Tuesday, April 30, 2019

The Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples has the honour to table its

SIXTEENTH REPORT

Your committee, which was authorized to examine the subject matter of Bill C-91, An Act Respecting Indigenous languages, and has, in obedience to the order of reference of February 28, 2019, examined the said subject-matter and now reports as follows:

Indigenous languages are deeply connected to the homelands, identities, cultures, laws and worldviews of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous languages are Canada’s first languages, spoken long before the arrival of settlers. In the past, the Government of Canada implemented policies aiming to assimilate Indigenous Peoples into Canadian society and suppress their languages and cultures. These policies, including residential schools and the Sixties scoop, among others, contributed to the critical state of the 70 Indigenous languages spoken in Canada today. The vitality of Indigenous languages varies across the country, but no Indigenous language is safe. The committee recognizes that, given their critical state, work to revitalize, protect and promote Indigenous languages is an urgent task necessary to ensure that Indigenous youth for years to come can learn their own Indigenous language(s). Further, Algonquin Elder Claudette Commanda, the Executive Director of the First Nations Confederacy of Cultural Education Centres, suggested that revitalizing Indigenous languages could have a positive impact on the health of First Nations communities and the self-esteem of First Nations youth.

During its pre-study, your committee heard from over 30 witnesses who shared their hopes, concerns and perspectives regarding Bill C-91. Despite their involvement in the co-development process, Inuit were particularly concerned that, the bill was not distinctions-based, did not reflect Inuit priorities and did not take into account the unique status of Inuktut as a language spoken by many Inuit in their homelands. Many other witnesses supported Bill C-91 as a positive step towards language revitalization.[[1]](#footnote-1) However, your committee was concerned that many felt they had little choice but to support the bill, given the limited time remaining in the parliamentary session.[[2]](#footnote-2) Recognizing that generations of Indigenous Peoples have advocated for legislation to protect their languages[[3]](#footnote-3), these witnesses saw Bill C-91 as an important opportunity not to be missed, one that might not arise again for many years. For this reason, some witnesses believed it important to pass the legislation as a starting point, with the hope that it be amended in the future to address ongoing concerns and further support Indigenous work towards language revitalization.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In response to the critical state of their languages, Indigenous Peoples across Canada have developed unique approaches to revitalize, strengthen and protect them. Ultimately, the committee believes that Indigenous Peoples are best positioned to lead language revitalization efforts. To support this work, any Indigenous language legislation or strategy must provide adequate resources while recognizing the autonomy and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples including jurisdiction over their languages. Indigenous women and Elders play a vital role in passing on language to future generations and it is predominantly women who are leading work to reclaim Indigenous languages in their communities through the development of immersion schools, curriculum in Indigenous languages, language nests, and on-the-land programs. In many cases, programming is delivered through Indigenous institutions and local/regional organizations such as friendship centers and First Nations cultural centres. Post-secondary institutions support this work by offering programming in Indigenous languages and supporting the creation of resources like dictionaries and textbooks.[[5]](#footnote-5) Many witnesses believe that sufficient, long-term funding would increase the number of fluent speakers by supporting these initiatives, often operating with limited budgets and few resources.[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Funding**

Algonquin Elder Claudette Commanda reminded the committee that Bill C-91 does not guarantee funding for Indigenous languages. While there is no funding amount included in the legislation, the government has announced funding to implement its measures. Budget 2019 proposes to invest $333.7 million over five years, beginning in 2019–2020, with $115.7 million per year ongoing to “support the proposed Indigenous Languages Act.”[[7]](#footnote-7) However some witnesses felt that this funding was inadequate given the needs in Indigenous communities. The representative from the First Peoples’ Cultural Council shared that based on their experience in language revitalization, adequate funding for language revitalization should be between $200 and $900 million per year.

In addition to the adequacy of funds, their distribution was also a source of concern, as Algonquin Elder Claudette Commanda emphasized the lack of clarity in the bill about eligibility for funding and how it will be disbursed between First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. The Minister of Canadian Heritage confirmed that funding for Indigenous languages would flow through agreements between the Government of Canada and Indigenous governments and communities, enabling Indigenous Peoples to determine the priorities and projects that would receive funding. However, it is not clear how funding proposed through Budget 2019 will be distributed, nor is it clear how future budgets will adapt to meet language revitalization needs in Indigenous communities.

