AN ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES ACT: RECONSIDERING EQUALITY ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CANADA'S *OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT*

Valerie Galley is of Ojibwa and Canadian ancestry and a member of the Nipissing First Nation. In 2005, she graduated from Trent University with her MA degree in Canadian Studies and Native Studies. Over the past two decades, she has worked as a policy analyst, researcher, and writer on Aboriginal issues, in policy and program implementation, locally, regionally, and nationally. She has researched and written presentations and policy papers for various national Aboriginal organizations on topics such as partnership approaches with the Government of Canada, matrimonial real property rights, traditional healing and Indigenous languages. Currently she is an independent researcher and writer.

ABSTRACT / RÉSUMÉ

This commentary was written to highlight the merits of developing federal statutory legislation for First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages which allows for initiatives that foster language revitalization, specifically the speaking of languages in First Nations, Inuit and Métis homes. A philosophical argument is made for re-conceptualizing equality, a fundamental principle of Canada's *Official Languages Act*, and championing diversity in order to address the more than fifty-five Aboriginal languages whose status lies on a spectrum from vibrancy to nearing extinction. This piece draws upon Canada's *Official Languages Act*, scholarly literature regarding an Aboriginal languages act and the NWT *Official Languages Act* and relevant documents. Using the NWT *Official Languages Act* as an example, it is concluded that through re-conceptualizing equality, developing relevant statutory legislation for the revitalization of the more than 55 Aboriginal languages is possible.

Ce commentaire a été rédigé dans le but de souligner le bien-fondé de l'élaboration des mesures législatives fédérales concernant les langues des Premières nations, des Inuits et des Métis qui ont permis de mettre en œuvre des projets favorisant la revitalisation linguistique, particulièrement les projets qui encouragent les Premières nations, les Inuits et les Métis à parler ces langues à la maison. Une argumentation philosophique y est présentée en faveur de la reconceptualisation de l'égalité, principe fondamental de la *Loi sur les langues officielles du Canada*, et pour la défense de la diversité linguistique dans le but d'améliorer la situation de plus de 55 langues autochtones dont le statut se situe quelque part entre l'adaptation éventuelle et la disparition prochaine. Ce texte s'inspire de la *Loi sur les langues officielles du Canada*, de publications scientifiques concernant une loi sur les langues autochtones, de la *Loi sur les langues officielles* des T.N-O. et d'autres documents pertinents. En citant la *Loi sur les langues officielles* des T.N-O. comme exemple, on montre que la reconceptualisation de l'égalité et l'élaboration d'une loi pertinente pourraient permettre de revitaliser plus de 55 langues autochtones.

> *Conservation or revitalization of a language demands maintaining or restoring intergenerational language transmission. Since intergenerational transmission depends primarily on family and community networks, the focus on language conservation and revitalization efforts must shift from formal institutions to Aboriginal communities, families and social networks. This does not mean that other avenues should be ignored. It does mean, however, that the effect of all actions on language use and transmission in everyday communications must be taken into consideration. (Canada 1996, 616-7)*

INTRODUCTION

The Northwest Territories government has demonstrated that Indigenous language revitalization can be addressed through a legislative initiative and today, during this, the fortieth anniversary year of Canada's *Official Languages Act*, it is time for Canada to follow suit. Despite the fact that several Indigenous languages are endangered and others have become extinct, there is neither a piece of federal statutory legislation nor an overarching policy for the recognition and revitalization of Indigenous languages in Canada. Reason for optimism lies in the 2001 census which shows Aboriginal people are acquiring our languages as second languages (Norris 2007). In Canada, there are more than fifty-five Aboriginal languages with their status lying on a spectrum from vibrant to nearing extinction (Canada 2005).

Given the number of diverse languages in diverse situations, how then can First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples best approach a legislative initiative that will result in revitalization strategies for Indigenous languages? While the *Official Languages Act* focuses on what Fettes (1998) calls "high prestige activities" such as ensuring the delivery of public services and parliamentary proceedings in both official languages, Indigenous traditional knowledge keepers and linguists adamantly argue that speaking Indigenous languages at home is the most necessary action for language revival (McCarty and Watahomigie 1998).

