

Mutual Accommodation Primer: Multiculturalism

Subject Matter Expert

[Heather Nicol](#)

Acting Director of the School for the Study of Canada
Trent University

Discussion Overview

Mutual Accommodation Primer: Multiculturalism There might be no greater example of mutual

accommodation in Canada than multiculturalism.

[William Innes](#) • June 23, 2016 at 04:39 pm

Mutual accommodation is often confused with compromise, and suggests solutions which are less than ideal. In my experience compromise is the drive to limit conditions such that different needs can fit within existing space; whereas mutual accommodation is the drive to redefine space such that differing needs can be met. When the fathers of confederation set about defining a governance model for Canada they quickly recognized that the Westminster model of a unitary state would never work with the extreme diversity of the Canadian geography and culture; so they looked for a model which was more flexible to deal with our differences — a confederation. It was Canada's first experiment with mutual accommodation, which has become a defining characteristic of the Canadian experience and despite some notable failures (First Nations), has made our country such a special place. In today's world it is interesting to speculate whether the Westminster unitary state will survive in the UK itself, given the increasingly differing ambitions England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

• Post Awarded 70 DR

[Momin Rahman](#) • June 27, 2016 at 02:56 pm

Mutual accommodation is also necessary between different minority groups in Canada and recently, with the Orlando shootings, we have seen once again the positioning of Muslim cultures against LGBT rights and identities. It's a complicated issue, but here in Canada we do seem to have the ability to build pathways to dialogue and is that partly down to the culture of mutual accommodation? A recent example here from Toronto, with LGBT groups, LGBT Muslims and Muslim groups coming together to reject the homophobic and Islamophobic responses to

Orlando, <https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2016/06/26/muslim-and-lgbtq-communities-stand-together-against-hatred-and-prejudice-after-orlando-shooting.html>.

• Post Awarded 35 DR

[Chris Dummitt](#) • June 28, 2016 at 11:56 am

William Innes wrote on June 23:

Mutual accommodation is often confused with compromise, and suggests solutions which are less than ideal. In my experience compromise is the drive to limit conditions such that different needs can fit within existing space; whereas mutual accommodation is the drive to redefine space such that differing needs can be met. When the fathers of confederation set about defining a governance model for Canada they quickly recognized that the Westminster model of a unitary state would never work with the extreme diversity of the Canadian geography and culture; so they looked for a model which was more flexible to

deal with our differences — a confederation. It was Canada's first experiment with mutual accommodation, which has become a defining characteristic of the Canadian experience and despite some notable failures (First Nations), has made our country such a special place. In today's world it is interesting to speculate whether the Westminster unitary state will survive in the UK itself, given the increasingly differing ambitions England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

Thanks for this Bill. It's an intriguing idea, and I like your point about mutual accommodation not simply being compromise. Certainly compromise was involved in the confederation agreement, but it's also key that each side (or the many sides) feels that they are getting what they want.

[Chris Dummitt](#) • June 28, 2016 at 11:59 am

Momin Rahman wrote on June 27:

Mutual accommodation is also necessary between different minority groups in Canada and recently, with the Orlando shootings, we have seen once again the positioning of Muslim cultures against LGBT rights and identities. It's a complicated issue, but here in Canada we do seem to have the ability to build pathways to dialogue and is that partly down to the culture of mutual accommodation? A recent example here from Toronto, with LGBT groups, LGBT Muslims and Muslim groups coming together to reject the homophobic and Islamophobic responses to Orlando, <https://www.thestar.com/news/qta/2016/06/26/muslim-and-lgbtq-communities-stand-together-against-hatred-and-prejudice-after-orlando-shooting.html>.

This is a great recent example Momin - there ought not to be a centre - one group who is accommodating another. Because this just leads to one group seeming to be the one that does the accommodating and the others as those who are accommodated. This is an example, it would seem, of those with similar but not identical ideas and interests coming together in a unique way to share a message, and to grieve, and to hope, collectively.

• Post Awarded 10 DR

[Momin Rahman](#) • June 28, 2016 at 04:11 pm

Chris Dummitt wrote on June 28:

This is a great recent example Momin - there ought not to be a centre - one group who is accommodating another. Because this just leads to one group seeming to be the one that does the accommodating and the others as those who are accommodated. This is an example, it would seem, of those with similar but not identical ideas and interests coming together in a unique way to share a message, and to grieve, and to hope, collectively.

