuneration.

11 Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Ottawa: Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Tungavik, 1993), 191. <http://www.tunngavik.com/english/pub.html>.
12 Ibid. While Article 23 applied to all government operations in Nunavut, this paper focuses on the development of Aboriginal representation in the new territorial public service.
Training programs have continued since the inception of Nunavut, including the Public Service Career Training Program and the Summer Student Employment Program for Inuit; the Public Service Inuit Training Program to train Inuit for positions in the public service where they are under-represented; the Nunavut Senior Assignment Program, designed to enable land claim beneficiaries to “enhance their management, leadership and specialised skills,” on the job, under the guidance of senior managers within the GN, and Sivuliqtiksat - “a two-year management development program to prepare Beneficiaries [for] management roles in the GN public service.”

The GN’s culturally sensitive recruitment strategies include competency-based job descriptions “to ensure that knowledge, skills and abilities form the basis of qualifications for positions rather than the dependence on education and years of experience;” and interviews which focus on “the skills, knowledge and attitudes required [to undertake a job] rather than on perceived academic credentials.” As a former deputy minister of Human Resources in the GN noted, “efforts have been made to ensure that applicants are interviewed in their own language and a behavioural model of interviewing is adopted so that the candidate can draw directly on their own experience to explain their capacity to undertake a particular job.”

Data on levels of Inuit and Qallunaat (non-Inuit) employment within the GN enable us to assess the initial impact of these training and recruitment initiatives. While the GN fell just six percent short of its fifty percent Inuit employment target on 1 April 1999 (at a time when the GN’s public service was still relatively small), the overall level of Inuit employment declined marginally in the years after that, appearing to reach a low point of forty-two percent in June 2003 (Table 2). Since then there has been a gradual improvement in the representation of Inuit in the GN’s professional, managerial and executive posts. Data for 2007 show that while the
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16 Nunavut, Department of Human Resources, Inuit Employment Plan, 8.

17Ibid., 89.


20 Ibid.,12.

21 Nunavut, Department of Human Resources, Inuit Employment Plan, 61.

22 Author’s interview, David Omilgoitok, Deputy Minister, Department of Human Resources, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, April 2001.
number of Inuit and Qallunaat employed in the GN is now similar, the increase in Inuit employment in the GN has been concentrated in the paraprofessional and administrative support categories. Indeed, almost all posts in the lowest rung of the GN’s six employment categories are filled by Inuit and, in my observation, primarily filled by women.

- Table 2 about here -

Why has Inuit employment in the GN not accelerated more rapidly? The NUHRDS programme may not have been developed soon enough to ensure a sufficient pool of skilled Inuit workers in the early years of Nunavut. In addition, the long tradition of hunting and gathering in Inuit society and the continuing importance of these activities to the economies of many Inuit households, means that office work does not appeal to all Inuit. Indeed, this partly accounts for the complexities of attracting young Inuit men into the territorial government’s workforce.

The entry of Inuit into government employment is also affected by competition for skilled Inuit in Nunavut. The GN has to compete with the private sector and with the range of Inuit organizations that are affiliated to NTI and, in many respects, provide a more Inuit-oriented working environment. Moreover, as the government is still operating around twenty percent below its planned staffing capacity, the demands of working for the GN can be stressful. As one Inuk trainee in the Department of Human Resources commented:

> It's just work overload, trying to get so many things done with short deadlines. And trying to meet a lot of deadlines, and they seem to have to be done all at the same time. So it's difficult to let go of something and just to do something well...And when you're hired for a certain term, like myself, I can use myself as an example, I was hired for six months and it takes approximately six months to get used to a job. So for me it was quite challenging because I had specific tasks to do in this six month period, and it was almost like a very crash course in orientation, learning about the new government, the policies and everything else included as to what I was doing...[And all the time] I'm thinking and speaking in Inuktitut, but I've got to transfer it into English because that's how we work right now.

Addressing the slow rate of growth in Inuit employment in Nunavut

23 On the importance of hunting and gathering to Nunavut’s economy, see Hicks and White, “Nunavut: Inuit Self-Determination,” 37-8.