Re-examining the principle of *equality* as foundational to federal language legislation is one philosophical starting point. Legal scholar Slattery (1991), argues that the "constitutional space" for federal legislation exists in part because Indigenous languages were used as official languages through customary practice during treaty negotiations. The suggestion that our notion of *equality* must extend beyond simply having the same rights, to *equality* of *respect* and *interest,* is examined. The Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper articulated a context for *respect* in his June 2008 Apology to Indian residential school survivors, acknowledging that it was wrong to separate Aboriginal children from their rich and vibrant cultures.

Aboriginal people have an *interest* in revitalizing our languages because only by speaking our languages do we retain our distinct cultures as peoples. To this end, how legislative and policy initiatives can be used to restore the many diverse Indigenous languages to their once central nature in Aboriginal life is introduced. Using the NWT *Official Languages Act* as an example, the objective of this commentary is to highlight that it is possible to develop and implement Indigenous language legislation that addresses the diverse situations of several languages by accommodating the importance of community ownership.

A BRIEF SNAPSHOT: REASON FOR OPTIMISM

Many Aboriginal people, Indigenous studies scholars and proponents of social justice are frustrated over the status of Indigenous languages. In Canada, several Indigenous languages are endangered, while countless others have become extinct (Canada 2005). At the time of contact First Nations people lived in territories which now comprise Canada, speaking an estimated 450 languages and dialects belonging to eleven different language families (Canada 1992, xiii).

Today that number is decimated. Over the past one hundred years alone, an estimated ten Indigenous languages have become extinct in Canada (Norris 2007). According to the 2001 census, 235,000 of the 976,300 people (about 24%) who identified as being Aboriginal said they are able to conduct a conversation in an Aboriginal language; this represents a significant decline from 29% in 1996 (Norris 2007). A similar trend exists for the number of Aboriginal people with an Aboriginal mother tongue, showing a decline from 26% in 1996 to 21% in 2001.

On the positive side of the ledger, as Norris points out, the fact that more people could speak an Aboriginal language than had an Aboriginal language as their mother tongue suggests that Aboriginal people are acquiring their respective Aboriginal language as a second language, a positive development. This trend is not only reason for optimism; it is also evidence of an enduring commitment among Aboriginal people to maintain their languages, which in turn is cause to lobby governments throughout

Canada to elevate the status of Aboriginal languages through legislative and policy initiatives.

CANADA'S *OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT*: SILENT ON ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES

From 1963 to 1967, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism undertook the work which laid the foundation for the *Official Languages Act*. In the final report, the commissioners clarified that the examination of Indigenous languages is outside of the scope of their mandate, justifying why their inquiry focused upon the "two founding peoples" – English and French (Canada 1967, xxii, xxvi).

The *Act* adopts a "centralist rights-based philosophy" (Fettes 1998) which is evident in both the preamble and the purpose, where the *Act* focuses on ensuring the "equality of status and equal rights and privileges." The *Act* also guarantees the right to communicate in either official language within Parliament or federal government institutions – central institutions in Canada.

The *Act* also guarantees the following:

- The right of any member of the public to receive services in either English or French;
- Equal opportunities for officers and employees of Parliament or the Government of Canada to work in either official language;
- The commitment of the government to enhance the vitality of English and French linguistic minorities and to foster the full recognition and use of English and French in Canadian society;
- The cooperation with provincial governments and institutions to support the development of English and French linguistic minority communities;
- The enhancement of the bilingual character of the National Capital Region; and
- The recognition of the importance of preserving and enhancing the use of languages other than English and French while strengthening the status and use of the official languages. (*Official Languages Act* 1985)

The domains that the *Act* addresses are evidence for Fettes' characterization of the *Act*'s centralist philosophy, and focus on "high prestige activities". The *Act* focuses on central institutions and on the enhancement of the bilingual character of the National Capital Region. However, this approach would not allow Aboriginal language groups to "win the linguistic battle" (Fettes 1998), and the fact of a centralist rights-based philosophy for the *Official Languages Act* is not justification for applying that approach in the creation of policies to support Aboriginal languages.

ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE RIGHTS AND THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

Slattery (1991) argues that Aboriginal languages ought to be considered official languages in some sense. First, the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees the rights of Canadians and Aboriginal people to express ourselves in any language we choose, including Aboriginal languages. Second, while this guarantee of freedom of expression does not guarantee official status for Aboriginal languages in Canada, a guarantee of official status for Aboriginal languages can be drawn from the seemingly contradictory nature of the *Charter* (Slattery 1991; Gibson 1991): while Section 16[1] of the *Charter* declares that English and French are the official languages of Canada, implying that there are no others, Section 22, provides that nothing in sections 16 to 20 "abrogates or derogates from any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this Charter with respect to any language that is not English or French" (Slattery 1991). Finally, Slattery argues that Section 25 also addresses language rights:

> You also find in section 25 a provision that explicitly shields from the adverse impact of *Charter* guarantees 'any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada,' which would clearly cover language rights. (Slattery 1991)

In his analysis, Slattery reminds us that Aboriginal languages were used as "official languages" through customary practice in the formal exchanges made through ceremonies and in the negotiations of treaties when English, French and Aboriginal languages were used with interpreters playing an important role in these negotiations. Slattery concludes that while these two sections "clear a constitutional space for aboriginal language rights, they do not provide a foundation for them" (Slattery 1991).

EQUALITY REVISITED

*Equality i*s the main legislative paradigm in which the *Official Languages Act* was written. Opening a dialogue about an Aboriginal languages act requires expanding the discussion of equality beyond the English-French dichotomy to include First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages. The discussion of equality needs to be approached thoughtfully, such that language rights can be justified as they create an "egalitarian environment for Aboriginal peoples" (MacMillan 1998). Here three perspectives regarding the basis on which Aboriginal groups can claim equal status are briefly examined.

First, the *number of speakers* is one aspect of the issue of equality. If we were to determine whether or not Aboriginal languages should be officially recognized based upon the number of speakers, we would conclude that they should not (MacMillan 1998): as noted previously, the 2001 census found that about 235,000 people who identified as Aboriginal, said they had knowledge of or were able to converse in an Aboriginal language; this means that less than one percent of the total population of Canada speaks an Aboriginal language as a home language.[2]

The fact that so few Aboriginal people speak their Aboriginal language at home, however, does not preclude us from considering another perspective of equality: the *equality of respect*. A commitment to linguistic equality is synonymous to the *equality of respect* according to political philosopher, Kymlicka (1989). On June 11, 2008, Canadian politicians acknowledged that the respect for Aboriginal languages has historically been absent when they formally apologized for the aftermath of the Indian Residential School system – a system created in the late 1800s in the name of removing Indigenous languages from the consciousness of countless Aboriginal children and thereby, the collective consciousness of Aboriginal communities and Canada (Canada 2009). On June 11, 2008, Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper said in the House of Commons:

> First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages and cultural practices were prohibited in these schools. Tragically, some of these children died while attending residential schools and others never returned home. The government now recognizes that the consequences of the Indian Residential Schools policy were profoundly negative and that this policy has had a lasting and damaging impact on Aboriginal culture, heritage and language… We now recognize that it was wrong to separate children from rich and vibrant cultures and traditions that it created a void in many lives and communities, and we apologize for having done this. (Canada 2008)

Not only is the apology an acknowledgement of the historical wrongs enacted on Aboriginal peoples' languages, but it also creates a context for a renewed *respect* for these languages.

The international community has also inspired a renewed respect for Indigenous languages. The essential need to support Indigenous language revitalization has been acknowledged in the United Nations (UN) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Articles 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 (adopted in 2007 by the UN). In Canada this Declaration is the subject of ongoing political debate: the Government of Canada voted against the Declaration at the UN vote in 2007; however, Parliament voted to endorse the declaration on April 8, 2008, notwithstanding the objections of the minority government. To date Canada has not changed its formal position on the Declaration.

In 2008, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) made Indigenous languages (and their connection to biocultural diversity) a priority for its Seventh Session, which was held in New York from April 21 – May 2, 2008. During this annual meeting, approximately 1,000 Indigenous organizations, government representatives and non-governmental organizations gathered to address the themes of climate change, biocultural diversity and livelihoods; the stewardship role of Indigenous peoples and new challenges. Indigenous languages featured prominently in the discussion, with a half day being devoted specifically to Indigenous language revitalization. Not only were best practices for revitalization featured; the essentiality of diversity which is manifest in languages, Indigenous languages as a development issue; Indigenous languages as a children's issue and Indigenous languages as a human rights issue were among the discussion themes that were brought to the fore. Given the recent adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the affirmation of the urgent global situation regarding Indigenous languages at the UNPFII, the timing is right for a renewed respect of Indigenous languages in Canada.[3]

Third, *equal consideration of interests* requires recognition. Johnston reminds us why Aboriginal languages merit our collective interest.

