

Sustaining Multiculturalism: Problems and Priorities for Heritage Languages

by

Anjali Lowe
Honours B.A., McMaster University, 2001

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Linguistics

© Anjali Lowe, 2005
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisor: Dr. Joseph F. Kess

ABSTRACT

Canada actively promotes itself as a multicultural nation. Seeing that in the 2001 census, almost half of all Canadians reported an origin other than British, French, or Aboriginal, it can be said that Canada truly contains the globe within its borders. As the global economy becomes increasingly interdependent, and as linguistic and cultural diversity rapidly increase, it is as important as ever to address how Canada can fulfill its desire to become a multilingual and multicultural society. The 1971 federal policy of multiculturalism positioned the retention of heritage languages [HLs] as integral to maintaining cultural diversity. Yet, since the early nineties, HLs have been neglected by both federal and provincial governments.

For many communities, language is at the core of ethnic identity. It has been long argued that the two are inextricably linked. Though the relationship between language and culture is a contentious issue, few deny the benefits of a multilingual society. This thesis asks whether the government's *laissez-faire* approach to linguistic diversity has impaired cultural diversity and its maintenance. It investigates how the language policies of the Canadian government and three of its provinces, British Columbia, Ontario, and Alberta, have supported the maintenance of HLs, in talk and action, over the past thirty years.

Through a critical analysis of federal and provincial discourse, it is demonstrated that government policy and action have excluded and diminished the value of languages and their role in sustaining multiculturalism. What is more, the lack of support for HLs, at both levels of government, has demonstrated an attack on culture and the core value of multiculturalism; the creation of an inclusive society that ensures all Canadians access to and participation in Canada's social, cultural and economic institutions. The goal of this study is to develop a policy framework which works to decelerate the loss of one of Canada's most valuable assets -- its linguistic and cultural mosaic.

Supervisor: Dr. J.F. Kess (Department of Linguistics)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
1.0. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Purpose of the Study.....	1
1.2. What are ‘Heritage Languages’	6
1.3. Statement of the Problem	8
1.4. Significance of the Problem	11
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW	19
2.1. Language Policy and Legislation.....	20
2.1.1. Language Policy & Legislation in Canada.....	28
2.1.2. Language Policy & Legislation in the Canadian Provinces.....	35
2.1.2.1. Alberta	37
2.1.2.2. Ontario	43
2.1.2.3. British Columbia	49
2.2. Language Maintenance & Loss.....	54
2.2.1. Language Shift = Cultural Assimilation?	55
2.2.2. Why does Shift Occur?	59
2.3. Successful Programs of Language Learning and Maintenance	65
2.3.1. Language in Education	66
2.3.2. Language Programs	68
2.3.3. The Pre-Kindergarten Years	72
2.3.4. Other Innovations	73
2.3.5. What is Needed for Successful Heritage Language Learning and Maintenance?	74

3.0. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	76
3.1. Canadian Context.....	78
3.1.1. 'Language' in Multiculturalism.....	80
3.1.1.1. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act	80
3.1.1.2. The Annual Reports, Other Discourse, and Federal Action	85
3.1.1.3. Valuing our Diversity? Language-as-a-Problem.....	89
3.1.2. The Results of the 34-year-old Multiculturalism Policy	93
3.1.3. Federal Responsibility	98
3.2. Provincial Context	100
3.2.1. Ontario.....	102
3.2.1.1. Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism 1977, 1988	102
3.2.1.2. Proposal for Action: Ontario's Heritage Language Policy.....	108
3.2.1.3. Royal Commission on Learning, 1994	110
3.2.2. British Columbia.....	114
3.2.2.1. Multiculturalism Act, the Sullivan Commission, and Government Response.....	115
3.2.2.2. Annual Reports	118
3.2.3. From East to West: Ontario, Albertam, and British Columbia in Contrast.....	122
4.0. PLAN OF ACTION	130
4.1. Recognition of Languages in Legislation	133
4.1.1. Multiculturalism and Multilingualism in Policy	133
4.1.2. Provincial Language Policy	133
4.1.3. Federal Language Policy	134
4.2. Access, Choice, and Flexibility	136
4.2.1. Languages of Instruction	137
4.2.2. Language in the Curriculum.....	138
4.2.3. Bilingual and Immersion Programs.....	139
4.2.4. Equality of Access	140
4.3. Alternative Learning Options.....	144
4.3.1. Pre-School.....	144
4.3.2. After Graduation and Outside the Classroom.....	145
4.3.3. Study Abroad, Exchanges, and Summer Immersion	146
4.3.4. Challenge and Equivalency Exams.....	148
4.4. Communication, Research, and Resources	150
4.4.1. A National Heritage Language Institute	150
4.4.2. Support for Teachers.....	151
4.5. Language Outside the Curriculum.....	153
5.0. REFERNCES	155
APPENDICES.....	173
Appendix I: Canadian Multiculturlism Act	173
Appendix II: British Columbia Multiculturlism Act.....	178
Appendix III: Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism.....	183
Appendix IV: Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act.....	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Weak and Strong Forms of Education for Bilingualism	67
--	----

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of the Study

To say that Canada is a land of diversity is cliché. From the settlement of the indigenous peoples, the arrival of the French and British colonists, and the waves of immigration, Canada has always been a 'mosaic' of languages and cultures. Canadians have come to see this diversity as central to how Canada defines itself. The first Canadian immigrants in the mid 17th century were mainly of French or British origin, including English, Scot and Irish immigrants. They were soon followed by immigrants who had left continental Europe, enticed by economic opportunity in the new world; many were seeking refuge rather than opportunity (Kelley and Trebilcock, 1998). It was in the years prior to the First World War that Canada recorded the highest numbers of immigrants, peaking in 1913 when 400,870 immigrants arrived (Citizenship & Immigration Canada [CIC], 2002, 3). This figure has lowered significantly but has stabilized to a current target of 225,000 to 250,000 new immigrants annually, ranking Canada among the countries with the highest immigration rates per capita in the world. In 2000, Canada accepted 227,346 immigrants, in 2001, 250,484 and in 2002, Canada accepted 229,091 (CIC, 2001, 3).

It was the immigration policy of 1962, which relaxed the rules and procedures of the system of immigration, that has been one of the most powerful reasons for the steady growth in immigration found today (Kelley & Trebilcock., 1998). This policy made it illegal to discriminate against potential immigrants on the basis of race, national origin, religion, or culture; an ingredient of the previous practices that had, until 1962, gave preferential status to European immigrants. With this policy, and its adoption in 1967, immigrants began arriving from all regions of the world, leading to an unprecedented increase in the number of

non-Europeans in Canada, speaking a wealth of languages (Fleras & Elliot, 1992; Kelley & Trebilcock, 1998).

At present, not one European country ranks in the top five source countries¹ for immigrants to Canada: China, India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Korea (CIC, 2001, 8). In 2001, “about one in six people (almost 5,335,000 individuals or 17.5% of the population), were allophones, that is, they reported having a mother tongue other than English or French”.² This sum has grown “12.5% from 1996, three times the growth rate of 4.0% for the [Canadian] population as a whole” (Statistics Canada, 2002b). It is the metropolises of Toronto (Ontario) and Vancouver (British Columbia) that boast the highest number of allophones, over 35% of each city’s population (Statistics Canada, 2002a).

When so many Canadians have non-English or non-French mother tongues, one might suppose that multilingualism in Canada would be sustainable. Yet, this is not the case. It is only through the steady migration of allophones that Canada has been able to maintain its multilingual status. Second and third generation Canadians generally do not have communicative competence in the mother tongues of their parents. An extensive body of literature, including federally-commissioned reports, has demonstrated this rapid loss of mother tongue with each successive generation of Canadian-born immigrants (O’Bryan, Reitz & Kuplowska, 1975; Pendakur, 1990; Jedwab, 2000).

This thesis will tackle the pressing question of how languages can be maintained beyond the first or second generation of immigrants. It will present a critical investigation of the extent to which the federal and provincial governments have promoted the vitality and

¹ Until 1981, the top five source countries for immigrants coming to Canada were the United Kingdom, Italy, the United States, Germany and Portugal (CBC News, 2003).

² In 2001, the top non-official languages spoken at home were: Chinese*, Punjabi, Arabic, Spanish, Tagalog (Filipino), Russian, Persian (Farsi), Tamil, Urdu & Korean. *reported as Chinese, Cantonese, Mandarin or Hakka (CBC News, 2003).

stability of the languages of immigrants or ‘heritage languages’ in Canada since the announcement of an official federal policy of multiculturalism in 1971. My research will give special attention to the role of government in supporting successful programs of language maintenance inside Canadian borders. The ultimate goal of this study is to develop a policy framework which works to decelerate the loss of one of Canada’s most valuable assets -- its linguistic and cultural mosaic, thereby fulfilling one of the basic principles of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988): to “facilitate the acquisition, retention and use of all languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Canada” (Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada [MCC], 1989).

The following chapters explore how the language policies of two Canadian provinces, British Columbia and Ontario, have supported the maintenance of heritage languages over the past thirty years. These two provinces, being the most diverse (culturally and linguistically) in Canada, warrant careful examination. Of the approximately 225, 000 immigrants Canada accepts each year (at 0.7% of its population), most (76%) flow to our three largest cities (Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal). The inflow to Toronto is equivalent to 2.4% of its population, 1.4% of Vancouver’s population and 0.9% of Montreal’s populace (Justus, 2004).

Despite the history of large immigrant influxes into Ontario and British Columbia, it was Alberta which first authorized the teaching of languages other than English in the public school system in April 1971 (Martorelli, 1990). Once the federal government introduced a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework in 1971, Alberta, along with four other provinces (British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan), moved quickly to adopt its own policies of multiculturalism. Alberta’s Cultural Heritage policy of the same year embodied the spirit of the federal policy, pledging to support the preservation of the

rights and cultures of its native people, immigrant settlers and each ethno-group (Strom, 1971). In 1984, the province pushed its policy into the vanguard, clearly declaring their position on multiculturalism, a move the federal government was still unprepared to take. That is, Alberta formally acknowledged the relationship between a language and its culture, and decisively legislated its commitment to “encourag[ing] the preservation, enhancement and development of artistic, historical and *language resources* by ethno-cultural group in the province” (Martorelli, 1990: 25). Moreover, the new act put forth its dedication to ensure that Alberta’s “cultural heritage [was] treated as a positive factor in economic, social, artistic and educational development” (Martorelli, 1990: 25).

Present-day Alberta is becoming increasingly multilingual. Calgary, where 32% of Albertans reside, ranks fourth highest in terms of its proportion of new immigrants, trailing Toronto, Vancouver and Windsor (Justus, 2004). Of the 68,900 immigrants that arrived in Calgary from 1991 to 2001, all of the top five source countries were Asian, a vast contrast from the pre-1961 numbers when 87% of newcomers were from Europe (Justus, 2004, 44). These figures reflect the facts of immigration for the rest of the province. Today, more than half of Alberta’s new immigrants are from Asia (52.9%), a quarter from Europe (25.8 %) and the remainder from Central and South America (9.3%), the United States (4.3%) and Australia and the South Pacific (2.1%) (Frideres, 1998).

Alberta’s actions have, and continue, to set precedent for the western provinces from Manitoba to British Columbia. Thus it would be impossible to discuss policies of multiculturalism and multilingualism without reference to the development of Alberta’s own program of multiculturalism. Consequently, Alberta’s past and present state of affairs will serve as an adjunct to the core topic of this thesis, an assessment of the development of

British Columbia's and Ontario's policy and legislation of multiculturalism over a span of more than thirty years.

1.2. What are ‘Heritage Languages’?

The term *heritage language* [HL] refers to a language passed down from one’s family or country of origin (Cummins & Danesi, 1990). For the purposes of policy and legislation in Canada, ‘heritage languages’ do not include the aboriginal languages of the First Nations people or the official Canadian languages, French and English. Other terms such as ‘ethnic’, ‘minority’, ‘ancestral’, and ‘non-official’ or ‘third’ languages have all been used at different times and in different provinces (Cummins & Danesi, 1990). The usage of the term ‘heritage language’ has been mainly restricted to use in educational contexts. Statistics Canada and many other federal ministries generally make reference to ‘mother tongue’ (Statistics Canada, 2004a; CIC, 2003a). However, associated statistics for ‘mother tongue’ do not take into account individuals whose mother tongue and heritage language(s) do not correspond. According to Statistics Canada (2004), ‘mother tongue’ refers to the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood by the individual at the time of the census. A HL is not always acquired as a first language and, moreover, it may not even be understood; it is simply that it is the language of one’s parent(s).

While all of these terms refer to the same ‘objective reality’, it is difficult to “dissociate [them] from the discipline from which they were originated” (Jedwab, 2000: 7). The term ‘non-official language’, for example, is necessarily political as it makes a direct reference to Canada’s policy on official languages (Jebwab, 2000). It has been suggested that the term ‘heritage language’ has too strong an association with a time past, evoking connotations of “an ancient culture, past traditions and more ‘primitive’ times”, with the subtext that they are thus irrelevant to youth (Baker & Jones, 1998: 509). At present, both the British Columbia and Ontario Ministries of Education have chosen to employ the term ‘international language’ (British Columbia Heritage Language Association, 2004; Ontario

Ministry of Education, 2004) in order to highlight the global importance of languages other than English or French in contemporary society (Baker & Jones, 1998). Nonetheless, the designation 'heritage language' continues to be preferred by Members of Parliament, for organization names (e.g., British Columbia Heritage Language Association), in recent books and journal articles and even by ethno-linguistic communities themselves. This thesis will use the above terms interchangeably unless otherwise stated.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Of the near quarter-million immigrants that Canada accepts annually, more than half bring with them a language other than English or French (CIC, 2003a). As these rates of immigration grow,³ so too will the numbers of Canadians speaking non-official or HLs. Yet, despite federal and provincial policies and legislation intended to encourage the maintenance of HLs, linguistic assimilation is occurring at such a rate that, as a rule, HLs are lost within three generations (Veltman, 1988; Wiley, 1996). Clearly, the vision of Canada as a country in which its people speak and use a second or third non-official language as the language of the home (Fleming, 1983) is not in step with the ever-present reality of language shift (Jedwab, 2000; Pendakur 1990; Veltman, 1983). Nonetheless, at home and abroad, Canada persists in presenting a public image of a multicultural, multilingual mosaic (Chrétien, 2003).

Canadians continue to distinguish themselves from the ‘melting pot’ of its southern neighbour, the United States. However, the pressure to assimilate linguistically and culturally in Canada essentially runs parallel to the homogenizing forces felt in the United States (Came, 1990; Schrauf, 1999). All levels of government tout their multicultural sensitivity even though very little has been done to sustain or advance either of these values. The rhetoric is matched with inaction, thus rendering the notion of multiculturalism to a façade. “Symbolism does not come cheap...” argues Kess (2003: 17), who questions the sustainability of multiculturalism without multilingualism. Moreover, “effective heritage language programs do not simply call for native speakers; but also “the development of curriculum and teaching materials, the selection and training of qualified teachers, teaching resources (a library, audio-visual materials and so on), someone willing to undertake administrative management and control, adequate teaching facilities, and ideally, integration

³ The 2003 *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration* announced immigration levels stabilized at 220,000 to 245,000 for the calendar years 2004 and 2005 (CIC, 2003a).

into some kind of a program as a language of instruction, rather than simply as a subject without purpose or credit” (Kess, 2003: 17).

Despite the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism’s [RCBB] recognition of the critical connection between a culture and its language, the 1971 policy failed to incorporate the recommendation to include HL study into the elementary school curriculum. The federal policy, in effect, implied that multiculturalism was a viable reality without multilingualism, explicitly denying the findings of the RCBB which stated unambiguously that “culture and language, [serving] as its vehicle, cannot be dissociated” and strongly recommended the teaching of languages other than English and French (RCBB, 1970).

Regardless of its ambiguities, the 1971 announcement of a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework did set the stage for provincial policies on minority rights. It also prompted the creation of a Directorate of Multiculturalism to advise the province on multiculturalism issues which, in turn, established the Canadian Consultative Council [CCC] to speak for the interests of the minority communities. The CCC immediately put pressure on the federal government for funding of HL teaching. Within a year, the government conceded and authorized \$60,000 in funding for HL teaching-aids (Hobbs, Lee & Haines, 1991). In 1977, the Ontario government began its own program, the Ontario Heritage Language Program, which aimed to provide support for HL classes. British Columbia, however, did not begin funding supplemental HL schools until the early 1990s (Beynon & Toohey, 1991).

With Pierre Trudeau’s announcement of an official policy of multiculturalism in 1971, HL research gained strong momentum, while at the same time, the funding for HL programs slowed to a standstill. In 1988, Canada saw the passing of Bill C-93 into law as the

Canadian Multiculturalism Act, and in 1991, a federal bill (*Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act*, 1991) was passed pledging to create a national organization that would support the development of curriculum for the Canadian context and stimulate research on HLs (Hobbs et al., 1991); more than ten years later, this legislation has yet to be financed. The federal government is bound by its own legislation to promote multiculturalism through a number of policy objectives; its most significant objective declares it to be the responsibility of the Government of Canada to “preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada” (MCC, 1990: 15). Without the integration of languages into the lives of their speakers, cultural identity and, consequently, multiculturalism will not be sustained.

1.4. Significance of the Problem

Today, most Canadians see their country as a model of tolerance and diversity. While it has taken more than a century to arrive at this juncture, Canada's mainstream social attitudes are changing, driven by a more progressive younger generation. The *Globe and Mail* recently concluded that the 3.9 million Canadians in their twenties are "the most deeply tolerant generation of adults produced in a nation known for tolerance" (Anderssen & Valpy, 2003). This age-group characterizes itself as more comfortable with diversity and inter-ethnic marriages than their 30+ counterparts. Many (69%) of those over thirty (and 75% of 18 to 30 year olds) do feel that 'different cultures living in harmony' is a significant source of pride for Canadians⁴ (Centre for Research and Information on Canada [CRIC], 2003: 49). These numbers illustrate a marked contrast from similar polling only thirty years ago. When a 1961 survey asked if Canada should continue to restrict the admission of non-whites to the country, 53% of the respondents answered that the restrictions should continue (36% said there should be fewer restrictions and 11% were neutral or had no opinion) (Canadian Institute of Public Opinion Poll of July 1961, cited in CRIC, 2003). Despite an apparent growing respect for other cultures, all age-groups and ethnicities (ranging from 68 to 80%) agree that racism remains endemic in Canada. Furthermore, they believe that this racism is manifested by obstacles to entering and advancing in the workplace as well as differential treatment by the police (CRIC, 2003).

Attitudes have been slow to adjust to diversity. Just over twenty years ago, a Gallup poll reported that "31% of Canadians would support organizations that worked toward preserving Canada for whites only" (*Globe & Mail*, July 13, 1982 poll cited by Statsiulis,

⁴ 'Different cultures living in harmony' ranked third for the 18-30 age group and fourth for the 30+ , after 'the UN ranking of Canada as number one', 'the vastness and beauty of the land', and 'assisting planes after September 11th' (Anderssen & Valpy, 2003).

1990: 90). Another poll⁵ taken more than one year after the tragedy of September 11th, challenged the “image of the ‘Canadian mosaic’ as a benevolent tapestry of different cultures and religions”, exposing staunch support for the restriction of the number of immigrants from Muslim countries (44% approved, 42% opposed and 12% were neutral) as a response to the threat of terrorism (Blanchfield, 2002). Michael Sullivan, a pollster interviewed in the *Ottawa Citizen’s* report of the poll, suspects the trauma from 9/11 for “unleash[ing] a sleeping intolerance toward foreigners” and questions if those events have allowed “somehow, some of our more intolerant feelings to become more socially acceptable?” (Blanchfield, 2002).

Racism is perhaps more covert than it once was, but derogatory or hostile comments about minorities, their cultures or languages, are not infrequent. It was until only recently that residential schools were very much a part of the Canadian experience for many aboriginal children who were removed from their homes to be taught “European ways” with the intent that English be made their sole language of communication (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996; Hinton & Hale, 2001; Cummins & Danesi, 1990). The “continuing and tragic legacy” of the systematic eradication of the Canadian First Nations’ cultures and languages has yet to be truly redressed or mitigated (Kelley & Trebilcock, 1998: 20). This thesis will not deal with the grievous injustices inflicted on aboriginal people, but it does take the position that these events remain a grave tragedy in Canada’s history, and though the means of recompense are challenging, these wounds are in desperate need of attention.

Canada’s past is riddled with discrimination and intolerance, but it has begun to make amends for its actions and adopt a pluralistic vision of society. In 1986, after intensive negotiations, the Canadian government apologized for its actions toward Japanese-

⁵ The national results of the poll taken for Maclean’s magazine, Global television and the *Ottawa Citizen* results are considered accurate within 3.1 percentage points, 19 times out of 20 (Blanchfield, 2002).

Canadians during and after the Second World War (MCC, 1990). With anti-immigrant sentiment at its peak, Japanese language newspapers and schools were closed and individuals and families of Japanese ancestry were evacuated by force and interned in camps, stripped of their rights and possessions (Feuerverger, 1991). These scenes mirrored the offences of only two decades earlier when the *War Measures Act* (1914) was invoked to intern between eight and nine thousand ‘enemy-aliens’, including naturalized Ukrainian-, German- and Jewish-Canadians. Those not detained still suffered malicious discrimination and censorship of their language, finally losing their right to vote in the 1917 federal election (Kelley & Trebilcock, 1998).

The marginalization of minorities breeds self-hate and shame, discouraging the transmission of language and culture from generation to generation. The frequently cited ‘Canadian mosaic’ of language and culture is vanishing with each generation of Canadian-born immigrants. The symbolic recognition of the value of languages other than French and English has made little to no impact on the majority of children who still feel compelled to reject their mother tongue. Many second and third generation immigrants regret not having learned their mother tongue (Hinton, 2001b; Jedwab, 2000) and struggle to reclaim their heritage in their adult years, usually unsuccessfully (Hinton, 2001b).

Bissoondath (1994: 83) argues that, up to now, Canada’s policy of multiculturalism has essentially only helped to “Disney-fy” culture, reducing it from a complex entity, a history of a people hundreds or thousands of years old, to a stereotype, “lightened, simplified and stripped of the weight of the past” (Bissoondath, 1994: 88). It is through the process of promotion of culture as a “commodity [to] be displayed, performed, admired, bought, sold or forgotten” that it is has been devalued (Bissoondath, 1994: 83). The current approach to implementing the Multiculturalism Act (1988), which consists of support for

festivals, celebrations and tokenistic cultural events, “has done – and can do – nothing to foster a factual and clear-minded vision of our neighbours” (Bissoondath, 1994: 89). For these reasons, the current policies of the Canadian governments are in need of serious debate and revision.

Policy discussions must acknowledge the role of language as a powerful instrument for cross-cultural learning. Language is an appreciable and tangible means of gaining insight into another’s social customs, institutions, family structure, and cultural values and, consequently, is an effective means of developing respect for and acceptance of other cultures. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] has long maintained that it only through “the mastery of its language [that] a culture [can] be understood fully and truly” (UNESCO, 1994: 28).

Those opposing official multiculturalism allege that its sponsorship results in the Balkanization of communities and schools, promoting separatism among immigrants (Breitkreuz, 1997; Brown, 1997), or limits the freedom of minorities by restricting them to self-imposed cultural ghettos (Bissoondath, 1994). There is little question that immigrants assimilate. Immigrants, particularly younger immigrants, rapidly and readily endeavor to integrate into the dominant culture and language (Pendakur, 1990; RCBB, 1970). As immigrants are increasingly becoming citizens, they “participate in pan-Canadian parties” (Kymlicka, 1997). Intermarriage has increased, along with its acceptability (Kymlicka, 1997). Moreover, Statistics Canada reports that 98.5% of Canadians speak at least one of the official languages, French or English (Statistics Canada, 2001a). Younger first generation or second generation immigrants generally have a perfect grasp of one (or two) official languages (Portes, 1994).

New immigrants, old and young, have more difficulty adjusting if they are not proficient in an official language. It is the absence of support from all three levels of government that has left students of English as a Second Language [ESL] suffering. According to the parents' advocacy group *People for Education*, the number of ESL teachers dropped 30 per cent over the past five years while immigration to Ontario increased by 23 per cent from 1999 to 2000 (Kalinowski, 2002). In the Toronto public school board of York Region, 8,400 students need ESL instruction but the board is only funded for 2,600 children. This lack of funding has resulted in fewer ESL teachers. In 2002, there were only 84 elementary ESL teachers compared to the 120 teachers ten years ago (Kalinowski, 2002).

Even with the most successful teaching of English to ESL students, oral proficiency takes 3 to 5 years to develop, and academic English proficiency can take 4 to 7 years. (Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). Without the opportunity to develop second language proficiency, the gap between ESL students and native English speakers' academic performance continues to widen. An eight-year longitudinal study tracing academic achievement in a Calgary high school revealed a dropout rate of 74 % among ESL students as compared to a 30 % dropout rate for the general population of high school students (Watt & Roessingh, 2001). These results are corroborated by similar studies in the United States (Baron, 1991; Stein, 1986). But as literacy skills are transferable to one's second language, and because most ESL students have strong literacy skills in their first language, it is wise to continue developing the student's first language literacy alongside English language learning (Danesi, 1993). Without sufficient support for ESL, integration is enormously difficult. However, this gap is not the result of officially recognizing Canada's diversity, but simply a lack of government support for immigrant services and funding for ESL programs.

Current polling indicates a growing tolerance of cultural diversity over the past decades but the willingness to aid the maintenance of non-official languages (and perhaps even French in Anglophone Canada) has not ensued (Berry, Kalin & Taylor, 1977; Cummins & Danesi, 1990). The pursuit of multilingualism is not solely motivated by the preservation of multiculturalism. All Canadians benefit from the active support of multilingualism for the purpose of building an economically competitive and socially just society. If government fails to respond to the needs of business, security and citizens, then the tenets of Canadian identity will remain unsustainable.