Frustration with the slow rate of growth in Inuit employment in Nunavut was aired by Inuit leaders in the GN and NTI during lengthy negotiations with the federal government to ensure that the initial ten-year Planning Period Funding that underwrote the NLCA Implementation Contract was renewed for a further period in 2003. Negotiators from Nunavut argued that the federal government needed to invest more heavily in Inuit employment training to meet its NLCA commitments. Federal officials indicated that, without decisions by ministers to respond positively to such calls for new initiatives, the only recourse to support further training initiatives in Nunavut would be from existing sources of funds.

The difficulty in negotiating additional federal investment in training led NTI and the GN to appoint the international accountants, PricewaterhouseCoopers, to assess the costs of not building a population-reflective public service in Nunavut. Their report identified persistent barriers to Inuit employment in the GN, including Inuit perceptions of limited work available, low educational attainment amongst Inuit, the absence of sufficient mentoring of Inuit within the public sector workplace and the prevalence of English as the language of work. It also made a direct connection between a numerically representative and culturally reflective public service by arguing that “full implementation of Article 23 [in the NLCA] would ensure that Inuit have the power to develop and administer government policies in a manner consistent with Inuit values and culture, in direct proportion to the percentage of the population they represent.”

The report emphasized both the direct and indirect costs of not achieving an ethnically-representative public service in Nunavut. It advised that “full implementation of Article 23 would ensure that Inuit receive their fair share of Government funding resources, as per the requirement that the Representative Level be achieved at all occupational groups and grade levels.” Indeed the report estimated that “Inuit would have earned $258 million in compensation if Article 23 had been fully implemented…. [It also argued that] Inuit under-representation in Government, particularly in the high paying positions [meant that] $123 million of this compensation [was] expected to go to non-Inuit in 2003 [and that] the total


27 Author’s interview with David Baker, Director General, Strategic Policy and Devolution, Northern Affairs Program, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Hull, October 2002.


29 Ibid., 7.

30 Ibid., 15.
value of lost wages, if representation rates remain at their current level, is estimated
to be $2.5 billion over the next 18 years.\textsuperscript{31}

In addition the report emphasized that the realization of Article 23 would
ensure that the costs incurred by government “in the form of higher social support
costs for unemployed Inuit, lower tax revenues, and higher recruiting costs” arising
from the turnover rate for Qallunaat employees, would diminish.\textsuperscript{32} Indeed, the
report estimated that “the total net cost, estimated to be $137 million in 2003, is
borne almost equally by Inuit and Government.”\textsuperscript{33}

The report highlighted a range of indirect social and economic benefits that
would arise for Nunavut through increased Inuit representation in public service
employment, including reduced expenditure on high-cost health care delivery,
potential reduction in alcohol abuse and crime levels.\textsuperscript{34} It also anticipated that
additional benefits for Nunavut would arise through economies of scale in increased
training facilities, increased spending on goods and services in Nunavut (on the
grounds that Inuit would be more likely to spend a greater proportion of their income
in Nunavut than employees from the South) and increased innovation, including
more effective “leveraging of Government sustainable development initiatives and
the value of Inuit knowledge.”\textsuperscript{35}

Significantly, the report concluded by arguing that “a coordinated and
comprehensive strategy for the effective implementation of Article 23 should be
developed – one that takes into account both short-term and long-term goals.”\textsuperscript{36} In
particular, it recommended that the costs of focusing on “Quick-Ramp-up” strategies
such as Inuit-sensitive advertising, interviewing and training initiatives should be
assessed together with the costs of developing a longer-term “Human Capital
Strategy…based on the theory that the fundamental barrier to employment is
education.”\textsuperscript{37}

The importance of the educational dimensions of longer-term human capital
development was reinforced by the 2006 report of Justice Thomas Berger, written in
his capacity as the conciliator appointed to try and resolve the two year deadlock in
Implementation Contract negotiations between NTI, the GN and the Federal

\begin{itemize}
\item [31] Ibid., 9.
\item [32] Ibid., 8.
\item [33] Ibid., 9.
\item [34] Ibid., 54-9.
\item [35] Ibid., 52.
\item [36] Ibid., 12.
\item [37] Ibid., 62.
\end{itemize}
Government. Written after extensive consultations across Nunavut and in Ottawa, Berger’s report argued that the current range of training, scholarship, career development and retention programs for Inuit had over-focused energies on the demand-side of realizing Article 23, and detracted attention from the fundamental causes of the declining pool of educated Inuit available to take up employment in the GN’s public service.