> [Native peoples] lose not only the ability to express the simplest of daily sentiments and needs but they can no longer understand the ideas, concepts, insights, attitudes, rituals, ceremonies, institutions brought into being by their ancestors; and, having lost the power to understand, cannot sustain, enrich, or pass on their heritage. No longer will they think Indian or feel Indian. And though they may wear 'Indian' jewellery and take part in pow-wows, they can never capture that kinship with and reverence for the sun and the moon, the sky and the water, or feel the lifebeat of Mother Earth or sense the change in her moods; no longer are the wolf, the bear, and the caribou elder brothers but

> beasts, resources to be killed and sold. They will have lost their identity which no amount of reading can ever restore. Only language and literature can restore the "Indian-ness." (Johnston 1998)

For Johnston, the significance of Indigenous languages lies in understanding and passing down our distinct heritage (Battiste 2000). This means knowing and speaking our respective Indigenous languages as they express concepts, ceremonies and our institutions. Rather than the size of a language community, the importance then lies in the *equality of respect* and *interests*.

If interest is demonstrated through the placement of Indigenous languages as central to daily life, then how interested are Aboriginal people in Canada in revitalizing and retaining their languages?[4] Why should governments in Canada address languages that Aboriginal people (seemingly) do not use, asks MacMillan (1998)? Ironically, the policies such as the Indian Residential Schools policy, which led to the precarious state of the majority of Aboriginal languages, are what fuelled the displacement of Aboriginal languages from their once central nature in Aboriginal life. Using legislative and policy initiatives in today's context of reconciliation to restore Aboriginal languages merits attention.

AN ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES ACT: CHAMPION DIVERSITY AND MAKE IT RELEVANT

Where Indigenous languages are concerned, we need to look at the essential need for *diversity* which is different than *equality*. Equality means having the same rights or status (Fowler 1995). Diversity means a variety or a different kind (Fowler 1995). The *Official Languages Act* has ensured the equality of the English and French languages, but remained silent on championing diversity which could be achieved by ensuring the survival of the some fifty-five Indigenous languages in Canada. The prospect of the diversity of life being irreversibly interrupted by the decline in Indigenous languages is one reason for developing an Aboriginal languages act.

Just as Indigenous Elders and philosophers such as Johnston have done, Maffi speaks to the interrelations between cultural, linguistic and biological diversity and the consequences for their loss (Maffi 2005). Maffi suggests that if any one of the cultural, linguistic or biological diversity is affected, then one or both of the others will be too. When linguistic diversity is negatively affected, this results in the diminished capability of humanity to draw upon different world views of Indigenous languages to address the issues, problems and concerns in the world (Maffi 2005). Having recognized that Indigenous languages inspire thought, she challenges the world to care about the revitalization of Indigenous languages. This can be done by language speakers, language activists and policy makers alike.

An Aboriginal languages act needs to address the linguistic issues which are relevant to Aboriginal communities. In Canada, Aboriginal communities can be characterized as "small, declining, oral language communities" (Fettes 1998). Indigenous traditional knowledge keepers and linguists adamantly attest to the fact that Indigenous languages must be spoken in the home if they are to be revived and retained (McCarty and Watahomigie 1998). How, then, can an Aboriginal languages act accommodate the need for Indigenous people to speak their languages in their homes? Legislation must be *relevant* to the need. Unlike the *Official Languages Act* which promotes official bilingualism in Parliament and the public service, an Indigenous languages act must focus upon preservation, development and enhancement activities (Fettes 1998) in an effort to ensure *diversity*. Rather than adopting the "centralist rights-based" philosophy of the *Official Languages Act*, an Aboriginal languages act needs to focus on the fact that revitalization demands that people speak their languages at home.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT: EVOLUTION FROM EQUALITY TO DIVERSITY