But can there be no 'centre' or 'norm'? I know Trudeau said that Canada is a post national culture but I don't think historically that is true, particularly because of the treatment of indigenous peoples, but also because norms like heterosexuality have also been at the centre of the nation. Perhaps it is a process, and what we have to think about is not an 'end goal' but that the process of mutual accommodation must be our goal, always being open to shifting the norm. Can our politics really do that effectively? Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?

• Post Awarded 15 DR

[William Innes](#) • June 29, 2016 at 02:58 pm

Momin is right to identify the reality of the norms of existing society. It seems to me that the anti-immigrant sentiment sweeping Europe says there are limits to the extent and pace of societal change which are tolerable. Despite the inherent merit of diversity and inclusion reality dictates that societal change needs to proceed at a pace which challenges the norms but does not cause society to recoil. The problem is that this is not likely to meet the needs of those oppressed.

- Post Awarded 5 DR

[Chris Dummitt](#) • June 30, 2016 at 11:33 am

Momin Rahman wrote on June 28:

But can there be no 'centre' or 'norm'? I know Trudeau said that Canada is a post national culture but I don't think historically that is true, particularly because of the treatment of indigenous peoples, but also because norms like heterosexuality have also been at the centre of the nation. Perhaps it is a process, and what we have to think about is not an 'end goal' but that the process of mutual accommodation must be our goal, always being open to shifting the norm. Can our politics really do that effectively? Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?

Hi Momin - Great points. There are norms. I suppose what I'm aiming for here is to see mutual accommodation as, itself, a norm. I was struck when listening to the radio today. A reporter was on the street asking people (around Canada Day) to say the most unCanadian thing possible. Several people said things like: "Let's build a wall between..." and "Go back where you came from." It struck me as quite positive, even if not uniform, not shared by all, that these kinds of comments would be considered "unCanadian".

[Karen Everett](#) • July 1, 2016 at 12:27 pm

Momin Rahman wrote on June 28:

But can there be no 'centre' or 'norm'? I know Trudeau said that Canada is a post national culture but I don't think historically that is true, particularly because of the treatment of indigenous peoples, but also because norms like heterosexuality have also been at the centre of the nation. Perhaps it is a process, and what we have to think about is not an 'end goal' but that the process of mutual accommodation must be our goal, always being open to shifting the norm. Can our politics really do that effectively? Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?

Chris and Momin, your conversations around who does the accommodating, who is accommodated, and societal norms raises questions around social and political power relations and who needs to be involved in the process of change and what role they take.

[Momin Rahman](#) • July 4, 2016 at 11:00 am

Karen Everett wrote on July 1:

Chris and Momin, your conversations around who does the accommodating, who is accommodated, and societal norms raises questions around social and political power relations and who needs to be involved in the process of change and what role they take.

So we saw an example of this yesterday at the Toronto Pride Parade - with Black Lives Matter using a sit-down protest to get their demands addressed by Pride Toronto - the first Pride, BTW, attended by a Canadian Prime Minister. There is lots of evidence that black and minority members of the LGBT

community suffer more from negative policing and street violence and are less represented in mainstream LGBT groups - so there is a mutual accommodation negotiation over power going on within the LGBT community right now. And Karen's point is important here - lots of groups have less access to power, and so does that mean mutual accommodation cannot work properly unless we first make sure that the routes to the negotiation are equal for all? Like William says, norm change is difficult but it is necessary to challenge injustices, but how we do make sure we bring others along? Creating allies rather than provoking conflict and reaction?

- Post Awarded 30 DR

[William Innes](#) • July 5, 2016 at 01:44 am

Momin Rahman wrote on July 4:

So we saw an example of this yesterday at the Toronto Pride Parade - with Black Lives Matter using a sit-down protest to get their demands addressed by Pride Toronto - the first Pride, BTW, attended by a Canadian Prime Minister. There is lots of evidence that black and minority members of the LGBT community suffer more from negative policing and street violence and are less represented in mainstream LGBT groups - so there is a mutual accommodation negotiation over power going on within the LGBT community right now. And Karen's point is important here - lots of groups have less access to power, and so does that mean mutual accommodation cannot work properly unless we first make sure that the routes to the negotiation are equal for all? Like William says, norm change is difficult but it is necessary to challenge injustices, but how we do make sure we bring others along? Creating allies rather than provoking conflict and reaction?