Recent decades have also documented other significant advantages to bilingualism, in particular, academic and sociological benefits. Cummins and Danesi (1990) argue that language teaching has historically been a 'bourgeois tradition' carried out in private schools. Why, then, should not all students be able to reap the rewards of bilingualism which aid advancement intellectually (Pearl & Lambert, 1977; Bialystok, 1988; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991) and in the job-place?

Not only is knowledge of one's HL considered to be a key aspect of ethnic identity formation (Phinney, 1988; Tse, 1998) but fluency in one's HL is linked to self-esteem, more ambitious plans for the future and feelings of control over one's own life (Krashen, 1998a). It has also been found that bicultural⁶ youths' success in drawing on immigrant and mainstream cultures positively affects their educational achievement (Garcia, 1985; Feliciano, 2001).

Beynon, Ilieva, Dichupa and Hirji's (2003) study of recent graduates of teachers' colleges found that their knowledge of their HLs smoothed their transition into the job market and improved their ability to communicate with parents and grand-parents of

⁶ Feliciano (2001: 877) measures biculturalism by language ability, household language, and the presence of foreign-born family.

minority language children. The inability to communicate in the HL “interferes with interactions outside the family where the HL is spoken, which often results in feelings of isolation and exclusion from members of one’s ethnic group” (Cho & Krashen, 1998: 34). In a day and age where students are “facing many problems: change and instability, fragmentation, and loss of identity” (Runte, 1995: 11), “ensuring strong parent-child communication is an investment for both the individual and society” (Garcia, 1985: 38).

What is more, HLs are a tremendously valuable economic resource for Canada’s international trade, diplomacy (Snow & Hakuta, 1992; Cummins & Danesi, 1990), security and intelligence gathering (Cummins & Danesi, 1990). Post 9/11, the American Federal Bureau of Investigation disclosed that they had stacks of tapes to be translated from Arabic, Farsi and Pashto, leading to the criticism of universities for not teaching strategic languages (Nunberg, 2001). In Canada, security also has become a greater concern and this is evident from the recruitment campaigns for foreign language speakers. The Canadian Security and Intelligence Service [CSIS] is currently represented by a force in which over a third of its intelligence officers speak a foreign language and CSIS is steadily pursuing recruits with foreign language abilities (Elcock, 2003). Similarly, the Communications Security Establishment [CSE] of National Defence Canada now offers recruitment scholarships to graduate students with proficiency in Asian, Middle Eastern or Eastern European languages (CSE, n.d).

It is an arduous task to become a near-native speaker through school instruction alone. Second generation immigrants are often well equipped to develop their language skills to native or near-native proficiency and also meet citizenship and security requirements. In an increasingly interdependent world, industry and government are demanding the skills of bilinguals, often speakers of less commonly taught languages. However, the federal and

provincial governments have not given adequate resources to achieve a multilingual society (Commissioner of Official Languages, 1983 cited in Cummins & Danesi, 1990).

We must acknowledge that HLs are disappearing because they are not being transmitted from parent to child or supported in daily life. Social, economic and political factors may support language maintenance, but it ultimately depends upon the choices of speakers and not legislation. However, traditional language policy in Canada, being deeply rooted in the notion that ‘school is where you learn’, has focused on the creation of school curricula, instead of designing projects that mirror the home environment, where we learn to speak our mother’s language with confidence. Furthermore, there is very strong evidence that “language policy and language education can serve as vehicles for promoting the vitality, versatility and stability of [heritage languages]” (Hornberger, 1998: 455).

Language policy alone cannot save HLs, but our willingness to recognize and develop these languages as a vital resource is an opportunity to advance Canada’s desires to reflect the diversity of cultures and promote unity. It also offers Canadians “both the opportunity and the capacity to shape the future of their communities and their country” (Canadian Heritage, 2002b). Finally, it supports a just society that respects the dignity of all Canadians (Canadian Heritage, 2002b).

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review the existing literature pertaining to the subject of this study, HL planning, in particular the areas of *language planning*, *language maintenance* and *second language education programs*, each of which have two components: theoretical and applied. While one component is not easily extracted from the other, this section will focus its attention on literature concerned with concrete action and tangible results. Unlike many of the past discussions of language planning in Canada, which have tended to concentrate on those affecting official languages, the core of my examples will be drawn from heritage and minority language settings.

Section 2.1 will first define the field of language planning, briefly describing its development, features and practice. It will then illustrate the language planning model by examining the language situation in Canada and three of its provinces, Alberta, Ontario and British Columbia. Section 2.2 will review the theory of language maintenance, shift and loss, with particular reference to its application to Canadian immigrants. The final section will discuss second language education, surveying the considerable array of second language programs, their features and how they are exemplified in Canada. In an effort to determine the traits of successful programs of language learning and maintenance, examples from outside the Canadian context will also be presented.

2.1. Language Policy and Legislation

What is Language Planning? What is Language Policy?

Language planning could be widely defined as plans or policies that affect languages or speakers of a language. Kaplan and Baldauf's (1997) more narrow explanation reminds us that language planning always involves motivation from the language planners, who are attempting to change the linguistic behaviour of a given community, often with intentions of solving complex social problems.

For instance, while monolinguals use only one language in everyday contexts from the classroom to the living room, multilinguals control several languages and understand when and where to use each language. In a multi-ethnic country, the diversity of language poses a number of challenges for its government. Policy-makers inevitably have to consider a number of questions: Do they acknowledge the state as multilingual? Which languages should be used officially in the public realm? Which languages will be spoken and taught in schools? Should the national news broadcast in one, two or three languages (Reilly, 1998)? To manage these languages, the government may devise strategies, known as *language policies*.

Language policy is a component of language planning, the broader process that attempts to bring about change in language use. *Language planning* refers to the ideas, beliefs and practices as well as laws and regulations (i.e. policy) that can influence language change (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). *Languages policy* involves any decisions about rights, freedoms or power of a language and its speakers (Burnaby, 1996). It often used to delineate "the status, use, domains and territories of language(s) and the rights of speakers of the languages in question" (Schiffman, 2000).

These decisions about language may be made externally, outside the community of speakers, which is the case of a national language policy or internally, by the speakers

themselves, as with community or family language policies (Hinton, 2001). Community policies can be tremendously effective as they are initiated and enforced locally, which can result in stronger local participation and more adaptive programs because those affected by the policy are affected directly, thus have a vested interest in its success or failure (Romaine, 2002). Consequently, a government does not have to engineer all projects. Instead, governments can champion these local projects by means of financial support and resources in addition to research sponsorship and public awareness campaigns. This thesis will focus on external policies made by governments. In Canada, all three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal, assume some responsibility for determining language policy. To some extent, this sharing of responsibilities helps to ensure that national and local interests are considered (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997).

Why have Language Policies?

Language policies have been, and continue to be, used as device for the repression of languages, cultures and people (Hinton, 2001; Pennycook, 2002; Baron, 2001; Valdés, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995). They can prevent a language, even one spoken by a large majority, from being used in schools, commerce, government and media. As a result, when a community does not speak the 'accepted' language, a segment of society is successfully locked out from mainstream economy and public affairs.

Implementing an explicit policy, which makes clear the rights of speakers, can be an effective way of replacing an implicit and repressive policy already existing in practice (Herriman & Burnaby, 1996). Brunn's (1999) study of Mexican migrant children in Illinois demonstrates that the absence of a language policy, in this case a school language policy, can severely restrict the academic achievement and social inclusion of limited-English students in

English-only classrooms. This study found that teachers without any grounding in second language acquisition theory, due to a lack of language planning, were unable to contend with issues regarding the integration and instruction of limited-English students in their classrooms. This argument is echoed by Romaine (2002: 6) who points out that even when there is no specific reference to language, the policy is implicit. That is to say that “most majority languages dominate in many domains where they have only *de facto* and no legal status.” Conversely, explicit policies, which clearly state the rights of all linguistic groups, can stimulate constructive discussion of language issues, and produce more tolerant language policies (Schiffman, 2000; Herriman & Burnaby, 1996).

Fortunately, more and more governments are coming to view languages as resources. In the early 1990s, the Australian government began a national campaign to raise awareness of language as an economic resource and set about instituting programs of second language education. They believed these programs would boost their competitive edge for external trade within Asia and Oceania (Smolicz & Secombe, 2003; Ingram, 1994; Bodi, Marianne, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Australia’s Language and Literacy Policy (1991) identifies fourteen national priority languages⁷, which are a set of languages endorsed on the basis of either cultural or economic grounds (Ingram, 1994).

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), as well as Jernudd & Das Gupta (1971), argue that the reason that many other countries⁸ have not followed the Australian example, giving greater priority to language in resource planning, relates to the intangible nature of human resources. Human resources, though a considerably important aspect of government planning, are

⁷ Ingram (1994: 80) lists fourteen languages: Aboriginal language, Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Modern Greek, Russian, Spanish, Thai and Vietnamese. It is important to note that he also lists ‘Aboriginal languages’ as the first of these priority languages, which is wholly inaccurate and diminishes the importance of the more than 200 indigenous languages spoken in Australia.

⁸ This is particularly true of English dominant countries which are in a fortunate position for the moment, as English has arguably become the global lingua franca for trade and diplomacy (Maurais & Morris, 2003; Kontra, Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas & Várady, 1999).

frequently neglected due in part to the challenge of measuring their worth (Jernudd, 1971; Thorburn, 1971). Human resources are notoriously difficult to weigh in terms of their benefits and “attendant costs”. Moreover, initiatives for human resource development generally exceed the life of a political administration, requiring several generations for implementation and to demonstrate measurable changes in public attitudes and behaviour (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997).

Romaine (2002) provides a convincing argument that it is the flimsy linkages between policy and planning that have sunk numerous language policies, legislations, conventions and treaties. Citing the case of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1998), she reveals how the deliberately obscure articulation of language rights in the charter, which was intended to provide a legal instrument for language protection, has effectively undermined the entire initiative. The ambiguous language, which was used so that state governments could tailor the charter to their individual contexts, leaves open the definition of complex terms such as ‘European cultural tradition’ and ‘territorial base’ to the discretion of each country. The failure to clarify these terms has empowered states to exploit these definitions and exclude certain linguistic minorities from the charter altogether.

In other cases, tokenistic policy is introduced with no follow-up substantive action. It is not uncommon to find examples of minority languages being raised to ‘official’ status, but to a status that comes without the power to be used in the public domain including education, public administration or media. Additionally, implementation of policies can be made impossible without adequate funding, materials, teacher training and knowledge about language issues. This is often typified by parental trepidation about their children not acquiring the dominant language, and elites and majority language speakers fearing the loss of their social status (Romaine, 2002).

While Romaine (2002) admits that her argument could be “unduly pessimistic”, the essence of her argument is valid. By and large, policy can be seen as either ‘symbolic’ or ‘substantive’ (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Peddie, 1991). Symbolic policies aim to ‘make people feel good’, though the actual policy directives are often ‘nebulous’ and ‘vague’. Substantive policy, on the other hand, takes ‘specific steps’ to make the policy a reality (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Therefore, it is not that language policy is inherently incapable of improving the language situation of endangered languages but that a policy without clarity, planning, implementation, public or speaker support, resources, or the legal instruments for reinforcement is being set up for failure.

In the last twenty years, indigenous peoples have found innovative ways to use language policies and planning to breathe life back into their languages, particularly when introduced through bottom-up, grassroots projects (Hinton & Hale, 2001). Unlike the almost 50 indigenous languages facing extinction, languages brought to Canada by recent immigrants will not disappear completely since they are generally still spoken in their countries of origin (Hinton, 2003; Natural Resources Canada, 2004). Nonetheless, concerns about the sustainability of their languages in the adoptive country are realistic and rightfully justifiable (Herriman & Burnaby, 1996; Hinton, 2001). The policy successes of aboriginal language revitalization (some of which will be discussed in 2.3) have resulted in greater optimism and the expectation that governments can use policy to develop the “political, geographical and economic factors that support the maintenance of linguistic and cultural diversity” (Romaine, 2002: 21).

Types of Language Planning

Fundamentally, language planning can fall into the two categories which Kloss (1969) calls *Status* and *Corpus* planning. Cooper (1989) recognizes a third type, *Acquisition* planning, which considers a language's role in education. To these classifications Hornberger (1997) adds a fourth, *Writing*. All four types are elaborated upon by Hinton (2001) in consideration of two orientations in planning for a language revival context. The first is *Cultivation Planning* which involves the consideration of micro-level issues of usage and the second orientation, *Policy Planning* refers to what was defined previously as 'language policy' or language laws, regulations and rules. Hinton's (2001: 52) discussion is summarized below.

The first type of planning, *status planning*, looks outward, focusing on social issues which are external but related to the language. Status planning considers the uses of a language, and the prestige conferred upon it by a government, agencies and general society as well as speakers themselves. A very common planning decision under the policy approach involves whether or not to grant a language official status. Under the cultivation approach, language planners will likely set the goal of introducing or returning the target language to the language of daily communication.

On the other hand, *corpus planning* looks inward at the language itself and is as such essentially linguistic. This type of planning may involve the establishment of a language committee to reform spelling, coin new terms or create a script for a language (Schiffman, 2000). In this instance, the work of the committee would be considered cultivation planning while the authorization of the committee to formulate directives is a case of policy planning.

Planning for Acquisition concerns itself with the users of the language and aims to increase the number of speakers of a language(s). A cultivation approach would consider how a language can be sustained and reacquired by a community while the adoption of a

policy approach may entail the launch of national or regional programs of language education.

Finally, *Writing* deals with writing systems, developing or modifying a writing system (cultivation planning), or of obtaining government endorsement of the writing system (policy planning).

Language maintenance planning could potentially include all or just one of Hornberger's (1997) types of language planning and could be approached in terms of cultivation or policy or both. Though HLs vary in their status in their source country, many have established writing systems and have active language communities using standardized forms of the language. For this reason, writing and corpus planning are not necessarily central features of language maintenance planning. This thesis will thus give its focus to acquisition and status planning for HLs.

How is Language Planning Implemented?

The performance of a language plan is dependent not only on the soundness of its plan but also the course of action used to encourage the adoption of a language or a particular form. Language maintenance planning frequently relies on governmental and educational measures taken to put language policies into practice. This strategy is not without its drawbacks. Governments can back their policies with powerful resources, such as financial support and legislation but their policies are limited to the duration that an administration holds power, which often results in program discontinuity whereby programs are initiated every 4 years. As funding is not always guaranteed beyond the electoral term, program administrators, by and large, only make short-term plans for the period of funding, awaiting approval of subsequent grants (Herriman & Burnaby, 1996).

Acquisition planning (described above) or Language-in-Education Planning [LEP], though considered to be one of the most ‘potent’ means of implementing language, is only one facet of a language plan or policy and should not be the sole course of action. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 123) suggest that the perception that LEP is the most effective type of planning relates to the most obvious reason that the education is already dealing with “standard versions of a language out of necessity.” Education is, thus, a prime site for impressing a language change. Alternatively, Hinton and Hale (2001) argue for the use of education in programs of language revival for the reason that they target the younger generations who are the next cohort of native speakers. They also advocate alternative forms of child and adult education such as immersion nursery schools and adult language apprenticeships.

Kaplan (1997: xiii) rightly argues for the need for language planners to develop policy for life outside the classroom. The exclusive use of LEP, he continues, is “absurdly ineffective” as it only reaches the fragment of the population in school at a given time, so that several generations must pass through before an entire population can be reached. In point of fact, it is the re-establishment of a language in daily life that supports its maintenance and transmission to the next generation. Consequently, “it is easily demonstrable that the incentives for language learning lie outside the education sector; when civil service requires bilingualism for employees, that is a powerful incentive” (Kaplan, 1997, xiii).

Similarly, Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971: 197) insist the optimal language plan “requires the coordinated attention of political, educational, economic and linguistic authorities.” It is thus critical that language planning and policy implementation has a hand in all spheres of influence – public life, education and business.

2.1.1. Language Policy & Legislation in Canada

Though language policy has historically been exploited as an instrument of oppression of minority languages (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995, for further discussion), it is increasingly being considered an effective tool for the promotion and encouragement of HLs (Hinton, 2001; Hornberger, 1998). This was demonstrated by the elevation of the prestige and use of French, an official language in Canada since Confederation, through a vigorous policy of promotion.

In the early sixties, the Quiet Revolution, a movement to secure greater power in the francophone province of Quebec and representation federally, provided a platform for the rise of a number of independence groups and eventually escalated to domestic political violence and serious threats of secession (Warren, 2003). In 1963, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, faced with precarious tensions between Canada's two largest language communities, formed the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism [RCBB] to investigate and "report on the state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada" (RCBB, 1967: Appendix I). The Commission was asked to examine bilingualism in federal institutions as well as in the system of education although it was not under federal but provincial authority (RCBB, 1967). Furthermore, the government requested that the Commission recommend the necessary steps to "develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races" while also "taking into account the contribution made by other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and measures to safeguard that contribution" (RCBB, 1967: Appendix I).

The series of reports issued by the RCBB from 1967 to 1970 spoke boldly of the fact that Francophones, in Quebec and in Canada at large, were being sidelined in education

(RCBB, 1968) and employment⁹ (RCBB, 1969; MacMillan, 2003). The Commission's distressing findings prompted a number of major initiatives such as the integration of official minority languages into the school curriculum (Yee & Sodhi, 1991; Commissioner of Official Languages, 1971) and the removal of barriers to promotion in the public service (Commissioner of Official Languages, 1971). Even before the completion of the massive six volume study, the federal government, anticipating the recommendations of the Commission, declared that English and French would have equal status as the two official languages of Canada (Commissioner of Official Languages, 1971; Official Languages Act, 1969).

During 1965, the members of the Commission held hearings across the country to gather input from all Canadians (RCBB, 1967, Appendix II). In these meetings, Ukrainian-Canadians were some of the most vocal of ethnic groups, presenting thirty-seven briefs in total to the Commission (Martorelli, 1990; RCBB, 1965). While Ukrainians and other minorities accepted that logistically Canada would have two official languages, English and French, they questioned the idea that Canada had 'two founding races'. They stood strongly against a 'bicultural' identity which ignored the contributions of the many groups that migrated to Canada early in its history and who had been instrumental in "clear[ing] and open[ing] great stretches of territory in Northern Ontario and the Prairies" (RCBB, 1965: 126). Moreover, they feared that official biculturalism would reduce non-British and non-French to second-class citizens, stripped of their basic rights (RCBB, 1965).

The Commissioners felt the unease of these words and raised alarm in Book IV of their reports, putting forth sixteen recommendations relating to ethno-linguistic and ethno-

⁹ For instance, Francophones were under-represented in federal institutions and it was found that Francophones made up a greater proportion of the lowest salary group (23.9%) than the highest (10.4%) (Figures from (RCBB, 1969a) cited in MacMillan, 2003: 91).

cultural maintenance with three of the directives dealing directly with the public system of education. An unequivocal link was drawn between language and culture, and it was proposed that more advanced instruction in languages other than English or French be offered where there was sufficient demand (RCBB, 1969; Bublick, 1978). The fourth volume of the RCBB, *The Contribution of Other Ethnic Groups*, made it clear that the Commission envisioned a wealth of diversity sustained within a bilingual framework with language as its vehicle, thus “safeguard[ing] the contribution that [the] languages [could] make to the quality of Canadian life” (RCBB, 1970: 141).

Less than two years later, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau responded to Book IV and declared that Canada would be a model of ‘multiculturalism within a bilingual framework’ (Trudeau, 1971), becoming “the first country in the world to adopt an official multiculturalism policy” (Canadian Heritage, 2002a: 3).

There were four principal objectives of the policy:

- *Assist cultural groups to grow and contribute to Canada*
- *Assist cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers*
- *Promote creative exchanges among all Canadian cultural groups*
- *Assist immigrants in acquiring at least one of the official languages* (Trudeau, 1971)

Though policy implementation was contingent on sufficient government funding, “nearly \$200 million was set aside in the first decade of the policy for special initiatives in languages and cultural maintenance” (Library of Parliament, 1999: 4). This policy was then set in motion with the appointment of a Minister of State for Multiculturalism and the establishment of a body to represent the interests of Canada’s multicultural communities, the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism [CCCM], which immediately lobbied the federal government for financial support of HLs (CCCM, 1995: Appendix A). The

government eventually conceded, and in 1975 approved a small budget of \$60,000 for ‘non-official teaching aids’ (Hobbs et al., 1991).

The government, having admitted responsibility for the promotion of HLs under its policy of multiculturalism, demonstrated to policymakers that, in its eyes, culture and language were undeniably and intricately connected. This interpretation of the policy set the stage for another development, the Cultural Enrichment Program. This brought modest support, to the tune of 10% of operating costs, directly to communities for HL instruction during non-school hours, generally on Saturday mornings (Cummins, 1994a; CCCM, 1977). Despite public resistance to the government funding of HL teaching (Berry et al., 1977; Cummins & Danesi, 1990), financial support continued to increase. From the period of 1973-1975 to 1981-1984, the proportion of the multiculturalism grants allocated to HLs increased almost seven-fold, from 3% to 20% (Stasiulis, 1988). More than three million dollars in funding was granted to 863 schools teaching 58 languages across Canada during the 1986/87 school year (Canadian Ethnocultural Council, 1988).

This growing awareness of HLs and cultures culminated in the 1988 Multiculturalism Act of Canada (Bill C-93), a more developed adaptation of the previous policies which reaffirmed the federal government’s intent to encourage the participation of all individuals in Canadian society, to promote multiculturalism and to *“preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada”* (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988). In essence, the Multiculturalism Act had two objectives, the first being the survival of the ethnic groups and their culture and the second being a tolerance of this diversity and an absence of prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Soon after, the act to establish the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship (C-18) was passed, a move considered to be a significant recognition of fundamental position that

cultural diversity held in Canadian citizenship (Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada [MCC], 1990: 1).

On the recommendations of the RCBB regarding “non-official” languages, the government also began sponsoring forums for discussion of language issues (Cummins, 1984) and commissioned a number of studies on the topic of the HL maintenance, language programs and attitudes towards multiculturalism (Berry et al., 1977; O’Byrne et al., 1986; Geva & Salerno, 1986; Pendakur, 1990). However, as HL research gained strong momentum (O’Byrne et al., 1986; Cummins, 1983, 1984; Cummins & Danesi, 1990; Swain & Lapkin, 1991; Yee & Sodhi, 1991), the funding for HL programs slowed to a standstill. Support for HL supplemental schools ceased “as a part of more general fiscal belt-tightening” (Cummins, 1994a: 436), the Cultural Enrichment Program was eliminated, though it was promised to be replaced by new initiatives (Yee & Sodhi, 1991). In its final year, the Supplementary School Assistance Program supported 1,763 schools teaching 62 languages to 142,879 children across the country (MCC, 1990). And finally, in 1991, the federal government passed Bill C-37, which pledged the creation of a national HL institute in Edmonton. The institute, with an annual budget of \$1.3 million for five years (MCC, 1990), would fulfil the mandate of supporting the acquisition, maintenance and use of mother tongues across the country (Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act, 1991), but more than ten years later, this legislation has yet to be financed.

The MCC Annual Reports from 1988/89 to 1991/92 describe the support and funding of specific activities on the national and regional levels including seminars and workshops and language programs supported “under a formula for partial funding” (MCC, 1989: 25), though by 1993, on page one of the 1992/93 Annual Report, language

maintenance is decisively excluded from the objectives of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (Canadian Heritage, 1994).

Multiculturalism, particularly the teaching of HLs, continues to be a contentious issue with Canadians. In the second reading of Bill C-53 (1994) to create the Department of Canadian Heritage, the Queen's opposition (the Reform Party) challenged not only the new department but the value of multiculturalism at all.

Canadians remain unsure of what multiculturalism is, what it is trying to do and why and what it can accomplish in a free and democratic society such as ours. Multiculturalism can encompass folk songs, dance, food, festivals, arts and crafts, museums, heritage languages, ethnic studies, ethnic presses, race relations, culture sharing and human rights. Much of the opposition to multiculturalism results from the indiscriminate application of the term to a wide range of situations, practices, expectations and goals, as well as its institutionalization as state policy, an expensive one at that. (Brown, 1994)

In the statement above, Brown (Calgary Southeast) makes a sound argument that the federal policy of multiculturalism has been exceedingly vague. Its lack of direction has made possible the financing of some questionable pursuits (though Brown may, or may not, be including language learning in this category of 'questionable pursuits'), all in the name of multiculturalism.

Since 1971, Canada has leapt forward. It initiated, and for a time, helped to sustain HL research and education across the country. Burnaby (1996: 218) reiterates, that "we have much to be proud of in terms of racial and ethnic tolerance and its implications for language [but] the glass is still half empty at least." In fact, the federal government's elusive concept of multiculturalism has done little for Canada's other minority languages. Though they subsidized non-official language learning, federal officials never formally stated that the culture-language connection was also true for languages other than French. Stasiulis (1988: 87) sums up the facts quite nicely.

The fact remains that successive federal governments have never thrown their resources, legislation, nor the prestige of the Prime Minister's Office behind multilingualism (or, for

that matter, multiculturalism) in the way that the Trudeau government, obviously, did for bilingualism. Nothing demonstrates better the lop-sided relationship between the federal government's support of official and non-official language instruction than the disparity in financial support for multilingualism and bilingualism. During 1986-87, \$3.83million was spent on heritage and modern (third) language training, while over \$218 million was allocated to 'Official Languages in Education'.

2.1.2. Language Policy & Legislation in the Canadian Provinces

The British North America Act [BNA Act]¹⁰ (1867) and subsequently the Constitution Act (1982) and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), split legislative responsibilities between the federal and provincial governments. While both levels of government see to matters of immigration, the BNA Act and Constitution Act established education to be under the legislative jurisdiction of the Canadian provinces, though it remains subject to federal law (Burnaby, 1996). Consequently, the systems of education across the country are diverse and have distinct features. Most provinces, however, do support the study of non-official languages as subjects of study, and in British Columbia [BC] and Ontario the study of a second language is mandatory. BC and Ontario also attract the majority of new Canadian immigrants, making them not only but also the most populous¹¹ provinces but also the most diverse provinces in Canada (CIC, 2002), both linguistically and culturally¹². In 2001, speakers of “non-official” languages amounted to 24.3% and 23.7% of BC’s and Ontario’s entire population, respectively (CIC, 2002). Despite this likeness, the two have pursued divergent paths toward multiculturalism and multilingualism.