Berger argued that only if questions about the supply- and demand-side of the development of a representative public service were addressed in tandem could Article 23 be realized. As he noted, “Today there are about 100 Inuit high school graduates every year. [Yet] the achievement of Article 23’s objective of representative Inuit employment (i.e. 85 per cent) would require the addition of something like 1500 Inuit to the workforce, over and above the number required to maintain current levels in the face of retirements and other departures from the public service.”

Berger’s report brought a further critical dimension to the debate about the cultural importance for Inuit of increased educational investment in Nunavut. It asserted that “only a robust and effective system of bilingual education [in the Inuit Language and English] can provide the foundation for the fulfillment of the objective of Article 23.

Berger argued that if “Nunavut students had first and second language skills by the time they complete their schooling, they would be able to maintain their identity and their culture, and at the same time be equipped to enter governmental or private sector employment.” As he noted:

Nunavut needs a generation of executives and managers, computer software designers, architects, audiologists, nurses, doctors, lawyers, accountants, x-ray technicians, RCMP members and, of course, teachers. It is likely that few of them will receive their post-secondary education in Inuktitut…A central objective of the Nunavut education system, therefore, must be to produce high school graduates whose ability to function in English enables them to enter colleges and universities in southern Canada and to achieve success in their chosen programs, so that they can qualify for responsible positions in their own public service.

Berger recommended that there should be a more gradual shift in language
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39 Ibid., 55-8.

40 Ibid., 45.

41 Ibid., 30.

42 Ibid., 23.
instruction in Nunavut’s schools so that when English became a language of instruction in Grades 4/5, Inuktitut was not abandoned but remained a language of instruction alongside English, with at least two periods a day being taught in Inuktitut (possibly with greater Innuinaqtun immersion in the western Kitikmeot where the regional dialect is so endangered).  

Berger recognized that as “only 35 per cent of teachers speak Inuktitut,” there were insufficient teachers in Nunavut to ensure a rapid promotion of bilingualism within the school system. He therefore argued that interim measures, including language nests in families and drawing Inuktitut speakers in the community into the school system, would need to accompany the training of potential teachers to teach in both Inuktitut and English. 

Berger acknowledged how “Nothing quite like this has been undertaken in Canada in the past. There is no template for a jurisdiction-wide bilingual education program for all children.” Nonetheless, he argued that an additional investment of $20 million per annum would be essential to develop the levels of teacher training and bilingual curriculum materials needed to lay the foundations for such an education system. He also argued that the bulk of this funding would have to come from the federal government and would have to be “over and above what Nunavut receives through Territorial Formula Financing. It is funding that, like the federal funds that go to the provinces and territories to fund English and French, will have to be targeted funding, not devoted to any other territorial priorities.” 

Although the federal government set up a working group to review Berger’s recommendations, it would not agree to inject additional targeted funds into Nunavut over and above those contained in the Territorial Funding Formula. This impasse in implementation contract negotiations led NTI to file a $1 billion law-suit against the federal government in December 2006 for breach of the implementation contract. This included a claim against “the total salaries and benefits lost to Inuit
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43 Ibid., 49.
44 Ibid., 31
46 Ibid., 30.
47 Ibid., 40.
48 Ibid., 41.
amount[ing] to $123 million annually because the government has not implemented the land claim and continues to import a Southern workforce.”

While NTI’s legal challenge clearly reinforces the financial implications for Inuit of not implementing Article 23 of the NLCA, the two external reports highlight the structural issues, rooted in the education system, that make the achievement of a representative public service so complex in Nunavut. Indeed, the Nunavut experience suggests that the quantitative dimension of creating an ethnically-reflective public service in Aboriginal communities cannot simply be considered as a project to be addressed by those responsible for the development of the public sector workforce. Only if this project is viewed as part of a longer-term and adequately funded education and training strategy, will both the supply-side and the demand-side of creating a public service that represents Aboriginal people prove possible.

**Building a Culturally Conscious Bureaucracy**

Rethinking the administration of government to take account of Aboriginal perspectives is more than a question of numerical representation. It also involves building a culture of public government that reflects Aboriginal values. In Nunavut this has taken two forms: identifying methods to embed Inuit cultural perspectives into the operation of government and developing policies to increase the use of the Inuit Language as an official language of government.