In the absence of clarity around funding, witnesses identified characteristics they believe are essential to ensure funding contributes to language revitalization. Funding must be permanent, long-term, and reflect the diversity of Indigenous Peoples and languages, including those living off-reserve and in urban centres. As emphasized by the Native Women’s Association of Canada, “funding must be consistent with Jordan’s Principle[[8]](#footnote-8) to ensure there are no jurisdictional disputes. As Jordan’s Principle ensures Indigenous children receive essential public services, regardless of where they live, Indigenous languages must be considered an essential service.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Further, witnesses felt that funding should be distributed to Indigenous Peoples undertaking language revitalization work, as opposed to national political organizations.

Another important characteristic raised by witnesses is that funding for Indigenous languages not duplicate existing services or create more bureaucracy. Bill C-91 proposes to establish an Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages. Helen Klengenberg, the Official Languages Commissioner of Nunavut, stated that the proposed Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages “will be a duplication of services and an unwise use of public funds that instead could be used to enhance what is already in place in Canada.”[[10]](#footnote-10) To avoid duplication of services, the committee feels that existing infrastructure and institutions could provide services and programs. For example, the committee was reminded that friendship centres across Canada could provide language programming if funding were provided.

Finally, witnesses emphasized that funding must be core funding rather than project-based. Core funding would enable Indigenous communities to plan for the future and pursue long-term projects, such as writing their own curricula.[[11]](#footnote-11) Project-based funding forces Indigenous communities into “exhaustive reporting measures”[[12]](#footnote-12) and is not accessible to all, since organizations or communities may not have the capacity and resources to hire a professional grant writer. Regardless, grant-writing is time consuming and may take time away from program delivery. At T'selcéwtqen Clleq'mel'ten, a Secwepemc immersion school in British Columbia, the principal prepares grant proposals, diverting time from preparing educational plans and further land-based research. Project-based funding, offered on a year-to-year basis, does not enable Indigenous communities to develop their own curricula, plan for future projects, or retain staff.[[13]](#footnote-13)

It is clear from witnesses that revitalizing languages depends upon adequate, sustainable and long-term funding. Your committee is concerned about the lack of clarity regarding funding for Indigenous languages, and therefore urges Canadian Heritage to work with Indigenous communities and organizations involved in Indigenous language revitalization to ensure that their funding concerns are addressed.

**Consultation**

Although the Minister of Canadian Heritage stated that the bill was co-developed with the Assembly of First Nations, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and the Métis National Council, some witnesses felt they had the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process, while others did not. Some organizations, such as the Métis National Council, the Assembly of First Nations, and the First Peoples’ Cultural Council described positive consultation experiences. Organizations participated in the co-development process in different ways. For instance, the Gabriel Dumont Institute led engagement sessions to provide background on Michif and recommendations on content that should be included in the bill.[[14]](#footnote-14)

However, other organizations and communities, felt that they were not meaningfully involved in the co-development process. The Congress of Aboriginal Peoples and Six Nations of the Grand River described a lack of consultation. While some organizations were provided with opportunities to obtain feedback from their members on the development of the legislation, they sometimes faced tight time constraints. For instance, the Native Women’s Association of Canada stated that they were not “meaningfully consulted,” reporting that they were only provided with about five months to undertake community engagement sessions and an online survey. Prior to the bill being tabled, they were also given 36 hours to review the text and provide recommendations.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The committee was concerned that organizations representing Indigenous Peoples who are often overlooked, such as women and non-status First Nations, continued to be left out. This exclusion was particularly troubling, given the vital role of women in the transmission of Indigenous languages to future generations. The Métis Settlements General Council, a group not represented by national or regional organizations, was also left out. Despite their exclusion from the process, many Indigenous organizations fought to ensure their voices were heard by requesting meetings and submitting documents to Canadian Heritage. However, in some cases, their suggestions were not reflected in the bill[[16]](#footnote-16), and these witnesses are now advocating for amendments to it.

The committee was deeply concerned that inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), though initially hopeful about the co-development process, quickly became frustrated and disappointed. Throughout the process, ITK consistently emphasized several Inuit priorities they believed must be reflected in the legislation in consideration of the unique situation of Inuktut, which is spoken by many people in Inuit Nunangat. ITK told the committee that no one from Canadian Heritage provided feedback to suggest that it would not be possible to include Inuit priorities in the legislation. When ITK realized they had a different vision for the legislation than the other co-development partners, they continued to participate by meeting bilaterally with federal government officials.[[17]](#footnote-17) In the end, Bill C-91 does not reflect Inuit priorities, leaving ITK to push for amendments to the bill to address their concerns in the limited time remaining before the end of the parliamentary session. ITK proposed amendments to add an annex to the bill. These amendments were shared with Canadian Heritage, and a Ministerial special representative has been appointed to work with Inuit. Although the Minister of Canadian Heritage told the committee that every effort was made to meet with Inuit, ITK and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. both stated there had been no progress to date in addressing Inuit concerns.