Federal legislation and policy sets the tone for provincial action. Trudeau’s 1971 speech of ‘multiculturalism within a bilingual framework’ resulted in the establishment of a series of multiculturalism policies by provincial governments. Not unexpectedly, in the same year, both the Alberta and Ontario parliaments adopted multiculturalism policies (Tavares, 2000). British Columbia’s response to the federal policy followed much later. All of the

¹⁰ This act was renamed as the Constitution Act, 1867 and is thus referenced under this name.

¹¹ British Columbia has 13% and Ontario boasts 38.8% of the Canadian population (Statistics Canada, 2001b).

¹² Alberta (10%) comes in a near fourth after Quebec (23.6%) in terms of the non-French, non-British proportion of their populations (Statistics Canada, 2001b).

provinces have some policy of multiculturalism; however, their individual recognition of HL education varies significantly (Tavares, 2000).

2.1.2.1 Alberta

The years prior to the Second World War gave Alberta its first major waves of immigrants, many of whom were farmers from Britain, Western Europe and the United States. This was followed by another surge from about 1890 to 1914, bringing Ukrainians, Poles and Russians who quickly put down roots in the West (Martorelli, 1990). During the early 1900s, most Ukrainian children were attending Ukrainian-medium missionary schools which eventually gave way to the establishment of English-Ukrainian bilingual schools. However, the willingness of the provincial government to compromise came to abrupt halt with the outbreak of the First World War. Across the country, bilingual schools were closed and in 1916, Alberta's legislature resolved that English would not simply be the medium of instruction in all schools but the language for all Albertans (Martorelli, 1990).

It would be more than fifty years later that a language other than English would be allowed back through school doors. Spurred by the expansive federal response to the reports of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism [RCBB] (above), the province decided to amend the Alberta School Act of 1916 (Martorelli, 1990), reversing its ban on the newly anointed official language in schools. This returned French to a medium of instruction but resolutely excluded any non-official language from being used in Alberta classrooms (Martorelli, 1990: 51; Alberta School Act, 1970).

When the fourth volume of the RCBB (1970), the *Contributions of Other Ethnic Groups*, was released, a Ukrainian teachers' association attempted to persuade the province to make a second amendment, authorizing limited study of Ukrainian from grades one to twelve (Martorelli, 1990). When the association was unsuccessful, another, more influential group took up the cause. Edmonton's Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club [UPBC] set up a Multicultural Committee with the mission of effecting a positive response toward the

recommendations of RCBB's Book IV. More particularly, they wanted Ukrainian to be installed as a language of instruction; but they started small, asking only that it be taught as a subject one hour a day (Martorelli, 1990; Dawson, 1985).

The Multicultural Committee moved quickly and soon arranged a meeting of various members of the UPBC and "an impressive contingent: Premier Harry Strom, the Honourable Robert Clark (Minister of Education), the Honourable Erhard Gerhart, (Attorney-General) and the Honourable Ambrose Holowach (Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation)" (Martorelli, 1990: 53). Exactly one week later, April 21, 1971, Premier Strom "not only endorsed the multicultural rationale and proposals of the professional and businessmen's brief, but promised a full-scale conference on cultural policy" (Martorelli, 1990: 53; Dawson, 1985). The province's concession did not end at that, for the Bill to amend the Alberta School Act (which received Royal Assent only fourteen days after the initial briefing) sanctioned school boards to use non-official languages as the medium of instruction in the public school system (Martorelli, 1990; Dawson, 1985; Alberta School Act, 1970). That summer, the Premier launched the province's new outlook on minority language education, expounded in the *New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta*. This avant-garde policy of multiculturalism detailed four principles, the most important to HLs being the second which commits the province to "preserv[ing] the cultural wealth" of their native peoples, immigrant settlers and other ethnocultural groups (Strom, 1971).

Following the course of the federal multiculturalism policy, Alberta also established a Cultural Heritage branch of the province's Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation in addition to a consultative body, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Council, to advise on policy issues. In 1984, four years prior to the enactment of the federal policy, Alberta took its own

policy into law as the Cultural Heritage Act, which also made provisions for the support of ethno-cultural languages (Alberta Cultural Heritage Act, 1984).

The Multicultural Committee of the UPBC were very well-connected, particularly in the wake of a newly elected Progressive Conservative Premier, Peter Lougheed, who was a personal friend of the Committee's co-chairman (Martorelli, 1990; Dawson, 1985). This influence made it easy to organize another meeting in 1973 of the Multicultural Committee and four cabinet ministers, after which the provincial government offered to finance eight Ukrainian-English pilot programs for grades 1 through to 3 in Edmonton (Martorelli, 1990). Though significant obstacles were encountered in finding qualified teachers, appropriate curriculum materials and transportation for the students from all over the city, the assessment of the three-year program was very favourable (Martorelli, 1990; Dawson, 1985). The evaluation revealed that the students had not just increased their Ukrainian language skills but also their English vocabulary and comprehension, as well as receiving superior¹³ scores on arithmetic tests (Martorelli, 1990; Ewanyshyn, 1985).

In the 1980s, Alberta passed three significant pieces of legislation: the *Alberta Cultural Heritage Act* (1984), *Alberta School Act Amendment* (1987) and a *Language Education Policy for Alberta* (1988). The first was the enactment of Alberta's 1971 multiculturalism policy, while the second amended the Alberta School Act to encourage the use of languages other than French or English to be used in all schools from Grade 1 to 12 as the language of instruction for up to fifty percent of the school day. It did, however, stop short of requiring boards to set up bilingual programs (Martorelli, 1990; Alberta School Act, 1970). This amendment was

¹³ The students in the Ukrainian –English bilingual program averaged test scores in vocabulary, comprehension and arithmetic that were higher than those of the students in the regular English program (Martorelli, 1990). This may be attributed to a number of factors, including increased parental involvement and student-centered instruction (see Read (1996) for similar results in late-immersion pilot programs in Australia).

followed by a third noteworthy step, the pronouncement of Alberta's new direction in a Language Education Policy.

Martorelli (1990) makes the case that, in Alberta, troubles that were encountered in the start-up and administration of subsequent HL schools resulted from practical issues of space, enrolment, curriculum development and feasibility. He maintains that any opposition to the programs did not stem from "ideological reasons or concerns regarding the legitimacy of such program[s] in the school system" (Martorelli, 1990: 62). This lack of resistance may be partly attributed to the fact that much of Alberta's immigration took place early on in Canada's history, prior to the outbreak of the First World War, and thus the longstanding groups, such as the Ukrainians, are considered not only immigrants but 'founders' of Alberta (Martorelli, 1990: 47).

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, Alberta was receiving a steady annual flow of nearly 20,000 immigrants, many of whom were not of European origin (Frideres, 1998). Though the recession of the 1980s had levelled immigration,¹⁴ as immigration returned to pre-recession levels, the province began to see its demographic transform, particularly in terms of the source countries of its new immigrants (Frideres, 1998). Between 1986 and 2001, Calgary's share of the province's immigrant population climbed from 38% to 45% (Justus, 2004), shifting away from its traditionally British and American immigrant base. For the Calgary and Edmonton residents who immigrated to Canada between 1991 and 2001, the top five countries of origin were in Asia (Justus, 2004). The 2001 Census laid bare the resultant shift in mother tongues, reporting that of the approximately 15 percent of Albertans who spoke a non-official language, 2 percent indicated that Chinese¹⁵ was their

¹⁴ Immigration dropped to a low of 9000 in 1985 (Frideres, 1998).

¹⁵ Statistics Canada's (2001b) designation Chinese includes a tally of Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka and other varieties.

mother tongue, followed by German, Ukrainian, Punjabi, Polish and Spanish (Statistics Canada, 2001b).

Provincial reports throughout the 1990s reveal that the government had started to look to Asia for new investment while some Asian countries, particularly Japan, were also beginning to take notice of Alberta (Alberta Japan Office, n.d.; Consulate General of Japan at Calgary, 2003). The Japan Foundation, as well as the Asia-Pacific Foundation of Canada, began promoting Asia through language courses and cultural events (Tavares, 2000). In 1995, the province released the details of a new curriculum that would introduce Japanese language and culture classes (Alberta Education, 1995). It was apparent that language was no longer being considered just an advantage to bilingual individuals. A report from 2000 regarding investment strategies, *Framework for Alberta's International Strategies* (Alberta, 2000), emphasizes Alberta's linguistic diversity as key to creating new business opportunities. Its 'action plan' sets sights on increasing enrolment in international and second language programs which stress fluency rather than 'cultural maintenance' (Tavares, 2000; Alberta, 2000). At the same time, the government was taking a closer look at language learning in the province, particularly enrolment, (Alberta Education, 2000), retention (Sokolowski, 1999) and the need for added instructional hours (Sokolowski, 1999).

Most recently, Alberta's Commission on Learning (Alberta, 2003) has pushed the province to take more expansive and decisive action. The government gave support to 84 of its 95 recommendations which included placing more emphasis on second language education, thus demonstrating its intentions to put support behind a number of initiatives (Alberta Learning, 2003). In response to Recommendation 8 of the Commission's report, the government responded that they want every Alberta student, from grade 1 to 9, learning a language in addition to English or French by 2011 (Alberta, 2005). It looks as though

Alberta will continue to remain a trail blazer, taking full advantage of its citizens as vital resources for Alberta's future.

2.1.2.2. Ontario

Though many more of Canada's early immigrants settled in the prairies, since World War I and II, most subsequent immigrants see Ontario, 'Canada's industrial heartland', as their premier destination (Martorelli, 1990; King, 1998). Today, almost three-fifths (58%) of newcomers settle in Ontario, particularly in the urban corridor from Toronto to Windsor (CBC News, 2003).

In 1971, more than half of Torontonians were immigrants and 31% of the residents of Canada's largest city spoke neither French nor English as their first language (Bublick, 1978). In 1975, 45% of all elementary school students in the City of Toronto did not have English as their first language (Bublick, 1978). In 2001, just over 2 million (44%) of Torontonians were born outside Canada, with China, India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Korea being the most common countries of origin. As only half of Toronto's inflow comes from these countries, the result has been an exceptionally diverse city (Justus, 2004). Furthermore, recent immigrants are no longer heading into the downtown core. In 2001, the surrounding towns of Markham, Richmond Hill and Mississauga actually had proportionally higher numbers of school-age children of immigrants (1 in 4) than Toronto proper (where only 1 in 6 school-age children of immigrants are living) (CBC News, 2003).

It was at the centre of this cultural melange that the province established the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism [OACM], which was appointed to "advise the government of Ontario's policies with direct implications for Ontario's cultural communities" (Bublick, 1978: 17). Similar to the national and Alberta advisory councils, the OACM immediately made calls for the Ontario government to provide support for HLs. In the Ontario case, the OACM pressured the province to authorize instruction in languages other than French or English (OACM, 1974; Bublick, 1978). The Council further advocated

that the province more actively “inform the public about the policies of the government in the area of third language education and instruction and about the facilities available” for HL instruction (OACM, 1974: 6). By 1975, the Ministry of Education [OMOE] had also set up its own internal multicultural committee to examine policies and prepare recommendations for the ministry (Bublick, 1978). In the same year, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation was established to support cultural maintenance and break down the barriers to full participation in Ontario (Bublick, 1978).

In the spring of 1977, the Government of Ontario at long last announced an official policy of multiculturalism¹⁶ (OCAM, 1978). Ontario’s Premier William Davies affirmed the province’s acceptance and admiration of its “multicultural character” and its belief “that encouraging children to understand the language and culture of their parents contribut[ed] to the quality of both education and family life” (Ontario Throne Speech, March 29, 1977 cited in Bublick, 1978: 21). He declared that the province’s policy on multiculturalism warranted a ‘third-languages’ policy and soon announced that the province would pick up the tab for 25% of the costs of teaching HLs through Continuing Education grants (CEA, 1983). The Ontario Heritage Language Program [OHLP] would, however, restrict funding to 2½ hours a week of instruction to be held *outside* regular school hours in extended-school day or Saturday classes (Cummins, 1994a) or no more than 2½ hours a day in the case of summer school classes (Bublick, 1978). The province did not, however, authorize the in-school instruction in non-official languages, relegating their use to ‘Saturday’ schools.

Even before the Ministry of Education established the OHLP, Toronto¹⁷ teachers had made public their stance on third language instruction. They contended that promoting

¹⁶ This policy was formally legislated in 1982 (Library of Parliament, 1999).

¹⁷ Here I use ‘Toronto’ to refer to the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) or Metropolitan Toronto which includes the Toronto School Board (Toronto), the Peel School Board (Mississauga) and York School Board (York Region).

mother tongues strengthened student self-esteem while their exclusion from the classroom could hinder academic achievement (Martorelli, 1990). The Toronto School Board [TSB] and Toronto Catholic School Board [TCSB] (the province's largest school boards) had already had substantial experience administering HL classes. As early as 1973, the TCSB, for instance, had been collaborating with community organizations and had begun piloting "Heritage Languages" classes for some 5,700 children in 14 schools" (Toronto Catholic District School Board, n.d).

During the first year of the OHLP (1977-78 school year), Natarajan (1991) counted 42 school boards receiving funding for 2000 classes in 30 languages to more than 50,000 students. In Toronto alone, there were 6255 students enrolled in 275 classes learning 13 different languages (Bublick, 1978). The school boards of Toronto, York and North York all publicly endorsed third language teaching. However, they argued that, ideally, third languages would be a part of the regular curriculum (Bublick, 1978).

The campaign to bring HLs into classrooms did not end there. Members of Ontario's Parliament were also advocating the integration of third-languages into the curriculum. In 1974, a private members' bill was introduced by Jan Duksza (NDP) to "enshrine into law the right of students to have a heritage language education either as a subject of instruction or a language of instruction," but it did not move past its second reading in 1978 (Bublick, 1978: 42). In 1986, when OHLP enrolment had almost doubled from the start of the program¹⁸ (Natarajan, 1991, 41), another private members' bill was submitted. Bill 80 asked that HL instruction be held during regular school hours, but despite receiving approval, the bill disappeared into 'review' between its second and third readings (Grande, 1987).

¹⁸ 91,110 students (versus 50,000 students in 1977/78) were enrolled in 4,364 classes which were teaching more than fifty languages with a cost to the province of \$11.5 million (Natarajan, 1991).

More than a decade after its original announcement, in the same year that the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988) was passed, the Ontario government released a discussion paper which renewed its commitment to the OHLP by means of increased training opportunities and materials development. Most significantly, it decided that no longer would the establishment of HL programs be at the discretion of school boards. The approved Bill 5 (1989) amended the Education Act, making it mandatory that boards offered a HL program at the request of the parents of 25 or more elementary school students (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1987; Natarajan, 1991). The policy paper made it explicit that the “inclusion of heritage language learning in the regular school curriculum [was] *not* advocated by the Ministry as it would result in an excess of technical complications from transportation to finding “equally appropriate and relevant learning opportunities for children not involved in heritage language instruction” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1987: 3).

In the 1994 Royal Commission on Learning, more recommendations were made regarding international languages, but yet again, there was no endorsement to make international languages a part of the regular curriculum. The Commission stood firm, stating that the international languages programs should continue, but that languages other than French or English should not be made languages of instruction, and furthermore, that bilingual schooling would not be in the cards for the province in the near future (Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994).

In sum, Ontario students must study French until the ninth grade; it is not until high school that students have the option of continuing learning French or starting with another¹⁹ language (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1999). The languages taught in high schools are

¹⁹ The languages taught in public secondary schools are dependent upon the linguistic abilities of teachers and not the size of a certain language community.

not determined by the province or the district, nor do they necessarily reflect the community demographic. For instance, Japanese may be taught even though Portuguese is the most widely spoken language in a district or school. The language options generally depend on the language skills of the teachers already teaching, in the language department or elsewhere in the school.

Other languages are taught outside²⁰ school hours through community-organized, provincially supported programs which are generally taught on the weekends. By making an application to the Continuing Education Department of the school board, a community can establish international language classes outside school hours so long as there is an enrolment of at least 25 children²¹ (TCDSB, n.d). High school students may study a heritage or international language for an unspecified credit. However, while all courses follow ministerial guidelines and are offered as credits towards a high school diploma, there is no set provincial curriculum or testing in place (TCDSB, n.d; Hamilton-Wentworth, n.d). Since the 1987 *Proposal for Action*, the provincial government has not made many changes to the current system, though continuing education grants were reduced through a funding formula change by the Progressive Conservative government in Bill 160 (Legislature of Ontario, 2000). In June 2004, after the election of a new Liberal government, the first funding increase (2%) since 1977 was announced for the International Languages²² Program (International Language Educators Association, n.d). This move may indicate that the

²⁰ If the parents of at least 67 percent of the elementary students in a school request that a program be established during an extended school day, it is possible to have the school day lengthened to accommodate the classes (Toronto Catholic District School Board, n.d). Presently the TCDSB offers four languages: Ukrainian, Portuguese, Spanish and Italian under the extended day model and 23 outside regular school hours (Toronto Catholic District School Board, n.d).

²¹ Any student who is currently enrolled in one of the district's elementary or secondary schools is eligible to attend an international language class.

²² In October 1993, the government made a change in terminology moving from 'Heritage Languages' to 'International Languages' (International Language Educators Association, n.d).

province is finally prepared to discuss the future of HL education and perhaps its integration into the Ontario curriculum.

2.1.2.3. British Columbia

Each year, almost a fifth (17.5%) of immigrants to Canada head to British Columbia [BC] (CBC News, 2003), representing three-quarters of the province's recent growth (Ward, 2002). BC immigration patterns with Ontario's in two ways. First, the majority of its immigrants and their children (76%) are flowing to urban centres. The annual in-flow accounts for 1.4% of Vancouver's population (Justus, 2004). In 2001, the city of Richmond had the highest proportion of school-aged immigrants²³ (32%) compared to Vancouver (24%), Coquitlam (22%) and Surrey (11%), all of which are within a 100 kilometer radius on British Columbia's lower mainland (CBC News, 2003). Secondly, like Ontario, the most common country of origin for new Canadians is China, followed by India, the Philippines, Korea and Taiwan. As a result, of the 37.6% of Vancouver residents speaking a non-official language, Chinese was the most widely spoken as mother tongue (15.2%). However, in Abbotsford, where 23.9% of residents had a non-French or -English mother tongue, the most prevalent first-language was Punjabi (Ward, 2002; Canadian Heritage, 2001b).

British Columbia, specifically the Lower Mainland, has a long-standing immigrant population (CIC, 2000); nonetheless, it was not until very recently that the province conferred legislative authority to its previous policies on multiculturalism in the form of the Multiculturalism Act of 1996 (Tavares, 2000). Unlike the case of Ontario, it was a province-wide review of public schooling, the 1987-90 Royal Commission on Education (or the Sullivan Commission), that finally provided the impetus for a fresh approach to HL education. As the final reports of the commission were being released, the BC Ministry of Education [BCMOE] formed the Educational Policy Advisory Committee [EPLAC], composed of various stakeholder groups, including teachers, administrators, board trustees

²³ One in six (17%) of school-age children living in Vancouver immigrated within the past ten years (CBC News, 2003).

and a representative of 'minority ethnocultural communities', to develop a response to the recommendations of the Sullivan Commission (Beynon & Toohey, 1991). Within this body, an ad hoc sub-committee, the Heritage Languages Advisory Committee [HLAC], was also established.

The working plans of the Educational Policy committee demonstrated a clear belief that language instruction was vital to safeguard the province's cultural diversity. By the beginning of the 1990/91 school year, the BCMOE had set up the first government-sponsored HL pilot classes and begun developing HL curriculum and guidelines (BCMOE, 1989, 1990a). The third volume of the working plans outlined a ten-year schedule (through to 1998/99) of implementation which detailed the funding of HL programs, and teacher training, as well as the development of HL bursary and cultural exchange programs (BCMOE, 1990b).

At the same time, the adjunct HLAC published its own policy recommendations; they are basically three-fold, dealing with matters of program development (including funding and other support), teacher training, and information sharing. To address the first matter, program development, the Committee directed the BCMOE to "provide and support opportunities for learners to acquire or maintain HLs through a variety of programs" that met the needs and interests of learners (Beynon & Toohey, 1991: 610). In particular, the Committee stressed the integration of programs into regular school hours, ensuring that adequate funding was provided for the successful implementation and maintenance of the programs (Beynon & Toohey, 1991). Next, it recommended that training was made available to educators to develop their skills in teaching HLs. Lastly, the Committee proposed that the BCMOE take care to include all stakeholders in discussions of

HL education in addition to promoting the HL policies and programs to the wider community (Beynon & Toohey, 1991).

The BCMOE responded very positively and incorporated most of these suggestions into its *Year 2000 Framework for Learning* (1990c) which formally recognized HL education “as a legitimate component of the Humanities strand which runs through primary to intermediate and graduation programs” (Beynon & Toohey, 1991: 609; BCMOE, 1989, 1990b, 1990c, 1990d). *The Year 2000 Curriculum Framework* (1989) left the option for second languages at the elementary level but instituted mandatory second language study at both the intermediate and secondary levels. Though the earlier drafts of this document named French as the requisite language, this proposal was met by an opposition which felt “that mandated French [would] increase the drop-out rate” (BCMOE, 1990d: 27).

Soon after, a new ministry division, dedicated to multiculturalism and human rights, was established, and by the following year, Multiculturalism BC began administering modest HL grants to supplemental HL schools (Multiculturalism BC, 1994). In its first year running, 139 supplemental schools were awarded grants for the teaching of 22 languages to 15,463 students. Approximately 17% of the ministry’s program funding was allotted to HL supplemental schools, awarding a total of \$177,380 or \$20 per student (Multiculturalism BC, 1995). By the 1998-99 school year, the number of students in the after-school and ‘Saturday’ programs had grown significantly to more than 20,000 students studying 28 languages at 159 schools across the province (BC Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration, 1999).

By 1994, BC’s *Language Education Policy* had determined that all students should have the opportunity to learn languages significant within their communities (British Columbia Heritage Language Association, 2002) and BCMOE began developing a revised curriculum

for the five ‘international’ languages – Chinese (Mandarin), German, Japanese, Punjabi and Spanish - to be taught from grades 5 to 12 during school hours and by distance education (BCMOE, n.d).

At present, all BC students are required to study a second language (French or another language) between grades 5 and 8. Moreover, many²⁴ school districts offer second languages other than French from grade 9 to 12. Second language courses using BCMOE approved curriculum are considered acceptable credits that can be applied toward students’ second language requirement and are also tested by provincial exams (BCMOE, 1990d). Language curriculum has also been developed for two other languages, Italian and Farsi (mainly as the result of community initiative), and they are thus permitted to be taught in the public school system. However, the BCMOE has since shifted the responsibility and costs of curriculum development to individual communities (B. Bouska, personal communication, November 28, 2000).

In the same vein of cost-saving, the 2000/01 Report on Multiculturalism (published by the newly restructured Ministry of Multiculturalism and Immigration) stated that it had decided to shift its focus to English as a Second Language [ESL] standards and teaching. This shift has resulted in the slashing of funding to supplemental HL schools; in its place, \$59.5 million in ‘block’ funding was provided to school boards for ESL training (Ministry of Multiculturalism and Immigration, 2001).

Seven languages (American Sign Language, French, German, Japanese, Mandarin Chinese, Punjabi, and Spanish), in addition to a number of aboriginal languages²⁵, continue to be taught in the schools but the choice of language varies dramatically from school board

²⁴ As there is no complete survey of international languages offered by school districts in British Columbia, the exact number of school boards offering second languages other than French has yet to be determined.

²⁵ Some of the aboriginal languages developed through the BCMOE include Shashishalhem, Sim'algaxhl Nisga'a, Upper St'at'imcets, Sm'algyax, Secwepemctsin, and Heiltsuk (BCMOE, 2004).

to school board (BCMOE, 2004). While schools in the Lower Mainland may offer two or three of the languages in addition to French, many schools away from the urban centers do not offer anything other than French.

2.2. Language Maintenance & Loss

Nearly a quarter (23%) of the population aged 15 and older are first generation Canadians, a figure which has not been this high since 1931. Second generation and third generation Canadians account for about 17% and 58% of the Canadian population, respectively. It is indeed impossible not to recognize that Canada is a multicultural, multiethnic, and multilingual country whose diversity is still growing (Statistics Canada, 2003a). In 2001, almost half of all first generation Canadians were of non-European backgrounds (most frequently Chinese, East Indian²⁶, Filipino and Vietnamese) and just about a third were of European heritage (with Italian, German, Portuguese and Polish being the most common origins) (Statistics Canada, 2003a).

Over a generation, the demographic of new Canadians has radically changed. Of the 3.9 million second generation Canadians (aged 15 and older), 4 in 10 have only European ethnic ancestry (German, Italian, Dutch, Ukrainian and Polish being the most common origins), with just 10% having only non-European origins²⁷, of which the most frequent ancestries were Chinese and East Indian (Statistics Canada, 2003a).

It is not surprising that the proportion of Canadians speaking a non-official languages at home doubled, from 1.6 million in 1971 to 3.1 million in 2001 (Canadian Heritage, 2003). Nonetheless, most Canadians can speak one of the official languages. The last census (2001) revealed that only 1.5% of Canadians speak neither French nor English (Statistics Canada, n.d), as more Canadians than ever before are indicating an ability to speak both official languages (Statistics Canada, 2002c).

²⁶ The designation 'East Indian' includes responses of only East Indians and Indians from India. Punjabis, Pakistanis, Sri Lankans and other groups were counted separately (Statistics Canada, 2003a).

