

IPAC



IAPC

**NEW
DIRECTIONS**

**NOUVELLES
DIRECTIONS**

Serving the Public North of 60

Frances Abele and Katherine Graham

NO. 10

SERVING THE PUBLIC NORTH OF 60

A REDISCOVERING PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECT

By

Frances Abele

Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration

Carleton University

and

Katherine Graham

Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration

Dean Designate, Faculty of Public Affairs and

Management, Carleton University



NEW DIRECTIONS - NUMBER 10

©L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada, 2003
The Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 2003

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED/TOUS DROITS RÉSERVÉS

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) is the leading Canadian organization concerned with the theory and practice of public management. Its scope covers governance from the local to the global level. It is an association with active regional groups across the country. The Institute recognizes and fosters both official languages of Canada

IPAC/IAPC
1075, rue Bay Street
Suite/bureau 401
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 2B1 CANADA

Tel./tél: (416) 924-8787
Fax: (416) 924-4992
e-mail/courriel: ntl@ipaciapc.ca
Internet : www.ipaciapc.ca

L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada

L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada (IAPC) est la principale institution canadienne qui s'intéresse à la théorie et à la pratique de la gestion publique tant au niveau local qu'au niveau mondial. C'est une association composée de groupes régionaux actifs à travers tout le pays. L'Institut reconnaît et promeut les deux langues officielles du Canada.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This IPAC project was made possible by the following:

Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada
The Rural Partnership Branch, Agriculture Canada
Public Works and Government Services Canada

The Government of the Yukon

and

The members of IPAC, who are dedicated to excellence
in public administration

Thank you

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	vii
Sommaire exécutif	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Public Service and Public Servants: The North in Canada	3
History and Characteristics of the Territories	5
Chapter 2: The Roundtables	11
Whitehorse	11
Yellowknife	16
Iqaluit	20
Chapter 3: Final Thoughts	24
Appendix A: Advisory Committee	27
Appendix B: Agendas and Participants	28
Notes	38
About the Authors	40

Abstract

Ce rapport traite des enjeux auxquels fait face la fonction publique des Territoires du Nord du Canada. Il a été mandaté dans le cadre de son projet plus général *Redécouvrir la Fonction publique*. Une table ronde a eu lieu dans chacune des capitales territoriales et les participants invités provenaient des gouvernements territoriaux, autochtones et municipaux, ainsi que d'établissements d'enseignement supérieur et d'organismes autochtones. Ces développements dans le Nord comprennent: le transfert des responsabilités du gouvernement fédéral à chacun des gouvernements territoriaux; les projets conscients et déterminés visant à une mise en valeur territoriale au sein de chacun des trois territoires; l'explosion démographique parmi la population autochtone du Nord, les petites collectivités nordique et leur isolement réciproque. Le rapport se termine par un retour aux défis et thèmes communs. Il indique qu'un dialogue plus poussé entre les fonctionnaires de tous les territoires du Nord serait très bénéfique.

This is a study of public service challenges unique to Canada's northern territories. Part of IPAC's "Rediscovering the Public Service" Project, which is inspired by the desire for discussion of challenges for Northern government by IPAC members and their colleagues, the series of roundtables resulting in this publication were organized in 2002 – one in each of the territorial capitals. The study reveals that, while the territories have dealt with the changes and challenges facing all governments over recent years, there have been uniquely northern concerns that have been even more challenging. These unique challenges included the "territory building" process, an aboriginal baby boom, the smallness and isolation of communities, and the influence of the "aboriginal claims fact." Additionally, in each territory these challenges have taken unique forms. This publication reveals an important craft of Northern public administration that warrants broader appreciation of its achievements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report deals with the challenges of public service in Canada's three northern territories. It was commissioned by the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) as part of its broader project on "Rediscovering the Public Service." A major impetus for this particular study was the desire of IPAC members and their colleagues, working at all three levels of government in the North, to have focused and animated discussions of the challenges they face in the delivery of public services. These discussions took place in roundtables organized by IPAC and facilitated by the study's co-chairs in 2002. A roundtable was held in each of the three territorial capitals, with invited participants from territorial, federal, aboriginal and municipal governments, territorial postsecondary educational institutions and aboriginal organizations.

The report communicates the results of discussions in each capital, illuminating the distinct trajectory of public service in each territory and documenting innovation. It also attempts to improve communication among public servants in each of the three territories. No less important, the report has the goal of improving understanding between public servants "North of 60" and their southern colleagues. Accordingly, the report begins by setting the context for contemporary and future public service in the North. It notes that public services and public servants in the territorial North have been affected by the major reforms and challenges faced by Canada's public sector over the past fifteen years. It suggests, however, that large processes and political forces indigenous to the North have exerted an even more profound influence. These northern developments include the devolution of responsibilities from the federal government to each of the territorial governments, the conscious and determined projects of "territory building" within each of the three territories, a baby boom among the northern aboriginal population, the small size of northern communities and their isolation from each other, and the influence of the "aboriginal claims fact" as a catalyst for practical challenges in providing public services in new ways. While these are common elements of the northern context, the report emphasizes that each element plays out differently in each of the three territories and discusses the specifics of each territory at some length.

Each of the roundtables is the subject of a separate discussion, organized along three broad themes that emerged as pre-eminent in each case:

- the state of aboriginal claims and their intergovernmental consequences for public service;
- citizen-state relations – public expectations of government and the role of government in citizens' lives in each territory; and
- the innovations and challenges in providing public services in this environment.

The report concludes by returning to common challenges and themes. It suggests that there may be significant benefit from more dialogue among public servants from across the territorial North. It recommends establishment of a virtual and actual "Academy of Northern Public Administration" to facilitate a network that works on practical challenges of northern administration.

It also concludes that there is an important craft of public administration in the territorial North that warrants illumination in the North and in southern Canada. At the core of this craft is an ability to both live and work with the public in very close quarters, responding quickly and in a practical way to challenges that often stem from living in an isolated and harsh environment.

The ingenuity and dedication that is required of public servants in the North, as a result of these circumstances, is paralleled by the need for them to understand the broader context in which they are serving. In the true Canadian way, understanding the inter-governmental context is extremely important. The future northern public servant will also, however, require an ability to understand and work within changing relationships between governments and the private and voluntary sectors.

SOMMAIRE EXÉCUTIF

Ce rapport traite des enjeux auxquels fait face la fonction publique dans les trois Territoires du Nord du Canada. Il a été mandaté par l'Institut d'administration publique du Canada (IAPC) dans le cadre de son projet plus général «Redécouvrir la Fonction publique». L'incitation majeure à entreprendre cette étude particulière a été le désir des membres de l'IAPC et de leurs collègues travaillant aux trois paliers de gouvernement dans le Nord, de discuter en profondeur et débattre les enjeux qui se posent en matière de prestation de services publics. Cette discussion s'est tenue en 2002 au cours d'une série de trois tables rondes organisées par l'IAPC et animées par les co-présidents de l'étude. Une table ronde a eu lieu dans chacune des capitales territoriales et les participants invités provenaient des gouvernements territoriaux, autochtones et municipaux, ainsi que d'établissements d'enseignement supérieur et d'organismes autochtones.

Le rapport communique les résultats des discussions tenues dans chaque capitale – mettant en lumière la trajectoire particulière que suit la fonction publique dans chaque territoire et documentant les innovations. Il tente également d'améliorer les communications parmi les fonctionnaires dans chacun des trois territoires. Non moins important, ce rapport a pour but de favoriser une meilleure compréhension entre les fonctionnaires du Grand Nord et leurs collègues du Sud. Par conséquent, il commence par établir le contexte de la fonction publique d'aujourd'hui et de demain dans le Nord. Il attire l'attention sur le fait que les services publics et les fonctionnaires dans les Territoires du Nord ont été affectés par les réformes et les défis importants auxquels la fonction publique canadienne a dû faire face au cours des quinze dernières années. Il semble indiquer, cependant, que les grandes méthodes et tendances politiques indigènes au Nord ont exercé une influence encore plus profonde. Ces développements dans le Nord comprennent; le transfert des responsabilités du gouvernement fédéral à chacun des gouvernements territoriaux; les projets conscients et déterminés visant à une mise en valeur territoriale au sein de chacun des trois territoires; l'explosion démographique parmi la population autochtone du Nord, les petites collectivités nordiques et leur isolement réciproque; et l'influence de la réalité des revendications autochtones en tant que catalyseur des enjeux courants de la prestation de nouveaux modes de services publics. Même si ces éléments sont communs au contexte du Nord, le rapport souligne que chaque élément est utilisé différemment au sein de chaque territoire et décrit en détail les caractéristiques particulières de chacun d'eux.

Chaque table ronde comprend une discussion organisée autour de trois thèmes généraux qui apparaissent comme les plus importants dans chaque cas, à savoir:

- L'état des revendications et leurs conséquences intergouvernementales pour la fonction publique;
- Les relations entre l'État et les citoyens ce qu'attend le public du gouvernement et le rôle de l'État dans la vie des citoyens dans chaque territoire; et
- Ce qui est perçu comme une innovation ou un défi en matière de prestation de services publics dans cet environnement.

Le rapport se termine par un retour aux défis et thèmes communs. Il indique qu'un dialogue plus poussé entre les fonctionnaires de tous les territoires du Nord serait très bénéfique. Il recommande d'établissement d'une Académie d'administration publique du Nord virtuelle et réelle afin de favoriser le fonctionnement efficace d'un réseau axé sur les défis courants de l'administration du Nord.

Il démontre également qu'il existe des administrateurs publics de métier dans les territoires qui jettent de la lumière dans le Nord et le Sud du Canada. Au centre de cette expertise se trouve une capacité de vivre et de travailler avec le public dans des quartiers très fermés, et de faire face rapidement et de façon pratique aux défis qui proviennent souvent du fait de vivre dans un milieu isolé, dans des conditions difficiles.