The broader question of embedding Inuit cultural perspectives in public government in Nunavut took root in the early stages of the GN. The first government’s strategic plan for the long-term development of Nunavut emphasized how *Inuit Qaujimajatuqtangit* (IQ) -- that which is long known by Inuit – would “provide the context [for developing] an open, responsive and accountable government.”

CLEY took the lead on developing IQ, with support from activists in DSD and the Department of Justice. A two-day workshop in Niaqunngut (Apex) in September 1999 was followed by IQ initiatives across departments, designed to raise awareness of Inuit culture and integrate Inuit knowledge into bureaucratic operations. (Table 3). The process of developing policies to support this objective was emotionally intense because interpretations of Inuit knowledge vary across communities, genders and generations. There was no consensus within the GN about the most effective way to integrate Inuit knowledge into bureaucratic practice.

- Table 3 about here-
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In November 2000, the minister for CLEY appointed an Inuit-only Task Force (made up of two GN employees, two members of the Nunavut Social Development Council and two elders) to consider the development of a government-wide strategy on IQ. Its 2002 report urged the GN to rethink its approach and “incorporate itself into Inuit culture” rather than only seeking to “incorporate Inuit culture into itself.” In response, the GN began to connect the procedural orientation of early IQ initiatives with a policy-based analysis of IQ, requiring government departments to evaluate policy objectives in their annual business plans in terms of IQ. Moreover, in 2003, the GN established Tuttarviit, an interdepartmental committee which operates solely in Inuktitut and brings together IQ committees in other departments, like that of Illinit (dog team) in the Department of Justice, established “to find the road that people can follow.”

When the second elected government of Nunavut took office in 2004, it emphasized how the “important principles of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit,” transmitted inter-generationally through the advice of elders are “particularly relevant to the way [the GN] should deliver its services.” Its strategic plan disaggregated the principle components of IQ and identified how these could be transposed into government practice. Although many IQ principles, when transposed into bureaucratic objectives for territorial governance reflect best practice objectives that would ideally be found in any Canadian public service, others, such as Qanuqtuuriq (survival-based resourcefulness) and Avatittinnik Kamatsiarniq (stewardship of the land, animals and the environment) are strongly rooted in Aboriginal priorities (Table 4).

The decision to address the issue of IQ within the GN has produced some important consequences. First, although there was significant debate in the early days of Nunavut about elders not being integrated into governance of the new territory, IQ initiatives provided opportunities for elders to advise officers in the GN about ways in which working practices and policies could reflect fundamental aspects of traditional Inuit culture. Elders were directly involved in the 1999 IQ workshop in Niaqunngut. They were key members of the GN’s IQ Task Force. In 2001 the Department of Justice created the post of Elder-in-Residence, to advise public servants (and more recently, Illinit) about how the department could take account of traditional Inuit law. Moreover, in September 2003 the GN announced the creation of an 11 person IQ advisory council - Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Katimajit (IQK) – which ensures that elders and community representatives advise government
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55 Author’s interview with Myna Ishulutak, IQ Coordinator, Department of Justice, Government of Nunavut, June 2006.

about the integration of IQ into its working practices and policy developments.\textsuperscript{57} In order to reinforce connections between elders and public servants in the design of the GN’s policy on IQ, this council was reappointed in September 2005 with clearer links to Tutarviit.\textsuperscript{58}

Second, for an Inuit workforce operating in a government that functions primarily in English the process of working on IQ -- in committees with other Inuit -- has provided forums for raising consciousness about the broader position of Inuit within the GN and the potential experience of working in an Inuit-defined workplace. A former assistant deputy minister of Education explained it this way:

\begin{quote}
Its easier to understand the concept if you reverse the table. Let’s say for example we were living in a totally Inuit society all across Canada and here in Nunavut it was all Qallunaat and everything has been running the Inuit way and if you were going to make the government and all the systems more Qallunat when its been operating in a very Inuit way how would you go about doing it? You wouldn’t just set up an IQ committee or a Western Qaujimanatuaqangit Committee you wouldn’t just do that, you would look at all aspects of how people relate to each other, how people make decisions, how policies are made, what impact they have on the people because policies are not just about things on paper. Its about how people operate and how they relate to each other and how decisions are made and how you service people and how you program things.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