²⁷ The group of second generation immigrants of non-European origin tends to be younger than others in the second generation because, for the most part, they are the Canadian-born children of immigrants who came from Asia since the 1970s (Statistics Canada, 2003a).

Yet, in spite of the rising numbers and linguistic diversity²⁸ of immigrants arriving in Canada each year, as was indicated in Chapter 1.0, multilingualism is not increasing. In fact, it plunges with Canada's citizens who are second or third generation immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2003a). This is not a recent trend, but an established and undeniable fact.

2.2.1. Language Shift = Cultural Assimilation?

Many researchers equate language shift, the gradual replacement of one's first language by another, with cultural assimilation. However, this equation continues to be a matter of litigious debate which questions if culture and ethnic identity can exist after language shift. Numerous studies (Statistics Canada, 2003a; Jedwab, 2000; Fishman, 2000) seem to support a 'yes' answer that ethnic identity lives on even after an individual gives up his/her language. In the most recent Canadian census, Jedwab (2000) notes that many more Canadians identify themselves with a particular ethnic group than can actually speak an ethnic (or non-official) language. A 2001 poll by Statistics Canada and Canadian Heritage saw similar results, though their findings fit more closely within the traditional concept of assimilation. The poll, unlike the Census, approaches assimilation more directly by asking: (a) how strong respondents' sense of belonging was to their ethnic or cultural group(s); (b) how strongly they valued ethnic customs and traditions; and (c) how often they had been in contact with family in their country of origin. First generation immigrants who had arrived in the past ten years all reported strong ties with their community, traditions and home country, whereas the strength of relationships and ties to their "homeland" waned with immigrants who arrived prior to 1991 and diminished even more significantly for the second and third generations.

²⁸ These newcomers generally speak their mother tongue and more than half are at least partially bilingual in an official language (CIC, 2002).

In spite of the vast numbers of speakers of non-official languages, little empirical research has been done on language use among minorities in Canada, particularly when compared to the stacks of studies investigating the use of Canadian official languages. Lieberman (1970) completed the first study to consider language maintenance among minority groups based on census data. His study focuses on the reasons for shift, or lack thereof, by official language minorities, particularly for Francophones outside Quebec. In the maintenance of bilingualism, Lieberman noticed there was a greater likelihood for two groups to maintain their bilingualism, the urban children of bilingual parents and men. The children of bilingual parents living in cities had slightly better odds than children outside cities for the maintenance of French, which Lieberman attributes to their access to French-medium instruction. The second gap revealed that men were more likely to maintain bilingualism into adulthood. He ascribes this difference to the 'occupations pressures' operating on men in the workforce as bilingualism in French and English provided employment rewards. Though Lieberman avers that ethnicity can be maintained without mother tongue, his final words are the most telling where he concludes that "mother-tongue maintenance is a central feature in the continuity of an ethnic group in contact" (Lieberman, 1970: 250). This conclusion stands out against the classic study by Fishman (1966) of immigrant culture and language retention in the United States which make a case for ethnicity persisting long after ethnic language loss.

A second study of census data by O'Bryan et al. (1972) does not wholly disagree with Fishman's position, although the authors side with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, taking the position that language retention is vital to cultural retention. Considering the variables of 'mother tongue' and 'home language' and the shift from using the mother tongue to a another language in the home, O'Bryan et al. (1972: 165)

conclude that “an immense cultural resource is almost lost in a single generation”, reporting that fluency was claimed by only one in ten of second generation immigrants and had “disappeared entirely in third and subsequent generations.” In a similar study using 1986 census data, Pendakur (1990: 1) clarifies the issue, “when discussing the maintenance or shift of immigrant languages, the question is not ‘*Will a group lose the use of a non-official language,*’ but rather, ‘*When will the language be lost?*’”

Even in the face of the continued movements to maintain and revitalize languages in Canada, the three-generational language shift is still very much the reality. Following six²⁹ long-standing ethnic communities in Canada’s metropolitan areas by using census data from 1991 to 1996, Jedwab (2000) reveals that the rate of shift (or transfer) to French or English varies with each community, due in part to external factors such as further immigration. The Chinese community, which had been replenished with native speakers with the steady immigration from 1991 to 1996, had significantly lower rates of shift (16%) to English in comparison with older immigrant groups without continuing immigration such as Ukrainian (75%), Italian (47%), and Polish (42%).

The analysis also adds force to the argument that diversity encourages more diversity, for it is in the urban centres of Toronto and Vancouver that Jedwab (2000) found the highest rates of language maintenance for all six language groups. Moreover, in regions with Francophone populations, non-official language bilinguals have high rates of sustaining their HL, which evinces a relationship between HL maintenance and trilingualism. Immigrants learn the predominant language (French), the language of economic mobility in North America (English), and continue to use their HL. This finding makes it clear that HLs do not interfere with the acquisition of the official languages. It also suggests a reciprocal

²⁹ Jedwab (2000) focuses on the Chinese, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Ukrainian, and Polish communities in Canada.

relationship in which the promotion of HLs supports official language bilingualism and vice versa; a fact very significant for HL as well as official language planning.

Language shift is not limited to only HL speakers. It is an established and well-documented process for francophones outside Quebec (Castonguay, 1998), in other countries (Mukherjee, 2003; Hulsen, De Bot & Weltens, 2002; Raschka, Wei & Lee, 2003), particularly the United States (Alba, Logan, Lutz & Stults, 2002; Fishman, 1966; Portes & Hao, 2002; Veltman, 1983) and for a variety of language communities. Fishman (1966, 1991) encapsulates this shift in a model of language maintenance in which minority languages cease to be passed from parent to child within three generations. In second generation, it can be difficult to estimate the number of speakers claiming non-English mother tongues, as this fluctuates with a number of variables such as the size of the community, length of residence and exogamy, but by third generation, as a general rule, the languages will no longer be spoken (Fishman, 1966).

Veltman (1983) builds on Fishman's (1966) research, using American census data to demonstrate a 'two-generational' shift to English. Generally recent immigrants, while they take up English as their main language for everyday, do continue to use their mother tongue. With time, their second language replaces the first as the usual language, though the rates of this shift are distinct for each ethnic group.³⁰ However, any variation in levels of shift among foreign-born immigrants with non-English mother tongues can be averaged out to an 'anglicization' rate of approximately 90% for native-born second generation immigrants. According to Veltman, the figures are also very much in line with the Canadian census

³⁰ Veltman (1983) also observes that there was a growing tendency to adopt English in all age groups but highlights the marked increase in anglicization during the teenage and early adult years, most notably once a child enters school. Though some groups' shift to English has been more gradual, he attributes this to the size of the immigrant group, their demographic concentration, and a continuing flow of new immigrants from the language group.

figures for 1971, and consequently he comes to the same conclusion as do all the previous researchers, that *no immigrant group is 'immune' to language shift*.

2.2.2. Why Does Shift Occur?

Hinton's (2001b) collection of first generation Asian-American students' 'linguistic autobiographies' reveals the most prominent reason for language shift or 'involuntary language loss', as she terms it. The most common feature of the more than 250 autobiographies examined is the fact that children "buy into [a] system of belief" that they must entirely reject their language in order to truly be a part of American society (Hinton, 2001b: 203).

The pressure to assimilate is an extremely powerful social force in the North America particularly for minority children (Schrauf, 1999). In Canada, the dominant language of English (or French in Quebec) permeates the classroom and the playground at schools. Aware that English is positively received by their teachers and peers, minority students generally bring the same attitudes into their homes even though they realize that their parents prefer the use of their HL. Children also intuitively recognize that their teachers and peers disapprove of the use of a 'heritage' language; this realization causes children to distance themselves from ethnicity through rejecting the most salient feature of their ethnicity, their language (Hinton, 2001b). In an ethnographic study of a monolingual French school in Toronto, Heller (1999) found that while bilingual students acquiesced to French in classrooms and with teachers, the informal language among their peers was English.

Caldas and Caron-Caldas' (2002) report on the language use of their three French-English bilingual children in Louisiana is perhaps one of the most indicative studies of

adolescent pressures to assimilate to the dominant culture. Although it has long been argued that home language determines a child's propensity for bilingualism, Caldas and Caron-Caldas demonstrate a striking preference for monolingualism in English even if when children are schooled in French and French is consistently used by their parents in the home. Even more interesting is the fact that their English monolingualism is replaced by French monolingualism during the summers spent in Quebec, and once again with English when back with their French-English bilingual friends in Louisiana.

These two ethnographies expose the assimilatory pressures, though in both cases, all the subjects of the study have access to both languages as they are educated in the minority language. However, most minority language children do not generally attend HL-medium schools where they can experience their language in use and so are faced with even more powerful assimilative forces. Hinton's (2001b) linguistic autobiographies document how teasing and mockery or simply alienation inflicted upon immigrant children about their language, culture or ethnicity, can drive them to lose every trace of their heritage to blend in with and be accepted by their peers. Many of the autobiographies underscore the children's and teen's shame of their origins, language and family which propels language shift.

When I entered [name] Junior High School, my attitude toward the Chinese language changed dramatically, partially because I was no longer protected by the innocence of childhood and partially because [name] was located in a less racially diverse neighbourhood. When some of my classmates began to ridicule and throw racist remarks at Chinese people, I began to distance myself away from the Chinese culture. I felt ashamed when my parents spoke to me in Cantonese at a supermarket. I got into heated arguments about why only English should be spoken at home... I continuously tried to fit in, even if it meant abandoning culture and identity (Hinton, 2001b: 229)

Immigrant youth are often conflicted: torn between their want to integrate completely and as they get older (particularly after high school), their desire to make their culture and language a part of their identity. Krashen (1998b) argues that when a HL

speaker has partial fluency, a kind of ‘language shyness’ develops around using the language. Being a member of the HL group by birth, HL speakers are only too aware of the fact that “their imperfections are very salient to more proficient speakers, who may respond by correction and even with ridicule” (Krashen, 1998b: 41). This not only impacts their self-esteem but HL speakers may stop using their HL altogether because it isn’t ‘fluent’, ‘grammatically correct’ or spoken ‘with a proper native accent’ (Krashen, 1998b: 43), leading to even lower proficiency in the HL, added insecurity and estrangement from their HL community.

Parents experience many of the same assimilative pressures felt by their children. For instance, the discouragement of the sole use of a HL by bilingual parents in the home is made clear in Pacini-Ketchabaw, Bernhard and Freire’s (2001) observations of Latin American, Spanish-speaking mothers’ interactions with those on the frontlines of the Toronto school system, teachers. Pacini-Ketchabaw et al. found that even when mothers were not explicitly being told that speaking Spanish to their children would slow down their academic progress and acquisition of English, the implicit devaluations of bilingualism were ubiquitous. Language and speech problems as well as schoolwork difficulties were often attributed to the use of Spanish at home. Furthermore, the lack of encouragement by the schools or other public institutions was breeding fear, even guilt, among mothers that their promotion of Spanish in the home was somehow harmful for their children. This situation is not unique and many bilingual parents choose not to speak their language for fear of interfering with the learning of the dominant language, which could disadvantage their children in the workforce (Baker & Jones, 1998; L. MacGregor, personal communication, August 9, 2003).

Mainstream monolingual schools have also been described as being at the core of the process of assimilation. For this reason, many parents send their children to supplemental HL schools to gain knowledge of their HL and culture. In Canada, these schools are commonplace, particularly in more urban settings, but how effective are these schools? What are their instructional expectations? Literacy? Fluency? Feuerverger's (1991) conversations with Toronto university students, many of whom attended HL classes, expose some of the inconsistencies and difficulties confronting HL learning in schools. Though their experiences are not the same, two common themes emerged. The first is the need to integrate HLs into the regular curriculum, not only to bring legitimacy to the language, culture and speakers, but also to provide greater support for curriculum, materials development, and teacher standards. What is more, many HL speakers also believe that the school system and its curriculum are ethnocentric and in need of a 'global perspective' which presents the histories and contributions of groups other than the British and the French. One Portuguese-Canadian student stressed this in his recount of his own experience:

In my (community) heritage language classes [which took place after school hours], there was nothing that was related to Canadian history. I would learn about the Portuguese presence all over the world (Vasco Da Gama, Magellan, etc.) and then I would go to regular English school and there was nothing about that. I used to think (and so did many of my peers) that what I learnt in heritage classes were lies, distortions (Feuerverger, 1991: 673).

Many of the interviewees came back to the significance that a community carries in a child's life, commenting on the fact that language simply could not be solely taught within the confines of a classroom. They highlighted the importance of literacy in the HL, knowledge of cultural traditions, and history, emphasizing that the community involvement in the education of their children was vital to HL maintenance.

Hinton & Hale (2001) stress that language is transmitted in a community-family setting and this must be the core of any language plan. Fishman (2000), too, is resolute in

his position that the reversal of language shift hinges on the transmission of language to infants and young speakers of child-bearing age. He argues that one of the problems that a community, like the rest of society, faces is the use of schools as a 'band-aid' for all social and education problems. While supplemental HL schools can diminish the value of minority language as they are not considered legitimate schools, mainstream schools have their own paradox. For adults and children, there is a line drawn between schools and 'real-life' which has perpetuated thinking that schools teach concepts and skills that are not exactly useful out there in the 'real' world, things one can live without outside school, such as hyperbolas and the periodic table. There is thus a real inclination to group language in with such subjects, particularly when languages are taught as grammar separate from any culture or people. This practice not only devalues language learning and multilingualism, but the speakers themselves.

Given the odds, the tremendous pressure to assimilate culturally, linguistically and socially, it is truly a feat to raise bilingual children. How does it happen? Practically all researchers would first respond that the HL is used as the main language of the home (Hinton, 2001a; Fishman, 1999, 2000). In cases where children attempt to refuse to speak their HL, parents take rigorous measures. Bilinguals often remember how their parents insisted that the HL would be spoken within the home (Hinton, 2001b). In cases of exogamy, parents enforce the 'one parent, one language' rule which expects children to use the mother tongues of the parents with each. Quite frequently, home use is supplemented with HL classes on the weekends or after-schools which teach literacy and language for more formal domains.

Other community members may also be drawn on to encourage positive feelings toward the HL and the actual acquisition of the HL. Parents promote pride in their heritage

by fostering a connection to the culture and the home country through television, movies in the HL, visits to the homeland and facilitating connections to the HL at large, all of which provide opportunities to make friends who speak the same language (Luo & Wiseman, 2000).

Maintenance of HLs is still uncommon for second and third generation immigrant Canadians. It is thus critical that we consider how the goal of bilingualism in one's HL and official language(s) can be facilitated. The next section builds on the knowledge gained from looking at how language has been successfully maintained to determine the role education can play in developing bilingual HL and official language speakers (and even trilingual HL, English and French speakers).

2.3. Successful Programs of Language Learning and Maintenance

Although there are billions of bilingual people in the world--it has been suggested that over half the population of the world is bilingual--deliberately raising a child bilingually turns out not to be an easy thing to do (Hinton, 2001:12).

Hinton (2001) directly addresses the predicament that all parents who aspire to raise bilingual children must confront. It is the same question that will be considered in this section. That is, how do we produce bilinguals? For the most part, bilingualism is the natural result of living in a bi- or multilingual context in which “one language is used at home and another in school or on the streets” (Hinton, 2001: 13). In other cases, bilingualism stems from exceptional teaching, exceptional language programs and exceptionally motivated learners.

The previous section exposed the pervasive language shift confronted by HL speakers as well as many other difficulties of developing bilinguals in Canada, demonstrating how rare bilingualism is within two generations of Canadian-born immigrants. Once a child leaves the home for school, using the HL becomes ever more challenging in the face of an overwhelming obstacle as another world takes over, a world of teachers, friends and all things connected to the dominant language. This is exactly the reason why language planners are predisposed to targeting education in strategies for language maintenance. School plays such an important part in a child’s life and cannot be, by any means, considered ‘just a place for learning math and science’. It is in the school setting that children develop their world views and are socialized, learning to conform to society’s standards of behaviour and language.

Consequently, it is unreasonable to suggest that, without purposeful action (or ‘language planning’), Canada could possibly sustain multilingualism past the first generation

of each wave of immigrants. Planned strategies for ensuring language maintenance almost always call for acquisition or language-in-education planning which takes into consideration how schools and other educational-type institutions and organizations safeguard languages. In Section 2.1., it was noted that language planners should consider the many other areas that are touched by language such as the public service, business, and media, but they will not be the subject of this section, though they resurface as side notes later on.

2.3.1. Language in Education

Baker and Jones (1998) propose ten types of bilingual education (illustrated in Table 1 below), which they classify as either *strong* or *weak*. *Strong* forms of bilingual education strive to produce bilingual and biliterate children, while *weak* forms of bilingual education, though they do not always explicitly discourage bilingualism, result in monolingualism, or at best, limited bilingualism.

A common example of the weak form is ‘transitional’ education or what is termed ‘bilingual education’ in the United States. These programs allow the minority or HL to be used on a transitional basis as the child acclimatizes to his new surroundings; but as soon as he is able, he is expected to replace his HL with English in the classroom (Baker, 1998). The purpose of this type of education is not to foster the home language but to smooth the replacement of a child’s HL by the dominant language. Other weak forms include mainstream education with second language lessons; they generally result in a very limited bilingualism which does not usually provide learners with general communicative competence for everyday conversation.

TABLE 1: WEAK AND STRONG FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM

WEAK FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM					
	Type of Program	Typical Type of Child	Language of the Classroom	Societal and Education Aims	Aim in Language Outcome
1.	Submersion (Structured Immersion)	Language Minority	Majority Language	Assimilation	Monolingualism
2.	Submersion (Withdrawal Classes/Sheltered English)	Language Minority	Majority Language with 'pull-out' lessons	Assimilation	Monolingualism
	Segregationist	Language Minority	Minority Language (forced, no choice)	Apartheid	Monolingualism
		Language Minority	Moves from minority to majority language	Assimilation	Relative Monolingualism
5.	Mainstream with Foreign Language Teaching	Language Majority	Majority language with L2/FL lessons	Limited Enrichment	Limited Bilingualism
6.	Separatist	Language Minority	Minority Language (out of choice)	Detachment/ Autonomy	Limited Bilingualism
STRONG FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM AND BILITERACY					
7.	Immersion	Language Majority	Bilingual with initial emphasis on L2	Pluralism & Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
8.	Maintenance/Heritage Language	Language Minority	Bilingual with emphasis on L1	Maintenance, Pluralism & Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
9.	Two-Way Dual Language	Mixed Language Minority & Majority	Minority & Majority Languages	Maintenance, Pluralism & Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
10.	Mainstream Bilingual	Language Majority	Two Majority Languages	Maintenance, Pluralism & Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy

From Baker & Jones, 1998

As this thesis is concerned with promoting multilingual and multicultural perspectives, it will only deal with the strong forms of bilingual education which do not push HL speakers to assimilate completely and shift to English monolingualism, but rather encourage an appreciation of and competence in two (or more) language(s). This result is not only the underlying theme of this study but its fundamental goal.

2.3.2. Language Programs

One need not look far away to discover a language maintenance program in the community. Yet as described in previous sections (2.1 and 2.2), the three-generational process of language shift has prevailed. Why are these programs not effectively sustaining HLs?

Previous ethnographic studies of bilingual schools such as Guthrie (1985) highlighted that a Chinese two-way immersion program in California was actually working as a transition program (to English) for Chinese immigrants and Chinese-American students. Consequently, it is crucial that longer-standing programs are examined in order to determine their success and whether their success can be transferred to a Canadian context. Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that many programs suffer from the lack of rigorous program evaluation or to proficiency testing (with exit tests, for example), the lack of both is likely to obscure the effectiveness of a language program.

The most successful language programs are those which have chosen to play down the classroom as the site of language transmission. Moreover, they work on the principle that language is acquired, not learnt. That is to say, language is not treated as a subject to be learnt but a medium for learning. It is obvious, however, that schools try to be practical and cost-effective; thus, central to all of these programs is classroom-based learning with some innovative features.

Forty years ago, in 1965, Canadian French immersion programs were first developed in Quebec for majority English-speaking students. The immersion curriculum generally offers the first few years of schooling largely or totally in French; gradually the amount of French is reduced, transitioning into English (approximately 50% of the school day), as high school approaches (Baker & Jones, 1998).

The countless evaluations of French immersion student progress provide consistent findings. Immersion students are able to acquire fluency and literacy without injury neither to their English academic skills (Cummins, 1998) nor to the depth and challenge of the curriculum. They are not only able to read, write, speak and understand English as well as students in English-medium classes but also are described as having superior competence in French to their Core³¹ French counterparts in mainstream schools. However, graduates of immersion report “high degrees of confidence [when] carrying out functional listening and reading in academic environments but... [are less confident] in the accuracy of their [French] writing and speaking skills” (Wesche, 1993 as quoted in Harley, 1993). Swain’s (2004) work reports the same gap in the grammatical aspects of immersion students’ speech and writing and has advocated that teachers use activities to bring more attention to form, pushing students to self-correct through scaffolding.

Many factors have contributed to success of French immersion; one of the most prominent is parental involvement. In general, parents who choose French immersion for their children are very enthusiastic about the program and work closely with the equally committed immersion teachers (Baker & Jones, 1998). Additionally, the French immersion programs in Canada, which are not compulsory, have waiting lists and might be considered exclusionary (Orwen, 2003). For instance, limited proficiency in a first language can earn a student the ‘label’, unprepared for the challenges of immersion learning, and because of school and parental screening, they are less likely to enter the program (Cummins, 1998; Statistics Canada, 2004b). This detail might partially account for some of the strong achievement showings by immersion students in standardized testing.

³¹ Core French refers to the study of a second language as a subject.

Furthermore, the fact that both French and English are majority languages in Canada lends a great deal of prestige to the program. Likewise, immersion teachers, who are fluent bilinguals, do their best to instill a belief that French is a language of value. Other factors are also psychological. For instance, students are able to learn French without losing their home language and are not forbidden to speak their first languages outside class (Baker & Jones, 1998). What is more, a small group of students begin the program with similar levels³² and together follow the course of the program which encourages strong friendships and social networks (R. Strandquist, personal communication, September 17, 2004), in turn promoting self-esteem and self-confidence.

Canada's French immersion programs have been widely cited and have served as a model for programs such as Australia's immersion for Languages Other than English [LOTE]. In this 'cold-start' program, freshman high school students enter immersion streams, learning basic language skills in Indonesian, French, German, Mandarin, Hebrew or Japanese, as they study core subjects such as Social Science, Science and Mathematics (Read, 1996). These late immersion programs, which feature annual four-week exchanges with a target language country or community, have been met with improved academic performance and very positive reviews by parents and students alike.

³² It should be noted that second or foreign language learning can differ significantly from heritage language learning. HL learners generally already have some knowledge of their HL but at the same time there is no consistency in their proficiency. For some, it may be a reactivation of their knowledge, for others it may be speaking practice that is needed; others' knowledge may be simply limited to a few phrases, and that still leaves the question of literacy. The range of levels in a classroom can be tremendous.

Second language classrooms most often deal with students with little or no previous knowledge of the language of study and who are at similar levels as they advance. Thus one of the challenges to HL education is taking advantage of HL learners' innate knowledge of the language. Chen (2004), in speaking of the diverse range of levels among University of British Columbia's Chinese language student population, proposes that distinct pedagogical categories be outlined in order to best support student needs in terms of teaching materials, methods, evaluation, educational psychology, and so on. These categories would include Teaching Chinese as (a) a Foreign Language, (b) a Second Language and (c) a Heritage Language.

As in the case of the Canadian immersion, students in Australia enter the program by choice.³³ Yet because it begins at the secondary level, the curriculum is much more demanding from the start and teachers must be even more prepared to support the language obstacles. Unlike other secondary school classrooms, the classes tend to be more student-centred to extend students' language skills (Baker & Jones, 1998). This likely indicates that the students entering the program are very motivated, outgoing and willing to take risks, all traits of great worth in language learning, which may elucidate some of the success of the program.

Long before the first immersion school in St. Lambert, Montreal, the Ukrainian communities of Alberta and Manitoba had already organized bilingual schools, though with the intensified xenophobic attitudes that accompanied the First and Second World Wars, they were forced to close (Martorelli, 1990). After the reversal of the Alberta School Act (and later Manitoba) which had banned languages other than English in schools, they were resurrected with provincial funding in the 1970s in Alberta, as discussed in Section 2.1.2.1.

Unlike the Canadian French immersion program, which teaches an official language, the curriculum of language maintenance programs is taught through both a majority and a minority language. Baker and Jones (1998) stress that because these programs are judged against regular mainstream monolingual schools, there is a compelling need to demonstrate that students in bilingual HL/official language schools have equal or better academic achievement to warrant the support of the province, parents and the greater community.

Other long-standing bilingual programs include a network of bilingual programs in Edmonton. Duffy (2004) reports that the Edmonton School Board offers full bilingual programs (50/50) in seven languages (American Sign Language [ASL], Arabic, Mandarin,

³³ The students, being young adults, are expected to have a great deal of input in the choice to enter immersion which may suggest that they are already strong students.

German, Hebrew, Spanish and Ukrainian) at twenty-seven district schools. Four of the languages (ASL, Mandarin, German and Ukrainian) are offered from kindergarten through Grade 12. The Mandarin bilingual schools in Edmonton began in 1982 with 33 students in a pilot kindergarten program; their enrolment has grown to more than 1700 students (Edmonton Chinese Bilingual Education Association, 2004). Last year, of the Edmonton board's 82,000 students, more than 6,000 were enrolled³⁴ in bilingual programs. Edmonton's bilingual program students have outperformed other Alberta students on district-wide English language exams and Alberta standardized tests. The difference is only marginal in Grade 3, but by Grade 6, German, Hebrew, Mandarin and Ukrainian bilingual students all did considerably better than mainstream Alberta students; by Grade 9 the gap is significant (Duffy, 2004).

Canada is also home to a number of other bilingual schools, but no provinces, with the exception of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, publicly support non-official language bilingual programs (Manitoba Education, Citizenship & Youth, n.d.; Richards, 1991). As a result, most bilingual schools in Canada are private, charging substantial tuition fees. However, there is much to be learnt from bilingual programs and it is hoped that researchers will put more energy into gaining access to the multitude of programs successfully developing bi-, tri- and polylinguals in Canada.