L'ingéniosité et la volonté que doivent posséder les fonctionnaires qui vivent dans le Nord, du fait de ces circonstances, sont mises en parallèle par la nécessité de comprendre le contexte plus général dans lequel ces fonctionnaires répondent aux besoins. Dans la réalité canadienne, il est extrêmement important de comprendre le contexte intergouvernemental. Les futurs fonctionnaires du Nord devront également être capables de comprendre et de travailler dans un cadre de relations en constante évolution entre les gouvernements et les secteurs privé et sans but lucratif.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2002, the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) turned to the territorial North, as part of its broader project, “Rediscovering the Public Service.” A major impetus was the desire of IPAC members working in the three northern territories and their colleagues to have focused and animated discussions of the challenges they face in the delivery of public services. Over recent years, there have been major political developments in each of Canada’s three northern territories. These have raised opportunities and challenges of developing a public service that is responsive to northern circumstances. Equally important, the public service in Canada’s territorial North has been affected by larger sea changes in public-service reform and public management, as well as the fiscal challenges faced by Canadian governments in the latter part of the twentieth century.

The idea of a “Serving the Public North of 60” initiative was carried forward by an advisory committee (see Appendix A). The committee decided that the best approach to dealing with the challenges at hand was to hold a series of roundtables of northern public servants from all levels of government. A roundtable was held in each of the three territorial capitals, with invited participants from territorial, federal, aboriginal and municipal governments, territorial postsecondary educational institutions, and aboriginal organizations. The participants in each of the roundtables are listed in Appendix B of this report.

Participants were asked to consider a number of questions:

- What are the growing demands for service in northern rural and remote communities?
- How do governance and management practices affect the delivery of services in the North?
- How are governments accountable to the public they serve?
- What best practices from other jurisdictions are relevant to the North?
- How do governments and communities work together to build capacity for rural and remote communities in northern Canada?
- Is there potential for collaboration with foreign organizations, territories and nations on international concerns?
- How can the three territories work together to explore opportunities?

These questions were intended as catalysts for discussion rather than as a strict list of questions to be definitively answered. Professor Frances Abele of the School of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University and Dean Designate Katherine Graham of the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management at Carleton University were asked to facilitate the three roundtables. Generous financial support from Government Services, Government of Yukon; Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada; Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada; and Public Works and Government Services Canada enabled

them to travel to each of the capitals and assisted the initiative in other ways. The three workshops were held between March and May 2002. In each case, presentations from local participants on issues and initiatives to respond to the challenges of serving the public north of the sixtieth parallel provided a starting point to shape the specific discussion, in light of the broad questions set out above.

This document presents the results of “Serving the Public North of 60.” As with any such initiative, the challenge in writing this report has been to communicate the specific results of discussions in each capital – illuminating the distinct trajectory of the territorial public service in each case and documenting innovation – while simultaneously improving communication and understanding among public servants in the three territories. We also hope to build understanding among public servants working north and south of 60. This report attempts to achieve these broad goals by illuminating the context of government and public service in the territorial North. The next section of the report focuses on this important subject, addressing the first three of the objectives for the project

In treating these three questions, we have attempted to synthesize common characteristics and developments while also highlighting the unique character of each territory. We then present the results from each of the roundtables. We have chosen to use a common framework to discuss the three workshops rather than present a verbatim report. In each case, we present themes that emerged related to

- aboriginal claims and their intergovernmental consequences;
- trends in the relationship between northerners and their governments; and
- challenges and innovations in the provision of public services in this environment.

When the results are presented in this way, we can see priorities as well as the similarities and differences in each situation. The questions that launched the roundtable discussions are answered in varying degrees in the reported discussion, but we found that, as is the normal and desirable way of workshops, the interests and preoccupations of the participants dominated any prior agenda. Each roundtable also benefited from the presentations of best practices and interesting initiatives made by workshop participants, and these too had an important role in shaping the discussion. Some information about each presentation is included in our report, along with contact information for the presenters.

Public Service and Public Servants: The North in Canada

Public services and public servants in the territorial North have been affected by the major reforms and challenges faced by Canada's public sector over the past fifteen years. There are two reasons for this. First, the federal government still has a significant presence in the territorial north, and a number of public servants in each of the three territories are federal employees. They have been directly affected by various federal initiatives to rethink the public service and the delivery of public services. PS 2000 and La Relève provide just two examples. Secondly, territorial governments and municipalities in the North have shared the fallout of reduced or severely constrained federal spending, particularly in the 1995 to 2000 period. "Living within one's means" became an important theme in efforts to rethink the organization of territorial governments and the delivery of public services during this period.

After fifteen years of intensive public-sector reform and downsizing, public services in southern Canada are in a period of relative stability. The federal government, provincial governments and local governments have examined thoroughly the services that they offer. They have considered whether they should continue to offer these services and, if so, considered how they should be delivered. The major federal initiative of the mid-1990s, Program Review, and large-scale reforms in Alberta, Ontario and, most recently, British Columbia, are examples. In many provinces, there has been an equivalent, if not greater, amount of churning at the local government level. Local governments have had to survive at the end of the reform food chain – living with the impacts of downloading of responsibilities from other governments, the withdrawal of the federal and provincial governments from major sectors, such as social housing, and reduced intergovernmental transfers. As if this were not sufficient, municipalities in a number of provinces – most notably, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario – have been subject to a process of amalgamation over the same period.

These and other changes south of the sixtieth parallel have had important effects on public servants at all levels. Among the most disruptive and unfortunate have been labour stoppages, as public-service unions have disputed cutbacks and the intent and specific nature of some reforms. More positively, perhaps, there have been increasing efforts to refresh and refocus the way public servants see themselves and their jobs. This has been, in part, associated with systemic reform. Increasingly, it has also been borne out of the realization that "[t]he challenge facing governments, simply stated, is this: to find, to keep and to develop people with the needed skills in an increasingly competitive race for talent."¹ One reason for this is the aging demographic of the public service south of 60. Another reason is that we may be on the cusp of another period when people recognize the importance of building good public services overseen by a competent, stable public service that has adequate capacity.

If we had been writing this report fifteen years ago, we would have said that these Canada-wide developments would exert a profound impact on the public service and public servants in the territorial North. Our prediction would have been somewhat inaccurate – or at least quite incomplete. Developments within the territorial North have

mutated the impact of the systemic changes and ructions in the south. Large processes and political forces indigenous to the territorial north have exerted a more important influence, as follows:

- The federal government has been engaged in a process of devolution to the territorial governments over the past fifteen years. The actual process of devolution has occurred differently in each of the territories. But in each case, the actual and relative size of the federal public service, relative to the territorial and local levels has shrunk. The direct impact of various federal initiatives, such as La Relève, while still important, has been reduced.
- In each northern territory, we see an ongoing project of territory-building (or, in the case of Nunavut, territory-starting). Again, as will be discussed below, the specifics of this are different in each case. Nonetheless, there is common affirmation that the territory is “here to stay” and that its public servants and public service should reflect the requirements of stability and adaptability or innovation in serving the public interest.
- Unlike the Indian Program at the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Northern Program was not insulated from the budget cuts of the 1990s. In addition, many other departments with significant expenditures in the North also were cut back. Territorial budgets, on the other hand, remained somewhat more stable because of multiyear formula funding agreements between the federal government and the territories.
- The demographic and geographic context in the territorial North, compared to the south, is significantly different. Across the North, we see a baby boom among the aboriginal population. This raises challenges for the education system and other human services that are at the opposite end of those faced as a result of the aging population and declining rate of natural population growth in the south. In the specific case of Yukon, there has been some depopulation, as a result of declining resource development. In the geographic context, the public-service impact of the isolation of territorial communities one from the other and their small size cannot be minimized. This leads to certain fixed costs, difficulties in realizing any economies of scale and challenges of building public-service capacity across the range of public services that we consider basic. Distance makes “local amalgamation” inconceivable.
- There are some particular characteristics of the private and voluntary sectors in the territorial North that inhibit their ability to take advantage of outsourcing opportunities or to fill the vacuum in the wake of government downsizing. The private sector in the territorial North is relatively underdeveloped, compared to southern Canada. Much indigenous entrepreneurial effort has been focused on the resource development sector or on retail and tourism. The skills and capacity of private firms in the North to take up major public-service delivery contracts remains limited. The voluntary sector is already stretched and has an extensive history of co-development with the territorial governments and financial reliance on them. This is

especially true at the community level. Volunteer burnout is a long-standing problem in the North.

- The evolution of aboriginal claims in each of the territories has been a crucial factor in shaping governments in the territories and the vision of what constitutes public service and the “ideal” public servant. We will elaborate further in our discussion of the context of each territory. We will also return to this point again and again, as we present the results of the three roundtables. The important thing to note at this point is that the paradigm of public service and the matching role of the public servant in the North have shifted over the past fifteen years. Previously, aboriginal claims were seen as something largely isolated from public-service work, except for those individuals directly involved in claims negotiations. Increasingly, we see that the claims have become a fact of life for public servants in the territorial North. They are intellectually engaged by the substance of claims agreements and by the challenges of negotiation and implementation. More importantly, they are actively trying to think through new ways of doing things that both respect the “claims fact” and deal with the major practical challenges of providing public services to a small population across communities that are very different and isolated from one another.

Although the three territories share the circumstances that we have just listed, it would be a mistake to conclude that they are otherwise similar. Each has different fundamental characteristics and a distinct history, whether one considers geography, demography, culture, political institutions or economic base. In recognition of this and to provide context for the discussion of the workshop results, we provide next a capsule description of each territory.

History and Characteristics of the Territories

Most of Canada’s population, and almost all of its public administration, resides within a few hundred kilometres of the Canada-United States border. In this region, aboriginal people make up about three per cent of the population. In contrast, in the territorial north and in the northern parts of most of the provinces, aboriginal people form a majority or a large plurality of the population. The northern two-thirds of Canada is self-evidently an aboriginal homeland, as is plain to anyone who spends any amount of time travelling there. This fact has enormous implications for the shape and evolution of public governments in the territorial north, for the policy agendas of each territory, and for the delivery of programs and the provision of services. The history and current circumstances of each territory illustrate these points in distinctive ways.

Yukon

Yukon Territory was carved out of the extreme northwest of what was then the enormous North-West Territory of Canada in 1898.² The immediate stimulus for the creation of a new territory was the Klondike Gold Rush, which drew thousands of American and other prospectors into the territory of the Yukon First Nations in a very short period of time. Dominion government fears of American annexation led directly to the creation of a new

territory and the establishment of an elected government. No treaties were negotiated with the indigenous people of the area, though Treaty 8 (covering lands immediately south and east of the Yukon Territory) was signed in 1898, and, in 1921, Treaty 11 was concluded with the Dene immediately to the east in what is now the Northwest Territories.³ When gold fever waned and the non-indigenous population began to leave the territory, the scope of territorial government was somewhat reduced. For many decades, Yukon remained a territory governed by a commissioner, who held the rank of deputy minister in the federal Department of the Interior and its administrative successors, and an elected but advisory territorial council. This situation began to change in the late 1970s, when the commissioner left the legislative chamber, and the legislature assumed more independence.