The committee believes that Bill C-91 must better meet Inuit needs and priorities. Otherwise, the title of Bill C-91 is misleading and should be changed. In the time remaining, the committee urges Canadian Heritage to work collaboratively with Inuit to resolve their concerns, including providing feedback on ITK’s proposed annex. To ensure that this takes place in a timely manner, the committee will be writing to the Minister to ask for an update on progress and will likely recall the Minister and the Ministerial special representative to appear before the committee prior to clause by clause.

Should Bill C-91 pass, there are provisions that require the Minister to consult on funding and on the appointment of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages. When undertaking this work, the committee believes that Canadian Heritage could learn from previous consultation experiences and ensure that, this time, feedback on proposals is provided in a timely manner and diverse groups of Indigenous Peoples (such as women, non-status First Nations people, urban Indigenous Peoples, and those not represented by national or regional organizations such as the Métis Settlements General Council) are provided with opportunities for meaningful participation. Should Bill C-91 pass, your committee will closely monitor the implementation process as it unfolds, to ensure that it is meaningful and constitutes true co-development for all Indigenous Peoples and communities.

**Education**

Your committee heard that Indigenous-language learning in schools is essential to language revitalization. Many witnesses lamented that this was not addressed in the bill and referred to a number of barriers that limit access to Indigenous-language learning in schools. The lack of recognition of the rights of First Nations, Inuit and Métis children to be educated in public schools in their languages may contribute to the decline in Indigenous languages. As explained by Lorena Fontaine, Indigenous Academic Lead and Associate Professor at the University of Winnipeg: “[t]his right includes a duty for the government to take effective measures, whether inside or outside their community.” Some witnesses referred to Article 14 of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* as providing these rights. Others looked to the experience of other countries, suggesting that legislation in Bolivia, Norway, Finland, the Philippines and Peru recognizes children’s rights to be educated in their ancestral language.[[18]](#footnote-18) Witnesses referred to Canada’s history and experience of providing and protecting minority language education for English and French.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Another barrier relates to the limited number of speakers who can transmit language in schools. The committee heard that more support is needed for certifying teachers, but fluent speakers, who may not be certified teachers, could also play an important role in sharing the language in schools.

 Your committee heard that issues relating to language education are particularly acute in Inuit Nunangat. While there are promising initiatives, such as programming offered by Nunavut Arctic College, and the Inuit teacher education program in Nunatsiavut, witnesses described challenges relating to implementation of Nunavut laws to promote and extend the use of Inuktut in schools, as well as barriers to implementing strategies to increase the number of Inuktut-speaking teachers. Barriers include inadequate support for the training of certified teachers and limits on how non-certified language speakers can promote Inuktut in schools.

Outside of schools, given the close connection between Indigenous languages and cultures, language learning takes place in many ways. Language nests, family programs, mentoring, ceremonies, story-telling and on-the land programs provide Indigenous Peoples with the opportunity to learn their language and connect to their cultures. As discussed earlier, women and Elders play a vital role in language transmission and community-based language learning. As emphasized by Francyne Joe, President of the Native Women’s Association of Canada, “Indigenous languages preservation and revitalization must embrace the traditional ways of passing on languages from generation to generation. This means Indigenous women must lead the development of community-based language learning programs.”[[20]](#footnote-20) Your committee implores the Government of Canada to ensure that any Indigenous languages legislation or strategy recognizes the critical role of women, mothers and grandmothers in language transmission.