2.3.3. The Pre-Kindergarten Years

Like Canadians and Australians, the Maoris and Hawaiians have also recognized that classroom learning needs to be supplemented. Both have established that grass-roots

³⁴ Another 2,000 of Edmonton's students take part in French immersion (Duffy, 2004).

initiatives which emphasize community-based learning, aimed at the language needs of the whole family, can restore mother languages to the home (No'Eau Warner, 2001). For instance, immersion programs such as “language nests” (Hawaiian *Punana Leo* and Maori *Te Kohanga Reo*) employ the knowledge of elders as teachers while encouraging non-fluent parents to learn alongside their children (Hinton & Hale, 2001). The “language nests” feed into Hawaiian- and Maori-medium day-schools. Programs are offered in both languages at the post-secondary level (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001).

2.3.4. Other Innovations

Hinton and Hale (2001) set out the steps to the revitalization of native languages, even with minimal funding resources. Innovative and economic approaches such as the Master-Apprentice program aim to reproduce an immersion context in which a younger learner (the apprentice) is matched with a native speaker (the ‘master’ or mentor), with whom he lives on a full or part-basis for several months. The financial costs of the program are slightly less than other programs, but the cost results from the fact that both the ‘master’ and ‘apprentice’ are often required to take leave from their paid employment to commit themselves to this process of ‘natural’ learning and teaching.

The Master-Apprentice program works from the same principle as other immersion programs. It is a simple model that does not require substantial outside assistance and truly attempts to take advantage of a precious resource, elders. Not only are they native speakers with a wealth of knowledge of a community’s culture, traditions and history, but very simply, they just care. They have an investment in the community and want to be a part of it. The program, in some ways, is less of a program for language learning than an activity in strengthening community ties. However, strong community ties serve as a foundation for

language maintenance. HL speakers that feel a bond to their community (also described as ‘group membership’) have been shown to be more likely not to just acquire but maintain their HL (Tse, 1998).

There are many other variations on the immersion theme. The Government of Canada, for example, provides bursaries for any Canadian full-time student to study French in an immersion context, genuine or artificial³⁵ (Council of Ministers of Education Canada [CMEC], 2004). Many of the supplemental HL schools across Canada also attempt to provide HL-medium instruction, though the target of the instruction is generally not content but grammatical and written aspects of the language. This is much the same case for post-secondary classes offering credit in HLs. However, certain intensive language programs, such as the University of Toronto’s Japanese and Chinese language streams, have been known to produce students with advanced fluency and literacy after only two to three years of study (L. Saxon, personal communication, December 16, 2004; Wu, 2004).

2.3.5. What is Needed for Successful Heritage Language Learning and Maintenance?

Having only just examined a handful of bilingual programs, it is still possible to deduce the necessary elements for a successful program of HL learning and maintenance. On the surface, it is easy to recognize that they all use some form of immersion learning to varying degrees. This approach is important because it reinforces the notion that language is a way of life, “a social phenomenon not a schoolroom exercise” and “anyone that thinks otherwise is mistaken” (Kess, 1999: 71).

³⁵ The French-speaking population for each locale varies significantly from the very bilingual city of Ottawa, small Quebecois towns such as Chicoutimi, French enclaves such as St.Boniface, Manitoba, and even English-dominant cities such as Victoria, BC (CMEC, 2004). In Anglophone sites, the immersion is more artificial but with the signed commitment of students to speak French at all times, a great deal of learning still takes place. The program also offers Francophones the opportunity to study English in an English immersion setting.

It is not, however, simply the idea of being immersed in a language that leads to positive attitudes towards the maintenance of a HL. Each of the programs discussed creates close social networks that include parents, teachers, community and the students themselves, all of whom share a stake in the process. This intricate network serves as a net for support and motivation for all stakeholders. Group membership and the maintenance of that membership is one of the fundamental forces motivating individual choice, linguistic or otherwise (Yoon, 1996; Tse, 1998). In these cases, the program creates an inclusive setting which nurtures, promotes and validates students' first and second languages and cultures through challenging and interesting subject matter (whether by using the target language for studying regular school curriculum, playing sports, watching movies, composing a short story, or just by hanging out with their friends in the cafeteria). The use of two languages in a variety of situations and for different purposes naturally results in bilingual speakers. So it only makes sense that the same approach would make it possible to produce bilinguals more deliberately. All of these innovative programs maximize community resources. The programs expect a lot from their students, but also provide them with the environment to meet those expectations. Moreover, the students have not only met these expectations but are pushing beyond them. With support from government³⁶ and community, these achievements can translate into success in HL learning and maintenance, promising many future generations of bilinguals.

³⁶ Government support, not simply financial but for curriculum, teacher training, space, commitment of program continuance, has been vital to virtually all of the examples discussed.

3.0. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The great enemy of clear language is insincerity where there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, one turns as it were instinctively to long and exhausted idioms (Orwell, 1946).

Critical Discourse Analysis [CDA] is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of text and talk (i.e., discourse). Discourse is used everywhere for every type of interaction, from the supermarket to the floor of the House of Commons, expressing our feelings, our knowledge and how we see the world. When language or 'discourse' is used in politics and law, it has a great effect on power and inequality (Wilson, 1990). Moreover, our views are also shaped and constrained by discourse, thus without critical analysis of discourse to reveal "inequality and injustice denaturalize ideologies and demystify dominance and power," repression and marginalization will go unchallenged (Wodak, 1995). By critically examining discourse, it is possible to make the implicit, explicit (Wodak, 1995).

Generally, in the understanding of CDA, discourse is analysed to determine the significance, ideology and intent hidden in the words and sentences. We can also consider why certain words and ideas may have been left out of a given discourse. In the case of the federal approach to multilingualism as a principle of its multiculturalism policy, it is necessary to take the second approach more. The federal government, for the past three and some decades, has had little to say about the myriad of languages spoken by Canada's diverse population, though it can be depended upon to inject a regular dose of 'multiculturalism' into the national dialogue.

This chapter will adopt a critical perspective as it deconstructs federal (Section 3.1) and provincial (Section 3.2) discourse (legislation and policy) and action. Section 3.1 focuses on HL policy and legislation, giving prominence to the discourse of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and Annual Reports on the Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism

Act from 1988 to 2003. Section 3.2 considers the two provinces, British Columbia and Ontario (with reference to Alberta), contrasting the development and implementation of their HL policies and programs, particularly in the realm of education which is a provincial responsibility.

3.1. Canadian Context

From its conception, the official policy of Multiculturalism has been an issue of considerable contention. Bissoondath (1994), for instance, argues that the policy and the subsequent Multiculturalism Act (1988) have done little for minority culture and language, Balkanizing communities rather than bringing them together. It has also been argued that cultural and language maintenance inhibits the learning of an official language as well as integration into Canadian society (Lieberson, 1970). While the 1971 policy was arguably introduced as a device to quell minority group backlash over the declaration of English and French as official languages (Burnaby, 1996), its effect has been far-reaching.

Today, ‘multiculturalism’ underlies the Canadian political agenda and though it is highly politicized, the results of the policy are difficult to deny. ‘Multiculturalism’ is now a well-established word in Canadian households; it is considered fundamental to Canadian’s definition of self. There is a “society-wide acceptance” of the basic premises of multiculturalism—that Canada is a racially and culturally diverse country in which people are free to practice their own cultural traditions without prejudice (Cardozo & Musto, 1997: 13). This now has translated into more diverse faces in advertising and media, cultural sensitivity training in the workplace and in schools, and a more tolerant society. However, while Canadian society tolerates, accepts, and perhaps even values multiculturalism, the meaning encompassed in this concept still remains elusive.

This section investigates the government’s stated responsibility and shifting commitment to the principles of multiculturalism through a critical analysis of its policy, particularly in the form of the Multiculturalism Act (1988) which was supposed to act as a legislative base for the 1971 policy. First, this section deconstructs the Act, which recognizes the value of multiculturalism in law and outlines the resources provided for program creation

and implementation. This analysis helps to determine how authors of the Act saw the role of language in culture and in the advancement of the goals of multiculturalism. It then considers the Act's treatment of HL issues. Through an examination of the discourse and actions of the federal government (mainly from the Annual Reports of the Operations of the Multiculturalism Act supplemented by other public political discourse), it addresses how the government's laissez-faire approach to linguistic diversity has impaired cultural diversity and its maintenance. I argue that federal policies and action have excluded and diminished the value of languages and their role in sustaining multiculturalism. Moreover, the lack of support for HLs on a national level has demonstrated an attack on culture and the core value of multiculturalism; the construction of inclusive society that ensures access to and participation in Canada's social, cultural, and economic institutions for *all* Canadians.

3.1.1. 'Language' in Multiculturalism?

3.1.1.1. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act³⁷

The Multiculturalism Act is framed in the context of the Official Languages Act (1969), the Canadian Human Rights Act (1982), and other international agreements on civil rights and the elimination of racial discrimination, all of which deal with discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, religion or *language*. One such international agreement cited in the preamble to the Act, the *International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights*, states that “persons belonging to ethnic, religious or *linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture*, to profess and practice their own religion *or to use their own language*”³⁸ (Canadian Multiculturalism Act [CMA], 1988). Yet in the same preamble, the Government of Canada prefaces its own policy by “recogniz[ing] the diversity of Canadians as regards to race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society” (CMA, 1988), making *no* mention of linguistic diversity. Given the human rights assurances, including those of language guaranteed in the preamble, it seems logical that the Government would also recognize the diversity of languages as being a ‘fundamental characteristic of Canadian society’. Though the government presents international covenants which view language as a right, it was clearly not prepared to acknowledge the diversity of languages in Canada, let alone recognize them as a “fundamental” feature of the Canadian population.

The policy of the Act is set out in ten principles, the first declares it the government’s responsibility to “recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society” (CMA, 1988). Here, a working definition of ‘multiculturalism’ can be surmised from the statement that

³⁷ The Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988 is reproduced in Appendix I.

³⁸ Italics used here are my own.

Canada's "racial and cultural diversity" is a reflection of "multiculturalism" and thus it can be inferred that "racial and cultural diversity" are always understood. Most Canadians would not hesitate to include 'racial diversity' in their definition of multiculturalism, particularly in lieu of the fact that the official face of multiculturalism consists of reflecting the multi-racial reality on the covers of government reports, booklets, and other publications. However, while 'racial diversity' appears to be fairly straightforward, the meaning of 'cultural diversity', and particularly its relationship to linguistic diversity, is still under debate (Fishman, 1999).

Even after the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism's [RCBB] recommendation that 'ethnic' languages be taught in elementary schools and their explicit statement that language was the vehicle which would safeguard cultural diversity for future generations, Trudeau's official policy of multiculturalism did not reiterate the linkages between a culture and its language. The government, however, was later forced to admit that language maintenance would be instrumental in sustaining multiculturalism. It seemed that the debate would be settled in the Multiculturalism Act, especially after the Standing Committee of Multiculturalism also declared that the policy would be ineffectual without serious attention to language. After the incessant debate, it seemed necessary that the new Multiculturalism Act make explicit the government's understanding of 'culture'. That is, was language a part of culture, necessary for its maintenance, or were language and culture distinct without consequence for the other? Unfortunately, the Act did not elucidate the relationship between language and culture; as a result, the overlying notion of multiculturalism has remained tenuous and vague.

Section 3 of the Act declares it the responsibility of the Government of Canada to recognize and promote the understanding that it is the right of Canadians to "preserve,

enhance and share their *cultural heritage*.”³⁹ Yet the meaning of ‘cultural heritage’ remains indefinable as it is not clear what exactly constitutes ‘cultural heritage’. Does it refer to food, music, art, literature, dance, and dress – traditional and modern? Does it include systems of belief, ideology or religion? And does it include or exclude language? Nowhere in the Act does the government make clear its interpretation of ‘culture’. This omission has serious consequences for languages other than English or French, as the ambiguous expression of the Act allows ‘language’ to be both included and excluded from the definition of culture. Thus, the ill-defined concepts of ‘culture’ and ‘multiculturalism’ vary with each government, political party, and government report, being redefined to strengthen a host of political ideologies and agendas.

The policy objectives of the Act continually make reference to multiculturalism “as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian heritage and identity” which “provides an invaluable resource in shaping Canada’s future” (CMA, 1988: 3.1.b). The government is responsible for ensuring that “social, cultural, economic and political institutions [are] respectful and inclusive of Canada’s *multicultural* character” (CMA, 1988: 3.1.f). Yet how is the government expected to “advance *multiculturalism*” (CMA, 1988: 3.1.j), “encourag[ing] the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the *multicultural* heritage of Canada” (CMA, 1988: 5.1.d) or even review the operations of the *Multiculturalism* Act without an unequivocal or consensual understanding of ‘culture’ or the concept of multiculturalism? This case shows a parallel with the earlier example of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (see Section 2.1) as the primary goal was undermined through the use of obscure and undefined terminology (Romaine, 2002). The use of deliberately vague language in

³⁹ The italics are my own.

terminology and in defining its responsibilities allows the government to escape culpability--past, present or future.

The Act outlines the approach to be taken in implementing its policy goals, stating that the Minister may take the measures that he/she “considers appropriate” in implementing the Act. The Act asks the Minister to:

Encourage and assist individuals, organizations and institutions to project the multicultural reality. (5.1a)
Encourage and promote exchanges and cooperation among the diverse communities. (5.1c)
Encourage the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the multicultural heritage of Canada. (5.1e) (CMA, 1988).

These procedures for implementation (above) are weakened by the vague imprecise language in which they are stated. Even if it is contested that the mandate is not being fulfilled, the language of the Act promises no commitment to the implementation or the success of the policy. In the case of 5.1.e, *Encourage the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the multicultural heritage of Canada*, neither assistance (5.1.a) nor promotion (5.1.c) are promised, simply a very passive *encouragement*.

It is in the second to last item in the list of measures of implementation that the Act finally contends with the issue of language. Although the ‘language’ is relegated to the end of the list, its objective of “*facilitat[ing] the acquisition, retention and use of all languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Canada*” is clear (CMA, 1988: 5.1.f). The government’s role in this strategy of implementation is phrased straightforwardly. A conscious decision is evident not to preface this statement with word ‘encourage’,⁴⁰ (i.e., ‘encourage and facilitate’ or

⁴⁰ The Official Languages [OL] Act, also shows regular use of the expression ‘encourage’ through the articulation of its mandate (R.S., 1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.), s. 42; 1995, c. 11, s. 27.); however, it is clear that the OL Act has received substantially greater attention in funding and support for implementation, evaluation and research by the ministry charged with ensuring the mandate is met. Examples of the vague language of the OL Act are apparent in the following excerpt from the OL Act (Section 43.1).

‘encourage the preservation of...’), which diminishes the force of the other policy statements. The Act, however, fails to articulate an explicit connection between the “acquisition, retention and use” of languages and the implementation of a policy of ‘multiculturalism’. Nonetheless, though the connection is implicit, it may be reasoned that if language maintenance is a strategy for the realization of the multiculturalism policy, it must then follow that the Act’s working definition of multiculturalism necessarily includes linguistic diversity. By any definition, language is not a component of ‘race’, thus language must be encompassed within the interpretation of ‘culture’, and from this point forward, it will be assumed that the authors of the Act were of the same opinion.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage shall take such measures as that Minister considers appropriate to advance the equality of status and use of English and French in Canadian society and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may take measures to

- (a) Enhance the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in Canada and support and assist their development;
- (b) *Encourage* and support the learning of English and French in Canada;
- (c) Foster an acceptance and appreciation of both English and French by members of the public;
- (d) *Encourage* and assist provincial governments to support the development of English and French linguistic minority communities generally and, in particular, to offer provincial and municipal services in both English and French and to provide opportunities for members of English or French linguistic minority communities to be educated in their own language;
- (e) *Encourage and assist provincial governments to provide opportunities for everyone in Canada to learn both English and French;*
- (f) *Encourage* and cooperate with the business community, labour organizations, voluntary organizations and other organizations or institutions to provide services in both English and French and to foster the recognition and use of those languages;
- (g) *Encourage* and assist organizations and institutions to project the bilingual character of Canada in their activities in Canada or elsewhere; and
- (h) With the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into agreements or arrangements that recognize and advance the bilingual character of Canada with the governments of foreign states.

3.1.1.2. The Annual Reports, Other Discourse, and Federal Action

Eight of the sixteen recommendations in the RCBB's *Book IV: On the Contribution of Other Ethnic Groups* dealt specifically with languages other than French and English [LOFE]. The Commission was unequivocal in their belief that language and culture were interdependent. Moreover, they insisted that public schools were essential to the safeguarding of "other" cultures and directed the government to incorporate LOFE into the regular school day.

Prime Minister Trudeau's 1971⁴¹ speech made it clear that Canada was to have no official culture, but two official languages, English and French. Essentially, the policy recognized the multiplicity of cultures and the need to maintain them, but did so without any reference to 'language', failing "to address the linkage between culture and language, [denying] an essential element of self-identification for many ethnic groups" (Hudson, 1987: 64).

The federal government continued to ignore the RCBB's recommendations and did not assert an opinion on the language issue until the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism [CCCM] directed the government to integrate LOFE into the public school system. Eventually the government conceded that there was a link between language and culture and provided some funding for LOFE. But even then, the federal government did not "encourage" the provincial governments to incorporate LOFE in the classrooms (as had been done with French). Instead they gave a nominal subsidy to the communities themselves for supplemental HL classes under the Cultural Enrichment Program.

By 1987, the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism [SCM] set up to examine the multiculturalism policy, clearly expressed their views on the ineffectiveness of the aging

⁴¹ It took two full years before the federal government responded to Book IV, and unlike the Official Language Policy which was quickly enacted, the multiculturalism policy was not put into law until 1988, more than 15 years later (Canada, 1987).

policy. “The Multiculturalism Policy of 1971”, they wrote, “is clearly insufficient and out of date. It does not have the ability to respond to the needs of today’s multicultural society. There is a sense that this 15-year-old policy is floundering. It needs clear direction” (Canada, 1987: Preface).

The SCM argued that though the Charter of Rights and Freedoms had previously been revised to include a clause requiring that it be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians, it did not provide a legislative base for the multiculturalism policy which could support programs, a minister, or a department. Moreover, the policy did not even describe how it was to be implemented. Key to SCM’s solution for saving the ‘floundering’ policy was the enactment of the policy, stating that “it [was] time to further recognize the multicultural reality of Canada by giving [the] reality its own legislative base” (Canada, 1987: 18). Furthermore, the SCM argued for the “complementary nature of bilingualism and multiculturalism” citing the 1985 Official Languages Annual Report which endorsed multiculturalism and openly supported HL teaching (Canada, 1987: 19).

Following the SCM report, the Multiculturalism Act was passed with the preservation and enhancement of languages other than English and French as one of the fundamental principles of the Act. ‘Language’ was linked to ‘culture’ (albeit implicitly) in the Act and was promoted as such in talk and action by the new Minister of Multiculturalism. This implicit connection is evidenced by the funding of HL supplementary schools, and the passing of the bill to create the Canadian Heritage Language Institute [CHLI]. Support for the belief that HLs played an essential role in cultural maintenance and in breaking down of cultural barriers continued until about 1991. This was the year that the Cultural Enrichment

program was cut, the CHLI failed received the funding it had been promised, and the words “heritage languages” ceased to appear in the annual reports.

In the *First Report of the Operations of the Multiculturalism Act*, the new minister of Multiculturalism uses bold language, pledging “an active and energetic multiculturalism” (MCC, 1989: Forward). Remaining faithful to the commitments of the CMA, the minister sets out four policy directions to be the focus of funding and support: *Race Relations*, *Heritage Cultures and Languages*, *Community Support and Participation* and *Cross Government Commitment*. The Heritage Cultures and Languages Program aimed to assist Canadians in “preserving and enhancing” their rich cultural heritage (MCC, 1989: 25). It is apparent that in the 1988/89 Report that HLs were considered an essential part of ‘cultural heritage.’ ‘Language’ is plainly stated as a key component of Multiculturalism and as “one of the main vehicles through which a culture is expressed,” affirming one of the goals of the Multiculturalism Act itself—to “preserve and enhance the use of the languages other than English and French” (MCC, 1989: 25). Even the program which partially funds HL classes was called the *Cultural Enrichment Program*. The report also describes the creation of a new department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship, a “crucial development in the citizenship and national identity aspects of nation building,” affirming the inextricable link between language and culture (MCC, 1989: 3).

Conversely, since 1991, the federal government has avoided all discussion of Canada’s wealth of linguistic diversity and its array of languages other than French or English being taught in schools (in public and separate school boards, at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels and during regular and weekend programs). At the same time, the government never hesitates to tout Canada as ‘diverse’ and ‘multicultural’, flaunting its ‘cultural mosaic’ while consistently neglecting to mention its linguistic mosaic

and its non-existent support of the languages of Canada's many cultures. The government continues to support dance, music and food festivals but has discontinued support for one of the most tangible components of culture.

More recently, talk of 'language' is erratic and is generally non-existent except in some vague reference to 'linguistic diversity'. Moreover, the Ministry of Canadian Heritage refuses to support the development of language resources or to reaffirm the culture-language link set out by previous governments. In the introduction of the 1999/2000 Annual Report, the Minister of Canadian Heritage describes Canada as "a microcosm of all the world's "ethnic, religious, *linguistic*⁴² and racial diversity" (Canadian Heritage, 2001a: 1). In the next pages, she quotes the Prime Minister [PM] Jean Chrétien's speech in Berlin where he echoes the words of his minister, calling Canada "a post-national multicultural society...contain[ing] the globe within its borders" (Canadian Heritage, 2001a: 3). The PM stresses how "Canadians have learned that their *two* international languages and their diversity are a comparative advantage" (Canadian Heritage, 2001a: 3).

There is an intrinsic contradiction in these statements which tells the tale for the government's rapport with its *non-official* languages. While the minister advertises Canada's ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity, the PM tells Germany that Canada has *two* languages. He does not suggest that Canada has two official languages. Instead he says that Canada has *only* two languages and some formless diversity which, depending on the speaker, can include or exclude linguistic diversity.

In an Orwellian⁴³ fashion, HL maintenance was excluded as a principle of multiculturalism (an about turn from the interpretation of the Act from the previous two

⁴² The italics are my own.

⁴³ In Orwell's (1949) novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 'Newspeak' refers to the process in which words are narrowed to one meaning. In the context of the novel, this narrowing of meaning was thought also to limit one's

decades). While the federal powers may not be out to simply secure party loyalty, it is evident that they have attempted to control the public's understanding of 'multiculturalism'. Moreover, they have acted systematically to tear 'language' from 'culture', thus restricting 'multiculturalism' to only those meanings that fit within its ideology.

3.1.1.3. Valuing our Diversity? Language-as-a-Problem

The Canadian Multiculturalism Act clearly sets "the preserv[ation] and enhance[ment]" of HLs as fundamental to the safeguarding of Canada's cultures (CMA, 1988: 3.1.i). Though support for HLs was always in the context of "strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada" (CMA, 1988: 3.1.i), the government demonstrated an interest in language maintenance early on, though nowhere near as dedicated a policy as that towards the official languages. Contrary to the statement that official languages needed to be "*strengthen[ed] [in] status*," there was no equivalent statement for HLs, from which it may be inferred that it was believed that HLs had already been given sufficient status.

It is important to consider the words chosen to describe the federal responsibility in the Act, particularly those of 'preservation' and 'enhancement'. *Preserve*, for instance, is a term used to describe what is done to something dead and obsolete to prevent it from decay, whether a flower, a body or a language such as Latin, something that one cannot get back. The Act implies that the official languages needed to gain "status", while HLs, which were "old-fashioned", did not. Moreover, it seems that it was, and still is, preferred to just to *preserve* their marginal status in society.

understanding and ability to form concepts. The Party (the bureaucracy that rules Oceania in the novel) attempts to control or regulate the range of thought and expression of the general public to make it difficult to shape and develop individual thoughts. By eradicating the multiple meanings of a word, it was believed that the concepts would no longer exist as they were indescribable. For example, "the word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This field is free from weeds'. "It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free' since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts and were therefore of necessity nameless" (Orwell, 1949: 241).

The 2001/02 Report on the Multiculturalism Act highlights the need for federal institutions to “respect Canada’s multicultural character and reflect the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society” (Canadian Heritage, 2002a). These words are taken directly from the Multiculturalism Act. However, there is a clear divergence in the interpretation of these words from the 2001/02 Report to the Act itself. The Act interprets “cultural diversity” as including ‘linguistic diversity’, as demonstrated in Section 3.1.1., and was so interpreted by the governments in power previous to, and at the time, that the Act was enshrined into law, as evidenced by their support for language programs as perceptible support for ‘cultural diversity’. On the contrary, in the 2001/02 Annual Report, the words “cultural diversity” have been purged of their previous meanings, and their new meaning is not altogether clear. Policy directions and programming disregard HLs and push for “linguistic duality”. It seems clear that for the government of the time (which is the same at present), “cultural diversity” excludes ‘language’ from its consideration of ethnic, religious and racial diversity.

Yet, even as the words ‘heritage languages’ dropped from annual reports, ‘language’ was still being discussed. It is not uncommon to find a paragraph or two in the annual reports of the 1990s which acknowledge the “valuable economic assets” that have come from support of multiculturalism, such as “knowledge of languages, ways of doing business in other cultures and trade links” that have “provide[d] Canada with a competitive edge” (Canadian Heritage, 1995: 8). Federal ministries must also report their yearly efforts to recognize and reflect “multiculturalism”. The Ministry relays this information in its reports, often describing how federal institutions have employed the “special languages skills” of their employees (Canadian Heritage, 1996: 7). However, even the Ministry’s spin cannot diminish the importance that HL fluency has played in federal institutions at home and

internationally. Numerous federal agencies report how they have made use of employees' language abilities and how such abilities have been invaluable in communicating with potential trade partners, and securing contracts. For instance, the 1995/96 Report describes how the Canadian Grain Commission was able to secure a major contract with the Government of Hungary, "due in large part to [one] Hungarian speaking employee" (Canadian Heritage, 1997: 2).