Today, Yukon has responsible government, an eighteen-member elected legislature and a vital political party system.⁴ A 3,000-strong territorial public service is responsible to a population of 29,000 people, seventy-three per cent of whom live in the capital, Whitehorse. Most of the 8,000 people living in the rest of the territory are members of Yukon First Nations, speakers of Gwichen, Tr'ondek Hwech'in, Upper Tanana, Northern and Southern Tutchone, Tagish, Kaska and Tlingit, who are now organized into fourteen small First Nations.⁵ Overall, First Nations people comprise about twenty per cent of the Yukon population. Collectively, these nations negotiated an umbrella final agreement on land rights and, under the terms of this agreement, are now in the process of negotiating nation-specific agreements on land claims and self-government. The Yukon and federal governments are parties to all of these negotiations and agreements, which are gradually transforming the shape of territorial government. By 31 March 2003, devolution of natural resources-related responsibilities from the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the territorial government is expected to be complete.

Yukon's economy is based on traditional land-use (trapping, hunting, fishing and gathering), mining (gold, silver, lead, zinc and natural gas), tourism and public services. There is a small, secondary manufacturing sector. Currently, the territory is in an economic slowdown, due to the closings of all the major mines. Despite some out-migration, the unemployment rate in Yukon remains quite high (ten per cent in late 2002).

Northwest Territories

Until 1967, the Northwest Territories was governed from Ottawa. In 1967, the seat of government, the commissioner and senior public-service staff moved to Yellowknife. In these years, the territorial council comprised appointed members, most of whom were not northern residents. By 1979, however, the council, renamed the legislative assembly, was composed entirely of elected members, and the composition of the assembly came to reflect the demographic balance in the election of Inuit, Dene, Inuvialuit, Métis and non-aboriginal people. The Ninth Legislative Assembly, elected in 1979, decided to cooperate with aboriginal political organizations in designing a new constitutional future for the NWT. In the twenty years following, there were dramatic changes.

The legislative assembly created the Constitutional Alliance, a governmental and non-governmental partnership mandated to ponder the future constitution of the NWT. In 1983, the assembly held a plebiscite on division of the Northwest Territories, and following public endorsement of division, the alliance became two bodies, the Nunavut Constitutional Forum and the Western Constitutional Forum. These bodies helped create the conditions for division of the NWT in 1999 to create two new territories, Nunavut and a new Northwest Territories comprising the western part of the former NWT. The constitutional forums also began a long process of research and public discussion about the appropriate future form of government in the new territories. In the west, this discussion continued for a decade and a half, progressing through several commissions and phases, always responding to developments in the comprehensive claims negotiations.⁶

In the late 1970s, it appeared that two comprehensive claims agreements (modern treaties) would be negotiated in the Northwest Territories: one by Inuvialuit residents of the Mackenzie Delta/Beaufort Sea area through their representative organization, the Committee for Original People's Entitlement; and another by the Dene and Métis, whose homelands comprised the rest of the territory, negotiating jointly through the Dene Nation and the Métis Association of the Northwest Territories. History, however, did not unfold in this way, and ultimately a much more complex set of arrangements concerning aboriginal rights and self-government emerged.

The Inuvialuit (whose homeland is the Mackenzie Delta/Beaufort Sea area) signed a modern treaty in 1984. There followed agreements signed by the Gwich'in (the most northerly of the Dene groups) in 1992 and the Sahtu Dene (their Mackenzie Valley neighbours to the south) in 1993. The claims agreements provided certainty about land ownership, with identified collective holdings in fee-simple and other use rights to larger areas of the traditional territory, specific participation in a variety of land and resources management boards, and substantial cash payments for rights surrendered, which the various groups have invested for collective purposes.

There are still some large outstanding land and governance issues in the Northwest Territories, for the Deh Cho Dene (whose homeland is southwest of Great Slave Lake), the Dogrib (Tli Cho Dene in the Yellowknife area), the Akaitcho Dene (southeast of Great Slave Lake), and the Métis people living in these same areas.⁷ Land and governance issues are being negotiated within a framework of principles that recognizes aboriginal entitlement and includes the possibility of diverse specific arrangements. Negotiations concern both land (ownership and management) and self-government.

Another process is important to the current circumstances of the Government of the Northwest Territories. As we noted earlier, the resident public service in the NWT dates from the transfer of the capital from Ottawa to Yellowknife in 1967. A second wave of devolution occurred in the 1980s, involving the transfer of responsibility for a few more government services (such as fire control and health care) to the territorial level.⁸ A third stage has been opened by the current minister of Indian affairs and northern development, and this time the intent is to devolve powers concerning land and natural resources to the

territory. In this round, which deals with powers at the heart of economic development, all of the aboriginal entities, along with the territorial government, will participate in the negotiation of devolution.

There have never been formal political parties in territorial elections, although often the party affiliation of particular members is known. In the absence of legislative parties, the premier and cabinet are elected by all of the legislators in committee of the whole. The premier assigns portfolios. The absence of political parties and the consequent differences in legislative practices give the “consensus government” of the Northwest Territories a particular dynamic, with those members of the legislature who are not in the cabinet often acting as an “unofficial opposition.”

Compared to the situation in Yukon, where processes are complicated enough but at least ordered by the Umbrella Yukon Claim Agreement, the constitutional and political landscape in the Northwest Territories is extraordinarily heterogeneous and complex. Yet, there are ordering principles now accepted by all parties: institutional development of the territorial government must be coordinated with the implementation of aboriginal land and self-government rights; the institutions of public government will incorporate various forms of indigenous self-government; and whatever changes are ahead, these will be negotiated by citizens, in as public a fashion as possible.

The economy of the Northwest Territories is perhaps the strongest of the three territories, with generally lower unemployment rates (around or below the national average in most recent years) and active development of several non-renewable resources, including, most prominently, diamonds, oil and natural gas. Like the other two territories, the Northwest Territories confronts a significant problem of uneven development, with jobs being much more plentiful in a few wage-employment centres and relatively scarce elsewhere.⁹

Nunavut

The signing of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement in 1992 and the creation of Nunavut Territory on 1 April 1999 were the culmination of twenty-five years' political development and negotiation.¹⁰ The creation of the new territory was the result of the ability of Inuit to persuade their co-residents in the former Northwest Territories to support division of the territory and their ultimately successful campaign to press this case in their relations with the federal government.

As is the case in the other two territories, the Government of Nunavut is a public government. Because Inuit comprise approximately eighty-five per cent of the population, there has been no discussion of concomitant Inuit-specific self-government negotiations similar to those in either Yukon or the Northwest Territories. For Inuit, the Government of Nunavut, together with the terms of their modern treaty, constitute their path to self-determination.

The achievement of Nunavut is particularly striking when seen in historical context. Some Inuit have had trading and other contact with some non-Inuit peoples for virtually

their entire history, but, until the Second World War, most Inuit lived on the land in relative isolation from the rest of the globe. Wholesale and rapid transformation of their way of life and integration into the Canadian economy, political system and cultural life began with the war and accelerated afterwards with the expansion of social welfare, health and education programs into the North.

All of these changes, but the social programs especially, eventually completely reorganized the Inuit way of life. Families were induced to settle in communities (limiting or eliminating the seasonal round upon which traditional life was based). Rental housing was provided, built on southern designs, which required imported energy to heat and imported skills to maintain. Communities were built and extended families were relocated, sometimes for reasons of social engineering or protection, while individuals disappeared from families when they were moved south for health care. And, to make administration of all these changes easier, Inuit were numbered by public servants who could not understand or work with the Inuit system of naming. The post-war changes in northern Canada resemble, in magnitude, thoroughness and direction, the Industrial Revolution of Europe, but they differ from these changes in that they took place within one or two generations. As well, an important aspect of these changes is that they were driven by government – in this case, the federal government. It carried out socially focused initiatives, based on contemporary beliefs about what would be best for Inuit, and other nationally motivated projects related to defence and resource development.

The jurisdiction and powers of Nunavut are similar to those of the other two territories, though there is unlikely to be devolution of control over natural resources to Nunavut in the near future. As is the case for the Northwest Territories, there are no political parties in the Nunavut legislative assembly. A major project of institutional development is still under way, and challenges of organization, innovation and human development will occupy people in the territory for some years to come.

Several distinctive features of government in Nunavut are relevant here. First, the Government of Nunavut co-exists with a number of other powerful institutions created by the comprehensive claims agreement: besides Nunavut Tunngavik Inc, the body that administers the comprehensive land-claim funding, there is the Nunavut Planning Commission, which is responsible for land-use planning; the Nunavut Impact Review Board conducts environmental and socio-economic reviews of development projects; and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board oversees human impact on the northern wildlife. The working relationship between these bodies and the institutions of government is not yet fully established. A second distinctive feature of the Government of Nunavut is its commitment to implementing *Inuit qaujimajatuqangit*, an initiative to ensure that bureaucratic practices will reflect Inuit values about human interaction. Related and complementary goals are to make Inuktitut the working language of the public service and to ensure that Inuit are represented in the public service in proportion to their presence in the labour force. Finally, the Government of Nunavut is in the process of decentralizing the public service, including headquarters functions, to towns and communities outside of Iqaluit. Taken together, these distinctive aspects of governance in Nunavut create a most ambitious agenda for the new institution.

Nunavut is heavily dependent on federal transfers for its expenditure budget, and unemployment rates, particular among younger Inuit outside of Iqaluit, are about double the Canadian rates.¹¹ The growing public sector creates a growing number of good employment opportunities, and the decentralization policy is taking these opportunities to the smaller communities where unemployment is highest. Mineral development potential in the territory is enormous, and there are good prospects and at present steady development in tourism and the commercial production of wild food.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROUNDTABLES

Although participants in the roundtables were asked to consider seven basic questions, as starting points for discussion, each roundtable was intended to be wide-ranging and guided by the interests and concerns of the participants. In particular, we were gratified but not surprised to note that the presentations prepared by participants at each roundtable tended to shape the discussions that ensued. As we reviewed the results of each roundtable, it became evident that it would be most useful to organize presentation of the results in terms of three broad themes that emerged as pre-eminent in each case:

- the state of aboriginal claims and their intergovernmental consequences;
- citizen-state relations – public expectations of government and the role of government in citizens’ lives; and
- providing public services in this environment.