[William Innes](#) • July 5, 2016 at 01:46 am

For sure mutual accommodation won't occur unless all the parties have a similar opportunity to articulate their views

[Chris Dummitt](#) • July 5, 2016 at 12:36 pm

Just to bring us back a bit to multiculturalism as an example - and to follow up on Momin and Karen's points about inequality. What strikes me as interesting about the origins of the multiculturalism policy (and we won't get into the controversy in Quebec about this) is the way it came out of demands from those like Ukrainian and Japanese Canadians to see themselves as part of the Canadian story. IE not as a side-bar to a British and French duality of Canada. It was about insisting on the many hyphenations and origins and cultures of all Canadians.

[ruth harper](#) • July 14, 2016 at 03:36 pm

From a different viewpoint, mutual accommodation must be centred in us being Canadian and also recognizing that there are universal values.

- Post Awarded 5 DR

[Andrew Griffith](#) • July 20, 2016 at 11:29 am

Chris Dummitt wrote on July 5:

Just to bring us back a bit to multiculturalism as an example - and to follow up on Momin and Karen's points about inequality. What strikes me as interesting about the origins of the multiculturalism policy (and we won't get into the controversy in Quebec about this) is the way it came out of demands from

those like Ukrainian and Japanese Canadians to see themselves as part of the Canadian story. IE not as a side-bar to a British and French duality of Canada. It was about insisting on the many hyphenations and origins and cultures of all Canadians.

Part of the uniqueness of Canada the policy and approach was largely developed by pressures from white and Christian communities, with broad enough principles that it could apply to visible and religious minorities.

- Post Awarded 10 DR

[Chris Dummitt](#) • July 21, 2016 at 09:26 am

Andrew Griffith wrote on July 20:

Part of the uniqueness of Canada the policy and approach was largely developed by pressures from white and Christian communities, with broad enough principles that it could apply to visible and religious minorities.

Thanks for the reply Andrew. I'm glad you've come to the site and brought your incredible expertise on the topic. It is striking how debates in a 1960s Canada that was, ethnically and otherwise, very very different from the Canada of today created a broad policy framework (eventually multiculturalism) that has proved to be pretty flexible in a Canada that has changed markedly. Though, it's not as if multiculturalism doesn't have its critics....

[Andrew Griffith](#) • July 21, 2016 at 11:04 am

Chris Dummitt wrote on July 21:

Thanks for the reply Andrew. I'm glad you've come to the site and brought your incredible expertise on the topic. It is striking how debates in a 1960s Canada that was, ethnically and otherwise, very very different from the Canada of today created a broad policy framework (eventually multiculturalism) that has proved to be pretty flexible in a Canada that has changed markedly. Though, it's not as if multiculturalism doesn't have its critics....

What policy doesn't But overall, has largely passed the test of time.

[Richard Morgan](#) • July 29, 2016 at 12:48 pm

Momin Rahman wrote on June 28:

But can there be no 'centre' or 'norm'? I know Trudeau said that Canada is a post national culture but I don't think historically that is true, particularly because of the treatment of indigenous peoples, but also because norms like heterosexuality have also been at the centre of the nation. Perhaps it is a process, and what we have to think about is not an 'end goal' but that the process of mutual accommodation must be our goal, always being open to shifting the norm. Can our politics really do that effectively? Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?

Thanks Momin for your emphasis on change as a process rather than an end goal. As with nature, our societies are in a constant process of evolution, adaptation and renegotiation. Our efforts at mutual accommodation need to reflect that same dynamic and adaptive resilience.

- Post Awarded 5 DR

[Momin Rahman](#) • August 1, 2016 at 10:46 am

Richard Morgan wrote on July 29:

Thanks Momin for your emphasis on change as a process rather than an end goal. As with nature, our societies are in a constant process of evolution, adaptation and renegotiation. Our efforts at mutual accommodation need to reflect that same dynamic and adaptive resilience.