A precedent for Aboriginal language legislation has been established in the Northwest Territories (NWT). Their *Official Languages Act* has evolved from focusing on equality for the use of English and French to diversity, which is brought about by initiatives to preserve, promote and protect Aboriginal languages. In 1984 the Legislative Assembly passed its *Official Languages Act* (modeled after the federal *Official Languages Act*) for two express purposes: (1) to guarantee equal status for the use of the public who access government programs and services, and (2) to officially recognize the Aboriginal languages in use in the NWT (Northwest Territories 2008). In 1990, the NWT Government amended the *Act* to bolster the status of Aboriginal languages in an effort to "preserve and promote Aboriginal cultures through protection of their languages" (Northwest Territories 2008). Again, in 2004, major amendments were made to the Act, which resulted in the role of promoting and preserving NWT's official languages being turned over from the Official Languages Commissioner to the newly created position of Minister Responsible for Official Languages. The Minister, in turn,

established two boards: (1) the Official Languages Board and (2) the Aboriginal Languages Revitalization Board. While the Official Languages Board reviews the use of official languages in the administration and delivery of services to government institutions, the Aboriginal Languages Revitalization Board is responsible for reviewing programs and initiatives dealing with Aboriginal languages, and promoting and revitalizing Aboriginal languages (Northwest Territories 2008). Included in these amendments was the increase in the number of official languages in the NWT from eight to eleven.

Mark Fettes, language policy scholar, criticized the Government of the Northwest Territories for modeling its initial *Official Languages Act* after Canada's and thereby focusing on language use for government services rather than Aboriginal language programs designed around the goals of preservation and revitalization (1998). While it is unknown whether Fettes played a role in the NWT legislative changes, they were enacted in response to the *Final Report – Special Committee on the Review of the Official Languages Act* (Northwest Territories 2003). The reality is that official languages legislation can address the importance of community ownership – a necessary ingredient for language preservation.

CONCLUSIONS: A FUTURE VISION, REFLECTING ON THE PAST

Forty years from now, in 2049, imagine a grand celebration of the *Official Languages Act* of Canada as the diversity of our languages is celebrated. Imagine reflecting upon the preceding forty years and how Canada, a once bilingual country, became known globally for language diversity. Picture yourself in conversations about how the Government of Canada apologized to Aboriginal people for enacting the Indian Residential Schools policy which tried to rid Aboriginal people of Canada of their languages and cultures. Hear yourself citing studies such as the *Final Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* and *Towards a New Beginning: A Foundational Report for a Strategy to Revitalize First Nation, Inuit and Métis Languages and Cultures* and about how the *Aboriginal Languages Act* which, unlike the 1969 and subsequent amendments to Canada's *Official Languages Act*, turned our attention to language diversity and the relevant, community-based initiatives to achieve this.

Perhaps, you have delved into the archives only to uncover the legislative models, such as the one from the Northwest Territories, which contributed to this much needed change. And catch yourself reflecting that when this legislative initiative was truly undertaken, the numbers of Aboriginal language speakers did not warrant it but the commitment to the principles – equality of respect and the equality of interest – allowed us to draw upon our belief that this needed to be pursued. Finally, reflect on the day when Canada realized that its appeal for the *equality* of English and French, while sidelining Aboriginal languages, who manifest the glorious *diversity* of Canada, was woefully misguided for Aboriginal people and Canadians alike.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Also, see Galley (2009). Here, the term "Aboriginal" refers to the Indians (First Nations), Inuit and Métis of Canada as defined in the *Constitution Act* 1982. It is acknowledged that the First Nations, Inuit and Métis, given their respective positions to remain distinctive and strong preferences to not be party to pan-Aboriginal approaches would likely lobby for their own respective pieces of legislation. For the purpose of the more general analysis which is presented in this paper, the term "Aboriginal" is used when referencing people or peoples; the term "Indigenous" is also employed when discussing languages.

[2] This is based upon calculations using 30,021,251 as the population of Canada according the 2001 Census (Canada 2004).

[3] Note that no specific references have been cited; this synopsis is based upon the author's attendance at the 7th Session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in May 2008 in New York City (United Nations 2008).

[4] A valid response to this question can only be explored through a comprehensive nation-wide study regarding the attitudes of First Nations, Inuit and Métis people toward their languages.