Our report on each roundtable is organized around each of these three themes.

Whitehorse

The Whitehorse roundtable, on 11 March 2002, was the first in the series. A total of twenty-eight people participated (see Appendix B). They included public servants from the federal, territorial and municipal governments, as well as individuals working in aboriginal organizations. Also among the participants was a group of representatives of Young Yukon Government Professionals. This is a voluntary association of young public servants (aged twenty to thirty-five) who work in Yukon, in both the territorial and federal governments.

The day’s discussion was stimulated by three presentations. The first presentation was entitled “Self-Government in Yukon: New Approaches to Governance,” by Belinda Smith, director and senior negotiator in the Fiscal Relations and Program Transfers Division of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada. As the title suggests, the presentation focused on the implications of aboriginal claims in Yukon on governance. The second presentation, “Improving Services for Yukoners: The Role of the Department of Community Services,” turned to improvements in citizen access to government and service delivery. Siegfried Fuchsbichler, presenter, is assistant deputy minister in the Department of Government Services in the Government of Yukon and team leader of the Community Services Implementation Team. The day concluded with a discussion of future public-service recruitment and retention, stimulated by a presentation by the Young Yukon Government Professionals. The main issues and themes that emerged are reviewed below.

Aboriginal Claims and Intergovernmental Consequences

At the time of the Yukon roundtable, eight of fourteen Yukon First Nations had concluded self-government agreements with Canada, under the Umbrella Yukon Claim Agreement.

This agreement was signed in 1993 by the Government of Canada and the Council for Yukon Indians, representing the fourteen First Nations in Yukon, who reside in seventeen First Nations communities. The 1993 Umbrella Agreement committed Canada and the fourteen First Nations to negotiate individual self-government agreements, with Government of Yukon having an obvious interest.

Aboriginal people are the majority in smaller Yukon communities, such as Old Crow, but they form the minority of the population in larger centres, including Whitehorse. The implication is that, where they form the majority of the population, First Nations governments would serve that majority by providing such major services as health care and education. The actual number of people to be served would be relatively small, however. Residents not covered by the First Nation government would, in theory, continue to be served by the governments of Canada and Yukon and some form of municipal government. In larger centres, where First Nations governments represent a minority of the total population, the same basic pattern would exist but the population served by public government would be much more substantial. The Umbrella Agreement also provides for co-management structures for land-use planning and wildlife management.

The presentation “Self-Government in Yukon: New Approaches to Governance,” by Ms. Smith, and the discussion that followed pointed out some of the practical approaches and challenges associated with implementation of these new governance arrangements. The mechanism to bring about the transfer of responsibility from government to government is the Program Service Transfer Agreement. On a service-by-service basis, this provides for the transfer of jurisdiction and resources. This mechanism is available to implement the transfer of responsibility from either the Government of Canada or Government of Yukon to a First Nation. As of March 2002, however, it had only been used for federal–First Nation transfers.

The Program Service Transfer Agreement presents real challenges for all governments involved. One major challenge is how to provide services to all Yukoners, given demographics, geography and scale. For example, one area that is subject to transfer is social services. If all fourteen First Nations governments assume this responsibility and Yukon retains responsibility for non-First Nations people, there will be fifteen governments with autonomous authority over the terms and conditions of social assistance and, in theory, with separate delivery systems. The same holds true for health care and education. Practicality suggests that some collaboration will be needed among governments for the development and operation of public facilities. The question of service harmonization (not necessarily homogenization) among governments is also at the forefront. The challenge for public servants in Yukon and for officials in First Nations governments is how to provide services that respect the letter and spirit of First Nations self-government agreements without eroding access to service and limiting service levels, as a result of small scale and the limited fiscal capacity of all of the governments now involved.

There was considerable discussion about this important challenge. All agreed that rising to the challenge would require a changed mindset. One important element of this new mindset will be to focus on the specific practical challenge rather than on the past posture

of the parties in a negotiation. Governments and public servants of all types may, as appropriate, have to “step out of the way” and permit new institutions and people to take responsibility for governance. There was consensus that the first priority is to look for practical solutions to the challenges of this new division of responsibilities. This would involve focusing on the desired solution, recognizing the challenges of scale, and searching for common ground and recognizing areas of difference. There was also agreement that the principle of subsidiarity, whereby responsibility for service is vested with the most local level possible, should guide this process.

Citizen-State Relations

The first discussion of the role of aboriginal claims in shaping the public service in Yukon had an underlying theme. This concerned citizenship. Specifically, participants thought it important to recognize that people in Yukon had a common stake in the future of the territory. This was seen as an important principle that should underlie all discussions of governmental relationships and responsibilities. In order to build a sense of constructive momentum around this principle, there was an appetite among participants to discuss citizen engagement.

One very basic but important issue we worked through concerned the building of a broad public consensus about what to do with garbage. Garbage is a problem in some Yukon communities, as well as in remote areas. Participants agreed that it is increasingly important to look for holistic understanding of the problem and for solutions that work on many levels. The public servant of the future should be equally comfortable discussing the impact of poor practice on the broader environment and Yukon ecology as settling a dispute about the use of “burn barrels” in the community. Once again, participants spoke of a skill-set that focused on practical solutions.

The discussion of citizen-state relations also highlighted the relationship between past practice and future need. In Yukon, there has been a history of extensive public engagement by governments, by the Council of Yukon Indians and by First Nation leaders. Some of this has centred on proposals for economic development in Yukon – for example, the consultation undertaken by the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (Berger Inquiry) in the 1970s. There has also been extensive and almost continuous citizen engagement around the claims process and the rethinking of government in the territory. Participants noted that this places an onus on government to inform citizens effectively about who does what in government and how to access government. The fact that government is a major employer in the territory may result in increased appetite for this type of information and engagement by government servants who are also citizens.

Whitehorse roundtable participants agreed that recent developments enhanced the need for governments in Yukon to engage. Two important reasons were identified. First, the shifting pattern of responsibilities among governments makes it crucial that the public understand “who does what.” This is important so that citizens can access services appropriately. Participants thought that this information was equally important in order for citizens to hold the appropriate government body accountable. The level of civic

sophistication that the complexity of government responsibilities in Yukon requires is a challenge. The second reason why citizen engagement was seen as crucial at present is to manage expectations. Participants were concerned that the public be made aware of the challenges associated with implementing new intergovernmental relationships. They placed a high priority on educating the public about the cost of services in Yukon and the fiscal constraints on governments of all types. It was clear from the discussion that participants see a shift to more direct democracy, more citizen involvement in government, and a need to improve the calibre of public consultation and engagement.

Providing Public Services in this Environment

The second presentation, “Improving Services for Yukoners: The Role of the Department of Community Services,” by Mr. Fuchsbichler, spoke very directly to the challenge of providing public services in an environment that is rife with change and rising citizen expectations. The presentation identified four issues and challenges faced by Yukon government:

- how to deliver programs and services in light of growing demands and limited resources;
- how to build community capacity;
- how to identify opportunities to work together; and
- how to address roles and responsibility changes in northern governance.

The presentation then provided an overview of three key initiatives that are aimed at improving services to all Yukon residents and the process of public-service reform that must accompany implementation of these initiatives.

Recently implemented service improvement initiatives in Yukon include

- new telephone blue pages that list all federal, territorial, provincial (in cooperation with the Government of British Columbia), municipal, First Nation and key non-government listings by key word. Citizens no longer have to be intimately familiar with Canada’s intergovernmental maze to access service;
- a single change-of-address form that permits Yukoners to inform all Yukon government departments and agencies that they have moved. Residents of Whitehorse can also use this to inform the city government; and
- new telephone standards that set targets and best practices for response times and etiquette. Easy access to a real person who is knowledgeable about the area of inquiry is an important cornerstone of this initiative.

These three reforms in the way the Yukon government improves its services to citizens are to be followed by others. The goal is to make government more accessible and to streamline the process of interacting with government. Participants agreed that the process of undertaking these reforms was as important as the reforms themselves. Both reflect the new world of public service in Yukon. The Department of Community

Services is, itself, a manifestation of this new world, having been established as part of a Yukon government-wide renewal process.

Looking at the process of public-service reform, participants focused on the need to forge sound collaborations among governments and with community agencies. This is partly a reflection of the issue of scale, discussed earlier. The suggestion was made that the relatively small size of Yukon might provide an advantage in developing collaborative arrangements, as people can have face-to-face discussions relatively easily and generally know one another.

There was also discussion of the need to use specific service-improvement initiatives to empower front-line public servants. The first service-improvement reforms were centrally developed. There was consensus, however, that front-line public servants have good ideas for service improvement as a result of their experiences. The Community Services Initiative's experience suggests that examining the accountability relationship within the public service would enable governments to benefit from these ideas and insights. The idea of a culture change to give front-line public servants ownership of the work that they do was thought to be very important. Highlighting the rewards associated with having this sense of ownership was seen as an important recruitment incentive for new public servants in Yukon.

The perceptions and aspirations of new – specifically young – public servants in Yukon was the subject of the final presentation and discussion. The Young Yukon Government Professionals discussed the findings and recommendations contained in “Engaging and Developing a New Generation of Yukon Public Servants,” released in November 2001. This paper builds on discussions from the “Open Space Forum,” held in Whitehorse earlier in 2001, and the national “New Professionals Driving a New Public Service” initiative.

Young Yukon Government Professionals seek the following:

- changes in organizational culture, values and management practices – young public servants seek orientation to public service as a calling and more specific information concerning how their jobs fit in. There is also appetite for a formal code of ethics, widely disseminated to guide all public servants in their work. Active mentoring by senior colleagues is viewed as an excellent way of learning from experience but also of building communication to bridge the generational divide;
- more deliberate retention strategies – incorporating flexible work arrangements and the development of real plans for career development; and
- more emphasis on early recruitment – especially to attract young Yukoners into the public service. The presentation recommended that young people start to learn about public-service employment opportunities while still in high school, that co-ops and summer employment opportunities be used to give early experience, and that the Yukon grant program that supports Yukoners taking postsecondary education be used to track qualified recruits.