Now that has made me think about process again...and the petitions system in the UK Parliament (most recently used to argue for another EU referendum). Do we have any institutional way of making sure mutual accommodation is part of our governing process, apart from the Charter as ultimate legal test? I am wondering if any reform of the Senate might involve a requirement to consider issues petitioned by a group under mutual accommodation principles so that there is a higher level of institutional discussion rather than the ad hoc policy production and reaction that seems to operate now at the local level (and I am wondering here if that had been the case, would the Barbaric Cultural Practices act have passed muster early on or been scuppered right away as breaching our 'norms' of mutual accommodation?)

• Post Awarded 5 DR

[William Innes](#) • August 17, 2016 at 08:00 pm

Momin Rahman wrote on August 1:

Now that has made me think about process again...and the petitions system in the UK Parliament (most recently used to argue for another EU referendum). Do we have any institutional way of making sure mutual accommodation is part of our governing process, apart from the Charter as ultimate legal test? I am wondering if any reform of the Senate might involve a requirement to consider issues petitioned by a group under mutual accommodation principles so that there is a higher level of institutional discussion rather than the ad hoc policy production and reaction that seems to operate now at the local level (and I am wondering here if that had been the case, would the Barbaric Cultural Practices act have passed muster early on or been scuppered right away as breaching our 'norms' of mutual accommodation?)

[William Innes](#) • August 17, 2016 at 08:16 pm

William Innes wrote on August 17:

Momin — What a fascinating idea! It's great to see a specific suggestion about how we move MA forward. It would seem that the Senate (Reformed!!), as the house of "sober second thought" has a unique mandate to consider how governing issues relate to our fundamental values. The idea of giving default priority to petitions relating to MA (and other fundamental values) would give a practical voice to these values in the governing process. Our challenge of course is to raise the understanding and profile of MA as a important and defining characteristic of the Canadian narrative — which is what Canadian difference is all about.

[Heather Nicol](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • August 18, 2016 at 07:05 pm

I find this idea of process fascinating and I agree in principle. The concept of MA as a guiding thematic in governance is novel but not impossible. But why not be more ambitious that leaving MA to the Senate and the process of sober second thought? The problem as I see it is how to translate MA into mainstream everyday political decision-making. We see the issues most acutely at the level of local governance as we saw near the beginning of this discussion thread. At the local level the issues are more complex and emotional and it would seem to be here that we could focus the political process more sharply.

- Post Awarded 25 DR

[Momin Rahman](#) • August 19, 2016 at 05:47 am

William Innes wrote on August 17:

Momin — What a fascinating idea! It's great to see a specific suggestion about how we move MA forward. It would seem that the Senate (Reformed!!), as the house of "sober second thought" has a unique mandate to consider how governing issues relate to our fundamental values. The idea of giving default priority to petitions relating to MA (and other fundamental values) would give a practical voice to these values in the governing process. Our challenge of course is to raise the understanding and profile of MA as a important and defining characteristic of the Canadian narrative — which is what Canadian difference is all about.

So we need some good constitutional lawyers to help us develop this idea! I wonder if these kind of suggestions can form some kind of outcomes document from our discussions? The difficult issue is the one you identify - do we really understand MA as central to our political culture in the way that the Charter is?

[William Innes](#) • August 19, 2016 at 10:38 am

Momin Rahman wrote on August 19:

So we need some good constitutional lawyers to help us develop this idea! I wonder if these kind of suggestions can form some kind of outcomes document from our discussions? The difficult issue is the one you identify - do we really understand MA as central to our political culture in the way that the Charter is?

One of the elements of the site is to collect ideas for further development. I am sure this will be one of them.

[Amira Elghawaby](#) • September 1, 2016 at 10:43 am

What I think Canada has done such a great job on - and it may largely due to the influence of the First Nations' concept of the welcoming circle, as John Ralston Saul so beautifully posits - is to help bring in more and more people into the circle of what it means to be Canadian. Not that we are not without faults, but when I have presented on Canada's careful balancing of competing human rights at international fora, I am greeted with incredulity. This concept is pioneering and for a French Muslim, for example, listening to how the courts have worked to balance human rights, it sounds like "Disneyland". The Ontario Human Rights Commission has come up with numerous important policies and frameworks on these issues and I think we have a treasure trove of principles that help us move forward and in a way that is not exclusive or discriminatory. There is much work to do, particularly in education, so that Canadians fully understand our rights and freedoms, and understand what is at stake when there are attempts to treat certain groups like second-class citizens.