The Nunavut experience highlights the complexities of transposing Aboriginal knowledge into the contemporary bureaucratic framework of public governance. It also reveals the significance of empowering Aboriginal public servants to connect the project of a new government with the body of Indigenous knowledge developed through intergenerational survival on the land. This highlights the importance not just of connecting elders and youth through intergenerational cultural projects but of connecting elders and professional public servants in designing and developing culturally relevant procedures of governance. Moreover, as the process of developing IQ has provided Inuit public servants with the opportunity to work on a significant cultural project in Inuktitut -- it has provided Aboriginal public servants with the experience of working in a public bureaucracy entirely in their own language.


\textsuperscript{58} Nunavut, Department of Culture, Languages, Elders and Youth, \textit{Business Plan 2005-06} (Iqaluit: Government of Nunavut, 2005), F-4; Author’s interview with Shuvani Mike, IQ Coordinator, Department of Culture, Languages, Elders and Youth, Government of Nunavut, June 2006.

\textsuperscript{59} Author’s interview with Naudlaq Arnakak, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Education, Government of Nunavut, Iqaluit, April 2002.
Aboriginal Languages and the Language of Work

Inuit politicians have long considered the development of the Inuit language as central to their vision of Nunavut. As the Nunavut Constitutional Forum noted, back in 1983, “Perhaps there is no more fundamental goal of a Nunavut government, nor one more essential to guarantee the survival and unique contribution of Inuit in Canada…Official status for Inuktitut will hasten the full participation by Inuit in employment opportunities in Nunavut...testify to the unique cultural nature of Nunavut and...encourage other residents of Nunavut to learn the language of the majority.”

When the first elected government of Nunavut took office it stated that the territory should become “a fully functional bilingual society, in Inuktitut and English, respectful and committed to the needs and rights of French speakers, with a growing ability to participate in French.” It also emphasized that efforts would be made to ensure that “Inuktitut, in all its forms, is the working language of the Government of Nunavut.”

Making the Inuit language the working language of the GN is central to the full realization of Article 23 of the NLCA and the integration of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit into government operations. As Thomas Berger noted, “No other province or territory has a majority of Aboriginal people speaking a single language...Nunavut remains, in terms of the reality on the ground, a jurisdiction where the first language of the vast majority of the population is Inuktitut.” Nonetheless, Indigenous language use in Nunavut is complex. Inuit in Nunavut speak seven different dialects. Six of these are collectively referred to as Inuktitut, which uses a syllabic script and is spoken throughout the Baffin and Keewatin regions. The seventh dialect – Inuinnaqtun - uses Roman orthography and, though severely endangered, is still spoken in the western Kitikmeot region of Nunavut.”

In recent public documents the Inuit language has been used as a term that embraces both Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun.

Developing the Inuit language as an official language of work in the GN is
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61 Nunavut, Pinasuaqtavut: The Bathurst Mandate, 7.

62 Ibid., 4.

63 Berger, Conciliator’s Final Report, 16, viii.

64 Hicks and White, “Nunavut: Inuit Self-Determination,” 100 (fn 48).


important as most Inuit speak primarily Inuktitut or Inuinnaqtun at home but find themselves shifting between their Indigenous language and English in the workplace.\textsuperscript{66} However, this project is not straightforward. The limited teaching of Inuit languages throughout the school system means that Nunavut’s schools are “not producing graduates truly competent in Inuktitut.”\textsuperscript{67} As Jacques-Louis Dorais noted:

Without having been schooled in the Inuit language until the end of high school, nobody possesses enough Inuktitut vocabulary and speaking habits to express him- or herself with ease in all fields of conversation in this language. Such vocabulary does exist in specialized lexicons, but it is not taught in school. For the time being, then, mastering a level of Inuktitut sophisticated enough for expressing oneself easily when speaking about administration, technical topics, or even everyday life in a modern community constitutes a professional skill which only interpreters and translators possess (and which most of them do not use outside their work).\textsuperscript{68}

Moreover, in the Western Kitikmeot, where Inuinnaqtun is endangered, Indigenous language skills are more limited than in the Inuktitut-speaking regions of the territory, increasing the probability that Inuit employees in this region will speak and use English more easily than their Indigenous language.\textsuperscript{69} In addition, as Berger noted, “the Inuit of Nunavut have the lowest rate of literacy in English in the country” and the “‘early exit immersion’ model [of language training in the territorial school system] …provides students with an insufficient foundation in their first language and too sudden an immersion in the second.”\textsuperscript{70} In short, not all Inuit working for the GN have complete communication skills either in the Inuit language or in English. Furthermore, most Qallunaat working for the GN have nothing more than rudimentary Inuit language skills.