The Whitehorse roundtable concluded with a reflection on the distance travelled in terms of public-service development and the reform of governance in Yukon over the past

twenty-five years. There was agreement that there had been many changes. In the current context, implementation of First Nations government, the changing roles of other governments in Yukon, and the new relationships among all governments will shape the course of the public service of the future.

Yellowknife

The Yellowknife roundtable was held on 13 March 2002, with twenty-nine participants from the federal, territorial and municipal governments, from Aurora College, and the non-governmental sector (see Appendix B).

Two presentations framed the day's discussion:

Lynn Elkin, executive director of Corporate Human Resources in the Government of the Northwest Territories, discussed the program "Maximizing Northern Employment," with a focus on the aspects of this initiative that are internal to the territorial government. Maximizing Northern Employment is a cabinet-directed initiative to ensure, as the name suggests, that to the maximum extent possible, northerners are matched to the jobs available in the NWT economy. Aspects of the program include student employment programs, internships, public-private partnerships, director support of regionally generated employment support programs, advanced training for industrial jobs, expanded teacher education, student success centres at the Aurora, Yellowknife and Thebacha campuses of Aurora College, and a healthy workplace initiative for territorial employees. Although many of these programs had existed in the Northwest Territories for many years, in one version or another, Maximizing Northern Employment is innovative in that it represents the first time that all of these initiatives have been drawn together as aspects of a single purpose, with budget, time-lines and the possibility of monitoring and evaluation.

The Student Employment Program element of Maximizing Northern Employment resulted in 342 students being employed in the Government of the Northwest Territories, in Yellowknife and elsewhere. The Graduate Employment Program drew forty-seven interns to territorial government employment. Under Advanced Training-Industry, sixty-five drilling rig floorhands have been trained. The Expanded Northern Teacher Education Program had eighty-eight participants at the Aurora, Yellowknife and Thebacha campuses combined.

In the second presentation, David Livingstone, director of Renewable Resources and Environment at Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada, described the development of the Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management Framework. This is a multiparty process, led by the federal departments of Environment and Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to develop consensus on a strategy and a framework for dealing with multiple development projects in a setting where there are multiple actors and responsible agencies. (At the time, the immediate goal was a presentation to ministers by 31 March 2002.) As an example of the partnership approach taken by this initiative, Livingstone noted that it was guided by a steering committee that included

representatives of eight aboriginal organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations, industry, the Government of the Northwest Territories, the federal departments of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Environment, and the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Review Board, as well as observers from Nunavut.

Aboriginal Claims and Intergovernmental Consequences

As indicated earlier, the NWT is in the midst of a complex and multifaceted process of constitutional development. Unlike the case in the Yukon, in the NWT there is no umbrella agreement providing consistency among the modern treaties and self-government arrangements. Another important difference is the presence, in the NWT, of treaties 8 and 11. Furthermore, the indigenous nations in the NWT are operating on different schedules and towards somewhat different end-points. The earliest claim was concluded by Inuvialuit in 1984, while some other groups (such as the Deh Cho Dene) are in the early stages of a process that might lead to a quite different outcome. This situation, and the effect of two decades of public discussion of constitutional matters, seems to have created a general tolerance for institutional change and a shared expectation that most decision-making processes will be extremely inclusive and participatory.

These major developments in the institutions of government were seen to be important spurs to innovative practices. The impetus to innovate was strengthened by the fiscal restraint imposed on all levels of government in the 1990s, leading to new ways of cooperating and planning.

Participants in the workshop identified a number of shared projects and concerns – for example, the need to provide employment to northerners to the greatest extent possible and the need for coordination in program development and delivery. One expression of this is the formation of the Intergovernmental Forum, intended to support information exchange and cooperative planning.

Rather strikingly, participants did not identify areas where there was conflict over shared responsibilities, overlaps or gaps. In contrast to what might have been the case fifteen years ago, there were no “extremes” of opinion in the discussion; differences of opinion were muted and concerned subsidiary rather than core issues. There was consensus among the participants from all levels of government on the salience of modern treaties for the future of government, on the importance of public participation, and on the need for coordination and maximization of impact. However, perhaps reflecting the stage of negotiations on self-government, there was little specific discussion of the division of responsibilities among the three levels of public government and the future aboriginal governments that will be created by current negotiations.

It was evident that a new generation of public servants is coming to high office in the Government of NWT. These public servants are, compared to those in many southern jurisdictions, relatively young, and many are long-term northerners. For this cohort, there

never was a time when the federal or territorial governments could behave as if indigenous rights were an issue separate from the daily business of governing.

An interesting gap in the conversation had to do with devolution. The federal and territorial governments, and aboriginal organizations, are discussing the devolution of control over lands and resources to the territorial government, but this was not mentioned in the general discussion of providing services and delivering good government. Finally, we note that the municipal level of government did not receive much attention in the discussion on these points.

Citizen-State Relations

Workshop participants all expressed a commitment to the maximum degree of public participation, and they took coordination among their various agencies to be a basic and normal part of the job. Some noted that the size of the entire northern public service made communication more practical, remarking “We all know each other.”

On the other hand, there was concern about “consultation fatigue” among the citizenry and, especially, concern that there were simply not always enough people who were aware and active in the smaller communities to contribute to all the consultative and planning processes that they were asked to join. Related to this were comments concerning the tendency for the public service in the capital to dominate the agenda for policy and program implementation. For example, participants stressed the need to provide more staff development and employment programs to local and band governments, seeing this as a more or less permanent challenge of northern governance.

Another theme concerned the contrast between the “holistic” way in which individuals live life and experience government and the fragmentation that exists in program planning and delivery. This discontinuity is particularly difficult from the perspective of people living in the smaller communities, where there are many government actors and many opportunities for consultation but few people who are available and prepared to take advantage of these. The fragmentation among government policies and programs increases the difficulty of delivering services in a way that matches community needs and permits complementarity.

Participants spoke of the need to bring about cultural change in organizations and different branches of different levels of government, so that they will have common goals and the flexibility that comes from having made choices together.

Providing Public Services in this Environment

The main themes of this wide-ranging discussion included

- the persistent and pressing need for the development of the resident human resources capacity. There is still considerable local competition for talented and

well-educated people, and the only remedy for this is to increase the number of highly skilled people – especially by training northerners;

- the importance of partnerships. In the complex and constantly evolving jurisdictional and constitutional matrix that is the Northwest Territories, many and varied forms of co-management and joint planning and delivery have been tried. These initiatives are extremely important counterbalances to the tendency for gridlock, overlaps, incoherent program delivery and the emphasis of planning and process over delivery and evaluation; and
- the importance of the youth. With a comparatively young and growing population, the Northwest Territories enjoys the prospect of educating and training a territorially focused cohort of people committed to public service, broadly defined. Partnerships between other public and aboriginal institutions and the educational system are essential in this regard.

With substantial own-source revenue (about 43% of the last expenditure budget) the Government of the Northwest Territories has more and growing scope for independent action and longer-term planning. The increased revenue is largely a part of increased economic vitality, and participants noted that the increased vitality brought its own problems and service-delivery challenges – such as increased demand for well-educated workers and the increased social problems that come as a result of rising wages and wage-economy employment.

In contrast, it is evident that the federal role in northern service delivery is steadily declining, leaving the responsibility with the territorial and nascent aboriginal governments. In this regard, maximizing northern employment and in-service training for community-based personnel is extremely important.

In the area of service delivery, the natural tendency for government operations to be centralized in the capital presents a serious problem. It is a constant challenge to be sensitive to the needs in the regions. One response to this is a possible trend to more regionalization as self-government advances. Examples of this include Dogrib self-government negotiations and proposals for a public regional government in the Mackenzie Delta/Beaufort Sea area. Community empowerment is an inescapable trend, but it does bring with it challenges of training, consultation fatigue, integrated program design, harmonization of goals, and agreement about standards of evaluation. These are real challenges, directly confronted by public servants today.

Another important trend related to service delivery outside of Yellowknife is the use of information technology and differential citizen access to it. Much can be achieved with the new technologies, but at present infrastructure limitations make its application extremely uneven.

As will be observed, a considerable amount of time was spent at the Yellowknife workshop identifying the challenges for the future. The most important aspect of this

exercise is that there was considerable agreement among participants, regardless of background, on the essential challenges that the public service faces. The two presentations at the workshop provided examples of concrete actions to deal with important challenges. The approach taken, in each case, suggests that the public service of the future in the NWT will have to be very adept at connecting many specific actions and organizations to the resolution or mitigation of broad challenges.

Iqaluit

The Iqaluit roundtable was held on 6 May 2002, with twenty-seven participants from the federal and territorial governments, from Nunavut Arctic College, and the non-governmental sector (see Appendix B).

David Akeeagok began the day with a discussion of decentralization in the Government of Nunavut. He described three phases: 1) building the infrastructure for government and residences in several communities outside of Iqaluit; 2) transferring personnel from Iqaluit to other communities over a period of three years, and 3) developing a model for staff development and communication. He noted that in May 2002, the government was nearing the end of the second phase.

There were some immediate benefits from the decentralization project. Decentralization advances the goal of recruiting more beneficiaries of the land claim to the public service, because it “brought the jobs to the people.” It is now possible to work in a senior position with the government outside of Iqaluit. In addition, by bringing public-service jobs to the communities, decentralization creates jobs outside of the capital and brings to the other communities the attendant economic benefits. Mr. Akeeagok estimates that to date about \$25 million had been spent outside of Iqaluit as a direct result of decentralization.

Mr. Akeeagok also emphasized that there were many uncertainties arising from decentralization, stating “we are in transition; we do not know what the outcomes will be.” He stressed that there were bound to be some difficulties arising from decentralization: “now we are decentralized in a centralized system.” The response to this will be to learn from experience and particularly from evident mistakes. The government will rely on the advice of the employees who have been affected by decentralization.