- Post Awarded 5 DR

[Paul Schwartzentruber](#) • September 14, 2016 at 11:54 am

Excuse me as a new participant for asking but has there been so far any discussion of the rootedness of Canada's notion of mutual accommodation in the aboriginal circle--what JR Saul calls that "non racial...non-linear and non-rational idea of civilization" (A Fair Country). Saul argues that denying our

essentially aboriginal inspiration produces a false idea of Canada as a civilization and allows us to continue to pretend to be European. It's not just a historical interest then but shapes our reckoning of ourselves in a critical way. Anyway, have we talked about this?

[Heather Nicol](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • October 1, 2016 at 03:44 pm

Paul and Amira both raise very good questions. In other areas of this online community discussions we are situating the notion of accommodation within a First Nation thematic but not from this very important perspective. How can we bring in more and more people into the circle of what it means to be Canadian as Amira puts it, in ways which do not begin with a linear concept of civilization and accommodation? What would not denying our essentially aboriginal inspiration mean, as Paul asks, for a project of not just mutual accommodation, but of mutual legitimacy and recognition? Can we envision a civic process that might infuse Canadian society with this perspective from the bottom up, rather than the top down?

• Post Awarded 5 DR

[William Innes](#) • October 2, 2016 at 05:36 pm

Paul — Thanks for your thoughtful posting. The Idea of the aboriginal circle is really interesting as part of the Canadian mutual accommodation narrative. However I don't think that it is a formative influence any more than a European heritage might be. It seems to me that it is MA is more rooted in the practical and gritty hard work of creating a successful country despite the challenges of geography and culture — and its continued influence is not an inevitable fact of our DNA, but will require continued reinforcement, and that is why projects like Canadian are so important.

• Post Awarded 5 DR

[Paul Schwartzentruber](#) • October 4, 2016 at 08:39 pm

I agree with that Bill. I don't think JRS is saying that the aboriginal is more important, rather that we have ignored how it has been present all along in formative dialogue with the European strands. And because of that dialogue there has been fashioned the 'Canadian Difference' from the European traditions as well as the American ones. In that sense we are more Metis in fact than we have long been willing to admit to ourselves. And that explains why we are not a country of manifest destiny but of mutual accommodation, or something like that. This is (finally) a decolonializing approach to our history, (i.e., recognizing our real difference the European and the American model and allowing us to own it). How else after all could we explain that difference? Not by grit and hard work alone I think, since that is in the other models as well, but rather by having learned to live in this land with the people of this land. I find that kind of compelling, especially when looking at Canada from a global perspective.

• Post Awarded 30 DR

[Jay Son](#) • October 31, 2016 at 08:45 am

Momin Rahman wrote on June 28:

But can there be no 'centre' or 'norm'? I know Trudeau said that Canada is a post national culture but I don't think historically that is true, particularly because of the treatment of indigenous peoples, but also because norms like heterosexuality have also been at the centre of the nation. Perhaps it is a process, and what we have to think about is not an 'end goal' but that the process of mutual accommodation must be our goal, always being open to shifting the norm. Can our politics really do that effectively? Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?

Interesting thought "Can we have a shared culture, shared values, without some assumptions of norms?".

First off if anyone thinks they can legislate how people think they should re-examine that line of thought as its a dead end. Yes they may obey the law but it certainly wont change the way they may view certain people or issues. Why is it OK for some people to say I'm this way and you have to accept it but not afford everyone else the same thought? Some complain because there are people who don't like them or what they do. Well as long as they are not breaking any laws they have that right.. Yes it is a right. You may not like it but thats the compromise of living in a society that allows freedom of expression. Why is your way right and theirs wrong? You may say oh thats mean and hurtful, well maybe they think that what your doing is shameful and they don't agree with it. (I'm playing the devils advocate here) Secondly on the assumption of norms, every person on this earth has a reality different from everyone else. That being said how can you even have a definition of "normal"? I would say our laws shed some light on Canadian "norms" to some extent but once you start peeling back the layers of our society its easy to see the diversity in thinking and styles of living. Our laws protect vulnerable people and adding more laws doesn't change the fact that people wont always agree. Stifling our rights and freedoms will only cause a backlash. These rights and freedoms give people an outlet to make their views known. You cannot make everyone like what you like. Or agree with everything you say and do. Just as you (whoever is reading this) have views that may differ from mine. Its OK to not agree, and yes its even OK say mean things (within the framework of the law) these are just words. You may not like them but just as you have rights so does everyone else. Trying to make everyone agree with you by passing more laws and restrictions will only make those who disagree resent you more.