Yet, in spite of HL speakers' contributions to business and government, above and beyond the duties of their positions, there is little recognition of their specialized knowledge. What is more, for the most part, when languages other than English or French are discussed in Canadian Heritage's Annual Reports, it is usually in conjunction with the description of problem to be "managed" or "accommodated"--that is, when important information needs to be either made available or obtained from non-official language speakers. Without fail, in each report, the Ministry congratulates itself on its handling of the "linguistic diversity" of Canadians so that all citizens are able to "participate" in Canadian society. Census data is now often gathered using languages other than English or French. Essential services and informational brochures are increasingly being provided in non-official languages "to better serve Canadian citizens" (Canadian Heritage, 2001: 27). The 1999/2000 Report devotes more than a page to describe how its Ministry keenly recognized that the message of federal government's Family Violence Initiative was not reaching all Canadians, in particular those who spoke neither official language. Consequently, in order to get the anti-violence message to all Canadians, public service announcements were produced in "fourteen international languages" (Canadian Heritage, 2001: 28). It is absurd that after almost thirty years of multiculturalism, one of the most "tangible outputs" for 1999 was the translation of a public service announcement to ensure that minority communities were enlightened on the topic of

domestic violence. The government has not since deemed it necessary to produce additional multilingual broadcasts on other topics, such as environmental issues, voting or even translated *Canadian Heritage Moments*. It is clear that the federal government and particularly the Ministry of Canadian Heritage which is to serve the mandate of the Multiculturalism Act, regard minority communities and their languages as problems or obstacles in the way of trouble-free communication.

Language does not just stand in the way of communication. It also may be perceived as impeding integration into mainstream society. In Section 2.2, it was revealed that parents often have concerns about using their child's mother tongue in the home before he/she enters school. Moreover, when a child has difficulty adjusting to English when beginning school, the problems are almost always attributed to use of the home language. This situation is even the case for French bilingual parents in Ontario, with its fairly large Francophone population. All levels of government have failed to debunk these myths of language learning which seem quite suspect when "official" French-English bilingualism is being actively promoted federally.

Despite the silent depreciation of language learning, French continues to be taught in Anglophone Canada and vice versa. However, most students graduating from such weak forms of bilingual education leave with little more than basic conversational competence (Baker & Jones, 1998). Moreover, instead of the improving attitudes towards French, the current policy is actually accomplishing the opposite, fuelling students' negative feelings and resentment for having studied French without acquiring any real competence (Baker & Jones, 1998). Imagine if students were studying math for five years and still were not able to understand Grade 9 algebra because they had not yet mastered basic Grade 4 arithmetic. This situation is faced by students studying HLs in the school system as well (to be discussed

in the next section). If we consider the fact that French language instruction generally does not begin until Grade 4, and that alternatively, there is only a very limited number of immersion classes available, one has to wonder if the federal government has any commitment to language learning at all, not to mention to official bilingualism or multilingualism.

3.1.2. The Results of the 34-year-old Multiculturalism Policy

Tolerance?

We are not trying to achieve a tolerant society. Tolerance is putting up with something, accepting it, living with it because there is no alternative. We have to move beyond tolerance. (Weiner, 1990: 2)

Tolerance, notes Gerry Weiner (cited above), the former Minister of State, Multiculturalism and Citizenship, is not inclusive. Nor is ‘tolerance’ supportive or promotive. Lenihan and Kaufman (2001), in a paper which came out of a Canadian Heritage Roundtable Series, describe three ways of developing respect for other ethnic, linguistic groups. The first is respect that develops from *tolerance*. Lenihan and Kaufman (2001: 29) revise Weiner’s idea of ‘moving beyond tolerance’ in their second and third types of respect for diversity. The second is a respect which develops through *understanding* for why “[another’s] views may be at odds with one’s own.” The third type of respect is cultivated through *identification*. In this type, “citizens’ personal identities can be viewed as open and dynamic and individuals can transcend their own cultural experience to become what they are not,” whereby “someone from one cultural background may participate in the practices and customs of another group” (Lenihan & Kaufman, 2001: 29). This type of respect goes well beyond encouraging citizens to accommodate another’s differences through tolerance or even understanding. UNESCO (1994) also argues that the type of respect found through identification can only

truly take place through learning a culture's language. Very plainly, language learning must play a vital role in facilitating intercultural learning. If the recent government interpretation of 'culture' and 'ethnicity' were true, then simply by experimenting with "ethnic" cuisine, dance and music, it should be possible to develop genuine respect and understanding for another culture. However, this is by no means the case. The festivals, food fairs, dance, and public awareness campaigns have not fought discrimination. Instead, minorities are facing an increasingly "tolerant" society which is willing to acknowledge that diversity exists, but will neither actively promote nor repress it. This mind-set in no way encourages diversity, by supporting the legitimization of languages other than English or French, nor does it stand against implicit discrimination. Lenihan and Kaufman (2001) state that public recognition is crucial in providing support for efforts to promote individual and institutional openness. The government is privy to this information and in many cases commissioned the research, yet it still ignores language as being integral to Canada's 'diverse' future, not only a basic component of cultural maintenance but also as an extremely powerful weapon against racism.

Breaking Out of 'Ethnic' Stereotypes?

Encourage the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the multicultural heritage of Canada (CMA, 1988: 5.1.e).

After 1991, when language was dropped from the advertised concept of multiculturalism, the government solely promoted celebrations of culture such as festival, dance and food fairs. This practice demonstrates the features the government believed to be at the core of multiculturalism or perhaps what was intentionally being marketed as "multiculturalism". The government, in effect commoditised culture. In our "boutique multiculturalism", we accept many cultures, we even promote and support them financially...but stop short of

supporting language (Fish, 1997). Even though language has been described⁴⁴ as the vehicle of cultural maintenance as the most salient and tangible feature of culture, the government still refuses to support its teaching or learning, or even recognize it as a vehicle of cultural maintenance for ethnocultural communities as well as weapon in combating racism.

Rather, the government has been unwavering in its approach toward HLs within its policy of multiculturalism and as a result has allowed Bissoondath's (1994) contentions of 'ethnic' stereotyping to be proved correct. Under the heading *Identity: Preserving and Promoting Our Multicultural Heritage*, the 2001/02 Annual Report reasons that by "preserv[ing] and promot[ing] the Canada of yesterday", we can "realize that there are many threads in our historical tapestry" and "understand and embrace the Canada of today" (Canadian Heritage, 2002a: 19). In this document, the Ministry reports on the National Archives' new acquisitions relating to a "range of ethnic communities", including "interviews with Ukrainian Canadian communists" and "raw footage of a documentary on a Nazi war criminal" which are supposed to provide "insight" for those wishing to learn about "the diverse peoples of our country" (Canadian Heritage, 2002a: 19). While understanding a culture's history is necessary for one to develop respect for that culture, a sheltered representation can feed stereotyping. Removing culture from its context, without its historical, social and linguistic context, "multiculturalism" has not in fact helped Canadians to understand and respect their neighbours (Bissoondath, 1994: 89). Furthermore, the disregard for the multitude of languages as a dynamic force in Canadian identity, has, to all intents and purposes, forced the *preservation* of a static image of Canada's many cultures as

⁴⁴ It has been described as such by the Government of Canada, by Liberals, by Conservatives, by policy analysts, by provincial leaders, by the cultural communities (immigrant and aboriginal and 'founding'), by UNESCO, and even by those trying to eradicate ethnocultural groups.

folkloric stereotypes of costumes, music, dance and food without import in the modern world.

Access?

Promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to such participation (CMA, 1988: 3.1.c)

Tse (1998) points out that HL speakers need language to gain and maintain membership in their respective community, and in turn, to sustain their language and ethnic identity. This is true not simply for those born into a minority ethnocultural groups; it is also true for all Canadians. Language provides access. It is used to show membership or to distance oneself from the group. Second and third generation immigrants often do not have this option. Through language, individuals gain access to the culture of the mainstream communities. For example, police officers who speak HLs will be able to more easily gain access to ethnocultural communities and they will be more quickly trusted. This trust and understanding will allow police officers to do their jobs more efficiently while also promoting intergroup awareness and helping to defuse conflict. Language allows us to gain access to communities outside our borders, culturally and economically. The federal annual reports on multiculturalism demonstrate that language not only helps us gain access but also shows results in our ability to secure trade links and contracts with non-English, non-French speaking countries.

The federal government purports that it is valuable to have knowledge of languages, often non-traditionally economic languages such as Hungarian or Portuguese (Canadian Heritage, 1996). However, given that their own and other federally commissioned studies tell us that second generation, and as a rule, third generation Canadians, will not have

competence in their HL(s) due to the rapid process of cultural and linguistic assimilation in addition to the lack of access to sites in which to acquire a HL, they will not be able to gain access to the many positions that require non-French, non-English language skills. Moreover, they will not have the edge to compete for positions which see 'international' language skills as a bonus. Preference will be given to fluent speakers (generally first generation Canadians) with similar academic and work experience. The federal government continues to insist on the usefulness of cultural knowledge, but does not officially recognize that cultural knowledge is implicit in language knowledge.

The 1995/96 Report account of the Canadian Commercial Corporation [CCC] clearly demonstrates the need and value of language knowledge in international trade. The CCC not only employs a "high" proportion of foreign born Canadians because of their language abilities and cultural knowledge and it regularly reimburses the cost of language programs taken by their employees. Second generation immigrants should have similar knowledge, yet they do not. They have only a fraction of their potential knowledge, particularly linguistic knowledge. By not enabling second and third generation immigrants to maintain their HLs, the government has been effectively denying them entry into rewarding posts in the public service. What is more, if second and third generation Canadians are being shut out of these jobs, then so are all Canadians who have not been given the opportunity to learn another language. Lack of access to language learning opportunities and ineffective language programs with inadequate support (not enough teaching hours, no materials or teachers) has locked and will continue to lock all Canadians out of these opportunities, while creating an elite class who have been able to acquire a second or third language, thereby betraying one of the most critical principles of the Multiculturalism Act

“to promote the full and equitable participation of individual... in shaping all aspects of Canadian society” (CMA, 1988: 3.1.c).

3.1.3. Federal Responsibility

No country has escaped the massive social changes in equality and human rights during the past decades but their effect has been by no means uniform. It was decisions by the Canadian government to strongly champion these liberal ideals which has given rise to the proud and inclusive Canada of today. The federal government wields tremendous power. Not only does it control the largest share of the public purse but it also bears the knowledge that its laws and policies, its endorsement or lack thereof will be accepted by the majority of Canadians. For the most part, the country puts faith in the government evaluation and judgment of the facts, even if they are, at the outset, extremely controversial. Historically litigious issues such as French as an official language, open immigration, and multiculturalism have all become accepted and valued characteristics of Canadian society.

The federal government’s power to transform public opinion, however, has not been employed to legitimize heritage language status or use. The government has been reluctant to recognize the role of language in multiculturalism, to provide effective support to language maintenance (funds, knowledge, connections, training, national networks or even space in Canadian Heritage’s mandate) or to even acknowledge the value of language learning. This has thus had very serious consequences for HL learning; as well as the support of official language bilingualism.

It has been three decades since the federal government took on multiculturalism as a policy. However, during this time the rates of language loss have not slowed. The government admits that once it “responded largely to the *needs* of specific groups *enabling*

them to preserve and celebrate their identities” but has since shifted its focus to “assisting marginalized groups to build their capacity to better influence the social, cultural and economic and political institutions” (Canadian Heritage, 2000: 4).

This section has exposed how the federal government has continued to take credit for “enabling” ethno-cultural groups in maintaining their cultural identity, but failed to take partial responsibility for disabling the means for identity maintenance in their dismantling of the ideals of Multiculturalism. The launch of the federal policy and the initiatives that followed were substantial. However, the shifting interpretation of the Multiculturalism Act and the nebulous nature of the actual Act itself have only obscured the significance of language in terms of implementing multiculturalism. Moreover, without a clear mandate of the powers, duties and functions of federal institutions with respect to the HLs of Canada, the implementation of Act has been made nearly impossible. The Multiculturalism Policy and Act, though perhaps well-intentioned, has supported the walls that it was supposed to break down. Furthermore, the marginal support for HLs, cross-cultural understanding, and employment equity has actually resulted in a continued attack on language and culture.

3.2. Provincial Context

Canadian federalism has conferred the federal government with the greatest power and influence in the country. It controls most of the public wealth, and, as demonstrated in the previous section, Canadians' trust in federal leadership also gives it the capacity to greatly affect public sentiment. However, despite the Government of Canada's obvious power, Canada is rare among many other countries in that the federal government has no responsibility for education (Watts, 1970). Though the provinces exclusively manage this so-called "local" matter, the import attached to education is plainly evident.

When the RCBB devoted an entire volume of its six volume study to deal directly with education and its sweeping recommendations for improving the status and use of French in Canada, it was widely recognized that educational policy was requisite to realize any broad changes in language use. Chapter 2 detailed the far-reaching effects of language in education and why schools are continually recognized as playing one of the most significant roles in a child's life. They promote "intellectual growth" while also "prepar[ing] students for the transition from adolescence to adulthood and from school to employment", "instill[ing] cultural, moral and personal values" (Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994: 75). It is these reasons that have necessitated the federal government to take such a strong interest in integrating French into the school system, using its spending power to funnel hundreds of millions of dollars to second language education in the provinces to ensure that every Canadian student is studying French (Hayday, 2001).

The following sections examine the policies and legislation of Canada's two most multicultural and multilingual provinces, Ontario and British Columbia, in their promises and commitments to a plural society. Each province will be considered separately through the deconstruction of their relevant multiculturalism and HL policies, through talk and

practice. And finally, this discourse will be contrasted with reference to Alberta's language policies to reveal very different approaches to multiculturalism and HL maintenance.

3.2.1. Ontario

After the federal government declared Canada a bilingual, multicultural country, Ontario followed in step with a similar message about the province's diverse nature. However, there was no official public statement of the government's policy on multiculturalism despite the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism's [OACM] urging that the government "explain [their] concept of multiculturalism and indicate how it should be implemented" (OACM, 1975: 3). In 1977, Premier William Davies finally elucidated the province's policy as a "*new pluralism*" (OACM, 1978: 3), but it was not for ten years that the policy was revised and put forth formally by the Queen's Printer as *Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism* (1988), which followed *Proposals for Action: Ontario's Heritage Languages Program* (1987), a policy paper presenting the Ministry of Education's initiatives in HL instruction. These three items of discourse, in addition to the report of Ontario's *Royal Commission on Learning*, will form the basis of critical analysis of Ontario's approach to multiculturalism and HL maintenance. The province's lack of documentation somewhat complicates the picture, particularly in determining what exactly has been done in the implementation of multiculturalism and language instruction. A variety of other sources, used to examine the development of HL programs in Section 2.1.2.2, will assist in the construction of the context in which Ontario's few policy documents were drafted.

3.2.1.1. Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism 1977, 1988

Six years after the federal government announced its landmark Multiculturalism Policy, the Ontario government's inference that it was bilingual and multicultural became a reality at Queen's Park, when Premier Davies set out an official position and policy on multiculturalism. The policy, which had "nothing complicated about it," defined three basic

directions: equality, access and cultural retention. The government committed itself to “safeguarding the equality and dignity of the individual members of society, tak[ing] all necessary steps to ensure that no one [was] denied its services or [was] unable to secure access to them,” and defending the *right* to maintain cultural heritage and language (OACM, 1978: 3).

The Premier’s speech gave its focus to rights, declaring that “every ethnic group” had the *right* to equality, the *right* to access to government services and the “*right* to maintain ... its unique identity” (OACM, 1978: 3). It seems that the Premier makes a very strong commitment to the preservation of HLs in his claim that the government not only “firmly believes in” but “will fight for the *right* of individuals and groups to retain and develop their cultural heritage and *language*” (OACM, 1978: 3). This last statement must be given particular attention. “Fight[ing] for the rights” seems proactive, and it appears that the province is championing HLs and will ensure their stability, but a closer look at the words shows they actually denote something quite different. The government states frankly that it will defend and support the *right* of individuals and group to retain their languages. This, however, is not to say that there is any commitment to assisting language maintenance, just protecting the option or right to maintain languages. That is to say, the government is simply giving communities the permission to retain their languages and nothing more. As the Premier affirms, “there is nothing complicated about it” (OACM, 1978: 3).

The province’s rhetoric in stating its responsibilities in the promotion of multiculturalism echoes that of the federal government’s own blasé approach to supporting HL maintenance and acquisition, in that it believes in giving *rights* while at the same time doing all it can to shrug off any type of responsibility. Thus, to dodge the job of assisting individuals to acquire and retain language, the province was also reluctant to pass its policy

into law. The Premier speaks of legislating change, which at first gives the illusion that the government is prepared to boldly champion the ideals of multiculturalism. He explains the obvious truth, that “harmony” cannot be legislated, and while the government certainly cannot “legislate” racial harmony, he tells the public that the province will “lay the essential foundation” for pluralism. Yet instead of making a strong commitment to pluralism through an act of legislation that would have obliged a continued and guaranteed commitment, the Premier, with a quick turn of phrase, moves to a much more passive “adopt[ion]” of a Multiculturalism *Policy* (OACM, 1978: 3).

Premier Davies asserts that “the whole philosophy of multiculturalism is a two-way street” with “the common objective be[ing] a desire and responsibility on the part of all groups to understand and appreciate the contribution of others” (OACM, 1978: 3). His choice of words, “understanding” and “appreciation”, are extremely vague and passive. We ‘appreciate’ classical music, baroque art and gourmet food, but, as a rule, we enjoy them in a passive, disconnected fashion. “Appreciation” does not advocate becoming involved or engaged in a culture in some meaningful way. What the policy supports is a detached “general sensitivity and understanding” toward Ontario’s “diverse population” (OACM, 1978: 3). It discourages the experimentation with one’s own comfort zone needed to gain the type of respect for diversity advocated by Lenihan and Kaufman (2001) which comes from identification, not simply “understanding” or tolerance.

As was made dramatically clear in Section 2.2., the laissez-faire approach to language maintenance in Canada, like that of other multi-ethnic countries such as Australia and the United States, results in no language maintenance. It was also made evident that raising bilinguals is a very active process that requires strong community, school and parental involvement with the enthusiastic and “coordinated attention of political, education and

economic authorities” (Jernudd & Das Gupta, 1971: 197). The Premier concludes that “Ontario must be more than a place to stand,” insisting that Ontarians should be able to “stand tall”, “proud” and “secure” in their culture (OACM, 1978: 3). However, by ignoring the RCBB recommendations of integrating HLs into the elementary curriculum, the province chose to deny HLs legitimate status, refusing to give them value as worthy of being taught as a part of the regular school curriculum.

Interestingly, the OACM never did make much noise to the province about incorporating languages into the curriculum. Even after the first multiculturalism policy, a brief submitted to the Joint Senate Committee Studying the Constitution by the OACM only recommended that the “maintenance and development of non-official languages... be encouraged,” suggesting that the responsibilities of language maintenance be left largely to each ethnocultural group (OACM, 1979: 3). There was an about-turn by the next year’s report where the Council’s Education Committee recommended that the government “issue a definitive statement on the status of the French language and on languages other than English or French” (OACM, 1980: 21) and “enact specific legislation which would give statutory recognition to the multicultural reality of Ontario and provide guarantees for the preservation of the cultural and *linguistic* heritage of all Ontario’s citizens” (OACM, 1980: 27).

The government never did enact its policy, but, in 1988, the province reaffirmed its position in the *Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism*⁴⁵ which had a dual focus on culture and equality. The policy acknowledged “Ontario [as] a highly diverse society” whose members “represent[ed] many cultures, many of [whom chose] to maintain some or all of their traditions and pass them onto their children” (Ontario, 1988: 1). The government admits the empirical facts of Ontario’s ethnic and cultural diversity, but also insinuates that there

⁴⁵ The Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism is reproduced in Appendix III.

was always *choice* or option for cultural maintenance and that there were also many Ontarians who *chose* not to maintain their culture. It is questionable how many individuals and groups were actually opposed to retaining their cultural or linguistic heritage. What is clear, however, is that there were many Ontarians who were hoping to pass on their language and culture to their children (Berry et al., 1977) but who were faced with serious obstacles presented by a systemic and systematic process of assimilation, as demonstrated by the research on language maintenance in Section 2.2. The supposed “many” who were choosing to pass on their culture were more likely the exceptions than the rule, given the often insurmountable odds of language maintenance.

Similar to the 1977 policy, the 1988 policy was designed to encourage all people to “celebrate” and “share” their histories (Ontario, 1988), instead of actually maintaining and using them. In the wake of tremendous support for Bill 80, a private member’s bill to integrate HLs into the regular school day as a medium of instruction (Grande, 1987), the 1988 policy did not answer the calls of cultural groups looking for tangible action in a policy that moved beyond celebratory multiculturalism, and particularly one which supported language maintenance as a vehicle of cultural preservation.

The government reiterated its belief that Ontario citizens were “entitled” to “equal access and participation” and had the *right* to “preserve [their] culture” (Ontario, 1988). What the government was really saying was that Ontarians should accept that some citizens would preserve their culture and that they could rightfully do so. However, if Ontarians had the *right* to preserve their language and culture, why was the government averse to providing the *right* to do so in the context of the school system and not simply after-school and on weekends? At the same time that the government was purporting to be “fight[ing] for the rights” of communities to retain their language, they were unwilling to make the change to

the Ontario School Act which would truly provide individuals with the means to enjoy the *right* the government was so proudly waving in front of them. Though the policy states that it aims “to ensure that individuals of all cultural heritages have equal opportunity to develop their individual potential” (Ontario, 1988), it seems impossible that individuals could realize their *potential* when their languages and cultures were being locked out of public schools.

“Individual potential” is a broad expression. It might imply access to the resources to achieve academically, to develop athletic or artistic abilities, or to become fluent in a language or two or even, simply, in one’s first or HL. All of these activities would develop one’s ‘potential’, in terms of gaining a strong sense of self, supporting family relationships, and positioning individuals take advantage of job opportunities. Yet, while the government may have had some of these “potential” goals in mind, their unwillingness to bring HLs into the regular school day (advocated by Bill 80 and compromised with *Proposals for Action* to be discussed) demonstrated not only that they did not have the will to fulfil their own commitments but they did not see language learning as valuable to Ontarians and worthy of support. Moreover, they were not prepared to give Ontario students the means to fulfil their full “individual potential”, by providing them with the choice to “preserve”, “develop”, “share” or “celebrate” their culture (Ontario, 1988). The government states that cultural heritage should be developed as a “strength” to help Ontario “prosper”, but it makes no attempt to explain how it could take advantage of its diversity as a strength. Nor does it acknowledge language, the most tangible means of profiting from a “rich cultural heritage,” as a tremendous strength.

The government does acknowledge some sort of connection between culture and languages by explaining that cultural groups may “share historical, geographical, religious, racial, *language*, ethnic or social traditions” (Ontario, 1988), but does not in any way make

explicit a relationship between language and culture or explain how language could be important. These acknowledgements were taking place at the same time the province was enacting Bill 5, which made it mandatory for school boards to offer HL classes when parents of 25+ students requested a class, and, also putting forth *Proposals for Action* to avoid enacting Bill 80.

In general, the Ontario policies are vague and nebulous. They “encourage” Ontario citizens to “celebrate” and “share” a “greater knowledge, understanding”, “acceptance” and “awareness” of cultural diversity. The policy talks about “equal access” and “participation” but makes no substantive policy goals nor does it lay out how all Ontarians can be supported in gaining knowledge of other cultures or how it actually promotes access.

3.2.1.2. Proposal for Action: Ontario’s Heritage Languages Policy

Proposal for Action, the province’s effort to produce a tangible result from its policy tells how Ontario’s Ministry of Education had formulated a policy for HLs which is “sensitive to the past and continuing legacy of tradition and culture” in order to “provide the best educational opportunities to [Ontario’s] children” (Ontario Ministry of Education [OMOE], 1987: Preface). The Ministry’s reference to HLs does not make note of the significance of languages to their speakers nor how they can be useful in the present or the future of their speakers. Rather with continued reference to “the past”, “legac[ies]” and “tradition”, the government insinuates that these languages and cultures are not simply unviable, but already moribund and obsolete. Moreover, it ignores the fact that the languages are still spoken, often by large populations; they are official languages and of our trading partners and neighbours. Thus it raises questions about the Ministry’s core beliefs when it claims that it is concerned about “providing the best educational opportunities” (OMOE, 1987: Preface),

but it does not worry about providing *all* its students with access to learning the world's languages from school entry on, thus preparing them for an increasingly global economy.

While it is common knowledge that children readily acquire new languages and that they can learn more than one language at the same time without issue, the Ministry of Education resists integrating HLs into schools, particularly elementary schools. Even French, an official language, only becomes mandatory from Grade 4. Equipped with the knowledge that children can easily become bilingual, the province continues to oppose students beginning French as a Second language at an earlier age. This invites the question of whether the province is committed to language learning, given the province's current language teaching practice which gives the impression that it is acting to defeat its own policies of multiculturalism and language acquisition. When it comes to HL teaching, the province continually devalues and marginalizes language, and by implication, culture.

The Ministry's Proposal for Action argues the need to "capture the potential value" of the province's "linguistic diversity" (OMOE, 1987: 1). Clarifying the major reasons for offering HL studies, the proposal not only explains how HL students can develop their knowledge and ability to use their languages for personal reasons, but also that *all* students can take this opportunity to "develop new language skills" (OMOE, 1987: 1). This statement does not suggest that the program will give students fluency, so they can actually "function more effectively in [their] multicultural province" (OMOE, 1987:1). Once again, the Ministry devalues language by not only ignoring the fact that language fluency is extremely valuable at home and abroad but also that supplementary HL schools hold the *potential* for language learning.