As of December 2001, 340 positions were decentralized, with a further 78 positions to be transferred in 2002–03. Of the 340 positions decentralized by the end of 2001, 131 remained vacant – a vacancy rate of 37%, compared to an overall Government of Nunavut vacancy rate of 22%. On the other hand, decentralization appears to be improving the representation of beneficiaries in the public service: 59% of decentralized positions are filled by Inuit, compared to 42% across the public service and 28% in the capital.¹²

The second presentation of the day, by Jo-Anne Falkiner, described the Canada-Nunavut Business Service Centre, of which she is manager, in Iqaluit. This Nunavut version of a

federal program attempts to support business development by providing a single window for information about federal assistance to businesses. The assistance available ranges from a comprehensive database of relevant federal and territorial programs, to specific help with business start-up and business planning, to a general analysis of the Nunavut economy. All of the information is available on-line,¹³ but making it available evenly to small communities and large requires personal contact and considerable travel. Operating in Nunavut, with a staff of one, poses a number of challenges to do with distance, language and the as-yet imperfect development of information technology communication. The work is at the same time intensely interesting and varied. A high priority is training an Inuktitut-speaking person for the position, though this may be practically difficult in the current Nunavut labour market.

Aboriginal Claims and Intergovernmental Consequences

As challenging as circumstances in the young territory of Nunavut may be, there is one sense in which Nunavummiut have an easier task than is the case in the other territories. With the land claim completed, and the attendant governing arrangements in place in the formation of the new territory itself, the political and constitutional territory enjoys relative clarity and simplicity. Generally there is a high degree of social consensus, within government and in the society about the goals of the project to build Nunavut and about how these will be achieved.

In the workshop discussion, participants from all sectors agreed on certain goals for public service. All recognized the import of the provisions of the Nunavut agreement, which mandates a public service that is representative of the society. Participants from all levels of government referred to the desirability of high levels of beneficiary employment in their departments and agencies.

Several features of the situation create distinctive challenges for the Government of Nunavut. First, the commitment to beneficiary employment in the public service has created an extremely high demand for trained Inuit employees and strong competition for these individuals in the labour force. This has in turn led to an undesirable level of staff mobility, increasing the costs of training and personnel development. Secondly, there are some areas of uncertainty concerning potentially overlapping responsibilities among the beneficiary organizations, management boards, and the Government of Nunavut. And, thirdly, the government is a small one that deals not only with formidable service-delivery responsibilities but also with the constantly demanding machinery of Canadian federalism.

Federal departments operating in Nunavut face somewhat different but parallel challenges. These departments are also obligated by the Nunavut agreement to retain a proportionate number of staff who are beneficiaries, adding to the already high demand for these individuals in the labour market. The federal officials face some jurisdictional uncertainty as well, especially where their area of responsibility requires them to cooperate with Nunavut-based institutions. Finally, federal officials face an interesting existential contradiction. Working in Nunavut, they represent, locally, a large and

powerful institution, but at the same time they are frequently perceived to operate as small and idiosyncratic “outposts” of large departments with Canada-wide responsibilities.

A federal council has been formed in Iqaluit to support communication and cooperation among federal departments, and it will surely seek to address the labour-market issues.

Citizen-State Relations

At the moment, there is a very high level of public attention on the Government of Nunavut and some lack of clarity about where territorial responsibilities end and the responsibilities of other levels of government begin. There are very high expectations of service and responsiveness, and these wear particularly heavily on territorial public servants who are enduring the inevitable growing pains of any new institution. Experience and the passage of time may reduce the force of this contradiction, as will the efforts of federal public servants to communicate to all the residents of Nunavut about the other level of government’s programs and role.

All participants in the workshop took for granted the economic importance of the Nunavut government. Decentralization is premised on the role of public-service employment in stimulating and stabilizing regional and local economies. This reality adds a special dimension to northern public service in general and that of Nunavut in particular: government is at once the provider of needed services and the major engine of growth.

The government policy of *Inuit qaujimajatuqangit* – the initiative that ensures bureaucratic practices will reflect Inuit values about human interaction, – is intended to result in a public service that is distinctly different from what Nunavummiut experienced before 1999. The resulting public service should be more responsive, flexible and respectful to citizens, and these values should permeate interactions among public servants from all levels. While this is an important goal, in a public service under the stresses of starting up, decentralization and incomplete staffing, it is also a difficult one to keep alive.

Providing Public Services in this Environment

The challenge of human resources dominated discussions in this workshop. All participants were eager to share experiences and to discuss ways in which they could end the overheated competition for qualified beneficiaries and cooperate in increasing the size of the labour pool.

Another related issue is that of language. There is a commitment to make Inuktitut the language of work in the territorial bureaucracy, but this has so far not been realized. Inuktitut training for those who are not fluent, and for new employees imported from the south, is available but progress is slow and more needs to be done. It is particularly important that services be provided in Inuktitut: that is, that wherever government meets

them, people should be able to speak with public-service employees in the language in which they are most comfortable. This is working well for some departments but not for all.

Decentralization imposes particular burdens on public servants and managers who must cope with distance and separation. At the moment, this means a great deal of travel for all. Information technology is a major help, but sometimes face-to-face communication is essential, particularly for front-line staff who need to resolve issues in discussion with managers located elsewhere. The level of information technology infrastructure is not yet optimum, and many smaller communities have poor access. There are few personal computers, for example: government departments may be connected, but citizens are not.

Participants in the workshop raised the question of the overall quality of public service now being delivered. In light of the multiple other challenges faced by public servants, and the many demands on their time, sometimes quality of service to the public suffers. This is particularly difficult because it is important now to establish good relations between members of the public and the new Government of Nunavut.

In general, the discussion in Iqaluit focused on very current and pressing problems, with all parties animated by the recognition that new ground was being broken, and patterns set, which might have very far-reaching consequences for how the territory develops.

CHAPTER 3

FINAL THOUGHTS

The participants in these workshops were drawn from many areas of public service in the territorial North. They brought a keen interest in discussing their experiences as public servants and deep knowledge of the circumstances of their region. Appropriately and understandably, each roundtable discussion was shaped by the preoccupations of each place and time. Thus, discussions held a few weeks earlier or later, or involving a different group of people, might have had somewhat different emphases and scope. The workshop reports are like snapshots, taken at a particular family gathering, and, like family photos, they will have a certain enduring importance for what they record and what they reveal of a particular moment.

It is also possible to view the three photographs as a set, to see what is similar and what is different in each picture. By way of conclusion, we offer some observations based on such a comparison. The comments we offer below refer to the snapshots (that is, to the workshops as particular discussions) and should not be read as general statements about the state of affairs in each territory. More general comparisons would require extensive research, for which the current report may be seen as an introduction.

Reviewing the workshops in Whitehorse, Yellowknife and Iqaluit in overview, we offer the following observations:

- In each territory, it was evident that there is a commitment to high levels of cooperation among the different levels of government, with, in each case, the greatest challenge of cooperation arising for the municipal government in each capital city.
- In each territory, concentrated attention to staff training and development was evident. The nurturing of a northern-based and representative public-sector workforce was a priority for all.
- The urgent need for continued capacity-building, particularly at the territorial, regional and local levels, was evident.
- Unlike the situation anywhere south of 60, public services in the territories are intimately engaged in the process of implementing comprehensive land-claims agreements.
- There was a general recognition that the priorities, needs and perceptions in the communities outside the capital were very different from those within it, creating a gap with which all public servants had to deal.
- The importance and the role of information technology is changing rapidly and with differential impact in each territory. This underscores the importance of access to high-tech infrastructure outside the capitals.
- With the attention given in each territory to human resources development, a picture of the ideal northern public servant can be sketched. Such an individual is, of course, well-trained and possessed of adequate experience and judgement. In addition, the ideal public servant in the North is adept at

- spanning boundaries between departments and levels of government and between government and other organizations;
- implementing programs using imagination and adaptability;
- consciously working to develop cross-cultural understanding and respect; and
- dealing with the small-scale practice of government across the full range of functions and services.

Having listened to the discussion at the three workshops, and having had the opportunity to reflect on the process at some length, it seems clear to us that there would be merit in more communication among public servants working in the three territories. Though each territory is different, the list we have just reviewed above shows that some of the challenges faced by each are similar. Though service to the public north of 60 is similar in many ways to service to the public anywhere in Canada, there are also some distinctive northern circumstances. We would offer an institutional proposal: the formation of a (virtual or actual) “Academy of Northern Public Administration,” which would be charged with comparative research and analysis, and communication among members about new approaches, problem-solving and best practices.

The great distances in the territorial North and the technology now in place and being improved suggest that this academy might be largely virtual, in fact consisting of a web site for storage of shared information, studies and reports, focused discussion groups and a bulletin board or mailing list of northern public servants. The network would be mandated to deal with practical problems and successes, and it would facilitate sharing experience not only intergovernmentally but within each government. The conversation among people who are facing the challenges of northern administration in the very different circumstances of each territory might help them all improve their professional capabilities and their organizations’ practices. The establishment of a virtual academy would require leadership and sufficient resources to maintain it, as well as a simple process through which the members of the network could establish priorities and decide on common projects.

We have been led to make a proposal for an Academy of Northern Public Administration because we have been struck by the very particular challenges faced by people working in this field. Consider these factors:

First, in the small societies of the North, public servants are unusually visible to and connected with the members of the public they are there to serve. In bureaucracies serving larger populations (such as those in most provinces), public servants rarely meet more than a few of the people in the population who might benefit from their work, and they rarely meet them in other than business-related situations. This is not true in the territorial North, where the small size of all communities makes it likely that public servants will know families rather than individuals and will meet them in grocery stores, choir practices and community events. This inevitable circumstance of northern administration creates unique opportunities and pressures for the northern administrator.

The unique scale of the North – vast geographical distances and small, dispersed populations – and its particularly harsh climate place unusually stringent constraints on most forms of human activity, from hunting to building construction or the arranging of conferences and the adaptation of new technologies. These circumstances have produced extremely resilient and adaptable northern indigenous societies, and they dictate that modern northern public administrators should develop these qualities as well, as they seek pragmatic solutions in a unique environment. Northern public administrators must be able to act with alacrity, as the situation requires.