In order to signal the importance of developing the Inuit language as an official language of work in the public service, the GN has made some efforts to equip its Qallunaat employees with Inuit language skills. From early in the GN’s existence all new Qallunaat employees have been required, on appointment, to take a basic ten-week course in Inuktitut, with the option to move beyond this with further

\textless{}http://www.tunngavik.com/english/pub.html\textgreater{}.

\textsuperscript{67} Berger, \textit{Conciliator’s Final Report}, iv.


\textsuperscript{69} Nunavut, Nunavummit Kiglisiniartiit/Nunavut Bureau of Statistics, “Language Data from the 2001 Nunavut Household Survey.”

language training. However, only since 2006 have senior level Qallunaat employees been expected to develop their Inuit language skills beyond this preliminary level. Interestingly, the decision to require senior officials in the GN to develop their Inuit language skills has involved key Inuit and Qallunaat public servants working together in thrice-weekly language training: an initiative that starts to address a much broader question of how Inuit and Qallunaat might develop the linguistic capacities to communicate bilingually in each other’s primary language.

Simultaneous translation services are critical to the development of an effective public service in Nunavut. However, these services not only involve translation across Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun but between Indigenous and settler languages. They also require extensive development of new terminology. While the GN does not yet have the facilities to ensure simultaneous electronic translation, Asuilaak (the on-line living dictionary) has been created to develop a central data bank of terminology in Inuktitut, Inuinnaqtun, English and French. Although simultaneous translators are present for the Legislative Assembly and at key meetings of the GN, greater consideration needs to be given to the developing such facilities for routine use within the public service. After all, this would create an environment in which unilingual public servants could feel at ease discussing policy matters. In addition, it would ensure that all GN offices could deliver services directly to unilingual Nunavummiut.

Language Legislation
The development of the Inuit language as an official language of government requires legislative development, particularly as the official language legislation that the GN inherited from the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) reflected language use in that territory. The first elected government of Nunavut consulted extensively about the most appropriate way to revise this legislation for Nunavut. The second government has declared it will develop “made-in-Nunavut language legislation to foster the use of Inuktitut in the workplace and in the public and private sectors.”


73 Author’s interview with Jane Cooper, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut, June 2006.


75 Nunavut, Legislative Assembly of Nunavut, Special Committee to Review the Official Languages Act, Interim Report, Fifth Session, First Legislative Assembly, March 2002.

76 Pinasuaqtavut, 2004, 12.
Nunavut’s proposed language legislation moves beyond the approach adopted by the GNWT because it combines an Official Languages Bill with an Inuit Language Protection Bill.\(^77\) Tabled in 2007 (and, at the time of writing, still under legislative review), the *Proposed Official Languages Bill* seeks to place the Inuit language on a par with English and French as one of three official languages of Nunavut. It asserts that the Inuit language is “the indigenous language of Nunavut, the spoken and preferred language of a majority of Nunavummiut, a defining characteristic of the history and people of Nunavut.”\(^78\) The bill also considers the Inuit language to be “a necessary and strategic element in the improvement of Inuit social and cultural well-being…and the development of government policies, programs and services as contemplated by the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.”\(^79\)

The proposed bill would create a minister for languages who would then be expected to undertake a range of initiatives to promote the Inuit language, including the development of an official languages plan and an organizational strategy to ensure that the Inuit Language is developed within relevant organizations. It would also extend the powers of Nunavut’s Official Languages Commissioner by providing the office with “enforcement and investigative capabilities to ensure compliance of public and private organizations with their language obligations.”\(^80\) In addition, the legislation would create *Inuit Uqausinginnik Taiguusiliuqtii* (an Inuit Language Authority) with representatives from each region “to expand the available knowledge about and expertise in the Inuit Language,” carry out research and develop and publish standards information.