The Canadian Charter of rights and freedoms affords Canadians the freedom of religion, of thought, of expression, of the press and of peaceful assembly. Diminishing this diminishes the lives and deaths of everyone that have gone to war to protect it.

If any culture comes into this country and cannot abide by these rights and freedoms then the answer is plain and simple, that culture either changes its ways to allow these freedoms and rights or move to where they can practice their religion the way they want. NOT change our culture to fit their agenda.

- Post Awarded 10 DR

[Louise Mayer](#) • November 17, 2016 at 10:30 am

MA is indeed an interesting and important concept that requires more discussion. MA with our first nations people is a must and i think poverty and living conditions needs to be addressed before that can happen. I also think one part of MA that should not be overlooked is the environment, ma and the environment go hand in hand we need clean water, air and land for the survival of not just us but every living organism on this earth and greed should not be put first. As for climate change I agree it is happening but i am not sold on the idea it can be stopped, after all fossils have shown Ontario was once a warm sea and Saskatchewan a dense tropical forest. The earth is alive and ever changing not to say humans aren't impacting and speeding up climate change but i am on the fence on this one. I believe the first step to achieving mutual accommodation is with the elimination of poverty first and foremost. It is possible I believe and m.a. is a step in the right direction.

[David stigant](#) • January 10, 2017 at 06:24 pm

As a new participant, I have been drawn back to Innes' article of July 2016. That return took me to "a road not taken" which is to explore the negative examples more thoroughly to understand the "how" of that situation and what that negative result can teach.

Canada's means to dealing with the diverse First Nation relationship to Canada, means of dealing with First Nations schooling, means or "how" of dealing with the Metis descendents of early immigrant/First Nations families, means of starving First Nation to force relocation to reserves, all these failures to accommodate come to mind.

Canada's First Nations narratives should, I think, always be included in each narrative of Canada because its exclusion from the explorations of other stories will limit the benefit of the exploration. The history of multiculturalism seemingly excluded the first cultures.

An example might clarify this idea. As a child of English immigrants, our family narrative always returned to education as the way forward for individuals and the family. Education meant improved opportunities, income, prosperity, less back breaking work, etc. Including greater opportunity to contribute financially to the community.

As a public educator I often found that for my Aboriginal friends education was linked not to gain but loss: loss of children to schools away from community, loss of handed down ability to parent, show affection, have your children come to appreciate what you 'know', loss of children to the outside world, to abuse and addiction. Loss of respect.

My point would be that in order to "accommodate", the parties need to deeply hear both narratives as a starting point for building MA. That is prerequisite to "getting" what ma might look like and offer. I think in many ways our courts, the TRC, commissions, etc are ahead of the common understanding of this insight, but the reports are available but not easily accessible. They need to be made citizen friendly to support developing the linked narratives that speak to the 'body politic'. That wide base of understanding is needed to achieve political support for ma, as Macdonald asserted in his essay on the TRC.

Yeats said "if a way to the better there be it demands a full look at the worst". That includes really hearing both sides of the narrative.

- Post Awarded 55 DR

[Heather Nicol](#) (Subject Matter Expert) • February 12, 2017 at 04:15 pm

I think David raises a good point. If we don't hear both sides and understand the problems - we don't really stand a chance of changing much. I wonder how we can make the government reports and volumes of specialized material more accessible as he suggests? Some people have urged all Canadian education boards to make educating their students about indigenous history mandatory. Would that help? I do worry, however, that given the lack of equity in access to education - as David points out - means that even more money would be spend on educating non-Indigenous Canadians to this issue, while the education of Indigenous children would remain neglected and ignored. There has also been a lot of talk about preserving indigenous languages and ensuring that the next generations of aboriginal youth know their language and history. I think this is another important piece of the puzzle that is just as important. In other words, let's make a more critical approach to Canada's past something that would be useful for both Indigenous, as well as non-Indigenous, Canadians.