Finally, northern public administrators are constantly “mediating” two very different cultures and sets of circumstances. They must, of course, understand the northern circumstances in which they are working, with specific knowledge of the various cultures of the north; the impact of northern history (both recent and more distant); the particular practices of sometimes very small human settlements, including salient regional variations; the particular northern social and economic cycles dictated by climate and wildlife; and many other factors up to and including the specific logistical challenges of weather and communications resources. On the other hand, northern public administrators work every day as part of the general Canadian system of administration, and they must know intimately the cultural practices, purposes, urgencies and sources of delay in that greater multigovernmental system. In order to do their jobs well, they must interact daily with other public servants whose help and cooperation they need but whose knowledge of the North may be little. The lot of the northern public administrator, then, is not an easy one. Poised between two very different human systems and constantly working in each, the individuals who are able to find the opportunities in these circumstances and to make headway in the advancement of northern societies, have special skills indeed.

APPENDIX A

Advisory Committee

Anne Crawford
Secretary to Cabinet and
Deputy Minister,
Department of the Executive and
Intergovernmental Affairs,
Government of Nunavut

Siegfried Fuchsbichler
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Government Services,
Government of the Yukon

Karen Hecks
Senior Director, Northern Affairs
Natural Resources Canada

Donna Mitchell
Executive Director,
Rural Secretariat,
Agriculture and Agri-Food
Canada

Rod Monette
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Public Works and
Government Services Canada

James R Moore
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Northern Affairs
Indian Affairs and
Northern Development Canada

Judith Moses
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Privy Council Office,
Government of Canada

Ray Pierce
Regional Director General,
Central and Arctic Region,
Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Tom Sparrow
Public Works and Government Services
Canada,
Whitehorse Office

Hank van der Linde
Special Adviser,
Public Works and
Government Services Canada

Lew Voytilla
Secretary of Financial,
Management Board,
Government of the Northwest Territories

APPENDIX B: AGENDAS AND PARTICIPANTS

Whitehorse Roundtable Agenda

11 March 2002

**Westmark Whitehorse Conference Centre
Conference Room 1**

9:00–9:10 AM **Welcome and Introductions**
Katherine Graham, Chair

9:10–10:30 AM **Presentation and Discussion**

“Self-Government in Yukon: New Approaches to Governance”

Belinda Smith

Belinda Smith is director and senior negotiator in the Fiscal Relations and Program Transfers Division of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada.

10:30–11:00 AM **Networking Break**

11:00–12:00 **Discussion**

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of these broad considerations:

- how government appears from the community perspective
- challenges of negotiating and implementing aboriginal self-government

12:00–1:00 PM **Lunch and Networking Break**

1:00–2:15 PM **Presentation and Discussion**

“Improving Services for Yukoners: The Role of the Department of Community Services”
Siegfried Fuchsbichler

Siegfried Fuchsbichler is assistant deputy minister in the Department of Government Services in the Government of Yukon. He is also team leader of the Community Services Implementation Team.

2:15–2:30 PM

Networking Break

2:30–4:00 PM

Wrap-Up and Closure

Chair

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of four broad considerations:

- the public servant of the future (capacity, issues of recruitment, and retention)
- how to ensure the ACTIVE transfer of capacity to the territorial governments

Whitehorse Roundtable Participants

Tony Armstrong
President and CEO,
Yukon Workers' Compensation Health
and Board

Jennifer Ellis
Executive Director,
Training Policy Committee,
Government of Yukon

Leanne Brassard
Manager, Business Services,
Dana Naye Ventures

Robert Fendrick
Info Systems Manager,
City of Whitehorse

John Brown
Regional Director General,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Shirlee Frost
Regional Coordinator,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Kirk Cameron
Deputy Minister,
Department of the Environment,
Government of Yukon

Siegfried Fuchsichler (Presenter)
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Government Services,
Government of Yukon

Colin Dean
Chief Administrative Officer,
Haines Junction

Carol Genest
Manager, Yukon
Canadian Heritage

Patrice Dutil
Director of Research,
Institute of Public Administration of
Canada

Katherine Graham (Chair)
Dean Designate, Faculty of Public
Affairs and Management,
Carleton University

Ken East
Superintendent,
Parks Canada

Bob Gray
Deputy Surveyor General
and Chair,
Settlement Lands Committee,
Natural Resources Canada

Elizabeth Hanson
Director, Claims and Indian Government,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Bea Haydon
Director, Finance and Administration,
Council of Yukon First Nations

Stu Mackay
Dean, Professional Studies,
Yukon College

Darrell Maddill
Commanding Officer,
RCMP “M” Division

Donna McBee
Coordinator, Service Improvement
Department of Government Services,
Government of Yukon

Michael McBride
Team Leader, Workforce Renewal,
Human Resources Renewal,
Executive Council Office,
Government of Yukon

Bill Newell
City Manager,
City of Whitehorse

Jeff O’Farrell
Community Adviser,
Department of Community Services,
Government of Yukon

John Read
Director, Risk Management,
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Sue Ryan
Vice-President, Operations,
Yukon Workers’ Compensation health
and Safety Board

Jim Slater
Executive Director,
Association of Yukon Communities

Belinda Smith (Presenter)
Director and Senior Negotiator, Fiscal
Relations and Program Transfers
Division,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Tom Sparrow
Director, Yukon/NW British Columbia
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Joy Waters
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of the Environment,
Government of Yukon

Yellowknife Roundtable Agenda

13 March 2002
Yellowknife Inn Conference Centre
Copper Room

9:00–9:10 AM **Welcome and Introductions**
Frances Abele,
Katherine Graham, co-chairs

9:10–10:30 AM **Presentation and Discussion**

“Maximizing Northern Employment”
Lynn Elkin

Lynn Elkin is executive director of Corporate Human Resource Services in the Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of the Executive.

10:30–11:00 AM **Networking Break**

11:00–12:00 **Presentation and Discussion**

“The Development of the Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management Framework”
David Livingstone

David Livingstone is director of Renewable Resources and Environment at Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada

12:00–1:00 PM **Lunch and Networking Break**

1:00–2:15 PM **Discussion**

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of these broad considerations:

- how government appears from the community perspective
- challenges of negotiating and implementing aboriginal self-government

2:15–2:30 PM Networking Break

2:30–4:00 PM Discussion

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of these broad considerations:

- the public servant of the future (capacity, issues of recruitment, and retention)
- how to ensure the ACTIVE transfer of capacity to the territorial governments

Yellowknife Roundtable Participants

Frances Abele (Co-chair)
Professor,
School of Public Policy and
Administration,
Carleton University

Lesley Allen
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Advanced Education and Careers,
Department of Education, Culture and
Employment,
Government of NWT

Richard Bargery
Special Adviser, Intergovernmental
Affairs,
Department of Aboriginal Affairs,
Government of NWT

Earl Blacklock
Canadian Rural Partnership

Ted Blondin
Land Claims Negotiator,
Treaty 11 Council

Felicity Burr
Project Coordinator,
School of Community Government

Tim Coleman
Director, Northern Corporate Affairs,
Environment Canada

Debbie DeLancey
Assistant Deputy Minister
Department of Health and Social Services,
Government of NWT

Patrice Dutil
Director of Research,
Institute of Public Administration of
Canada

Lynn Elkin (Presenter)
Executive Director,
Corporate Human Resource Services,
Department of the Executive Council,
Government of NWT

Maurice Evans
President,
Aurora College

Loretta Foley
Deputy Minister,
Department of Education, Culture and
Employment,
Government of NWT

Yvette Gonzalez
Chief Executive Officer,
NWT Association of Municipalities

Katherine Graham (Co-chair)
Dean Designate, Faculty of Public Affairs
and Management,
Carleton University

Max Hall
Chief Administrative Officer,
City of Yellowknife

Linda Hayden
Manager,
Community Technical Services,
School of Community Government

Russell Heslep
Asset and Facilities Manager,
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Larry Hutchinson
Executive Director,
Sahtu Secretariat/Sahtu Dene Council

Steve Iveson
Executive Director, Negotiations,
Department of Aboriginal Affairs,
Government of NWT

David Livingstone (Presenter)
Director, Renewable Resources and
Environment,
Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Canada

Margaret Melhorn
Deputy Minister,
Department of Finance,
Government of NWT

Nathaniel Olson
Senior Policy Adviser,
Rural Secretariat (Northern and Western
Region)

Chuck Parker
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Mackenzie Valley Development Planning

Dan Schofield
Director,
School of Community Government

Elizabeth Snider
Secretary to Cabinet,
Government of NWT

Peter Vician
Deputy Minister,
Department of Transportation,
Government of NWT

Lew Voytilla
Secretary,
Financial Management Board,
Government of NWT

Wendy Ward
Client Service Unit Director, Western
Region,
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Bronwyn Watters
Director,
Policy Planning and Human Resources,
Department of Health and Social Services,
Government of NWT

Iqaluit Roundtable Agenda

**6 May 2002
Frobisher Inn, Iqaluit
Husky Room**

9:00–9:10 AM **Welcome and Introductions**
Frances Abele, Chair

9:10–10:30 AM **Presentation and Discussion**

“Decentralization in the Nunavut Government”
David Akeeagok

David Akeeagok is assistant deputy minister-decentralization in the Department of Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs, Government of Nunavut.

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of the following broad considerations:

- how government appears from the community perspective
- the next steps in decentralization and what their impacts will be

10:30–11:00 AM **Networking Break**

11:00–12:00 **Presentation and Discussion**

“Canada-Nunavut Business Service Centre: Multiple Channel Access to Single-Window Service”
Jo-Anne Falkiner

Jo-Anne Falkiner is manager of Canada-Nunavut Business Service Centre in Iqaluit.

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how governments can improve their performance as service providers by enhancing their ability to collaborate with each other.

12:00–1:00 PM **Lunch and Networking Break**

1:00–2:15 PM

Discussion

“Service to the Public: The Lessons of *Citizens First 2000*”

Patrice Dutil, Director of Research, Institute of Public Administration of Canada

PLEASE NOTE: The following presentation was cancelled on the morning of the session, as Mr. McLeod was transported to Winnipeg for a medical emergency.

“Pan-Artic Inuit Logistics (PAIL) as an example of Inuit/government Cooperation”

Brian McLeod

Brian McLeod is the CEO of the Kakivak Association

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how governments can improve their performance as service providers by enhancing their ability to collaborate with the community and with the business sector.