REFERENCES

Battiste, Marie. 2000. Maintaining Aboriginal identity, language and culture in modern society. In *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*, ed. Marie Battiste, 192-208. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Burnaby, Barbara. 1999. Policy on Aboriginal languages in Canada: Notes on status planning. In *Theorizing the Americanist tradition*, ed. Lisa Philips Valentine and Regna Darnell, 299-314. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

Canada. Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. 1967. *The official languages*. Book 1 of *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

———. Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. 1992. *Annual report of the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the year 1992*. Ottawa: Commissioner of Official Languages.

———. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. 1996. *Gathering strength*. Vol. 3 of *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group. Also available online at http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/webarchives/20071115053257/http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/sg/sgmm_e.html.

———. Statistics Canada. 2004. Statistical area classification: Highlight tables, 2001 counts, for Canada, Provinces and Territories. Catalogue no. 97F0024XIE2001016. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/english/census01/products/highlight/SAC/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Table=1a&StartRec=1&Sort=2&B1=Age&B2=Counts.

———. Canadian Heritage. Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures. 2005. *Towards a new beginning: A foundational report for a strategy to revitalize First Nation, Inuit and Métis languages and cultures*. Ottawa: Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures. Also available online at http://www.aboriginallanguagestaskforce.ca/pdf/foundrpt_e.pdf.

———Prime Minister's Office. 2008. Prime Minister Harper offers full apology on behalf of Canadians for the Indian Residential Schools system. News release, June 11, 2008. http://pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=2149.

. ———Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. 2009. Statement of apology. http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ai/rqpi/apo/index-eng.asp.

Fettes, Mark. 1998. Life on the edge: Canada's Aboriginal languages under official bilingualism. In *Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities,* ed. Thomas Ricento and Barbara Burnaby, 117-50. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Fowler, H.W., and F.G. Fowler. 1995. *The concise Oxford dictionary*. 9th ed. Ed. Della Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Galley, Valerie. 2009. Reconciliation and the revitalization of Indigenous languages. In *Response, Responsibility and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey,* ed. Greg Younging, Jonathan Dewar, and Mike DeGagné, 241-57. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Gibson, Dale. 1991. Heritage languages and the Constitution. In *Language and the State: The law and politics of identity*, ed. David Schneiderman, 313-32. Cowansville, QC: Éditions Yvon Blais.

Johnston, Basil H. 1998. One generation from extinction. In *An anthology of Canadian native literature in English*, 2nd ed., ed. Daniel David Moses and Terry Goldie, 99-104. Toronto, New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 1989. *Liberalism, community, and culture*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

MacMillan, Michael C. 1998. *The practice of language rights in Canada*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

Maffi, Luisa. 2005. Linguistic, cultural, and biological diversity. *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:599-617.

McCarty, Teresa, and Lucille Watahomigie. 1998. Indigenous community-based language education in the USA. Special issue, ed. Stephen May. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 11 (3): 309-24.

Norris, Mary Jane. 2006. Aboriginal languages in Canada: Trends and perspectives on maintenance and revitalization. In *Aboriginal policy research: Moving forward, making a difference,* vol. 3, ed. Jerry P. White, Susan Wingert, Dan Beavon, and Paul Maxim, 197-225. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc.

———. 2007. Aboriginal languages in Canada: Emerging trends and perspectives on second language acquisition. *Canadian Social Trends*, no. 83 (Summer): 20-8. Also available online at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/11-008-x2007001-eng.htm.

Northwest Territories. 2003. *Government of the Northwest Territories response to the Final Report – Special Committee on the Review of the Official Languages Act*. Yellowknife, NT: Government of the Northwest Territories. Also available online at http://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/Publications/PDF%20Publications%20Files/Policy%20and%20Planning/language_response.pdf.

Northwest Territories. Office of the Languages Commissioner. 2008. *Annual report of the Languages Commissioner of the Northwest Territories for the year 2007-2008*. Yellowknife, NT: Office of the Languages Commissioner. Also available online at http://www.gov.nt.ca/langcom/english/resources/annual-reports.html/.

Official Languages Act. R.S., 1985, c.31.

Slattery, Brian. 1991. Aboriginal language rights. In *Language and the State: The law and politics of identity,* ed. David Schneiderman, 369-74. Cowansville, QC: Éditions Yvon Blais.

United Nations. Economic and Social Council. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. 2008. *Report on the seventh session,* April 21 – May 2, 2008. New York: United Nations. Also available online at http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/session_seventh.html.