Additionally, the proposal fails to consider how the idea of language study outside school hours affects student participation. In high school and post-secondary language

classes, students come from a diverse variety of backgrounds, and majority language students often outnumber HL students. However, in after-hours classes, these figures reverse dramatically. The supplementary classes supported by Ontario's HL program, while open to all students regardless of background, are basically filled by HL students, with the rare participation of a majority language student. It is not that majority language students are not attracted to studying other languages, but that the classes are overwhelmingly perceived as being for ethno-cultural groups. Moreover, the supplementary HL classes are not viewed as "official", whereas when integrated into the school day, languages classes and languages are treated as legitimate, valuable and worthwhile.

Curiously, the government does explicitly acknowledge that the integration of HLs into the regular school day curriculum would provide "educational and social value" to the HL program and thus for HLs themselves (OMOE, 1987: 1). In spite of the acknowledgement of the value of HLs, the Ministry states that it fears that that integration "could serve to significantly fragment the goals and resources [available] for the education of Ontario's children" (OMOE, 1987: Annotation), and thus remains firmly against the "inclusion of HL learning in the regular school curriculum" but supports the "provision of the program as a significant enrichment activity" (OMOE, 1987: 4).

3.2.1.3. Royal Commission on Learning, 1994

Ontario's Royal Commission on Learning [ORCL] (1994) reports that "many parents and communities want their children to have opportunities to learn other languages" at the elementary and secondary level, often for personal reasons such as "appreciating other people and literature" and "travel and personal enrichment", though others feel language skills were a definite advantage in the world of business. The rationales vary, but "all had the

same goal: to give their children more of a chance to become or remain bilingual or multilingual in a bilingual, multicultural country” (ORCL, 1994: 150).

The Commission admits, however, that “there is virtually no international language instruction in elementary school and relatively little in secondary school” (ORCL, 1994: 151). What is more, the “proportion of students taking languages other than French and English has [been] decreas[ing] over the years” (ORCL, 1994: 151). Being “eager to see children offered the opportunity to learn an additional language while they are young and especially able to acquire native-like oral fluency,” the Commissioners in the sixth of 167 recommendations urge that “*the acquisition of a third language become an intrinsic part of the common curriculum from a young age up to Grade 9 inclusively, with the understanding that the choice of language(s) taught or acquired will be determined locally, and that the acquisition of such a third language outside schools be recognized as equivalent by an examination process, similar to what we term challenge exams within the secondary school credit system*” (ORCL, 1994: 151).

In Chapter 10, ‘Supports for Learning: Special Needs and Special Opportunities’, the Commission addresses the continuing calls for an amendment to the Education Act authorizing other languages to be used in instruction and opening the door for partial immersion programs. Here, the Commission clearly differentiates English and French from all other languages, stating that French immersion and extended French are “permitted because, like English, French is an *official language of instruction*” while “under existing provincial legislation of the Education Act, parallel programs in other languages – German, for example, or Russian – are not permitted” (ORCL, 1994: 211).

The Commission is well acquainted with the fact that other provinces, such as British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba “permit other instructional languages” and that “permitting school boards flexibility in program implementation [would] represent an

investment in Ontario's linguistic resources," yet it is wholly unwilling to "recommend a change to Ontario's legislation with respect to languages of instruction" (ORCL, 1994: 211). They do admit that they "strongly support the use of other languages as a transitional strategy, which is already permitted" (ORCL, 1994: 211). The Commissioners make it known that that they are "very concerned that all students in Ontario be truly literate in one of the official languages" (ORCL, 1994: 212), indicating a belief that language maintenance or learning of a "third" language obstructs student literacy and knowledge of the official languages. This view is contrary to Jim Cummins' (1994b) paper written for the ORCL on the role of language maintenance and literacy development that suggests that literacy development of the first language promotes literacy in a second language. In the end, the ORCL, though they acknowledged some *appreciation* of "the value of the existing optional International- (formerly Heritage-) Language program, elementary, [they were] *not* prepared to go well beyond that by suggesting that students be educated in an immersion or bilingual program in any one of a vast number of non-official languages" (ORCL, 1994: 212).

The Province's approach to HLs has been paradoxical on all fronts. It demonstrated that it saw language as a conduit of culture in that its multiculturalism policies always coincided with an announcement of some language initiative, a commitment to ensuring the *right* for language maintenance (1977) or decision to oblige school boards to set up HL classes when parents requested such a program (1987). From the beginning of its funding of HLs, the Ontario government has "strongly agree[d] that learning international languages, in addition to English and French, is valuable and should be encouraged" (ORCL, 1994: 151). Moreover, it admits that it has been established that bilingual programs can be feasible (ORCL, 1994), yet it still adamantly opposes integration of HLs into the regular school day and as an instructional language. It claims that the programs are open to all; it is not so

much legislation that limits access to HL programs, but the Province's complete rejection of HLs becoming part of the mainstream. This opinion is demonstrated by its refusal to make an amendment to the Education Act, and its taking cover behind the restrictions of the Education Act.

Access is a matter of perception. The province's disinterested approach to multilingualism and multiculturalism policy has never even attempted to promote the HL education programs to majority language students. The government's public discourse has made clear that it sees HLs as deeply connected to "the past" and "tradition", with no relevance to the modern world. Furthermore, it has attempted to marginalize languages to a folkloric status with a tokenistic policy that limits language to "heritage" instead of being an invaluable tool for constructing an Ontario of respect and knowledge.

3.2.2. British Columbia

Unlike the other Western Canadian provinces that implemented a policy of multiculturalism within a few years of the federal announcement of the intention to create a bilingual and multicultural Canada, it was not until the early 1990s that the richly diverse province of British Columbia [BC] began to recognize and support the teaching of HLs (Beynon & Toohey, 1991). In the context of the province's review of public education by the Sullivan Commission, BC began to fund the teaching of HLs. The Commission report, *A Legacy for Learners*, recognized the "enduring" diversity as an "elemental part of British Columbia life" and recommended that the province make a stronger commitment to multiculturalism in the school system (Sullivan, 1988: 11). Moreover, the Commission encouraged "schools to preserve diverse cultural heritages through languages instruction and through other studies in history, geography, art, music or drama to remind us who we are today and from the culture we once came" (Sullivan, 1988: 28).

The government response to the Sullivan Commission was extremely favourable and led to a series of Ministry of Education response documents, including *Enabling Learners: Working Plans No. 1, 2 and 3* (1989-1990), which outline a plan for multicultural education. The *British Columbia Multiculturalism Act* (1993) brought greater focus to HLs and "recognize[d] the value of multilingualism" (Multiculturalism BC, 1994: 49). This interest culminated in the *British Columbia Language Education Policy* (1996), making the study of a second language *mandatory* between Grades 5 and 8. In this section, these documents, along with the *Annual Reports on the Operations of the Multiculturalism Act*, are critically examined as public discourse to determine how the province has expressed its dedication to the construction of a multicultural society and has followed through with concrete action.

3.2.2.1. Multiculturalism Act, the Sullivan Commission, and Government Response

The British Columbia Multiculturalism Act [BCMA] was enacted for the purpose of “recogniz[ing] that [the] diversity of British Columbians as regards to race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry and place of origin is a fundamental characteristic of the society” which “enriches the lives of British Columbians” (BCMA, 1993: 2.a). Much like its federal predecessor, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, the provincial act does not make specific reference to language. The Act sets out eight policy objectives. The first declares it to be the policy of the government to “recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the racial and cultural diversity of British Columbians” (BCMA, 1993: 3.a). It continues, stating that it will promote “cultural understanding, respect, attitudes and perceptions” that produce “harmony among British Columbians” (BCMA, 1993: 3.b). This is extremely vague and provokes a number of questions. What is harmony and how do we produce it? It is questionable why the Act does not speak more specifically as the statement of such broad and lofty ideals makes the Act seem to be without substance.

The Act’s third policy objective declares that the province will “promote the full participation of all individuals in the society of British Columbia” (BCMA, 1993: 3.c). This statement infers that the government also supports “full” participation in schooling, and access to HL instruction. While the government did subsidize supplementary HL schools for some time, support was withdrawn in 2001 (British Columbia Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women’s Services [BCMCAW], 2001). The languages taught in BC schools do reflect, to a fair extent, the major HL communities of BC – Japanese, Mandarin, Cantonese and Punjabi. However, these languages are not taught in all schools across the province. Many schools in BC offer only French as a second language and the Ministry of Education does not require boards to offer other languages. If part of the reason for

providing HL instruction in schools is to “promote cross-cultural understanding”, “respect”, and positive attitudes (BCMA, 1993: 2.c), it would seem necessary that *all* students should be provided with access to learning another language, particularly those that reflect the cultural diversity of their province, that are significant to their community and that could be advantageous for their futures.

BC’s Multiculturalism Act, like the federal Act, fails to make explicit a connection between language and culture. The Act actually makes no reference at all to ‘language’ or even linguistic diversity. This omission makes it difficult to determine if the authors of the Act intended to exclude language from the legislation *or* that it is presupposed that language is a feature of “cultural heritage”. If the latter is the case, it is important to note that “cultural heritage” or “cultural diversity” appears in six of the eight policy objectives. However, whether ‘language’ is intentionally taken for granted or not, the failure to define “cultural heritage” is unquestionably a weakness of the Act itself. This denies communities the option of using the Act as a guarantee of support for language education as well as an assurance that they cannot be discriminated against on the basis of language.

In 2001, the provincial government took this option when it abandoned all support for HL supplemental schools in British Columbia. The lack of an explicit statement of the role of HLs in the province’s policy of multiculturalism, particularly in its legislative base of the Multiculturalism Act, allowed the government to bow out effortlessly from its support of more than twenty thousand students in the province learning a HL (British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration [BCMMI], 1994: 17). A statutory instrument, in particular one that states not only that *language* is some part of culture, but that *it* is one of the most salient features of culture, is needed. Without such an instrument, the government is free to break its commitment to language learning, which in

turn denies all citizens of the means of gaining understanding and respect of other cultures, one of the key objectives of Multiculturalism in British Columbia.

Fortunately, the most recent governments holding power in BC have not chosen to discontinue language instruction in the school system. This may be because the languages of focus in schools are considered to be “international languages” or “economic languages”, particularly Mandarin and Japanese. The British Columbia Ministry of Education [BCMOE] has taken an enthusiastic interest in making connections with Asia, in particular Japan and China, which are considered to be major economic players in global business. Early on, the government began to take an active interest in “international education”, looking to “provide students and teachers with opportunities to develop skills, knowledge and understanding which [would] enhance international cooperation, a sense of global citizenship and a well informed perspective on international affairs” (BCMOE, 1990b: 38). This attitude put the languages of the Pacific Rim at the forefront, and made Japanese and Mandarin integral to the curriculum (BCMOE, 1990b: 38). However, while these two languages do account for the HLs of a large number of British Columbian immigrants, support for non-traditionally economic languages are being pushed into the sidelines.

Working Plans 1 - 3, in response to the *Sullivan Royal Commission on Education's* recommendations, did not delay in finding a place for language education with its new interest in “multicultural education.” Perhaps the BCMOE realized that the province could profit from its diverse population and its proximity to Asia. In all of its documents responding to the Sullivan Commission, the BCMOE reiterates its mission statement: “to enable learners to develop their potential and to acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to contribute to a healthy society and a prosperous and sustainable economy” (BCMOE, 1989: 3). Like Ontario's policy documents, British Columbia speaks of

“developing potential”, which was needed to develop not only students’ knowledge and skills but also of transforming BC into a more knowledge based economy. By including HLs in the regular school curriculum, the province easily demonstrated that they could legitimately provide the “knowledge and skills” needed “to contribute to a healthy society and a prosperous and sustainable economy” (BCMOE, 1989: 3).

Working Plan #1 establishes HL instruction as an integral component of Multicultural Education, “ensuring that multicultural issues are reflected in [the] new curricula” (BCMOE, 1989: 42). These words reveal that culture and language were considered to be connected, with the underlying notion that language supports cultural maintenance and that language learning promotes understanding. Moreover, it demonstrates that the government believe that language should be an important element of any multicultural program it generates cross-cultural understanding and respect.

The BCMOE saw HL instruction as key to recognizing “the multicultural nature of British Columbia society” (Brummet, 1989: 23). BC was forward thinking in extending recognition of provincial diversity in its school system. School was the one place able to touch a generation of youth, affecting their psyche as British Columbians and “develop[ing] an appreciation for the variety of cultural groups that enrich [Canadian] society” while also learning of the historical foundations upon which [their] society is based” (Brummet, 1989: 23).

3.2.2.2. Annual Reports

Because the province has enacted its policy, as with the federal Multiculturalism Act, there is a requirement that the minister responsible for multiculturalism present an Annual Report before the Legislative Assembly, setting out the action it has undertaken to ensure the

operation of the Act. The Ministry responsible for Multiculturalism has changed several times. When the Act was first introduced, multiculturalism was a branch called Multiculturalism BC within the Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Human Rights (1993-94); this became the Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism (1994-95) and then the Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration (1995-99), which was non-existent by 2000. Multiculturalism is now managed under the eclectic mandates of the Settlement and Multiculturalism Branch in the Ministry of Community, Aboriginal, and Women's Services.

In the 1993-94 Report, Multiculturalism BC specified a number of goals, one of which was "promoting institutional change to better serve a culturally diverse community" (BC, 1994: 35). It seemed that the BCMOE also took this goal seriously, seeing it as essential to provide educational opportunities for students to maintain or acquire their HL.

The writers of the report are very much aware of the fact that "tolerance" does not bring respect or social harmony, stating that "promoting tolerance of cultural diversity is insufficient" and that "tolerance is fragile and can quickly be supplanted by intolerance" (BC, 1994: 36). The report advocates "understanding and acceptance" as the goals of multiculturalism (BC, 1994: 36).

"Acceptance" is also much too unstable. It is really only one step beyond tolerance. Tolerance is the acceptance, in some limited fashion, of the surrounding diversity. "Acceptance" does not infer greater understanding or respect, which is necessary for successful multiculturalism. "Acceptance" simply implies a willingness to admit that diversity exists and does not necessarily attribute any positive attitudes to that diversity. A situation can be at once "accepted" and also be the subject of hostility. "Acceptance" fosters only a superficial agreement to tolerate diversity not a deep respect and

understanding of diversity. It merely condones the diversity and differences, allowing racism and discrimination to remain strong just below the surface. Respect comes from identification with and understanding of another culture, and can only come from pushing individuals beyond their perceived identity and the belief that there is only one way of doing things and seeing the world, opening their eyes to diversity.

The HL program was designed to assist communities in providing instruction for the many languages “not available through existing education programs,” but when the province stopped supporting these classes, what did that action suggest about government support for “foster[ing] individual development, self-worth and cross-cultural understanding” (BC, 1994: 49) as well as “*equitable access* to services and resources” (BC, 1995: 3)? Equitable access should include access to language instruction in the school system; not only offering more languages, but providing a mandate that requires boards to offer additional language instruction to all of BC’s communities. Smaller communities are often cited as having major issues with racism; why is not the government working to alleviate these pressures on minorities by promoting cross-cultural awareness through language instruction and other campaigns?

While the reports insist that the classes are “open and accessible to everyone” (BC, 1995: 24), it ignores the fact that majority language students do not generally get involved in these HL programs. And while language classes integrated into schools are open to everyone in theory, in practice the classes are not accessible to all as they are not offered everywhere. Once again, in theory the classes are open; but without HL class offerings in all communities across the province, they certainly cannot be said to be accessible to all.

The BCMOE’s most notable step was integrating multiculturalism into the schools. A “special emphasis [was] placed by the Ministry of Education in developing a Languages

Policy and Guidelines that reflect the ethnocultural diversity of [its] schools” as the ministry revised its curriculum to offer Spanish, German, Chinese, Japanese and Punjabi, leaving the door open for the further addition of other languages (BC, 1995: 56). Instead of just producing campaigns about anti-racism and cross-cultural awareness, they took proactive steps to develop a language policy and also tried to reflect the diversity of its schools in its language course offerings. With this act, the province made evident its realization that language is, without a doubt, fundamental to ‘multiculturalism.’

3.2.3. From East to West: Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia in Contrast

The previous sections have carefully analyzed Ontario and British Columbia government discourse in the form of their policies, legislation, and reports in an attempt to get a clear understanding of their commitments to multiculturalism and multilingualism. The analysis considered how words have been carefully chosen to disguise varying attitudes and the often loose commitment to language, particularly HLs and their acquisition and maintenance, and thus the tenets of multiculturalism.

Chapter 2 demonstrated that language is unequivocally and inextricably tied to culture. At some point, both the federal and provincial governments have acknowledged this fact, but how and when they have admitted the language-culture link has differed tremendously and has tended to shift. For instance, the federal government's position on HLs did a 180 degree flip from its legislation of Multiculturalism in 1988. At that time, the Minister of State for Multiculturalism advocated a Canada in which its people spoke and used a second or third non-official language. This position changed radically after 1991, with the abandonment of HLs in federal policy directions and general denial that 'language' was even mentioned in the Multiculturalism Act.

In considering Canada's most multicultural and multilingual provinces, a similar floundering was found to be inherent in their policies and general approach to multilingualism. Although Ontario formally set forth its policy in the 1970s and revised it in 1988, no modifications have since taken place. British Columbia, on the other hand, only laid down its position on Multiculturalism in the early 1990s, almost twenty years after the federal government had enunciated a multicultural vision for the country. Yet even in its infancy, BC's Multiculturalism policy has generated more changes than Ontario's thirty-year-old policy of multiculturalism. Even more interesting is the fact that BC's Multiculturalism

Act makes no reference at all to language, while both the Ontario and federal policies make specific mention of language in the text of the policy or act. The Ontario 1977 Policy on Multiculturalism speaks of the right to “retain and develop [one’s] cultural heritage and language” (Ontario, 1988: 1). The federal Multiculturalism Act declares it the policy of the government “to preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988: 3.1.i). Despite their direct dealing with the importance of language in supporting multiculturalism, the Governments of Ontario and Canada have given the least support for integrating HL into the public school system. None of their policies or legislation actually set out what is necessary to carry out the policy goals. In contrast, BC’s Working Plans do make clear plans for a ten-year period, documenting the steps to fully integrate HLs into the curriculum. It is apparent that the explicit reference to language is not as important as making a clear link between a language and its culture. Furthermore, precise planning helps to ensure that the government follows through with its policy commitments.

Alberta’s *New Cultural Policy* (Strom, 1971) and its successor, *New Policy Directions on Cultural Diversity* (1981) both not only discuss language and education in great detail but explicitly identify “the intimate connection between culture and language” (Strom, 1971: 1). They state that Alberta was unwilling to ignore the ‘language’ in its cultural policy and that it would be “an integral part of that policy for historic and humanistic reasons” (Strom, 1971: 1). Moreover, the Alberta policies insist that cultural diversity (and linguistic diversity by extension) “enhances the quality of life in Alberta and is a cornerstone of unity, social harmony, and economic progress” (Alberta, 1981: 2). Thus a thorough, extensive policy of multilingualism needs not just clear planning, but passionate opposition to extracting

language from culture and the belief in the value of languages for individuals. According to Alberta's former Prime Minister, Harry E. Strom (1971: 1), cultures, themselves, deserve "dignity and value", as well as a place in the greater society for "economic and social development" (Alberta, 1981: 17). While the Ontario or British Columbia policies do speak highly of the positive influence of HLs, neither demonstrates such a plain and persistent support for language--all languages--as vital to individuals and society in all aspects of life.

British Columbia, however, does share certain features of Alberta's approach to HLs. BC, like Alberta, has not mandated that all its students study French. Unlike Ontario, on the other hand, French is a mandatory second language from grades 4 to 9, with any other language study as elective. In 1996, as a result of BC's enactment of its *Language Education Policy*, second language study was made obligatory for all students between grades 5 and 8, with continued study as optional. The language of study, however, is not fixed. Students can study French, Mandarin, Spanish, Japanese, Punjabi or other languages, if the demand is there. This policy is a "departure from official bilingualism in the sense that it puts Asian-Pacific languages on an equal footing with French as a mandatory second language" (Carey, 1997: 213). In Alberta, though its integrated second language programs are extensive, second language study has not been mandatory and has consequently "led to a great inequality of access for students across the province" (Sokolowski, 1999: 114). However, in 2003, in response to the Alberta Royal Commission on Learning's recommendations, the Alberta Ministry of Education took the needed step. It announced that a new, mandatory second-languages initiative for students in Grades 4 to 9 would be implemented (Alberta, 2004).

Alberta's School Act was amended in 1971 to give explicit permission for the use of languages other than French or English as the language of instruction in public schools

(Martorelli, 1990; Alberta School Act, 1970). BC's School Act, while it does not precisely authorize non-official languages in schools, has been interpreted as permitting them as the Act does not explicitly prohibit the use of HLs in schools. This reading, however, has not been used to push for the funding of province-wide bilingual or partial immersion programs. Ontario's Education Act, likewise, has no clause about the use of non-official languages during the regular school day but this lapse has been interpreted as a ban on languages other than French or English. This ambiguity allows the justification for prohibiting the integration of HLs into Ontario schools as anything other than a subject of study (ORCL, 1994).

The Ontario government has continued to resist including non-official languages in schools and is even more opposed to making any modification to the Education Act (ORCL, 1994). It argues that its resistance lies with concerns that the province would be unable to cope with the burden of integrating HLs into the curriculum. It maintains that integrated HL classes would result in "teacher shortages", "changes to teacher collective agreements" and potentially negative changes to "the learning experiences of children" as their education experiences would be fragmented and additionally meaningful work would have to be found for students not attending HL classes (OMOE, 1987: 3). However, there is little to support that this disruption would be the case, as Alberta and British Columbia have already established that HL study during the day can work. It seems more likely that the Government of Ontario's reluctance to consider and assess the real costs and benefits of such a proposal stems from something other than resources or teacher availability. By keeping HLs out of the schools, they are not showing a willingness to promote diversity nor a willingness to legitimize or "invest in Ontario's linguistic resources" (ORCL, 1994: 212). What the Ontario government supports, however, is the "transitional use" of other

languages in the classrooms (ORCL, 1994: 127) which is basically equivalent to exploiting a language for assimilation purposes. Transitional use of a language was very popular in the United States under the misleading label of “bilingual education”; a child’s mother tongue was used only “to the extent necessary to achieve competence in English” as a means of more effectively and rapidly assimilating the child into the dominant culture usually resulting in the abandonment of the mother tongue (Baker & Jones, 1998). Support for this type of assimilation is clearly manifested by the Ontario government in the ORCL report which follows its opposition to amending the Education Act to permit HL instruction with a statement of its concern that Ontario students be “truly literate in one of the official languages” (ORCL, 1994: 212). Ontario is more concerned with ensuring that everyone speaks an official language, or rather English (ORCL, 1994), and unlike British Columbia and Alberta, does not share the view of the vast literature documenting the value of HLs in developing literacy in a second language. The Ontario government has made obvious in its less than favourable view of languages (including French) and in its muddled talk, that it believes in the preservation of the hegemonic position of English in relation to all languages. It sees languages as a link to the past without value for society or the goals of multiculturalism.

Another issue that is revealed by the examination of the provincial systems of HL education is the lack of success in training students in the respective language. Section 2.3. identified the most important characteristic of a successful language program. That is giving the target language a veritable function. Immersion study operates on the belief that students should use the HL and official language(s) in a variety of natural situations and for different purposes. Yet many HL programs, particularly non-immersion programs, do not provide stimulating use of the language and are counter-productive to language acquisition

and maintenance (J. de la Campa, personal communication, April 13, 2005). In Ontario, even though French as an official language receives consistent federal funding and has a certain status, its inadequate programs have not led to positive attitudes towards French speakers. Students only begin studying French in Grade 4, and the following five years of study do not provide an intensive or effective program. Even if students continue with French as a subject until graduation from high school, they are highly unlikely to have much more than a basic competence in the language (Hayday, 2001). It is virtually impossible to become bilingual, even functionally, from such a limited exposure to French. Moreover, with French immersion being only offered at a few schools, few students have the opportunity to become bilingual. When students are not able to achieve even conversational competence in French, it is ridiculous to even toy with the idea that students could achieve fluency in their HL without integration into the school system where they could obtain more than 2½ hours of language instruction a week.

By including HL instruction in the regular day, British Columbia and especially Alberta have given languages legitimate status instead of relegating them to the after-school and weekend programs. However, the issue with non-official language education in all the provinces, including Alberta, lies with the fact that school boards are not required to offer languages other than French. Thus, Alberta, which permits partial immersion, as well as BC which has a second language requirement which is not limited to French, have not mandated boards to offer non-official languages, thus creating an inequality of access for students in each province. In BC, many schools only offer French and perhaps one additional language, resulting not simply in an urban-rural divide but an incredible inconsistency of offerings from town to town, which in effect denies students the opportunity to learn “economic” languages and to fulfil their individual potential. Furthermore, this policy suggests that the

fight against racism is somehow more important and pertinent in urban settings. Clews (2000) recently recognized rural racism in New Brunswick as a problem for immigrants and their children.

Alberta, similar to Ontario, funds many supplementary HL schools and offers students the opportunity to obtain school credits for their language achievement outside school hours (Canadian Ethnocultural Council, 1988). This credit is valuable as it still allows smaller communities to obtain HL instruction, particularly those that are not offered by boards in the regular curriculum.

Martorelli (1990: 103) argues that Ontario's lack of "political consciousness", "central location, and the fact that it houses the nation's capital causes Ontarians to view themselves as Canadians." These facts, along with its demand for acceptable leadership (conservative but progressive, believing in equal treatment for all), has allowed the provincial government to move glacially in implementing change. Ontarians, Martorelli (1990: 104) maintains, do not believe in change for change's sake, preferring "order, stability and continuity." The government only implements change "when times demand[ed] it" and could "be assured of being in power for a long period of time" (Martorelli, 1990: 140). Because Ontarians see themselves as Canadians, it seems that the Ontario government has tended to simply follow the lead of the federal leadership, especially in terms of its policies of multiculturalism. Stronger direction from the Government of Canada in promoting multiculturalism and multilingualism would likely induce Ontario to make needed changes to its policies to reflect its great diversity of language and culture.