2:15–2:30 PM

Networking Break

2:30–4:00 PM

Discussion

The purpose of the session is to brainstorm on how government can improve its performance as a service provider in light of the following broad considerations:

- the public servant of the future (capacity, issues of recruitment, and retention)
- how to ensure the ACTIVE transfer of capacity to the territorial governments

Iqaluit Roundtable Participants

Frances Abele (Chair)
Professor,
School of Public Policy and
Administration,
Carleton University

Leona Aglukkaq
Deputy Minister,
Department of Culture, Language,
Elders and Youth,
Government of Nunavut

David Akeegok (Presenter)
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Executive and
Intergovernmental Affairs,
Government of Nunavut

Wilf Attwood
Regional Director General,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Simon Awa
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Justice,
Government of Nunavut

Sidney Bruinsma
Manager,
Environment Canada

Rick Butler
Chief Administrative Officer,
City of Iqaluit

Rosemary Cooper
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Executive and
Intergovernmental Affairs,
Government of Nunavut

Patrice Dutil (Presenter)
Director of Research,
Institute of Public Administration of
Canada

Joamie Egeesiak
District Director,
Public Service Commission,
Government of Canada

Jo-Anne Falkiner (Presenter)
Manager,
Canada-Nunavut Business Service
Centre

Gregory Healey
Executive Director,
Nunavut Federal Council,
Government of Canada

Karen Hecks
Senior Director, Consultations and
Northern Affairs,
Natural Resources Canada

Stanley Hutchinson
Manager,
Natural Resources Canada

Carmen Levi
Deputy Minister,
Department of Human Resources,
Government of Nunavut

Richard Meredith
Regional Director,
Department of Justice,
Government of Canada

Richard O'Brien
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Community Government
and Transportation,
Government of Nunavut

Kathy Okpik
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Education,
Government of Nunavut

Marc Otto
Area Director,
Nunavut Area Parole Office,
Correctional Service of Canada

Doug Reti
Inspector,
RCMP

Helen Roos
Manager, Operations,
Canadian Heritage

Trish Smith
Regional Director, Human Resources,
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development Canada

Abraham Tagalik
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Health and Social
Services,
Government of Nunavut

Alex Taylor
Director,
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Tom Thompson
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Human Resources,
Government of Nunavut

Michael Rafter
Director, Financial Services,
Department of Community Government
and Transportation,
Government of Nunavut

Anthony Saez
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Culture, Language,
Elders and Youth,
Government of Nunavut

NOTES

- 1 Conference Board of Canada, *Building Tomorrow's Public Service Today: Challenges and Solutions in Recruitment and Retention* (Ottawa: Board, 2002), p. 1.
- 2 The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan followed in 1905, and Manitoba's boundary was extended from its 1870 "postage stamp" form in the Red River to the sixtieth parallel in 1912. In this year also Quebec's boundary was extended northward to the Arctic coast. These changes left the lands east of the north-south continental divide, north of sixty degrees latitude and north of the Quebec and Labrador mainland, as the renamed Northwest Territories.
- 3 On the historical circumstances surrounding the negotiation of the treaties, see René Fumoleau, *As Long As This Land Shall Last: A History of Treaty 8 and 11, 1870–1939* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973). Later events identified a gap between the oral and written versions of the treaties presented by federal representatives. The uncertainty over Treaty 11 did not lead to its abrogation, but it did leave sufficient doubt to require a renegotiation of the land question through comprehensive land claims. See the legal decisions *Paulette v. R.* and *Benoit v. R.*, and the discussion in Michael Asch, *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equality and Respect for Difference* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997). On northern history generally, see Shelagh Grant, *Sovereignty or Security? Government Policy in the Canadian North 1936–1950* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1988); Kenneth Rea, *The Political Economy of the Canadian North* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968); Kenneth Coates and William Morrison, *Canada's Colonies: The History of the Northwest Territories and Yukon* (Halifax: Lorimer, 1989); Kerry Abel, *Drum Songs: Glimpses of Dene History* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993).
- 4 Standings after the November 2002 election were Yukon Liberal Party, 12 members; New Democrats, 5; Liberals, 1.
- 5 <http://www.cyn.ca> At this web site there is current information about the status of claims and self-government negotiation.
- 6 Gurston Dacks, *A Choice of Futures: Politics in the Canadian North* (Toronto: Methuen, 1981); Kirk Cameron and Graham White, *Northern Governments in Transition Political and Constitutional Development in the Yukon, Nunavut and the Western Northwest Territories* (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1995).
- 7 Current information on the status of all outstanding negotiations appears at www.ainc-inac.gc.ca.
- 8 The 1980s wave of devolution to the governments of the Northwest Territories and Yukon was studied by an independent team of academics, resulting in Gurston Dacks, ed., *Devolution and Constitutional Development in the Canadian North* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990).
- 9 A good place to start is at <http://www.gov.nt.ca/RWED>.
- 10 An excellent introduction to Nunavut and the issues facing the new territory is Jens Dahl, Jack Hicks and Peter Jull, eds., *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of their Lands and their Lives* (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2000).

- 11 For data and an excellent discussion of various approaches to understanding unemployment in an economy such as that of Nunavut, see <http://www.gov.nu.ca> and publications of the Bureau of Statistics.
- 12 The term “beneficiaries” refers to Inuit who are entitled to the benefits of the land-claim agreement between the Government of Canada and the Tugavik Federation of Nunavut, the organization that represents the Inuit in Nunavut. Government of Nunavut, Department of Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs, Evaluation and Statistics Division, *Building Nunavut Through Decentralization: Evaluation Report* (Iqaluit: Department of Public Works and Services, 2002).
- 13 See <http://www.cbsc.org/nunavut>.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Frances Abele teaches in the School of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University in Ottawa, where she was director from 1996–2001. She has been studying indigenous politics and northern Canada for the last twenty-five years. She is the author of *Gathering Strength: A Study of Native Employment Training Programs in the Northwest Territories*, co-author (with Katherine Graham and Carolyn Dittburner) of *Soliloquy and Dialogue: Overview of Major Trends in Public Policy Relating to Aboriginal Peoples*, as well as numerous articles on federal northern policy and territorial political and economic development. Dr. Abele was deputy director of research – The North for the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. She is currently president of the Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies. Dr. Abele has been a consultant to federal and territorial governments, and non-governmental organizations, in such areas as employment, training and planning, diversity, the impact of downsizing and restructuring, strategic planning and staff development.

Katherine Graham is professor and dean designate of the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management at Carleton University. She will assume the deanship on 1 April 2003. From 1992 until 1996, she was director of the School of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton. She served as associate dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management from 1998 until July 2002.

Professor Graham's research interests are in the field of public policy and the management of government. She has focused these interests on local government and aboriginal policy. In a more eclectic vein, she served for three years as editor of *How Ottawa Spends*, the Carleton School of Public Policy and Administration's well-known annual review of the performance of the federal government. She is a sought-after commentator on public policy issues and has served as an adviser to all three levels of government in Canada and to governments abroad.

In 1990, she served as commissioner of election boundaries for the Ontario minister of municipal affairs and was responsible for developing a new electoral map for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. In 2002, she reprised this role, as a member of a three-person Task Force on Ward Boundaries for the new City of Ottawa.

Katherine Graham is the author and editor of numerous publications on local government in Canada. She has recently co-authored a major paper on aboriginal peoples and cities for the Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) and a paper on balanced urban growth for the TD Canada Trust Prosperity Initiative.

The New Directions Series

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) has, for many years, sponsored issue-oriented working groups of public servants and academics to find practical solutions to emerging issues. The Institute assembles groups of experts working on public-sector reform and public policy to discuss, compare, analyse, document and advance the understanding of critical issues and themes. While these reports are published in the language in which they were written, the executive summary is provided in the other official language.

The projects continue to explore a wide range of issues. In its continuing commitment to exploration and exchange, IPAC launched this series. Publications in this collection highlight critical findings and analysis from our action-oriented research activities. Besides advancing the understanding of current best practices, this work also serves to advance the understanding of what these initiatives mean with respect to the broader concerns of public-sector reform. These reports are available free of charge to IPAC members. Orders can be placed by contacting the IPAC national office in Toronto (www.ipaciapc.ca).

La Collection Nouvelles Directions

Depuis plusieurs années, l'Institut d'administration publique du Canada (IAPC) commandite des groupes de travail axé sur les grandes questions en administration publique. Composés de praticiens et de théoriciens, ces groupes d'experts se réunissent pour apporter des solutions pratiques aux nouveaux enjeux qui confrontent les administrateurs publics. Spécialisés dans les secteurs de la réforme administrative et des politiques, ils discutent, comparent, analysent les problèmes et questions critiques qui sont soulevés et documentent leurs observations, faisant ainsi avancer la compréhension dans ces domaines. Des rapports découlant de ces études sont publiés dans la langue dans laquelle ils sont soumis. Un sommaire exécutif est présenté dans l'autre langue officielle.

Nombreuses questions d'actualité sont continuellement étudiées dans le cadre d'activités de recherche. L'IAPC a donc lancé cette collection afin de poursuivre son engagement d'explorer et d'échanger. Les publications qui paraissent dans *Nouvelles Directions* mettent en relief des conclusions et analyses importantes qui sont tirées de notre recherche active. Tout en faisant avancer la compréhension des meilleures pratiques en vigueur, ces études permettent de mieux saisir leur importance en ce qui a trait aux préoccupations plus générales concernant la réforme du secteur public. Ces rapports sont offerts gratuitement aux membres de l'IAPC. Pour obtenir des exemplaires, prière de communiquer avec le bureau national de l'IAPC à Toronto (www.ipaciapc.ca).

Other Reports in the Series/ Déjà parus dans la collection

1. *Management and Performance Measurement in the Jewellery Industry: A Golden Opportunity?* By Ann Rauhala.

2. *Performance Management: Linking Results to Public Debate*. By John English and Evert Lindquist.
3. *From Controlling to Collaborating: When Governments Want to be Partners*. By Jim Armstrong and Donald G. Lenihan.
4. *Improved Reporting to Parliament*. By Jim Thomas.
5. *Crossing Boundaries: Privacy, Policy, and Information Technology*. By Harvey Schachter.
6. *Collaborative Government: Is There a Canadian Way?* Edited by Susan Delacourt and Donald G. Lenihan.
7. *Business Planning in Canadian Public Administration*. Edited by Luc Bernier and Evan H. Potter.
8. *Making Government the Best Place to Work: Building Commitment*. By Monica Belcourt and Simon Taggar.
9. *To Better Serve Canadians: How Technology is Changing the Relationship Between Members of Parliament and Public Servants*. By Jonathan Malloy.