**Service Delivery in Indigenous languages**

Another issue raised by many witnesses in the context of Indigenous language reclamation and revitalization is accessing federal government services in their language. The committee heard that, while some areas have so few fluent Indigenous-language speakers that providing translation services is not possible, in areas with a larger population of Indigenous-language speakers, it would be important for federal institutions to provide interpretation services and translation in Indigenous languages.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The committee heard that in Inuit Nunangat, people whose mother tongue is Inuktut do not have access to federal services in their language, even in Nunavut and Nunavik where Inuktut-speakers are the majority. The lack of federal services in Inuktut affects Inuit in many ways. As Aluki Kotierk, President of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated told your committee, “there are many examples of life-and-death situations, whether it be in the health care system, the justice system or the school system, where Inuit are put in a vulnerable and disadvantaged position because they are unable to understand what is going on around them because the language spoken is not their first language or a language that they don’t understand.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Your committee also heard that low numbers of Inuktitut speakers within the Canadian Coast Guard poses risks to public safety.[[23]](#footnote-23) In [*When Every Minute Counts - Maritime Search and Rescue*](https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/committee/421/POFO/reports/MaritimeSARReport_e%28forweb%29_e.pdf),[[24]](#footnote-24) the Standing Senate Committee on Fisheries and Oceans noted that there was currently a lack of Inuktut speakers at the Marine Communications and Traffic Services centre in Iqaluit. That committee encouraged the Canadian Coast Guard to recruit speakers of local languages so that staff in those centres could “effectively community with locals and those in distress.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

As Aluki Kotierk, President of NTI, told the committee, “what we want to see in Inuit Nunangat [is] that Inuit are able to walk with dignity and receive services that are available and comparable to other Canadians who receive services, but in their own language rather than relying informally on relatives, whether it be a niece, nephew, grandchildren or children.” President Kotierk also expressed that this is a basic human right that should be available to all Canadians.[[26]](#footnote-26) To address the issue of service provision in Inuktut, ITK proposed amendments adding an Annex to the bill, which includes the requirement for federal programs and services to be delivered in Inuktut “to the extent that demand requires and capacity allows.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

The committee heard that under the *Inuit Language Protection Act*, organizations (which include public sector bodies, municipalities or private sector bodies) in Nunavut must provide certain services in Inuktut.Ms. Klengenberg reported that she had obtained a legal opinion stating that the Government of Canada was required to comply with the *Inuit Language Protection Act* by providing services in Inuktut in Nunavut. Given the impacts on Inuit families and communities, your committee is deeply concerned that many individuals in Nunavut are unable to access federal services in Inuktut. We encourage the Government of Canada to ensure that in providing these services, they do so in a manner that is respectful of the dominant language in the region, and in compliance with Nunavut’s language laws.

**Conclusion**

Your committee recognizes the critical importance of Indigenous language reclamation and revitalization and understands that federal legislation to support Indigenous languages plays a key role in supporting future generations of Indigenous-language learners. However, your committee is gravely concerned about key issues raised by witnesses.

Many witnesses were concerned about the adequacy of funding. Your committee notes this concern; however, it is mindful about the limitations of the Senate’s ability to amend legislation that would require an additional appropriation or levy a tax. Your committee urges the Government of Canada to take this concern seriously and continue to address it as Bill C-91 is implemented. Furthermore, it remains unclear how funding will be disbursed to First Nations, Inuit and Métis organizations. We believe that to truly support Indigenous language revitalization, with respect to funding, priority should be given to communities and community-based organizations undertaking this work, rather than to political organizations

The co-development process led to significant disappointment for many participants, including ITK and the Métis Settlements General Council. Your committee believes that the concerns raised by them must be included in the bill. These concerns include, for example, suggested amendments to the bill to ensure the Métis Settlements inclusion under this Act, as well as, addressing the lack of federal services in Inuktut in Inuit Nunangat. In addition, organizations representing or providing services to Indigenous women and urban Indigenous people, felt that they were overlooked in the development of Bill C-91.

The committee believes that Bill C-91 must better meet Inuit needs and priorities. In the time remaining, the committee urges Canadian Heritage to work collaboratively with Inuit to resolve their concerns, including providing feedback on ITK’s proposed annex. To ensure that this takes place in a timely manner, the committee will be writing to the Minister to ask for an update on progress and will likely recall the Minister and the Ministerial special representative to appear before the committee prior to clause by clause.

The Government of Canada is seized of these matters and we expect these issues to be resolved. However, if the issues flagged in this report are not addressed, your committee may wish to recommend amendments to the bill during its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-91.

To conclude, your committee has emphasized that there need to be significant improvements made to Bill C-91. In addition, should the bill pass both Houses of Parliament and receive Royal Assent, your committee will continue to monitor its implementation, and progress to ensure that the concerns raised by witnesses are addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Senator Lillian Eva Dyck

*Chair*
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