The *Proposed Inuit Language Protection Bill* is designed as “a foundation necessary to a sustainable future for the Inuit of Nunavut as a people of distinct cultural and linguistic identity within Canada.”\(^81\) It sets out “to support the more meaningful engagement of Inuit language speakers in the socio-economic development, civic proceedings and governance in Nunavut” by ensuring that “the quality and prevalent use of the Inuit language will be protected.”\(^82\)

---


\(^{79}\) Ibid.

\(^{80}\) Ibid.

\(^{81}\) Ibid, Preamble, (a) and (b). [http://www.gov.nu.ca/cley/home/english/langbill.html].

\(^{82}\) Ibid., Preamble, (c) and (d).
The Bill specifies how “The Inuit language is a language of work in territorial institutions, and every employee of a territorial institution has the right to use the Inuit language at work to the extent and in the manner provided in this Act and the regulations.”83 To this end government is expected to identify and remove any barriers to Inuit language speakers gaining employment within the public service and to “identify and implement measures to increase the use of the Inuit language as a working language of the institution.”84 Individuals will be given “the opportunity to apply for jobs entirely in the Inuit language and, if selected for an interview, to have their interview conducted in the Inuit language.”85 Inuit employees who wish to work solely in the Inuit language will be allowed to do so, save in exceptional circumstances where the need to speak in English or French is specified in the employees’ job description. Indeed, the GN will be expected to “determine whether the new employee prefers the Inuit language as his or her language of work, [and to] ensure that management is able to communicate with employees who prefer to work in the Inuit language.”86 The proposed legislation also requires government to progress Inuit language training by offering “enhanced first and second language training to its employees” and ensuring that unilingual Inuit employees can communicate with co-workers and supervisors.

The proposed legislation requires government institutions to issue instruments in the Official Languages of “the community, region or other geographic area where the instrument applies,”87 so that a member of the public can exercise their “right to communicate with and receive the services of a territorial institution in an Official Language.”88 In addition, resonant of language promotion strategies developed in Quebec, it requires every territorial government organization to “display and issue its public signs and posters...in the Inuit Language together with any other language used; ensure that the Inuit Language text of its public signs and posters is at least equally prominent with any other language used;” and guarantee that “reception and customer services that are provided for the general public,” can be conducted in the Inuit Language.”89

Interestingly, the Proposed Inuit Languages Protection Bill links the objective

83 Ibid., Section 9 (1).
84 Ibid.
85 Nunavut, Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth, Language Legislation for Nunavut, 8.
86 Ibid.
87 Nunavut, Proposed Inuit Language Protection Bill, Section 11 (1).
88 Ibid., Section 12 (1).
89 Ibid., Section 3.
of creating the Inuit Language as the working language of government with a
broader commitment to developing territorially-based rights for Nunavummiut to
receive education in the Inuit Language. It proposes to give “every parent whose
child is enrolled in school the right to have his or her child receive instruction in the
Inuit language” and from 2019 (after a ten year phased introduction period), to
“require the Government of Nunavut to provide a level of instruction that would
allow students to achieve full proficiency in the Inuit language by the time they
graduate from high school.” Interestingly, these proposals are in keeping with the

The evidence from Nunavut is that the creation of an Aboriginal oriented
public service cannot be completed without legislation to ensure that Aboriginal
languages have official recognition in the relevant jurisdiction and that, as a result,
Aboriginal people can use their own language as employees or service recipients in
the public sector. However, the process is more complex than the historic examples
of promoting French and English as official languages of Canada as these initiatives,
in the late 1960s, were instituted against a background of each language already
being embedded in educational curricula. Encouraging the use of Aboriginal
languages as official languages of work can only prove effective as part of a broader
Aboriginal language protection strategy that links education and government
employment as critical means of Aboriginal empowerment. While the Proposed
Inuit Language Protection Bill is a starting point for Nunavut, its emphasis on
language rights still leaves the fundamental problem of resources for language
education and development unresolved.

Conclusion
Nunavut highlights how the integration of Aboriginal values into public government
is complex. It shows how this requires both a long-term strategy to increase the
number of Aboriginal public servants employed at all levels of the public service
and opportunities for Aboriginal public servants to work together to design
culturally-sensitive approaches to government operations. In addition, the project
demands an appreciation of regional specificities in Aboriginal culture and language
and clear systems for cross-cultural training of Indigenous and non-Indigenous
public servants.

While questions of institutional design, cultural recognition, language
protection and promotion interconnect in the development of a public service with
which Aboriginal citizens identify, this paper has shown how questions about
improving Aboriginal representation in public service employment cannot be
divorced from broader questions of investment in Aboriginal education. Moreover, it
has demonstrated how the process of developing public service institutions that
reflect Aboriginal values needs to be underscored by consultation between elders in
the community and public servants working for government. This will ensure that
the key people responsible for conveying Aboriginal thought and knowledge

90 Nunavut, Department of Culture, Language, Elders and Youth, Language Legislation for Nunavut,
7.
between generations are fully involved in the design and development of new approaches to public government that take full account of Aboriginal knowledge and values.

As we move towards the first decade of Nunavut’s existence as a public government, it is important to take stock of the extent to which progress towards creating an Aboriginal-oriented public service is being realized. While this paper has highlighted the complexities of developing full Aboriginal representation within the public service of this new jurisdiction, it has also emphasized how the recognition of Aboriginal values, language and culture have been central to that project. In conclusion, I would argue that the emphasis on identifying how key cultural values should inform public service operations in Nunavut is an innovation that could benefit the development of public services in other jurisdictions.
Table 1
Departmental Structure of the Government of Nunavut 1999 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Legislative Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Departments (Routine)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Social Services</td>
<td>Health and Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works and Services</td>
<td>Community and Government Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Government and Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Departments (Innovative)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Economic Development and Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, Language Elders and Youth</td>
<td>Culture, Language Elders and Youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2
Percentage (Number) of Inuit and Qallunaat Employees in Departments and Boards of the Government of Nunavut, 1999-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>Qallunaat</td>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>Qallunaat</td>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>Qallunaat</td>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>Qallunaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Board Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>(280)</td>
<td>(925)</td>
<td>(1243)</td>
<td>(1014)</td>
<td>(1395)</td>
<td>(1414)</td>
<td>(1506)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3  
Key Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Initiatives across the Government of Nunavut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>IQ Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs</td>
<td>Inuit-sensitive internal architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceremonial events (drum dancing etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tea on the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Public servant responsible for IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>IQ Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>IQ Committee – <em>Illinit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings in Inuktitut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Inuit elder for policy advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trips on the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, Language Elders and Youth</td>
<td>IQ Workshop 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ Task Force 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ Coordinator appointed 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate <em>Tuttarviit</em> 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Development of IQ curriculum materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Social Services</td>
<td>Elders brought in to advise on policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ Advisor in Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works and Telecommunication</td>
<td>Public servant responsible for IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Government and Services</td>
<td>IQ Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ Suggestions Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Research into IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>Elders brought in to advise on policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>IQ Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Author’s interviews with IQ coordinators in Government of Nunavut during research visits to Iqaluit: September 1999, April 2001 and June 2006.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ Principle</th>
<th>Government Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innuqatigiitsiarniq</strong></td>
<td>Promote impartiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating others equally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tunnganariq</strong></td>
<td>Make workplace friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering good spirit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being welcoming/inclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remove language and cultural barriers at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pijitsiriq</strong></td>
<td>GN staff to serve each other and community to best of abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving/providing for family and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aajuqaqigiinniq</strong></td>
<td>Important decisions to be reached through direct communication and consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make decisions through discussion and consensus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inuit language to be used widely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silence is part of communication and does not necessarily signify agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilimmaksarniq/ Pijariuqsarniq</strong></td>
<td>Workplace to be flexible and accommodating of new ideas and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development through practice, effort and action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inuit staff must be given opportunities to develop skills on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piliriqatgniñiq/Ikajauqtigiiniq</strong></td>
<td>Inuit and non-Inuit staff must work together from basis of their own knowledge to try and develop mutual understanding and a balanced approach to service and program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together for a common cause.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public will be best served by such collaboration and mutual understanding at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qanuqtuuriq</strong></td>
<td>Inuit have continually had to seek new ways to survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being innovative/resourceful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important for Government to realize it needs constantly to explore new opportunities to move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avatittinniq Kamatsiarniq</strong></td>
<td>Strong Inuit value that has sustained Inuit for eons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and care for the land, animals and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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