On the other hand, in the western provinces, most notably Alberta, the historic feelings of *Western Alienation* are deeply ingrained. The western provinces' belief that Ottawa has not promoted their interests has led the provinces to go their own way. This is apparent

from Alberta's and British Columbia's opting to not impose French as a second language for their students. Moreover, their very different demographics have had a great effect on the directions for language education. Alberta and BC have never had large populations of Francophones. In Alberta, for instance, German and Ukrainian speakers have exceeded the numbers of French speakers since the early part of the 19th century. Today, speakers of Chinese and German (as well as Punjabi in BC) as a mother tongue significantly outnumber the French as a mother tongue speakers in both Alberta and British Columbia (Statistics Canada, 2001b). These facts have influenced the languages of focus in schools and perhaps made the school boards reluctant to stick to the federal agenda in language education.

The examination of provincial discourse has made it evident that Ontario's cautious approach to reform has done little to support HLs and the objectives of multiculturalism, particularly when compared to the revolutionary developments in Alberta and British Columbia. Despite the demands and the need to meet the challenge and take advantage of its tremendous linguistic resources, Ontario's approach to sustaining multiculturalism seems ironic given its status as Canada's most diverse province.

The provinces, because they maintain absolute authority over education, are poised to make use of the school system as a site for powerful programs of multicultural education.

We look to the schools to help us sustain a climate in which racial, religious and linguistic differences will be both understood and appreciated, even if such differences are not easily accommodated within the framework of any one system. We have come to accept that the expression of cultural pluralism will be made manifest as differences in social and religious values, differences in relationships between home and school, and differences in perceptions about the role of school in children's lives – and that these differences will, at times, require mediation as we try to find common paths among uncommon positions (Sullivan, 1988: 28).

Language can and should play a crucial role in such programs to “achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, political life of Canada” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988: Preamble).

4.0. PLAN OF ACTION

The previous chapters have presented and analyzed the results of more than thirty years of federal and provincial policies of multiculturalism, and demonstrated that the policies have not made any significant impact on the retention and acquisition of heritage languages. Chapter 2 argued that it was not language policy in itself, but ambiguous rhetoric and weak implementation that has produced few tangible results.

The federal and provincial policies are now out-dated and no longer reflect or address the Canadian demographic, social, or economic reality. The provinces, particularly those which have been transformed by high levels of immigration including, Ontario, British Columbia [BC], Quebec and Alberta, now have “little in common with the province[s] that existed even three decades ago” (ORCL, 1994: 50). The world is more connected than ever before. It is now commonplace for Canadians to work, travel, and conduct business and trade across international borders. The job market has also undergone significant change. Those now entering the workplace can expect to change jobs at least once or twice during their careers. Additionally, the skills developed during their schooling can be invaluable in transitioning from school to work and from job to job. Finally, multiculturalism has become a self-defining national characteristic for all Canadians and is becoming important at all levels of government and business. Multiculturalism has become synonymous with the pursuit of a just, respectful, and cohesive society that gives all Canadians “both the opportunity and the capacity to shape the future of their communities and their country” (Canadian Heritage, 2000b). However, a multicultural Canada, which is *just, respectful*, and provides *equal opportunities* to all its citizens, depends upon federal and provincial institutions’ readiness to re-evaluate and revise current multicultural policies that recognize and value HLs.

The objective of this thesis has been not only to provide a descriptive study and critical analysis of language legislation, but also outline a frame of reference which outlines the steps to successful acquisition and maintenance of languages in Canada. Below, I put forth a series of practical and viable policies in an action plan to guide the provincial and federal governments in reforming their approach to multilingualism within an enthusiastic and tangible vision of multiculturalism. The recommendations deal with five issues, most of which are closely related to education: *Recognition of Language in Legislation; Access, Choice and Flexibility; Alternative Learning Options; Communication, Research and Resources; and Language Outside Education*. In proposing how policy should be adjusted to reflect and encourage successful HL maintenance programs, attention will be given not only to the needs and aspirations of ethnocultural communities as well as majority language Canadians. It is essential that all Canadians have the opportunity to take advantage of Canada's tremendous cultural and linguistic diversity.

Canada is becoming more and more a multilingual society with a growing number of immigrants with non-English or non-French mother tongues. In the last census, about 1 in 6 Canadians reported a mother tongue other than English or French (Statistics Canada, 2002c). Nonetheless, it has been established that such linguistic and cultural diversity is not, and will not be, sustained given the rapid rates of assimilation. Official multiculturalism seems to have helped Canadians to feel "comfortable in this country regardless of their ethnocultural characteristics," but visible minorities still report discrimination or unfair treatment "because of their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion" (Statistics Canada, 2003a: 26). It is clear that the need for an effective policy of multiculturalism has not diminished over time.

Unfortunately, the vague federal and provincial policies of multiculturalism have been continually reinterpreted and manipulated by government, undercutting program initiatives and producing very few positive results for HLs. The failure of the BC Multiculturalism Act, for instance, to acknowledge language as an essential part of multiculturalism has allowed financial support for the HL programs to be eliminated within ten years. Conversely, the federal Multiculturalism Act *did* make reference to language and included the acquisition and maintenance of languages as one of its policy objectives. But without explicit policy direction and definition of government responsibilities, the federal government was able to altogether reinterpret and ignore language as part of the policy.

The federal and provincial policies on multiculturalism are no longer relevant in philosophy, structure, or programs, given the enormous social, economic and cultural changes that have taken place since they were enacted (Alberta, 1981). What is more, the country is now demanding that the vision of multiculturalism move beyond arts, music, and 'tolerance' to more closely reflect the needs and aspirations of our time.

4.1. Recognition of Languages in Legislation

4.1.1. Multiculturalism and Multilingualism in Policy

Canada is part of a global economy where language skills are highly valued. Many governments have acknowledged language as an invaluable asset to business, trade and international relations, yet neither the federal or provincial policies have truly addressed 'language' and its relationship to multiculturalism. This lack has allowed their policies to be manipulated to serve political agendas rather than the needs and aspirations of Canadians. The time has come for all levels of government to revise their policies and legislation and to make significant investment in their citizens. The governments have promoted the belief that unity can be developed through public awareness and cultural festivals, but this approach has in no way affected the persistent process of language loss. Unless 'language' is given strong, sustained, and tangible support within the context of multiculturalism and education, the massive language loss of each generation will continue.

Recommendation 1

That all federal and provincial governments enact or revise policies of multiculturalism which:

- *Define multiculturalism and the role of language within it.*
- *Make a statement to the value of cultural and linguistic diversity and how it enhances social and economic well-being in Canada and the provinces.*
- *Recognize multiculturalism and multilingualism as essential means for developing cross-cultural understanding and deep respect for all of Canada's citizens.*
- *Include provisions for programs for Heritage Languages and Multilingualism in Education.*
- *Establish an Office for Multiculturalism to monitor, investigate and report on the implementation of multiculturalism within federal jurisdiction.*

4.1.2. Provincial Language Policy

BC and Alberta have both set out their positions on language education in provincial language policies. BC's *Language Education Policy* states that the Government of British Columbia will ensure all students have the opportunity to learn languages that are significant within their communities (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1994). Alberta's *Language*

Education Policy states also its support for the provision of opportunities for students wishing to acquire or maintain languages other than English or French, so that they may have access to a partial immersion (bilingual) program or to second language courses in languages other than English or French (Alberta Education, 1988). Ontario, on the other hand, has only curriculum guidelines, *International Languages Curriculum Guidelines: Part A: Policy and Program Considerations, Intermediate and Senior Divisions 1990* (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1990), which simply ‘encourage’ the teaching of any modern language in which students are interested. It does not, however, charge the government with the responsibility of ensuring that language learning opportunities are provided. Ontario must now come in line with the other provinces and give their students equivalent opportunities to develop fluency in any number of Canada’s languages.

Recommendation 2

That the provinces develop language policies which make specific commitments to language in education and pledge responsibility to international language education at all levels, from preschool to post-secondary.

4.1.3. Federal Language Policy

The traditional vision of Canada as simply two founding races with their two languages is at odds with the present-day multicultural, multilingual reality. All Canadians are very aware of the need to acquire English and/or French, and should be supported through federal and provincial programs to achieve high levels of competence in one or both official languages. At the same time, Canada’s future as a trading nation requires that its citizens have linguistic abilities in addition to those in English and/or French. A national language policy that recognizes and actively supports non-official languages has the potential to not only support trilingualism (in English, French and another language) but also provide the foundation for a Canada which supports the goals of multiculturalism. The federal government’s policies

have shown their great effect on provincial policies, as well as on the Canadian psyche. It is now time for the federal government to take the initiative to develop policies at the national level which recognize languages as a national resource and develop them alongside the official languages.

Recommendation 3

That the federal government develop a national language policy and take an active role in encouraging provinces to incorporate heritage languages into education, while also strengthening the status and use of the official languages.

4.2. Access, Choice and Flexibility

The ability to speak several languages has long been seen as a mark of culture and intelligence. Many Canadian parents want to give their children the opportunity to become bilingual in Canada's two official languages, in addition to another, non-official, language. The list of benefits of cultivating bi- and multi-lingualism in individuals and society is long. Academically, immersion students (immigrant and Canadian-born) show improvement in their grades and on standardized tests. Socially, with HL instruction students maintain their ethnic identity and language, which positively affects their self-esteem. Bilingualism is also an effective tool for developing respect for minority languages and communities. Economically, many of Canada's trading partners do not have English as their primary language of communication (Alberta Education, 1997), making multilingualism very useful in developing and sustaining trade links.

It is not simply the benefits but the costs of not developing multilingualism that are significant. The costs are great: time, effort, and other financial expenses. Many individuals struggle later in life with the "time, effort, commitment and motivation" needed to learn another language in high school or university, though usually not succeeding in attaining a high level of proficiency (Snow & Hakuta, 1992). In the United States, millions of dollars are spent to train foreign-service, military, and intelligence personnel in other languages. In the post-9/11 era, even Canada's security and intelligence community, including the Canada Security Intelligence Service [CSIS] and Communications Security Establishment [CSE], has begun "mobiliz[ing] itself for the war against terrorism... which implies a human resource development effort on the part of the intelligence services, in particular to acquire the cultural and language proficiencies, and analytical and intelligence skills for the tasks ahead" (Rudner, 2002: 29).

Canadian institutions need to develop their cultural and linguistic resources. It has long been known that immersion programs are one of the most effective means accomplishing this goal. However, a great obstacle that stands in the way of producing bi- or poly-linguals through immersion or bilingual programs. That obstacle lies with the fact that some provinces have prohibited the use of non-official languages in schools.

4.2.1. Languages of Instruction

The critical determiner of whether HLs can be used in the public school system rests with the provincial education (or school) acts, which may or may not have been amended to include non-official languages as instructional languages. Some provinces, such as BC, do not make explicit reference to non-official languages in their education acts but have interpreted the non-exclusion as permission for HL instruction. Other provinces, particularly Ontario, have done exactly the opposite.

Six of the ten provinces have made provisions in legislation for HL immersion or partial immersion programs, the exceptions being the eastern provinces and Ontario. Though the absence of international language programs in the eastern provinces is perhaps related to a lack of demand (Alberta Education, 1997: 24), Ontario certainly has the demand and interest. In this case, the provincial government has not accepted its responsibility to Ontarians in providing the best opportunities to achieve their full potential while promoting a socially and economically healthy society.

Recommendation 4

That all provinces amend their Education Acts to give explicit authorization for languages other than English or French to be used as languages of instruction.

4.2.2. Language in the Curriculum

The federal government and all the provinces have recognized the value of language learning and have recommended that language courses be offered to students. In recent provincial Royal Commission reports on education, it has been recommended not only that language learning be given an important place in the curriculum, but that it be offered from an earlier age. Although the addition of HL languages may present some challenges, it is necessary that the provinces begin to take advantage of their resources and develop them for our children and society.

Alberta authorizes resources for language programs that have a provincial curriculum and so too does British Columbia. However, neither appears to support the development of the curriculum, and this is left to the individual community to finance development of the materials, generally with the help of outside consultants (Alberta Education, 1997; B. Bouska, personal communication, November 28, 2000). To support equitable access, provincial governments should reconsider their policies on locally developed curriculum. All students benefit from well-developed and consistent curriculum. It is thus recommended that government take an active role in developing language curriculum.

Recommendation 5

That the “acquisition of a third language become an intrinsic part of the common curriculum from a young age” to Grade 10 inclusively, “with the understanding that the choice of language(s) taught or acquired will be determined locally, and that the acquisition of such a third language outside schools be recognized as equivalent by an examination process, similar to what we term challenge exams within the secondary school credit system” (ORCL, 1994: 151).

Recommendation 6

That the provinces should not only offer languages where there is sufficient demand but should provide services for creating provincially approved curriculum for languages not already being taught.

4.2.3. Bilingual and Immersion Programs

Once provincial Education Acts have been amended to permit additional languages of instruction, provinces should not wait for outside pressure but take initiative in piloting partial immersion programs. Multilingualism is widely regarded as a competitive edge and immersion as the best way to begin developing Canada's linguistic advantage. Immersion programs can reduce the high rates of attrition⁴⁶ often found among students studying a language as a subject, which is characterized by infrequent usage of a language. Moreover, the current practice of studying language as a subject does not provide students with the instructional hours needed to develop even basic 'survival skills' (Alberta Education, 1997).

Research has demonstrated that the time spent studying a language is linked to the level of linguistic competence achieved. Students enrolling in a secondary school language course for three years are exposed to the language for approximately 375 hours (Alberta, 1997). This may be sufficient to achieve the most basic survival skills in some European languages, but is certainly not enough to develop even limited professional, working proficiency. The time required to develop a given level of linguistic fluency varies by language and ability. "For the average learner [whose mother tongue is English], Group I languages (Spanish, French, Italian, etc.) require the least amount of time to learn, while on the other end of the spectrum, Group IV languages (Arabic, Japanese, Mandarin, Korean) require significantly more time to learn," due in part to their different writing systems (Alberta Education, 1997: 14). While "an average learner can achieve survival proficiency in a Group I language after about 240 hours of study, learners of Group IV languages require at least twice the amount of time (480 hours) to reach the same level of proficiency" (Alberta Education, 1997: 14).

⁴⁶ Attrition refers to the loss of language that results from not studying or using a language long enough to develop 'survival skills' or a stable competence.

Bilingual and immersion programs offer more hours of exposure to the target language and give students the degree and type of contact with the language needed to develop second language competence (Alberta Education, 1997: 43). If language is to be integrated into the curriculum, then it is imperative that language study be made worthwhile. It is necessary that appropriate programs and curriculum structure be put in place to give students the chance to achieve at least communicative competence.

Recommendation 7

That provinces, which have not already done so, set out a plan to launch pilot immersion programs, with bilingual/immersion programs being offered in a variety of languages within five years.

4.2.4. Equality of Access

A major criticism of federal and provincial policies of multiculturalism was their inadequate response to issues of ‘equal access’ and ‘participation’. All of the policies purported to promote access and participation, yet none took the substantive steps to ensure all citizens could gain access to learning about other cultures and languages. It was argued that this inequality of access undermined multiculturalism policies at all levels.

BC and Alberta both have made provisions for the teaching of HLs in schools. However, with no requirement that school boards offer languages other than French, students’ opportunities to acquire a second or third language are very limited. It is believed that language learning promotes cross-cultural understanding and respect for other cultures and thus it seems necessary that *all* students have the opportunity to acquire another language. Equitable access must be given to language instruction in the school system, to *all* students in *all* communities.

Alberta’s Ministry of Education has recognized this “great inequality of access for students across the province” (Sokolowski, 1999: 114) and is now taking the steps toward a

mandatory second-language initiative for students in Grades 4 to 9, which is also intended to push schools to offer more language study (Alberta, 2004). Not only should school boards have a mandate to offer additional languages beyond English or French, but their choice of languages should not be solely dependent on their economic status. Choices should also reflect languages which are significant in the province and community. To address the growing rural-urban divide, governments must insist on giving all students equitable access to the opportunity to develop their full potential and to be a part of transforming Canada into a country of knowledge and respect.

Supplementary HL classes were designed to help smaller language communities in teaching their languages, particularly those not offered through existing education programs. It is, therefore, necessary that the provincial governments provide support until such time that they are integrated into their local schools.

“Saturday” schools have always been linked to a belief that non-official languages have little value in the modern world for Canadians. This perception was propagated by the federal government with its support for after-hours classes without a policy of “encouraging” the provinces to integrate non-official languages into the regular school day. Today, both BC and Alberta have brought language instruction into the mainstream, but Ontario still holds close to its tradition of marginalizing non-official languages and is wary of making any change to the status quo. Both the provinces and the Canadian public are beginning to see the development of linguistic resources as a worthy endeavour and it is now time to give language education to all students. Though this need was partly addressed by previous recommendations, it is also important that the government seek to attract students of all backgrounds to language study. Because HLs were long relegated to after-school and weekend classes, the belief that language learning is only for ethno-cultural groups, trying to

hang on to “the past”, is still pervasive. In order to bring multilingualism into the public consciousness, it is essential that language learning and its benefits are promoted not only to attract majority language students, but to develop positive attitudes in the public for language acquisition and maintenance, and the value that multilingualism holds in Canadian society and for our children.

Language study at the elementary and secondary school levels has tended to produce mediocre results in terms of language proficiency. This result cannot be solely attributed to attrition and insufficient hours of instruction, though these factors have certainly impaired student achievement. Students in post-secondary language courses tend to show better results after an equivalent amount of instructional hours. This result is partly related to the fact that many of the post-secondary language courses are considered intensive. Even with only 3 to 4 hours of weekly instruction, students rise to meet the high expectations of their teachers who generally demand a great deal of home study (particularly memorization work). After a year of intensive post-secondary language study, students may gain the equivalent knowledge of 2 to 5 years of secondary school language courses. Schools need to provide more challenging curriculum and course work that push students to produce language early on (Swain, 2004), without exclusive emphasis on listening comprehension and grammar.

Recommendation 8

That provinces mandate school boards to offer languages, in addition to French or English, as a subject or in bilingual programs so that all communities and students have the opportunity to study and gain fluency in other languages, particularly those important to their community.

Recommendation 9

That for the present time, funding be provided to communities for supplementary HL programs, until their languages are offered in their local schools.

Recommendation 10

That the federal and provincial governments promote the value of learning non-official languages through print, radio, and television campaigns. Additionally, information campaigns should be undertaken to make Canadians aware of the programs and languages offered in their communities.

4.3. Alternative Learning Options

Language needs to be a way of life and must not be limited just to elementary and secondary schools; it should begin before and continue after graduation. It should also be a part of summers and weekends. The most successful language programs maximize the classroom as the site of language transmission, following the belief that language is acquired, not learnt.

4.3.1. Pre-school

Language programs seem to be rooted in a belief that one or two years of study will allow students to develop an ability that is just short of fluency. Research shows that for many languages, this is only enough time to provide a modest introduction to the language. With national day-care soon to be a reality (CBC News, 2005), it is important to determine a role for HLs in early childhood education [ECE]. It is well-established that beginning language study earlier can make a difference in language acquisition, in terms of fluency, pronunciation, and even motivation (Geva & Salerno, 1986; ORCL, 1995).

Ontario's RCL made it clear that "good pre-school" education was beneficial for all and argued that its rewards are far-reaching: from positive attitudes to learning, increased self-esteem, and more lasting effects on educational and employment aspirations (ORCL, 1994: 123). The Commissioners accordingly recommended that "full-time education be universally available for three to five-year-olds" though they also recommended that the phasing in of ECE into French-languages school units be given priority in space and funding (ORCL, 1994: 105).

This thesis, however, recommends that ECE be extended well beyond the modest vision of the ORCL to include ECE for all Ontario children with options for HL units. Geva and Salerno's (1986: i) study on HLs in preschools suggests that preschool HL programs would also "improve children's self-concept, their attitudes toward older members

of their ethnic community and their appreciation of their communal heritage” in addition to supporting their linguistic development. Moreover, parents in Geva and Salerno’s study, who already had children in a HL preschool program, indicated willingness “to pay 50-100% of the costs for maintaining such programs” (Geva & Salerno, 1986: ii).

Recommendation 11

That Early Childhood Education [ECE] with provisions for heritage language [HL] units be provided by all school boards to all children from 3 to 5 years in age whose parents choose to enrol them. HL pilot programs should be phased in with the introduction of national day-care or provincial ECE.

4.3.2. After Graduation and Outside the Classroom

In order to maintain the momentum of language study after graduating from high school, it is necessary that occasions to use the target language be created. The most obvious course is to extend the language study into the post-secondary education. A variety of languages should be offered at the post secondary level with sufficient seats for interested students to enrol. The language courses should be intensive and, if there is demand, streaming of students to reflect their proficiency levels.

Post-secondary classes may also be able to fill an additional role. School boards, particularly in less urban areas, cannot be expected to offer more than a handful of languages. However, universities and colleges, which have a great variety of offerings, could potentially admit high school students into language courses offered in the evening or summers. Moreover, a study should be undertaken to determine the feasibility in giving secondary school students the opportunity to gain credits toward their diploma through post-secondary language courses.

Recommendation 12

That both the federal and provincial governments support language instruction in a variety of languages at the post-secondary level.

4.3.3. Study Abroad, Exchange Programs, and Summer Immersion

Becoming fluent in a language may be a daunting task, but there are actually many ways to achieve fluency. What is needed, simply, is immersion. Immersion programs allow students to focus on language learning. In these programs, languages are learned faster, with longer retention and with more native-like ability. By studying abroad, students are not only immersed in a language, but also a cultural setting unparalleled by any classroom. In addition, study abroad programs draw participants from all over the world, which makes these programs not only international but multinational. Students are exposed to the culture of the country in which they are studying, as well as to the cultures of their classmates.

Immersion programs should allow students to study their own disciplines through study abroad and work closely with the students' home institutions to give credits for academic work during the program. It is important that educational institutions expand, strengthen, and market their exchange and study abroad programs and make them available to students of all ages and at all points in their schooling. An active and extensive support of study abroad and exchange programs at all levels of schooling will not only produce multilingualism but a citizenry not confined by cultural borders.

The federal government currently provides full-time high school and post-secondary students with bursaries to study an official language during intensive 5-week immersion programs at universities and colleges across the country. Similar programs for HLs, closely modelled on the federal bursary program, could provide students with the chance to study less commonly taught language in an immersion context. Although this program would present some unique challenges, its benefits could be enormous and would be sure to garner

a great deal of interest. A program of this magnitude would need the co-ordination of provincial and municipal levels (ministries of education and school boards). This would thus be an opportunity for federal authorities⁴⁷ or a national organization to assist in co-ordinating these parties (see Recommendation 17).

Such programs should not be limited to secondary school students but be open to university students and adults who want to learn a second or third language (though they would be required to pay their own fees). Federal institutions might also find intensive, immersion programs useful for training their employees in non-official languages. They may even consider reimbursing employees who complete these programs. Short-term intensive immersion programs would be an immense opportunity for all Canadians to learn another language. Such programs would also support students wishing to continue their language studies, as well as those students limited by the offerings in their own schools.

Recommendation 13

That the federal and provincial governments interact with local school boards to acknowledge exchange programs as an integral part of the learning experience and to work to develop larger programs that allow more student participation.

Recommendation 14

That the provincial and federal governments work to develop and support immersion language programs for all students: elementary, secondary, or post-secondary.

⁴⁷ Though the funding of these programs would require consideration of and discussion with the various stakeholders, provincial ministries of education, in addition to federal authorities, hold responsibilities for funding such initiatives (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988: 5.1.f).

4.3.4. Challenge and Equivalency Exams

Languages should not be acquired wholly in a classroom. Though it is important to advocate for students to have opportunities to learn languages in school, it is just as important to support students in learning or maintaining a language that they may have learnt at home, or elsewhere. Many students have strong knowledge of other languages already, whether a first, second or third language. These skills need to be recognized and valued. In order to encourage the private acquisition and maintenance of languages, the Ontario RCL (1994) recommended that students be given the opportunity to take challenge exams. These exams would allow them to receive academic credit in the language of their choice and “receive a mark that would be equated to a course level (e.g. equivalent to the completion of one credit in Italian)” (ORCL, 1994: 196). They would then receive up to two credits toward a degree or diploma. As the ORL report states, these exams are already available in Manitoba for languages taught in the public schools, as well as those not already in the regular curriculum.

The Ontario RCL also recommends the use of challenge exams for students with a tangible acknowledgement of their knowledge and achievement in the language. It also advocates their use as a type of placement test, which would allow students to enter more advanced language courses without taking the prerequisite courses. However, in the case of languages taught at the basic levels in grades 9 and 10, there may be no opportunity for advancement. Provincial governments must give more opportunity for language learning outside the regular curriculum guidelines. If the courses are not available in the elementary or secondary school system, opportunity should be provided to secondary students to obtain language credits in the community, or through post-secondary language classes.

The ministries (or another organization, perhaps federal) “should support the design and encourage the use of challenge exams in [language study], beginning in grade 10, for

students who wish to earn a limited number of credits in a language other than English or French, whether or not they receive instruction in the school system” (ORCL, 1994: 196).

Recommendation 15

That students be given the option to obtain “as many as two international language credits toward their diploma no matter where they obtained their training or knowledge of the language(s) if, upon examination, they demonstrate appropriate levels of language mastery” (ORCL, 1994: 196).

Recommendation 16

That the appropriate government agency be responsible for the funding and creation of HL proficiency tests for various languages – for challenge and equivalency purposes, and potentially as a means of indicating proficiency level to potential employers.

4.4. Communication, Research and Resources

4.4.1. A National Heritage Languages Institute

In February 1991, Bill C-37 received Royal Assent to create the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute [CHLI], a national organization that would develop teacher training programs, Canadian-oriented learning materials and conduct “research into all aspects of Canada’s heritage languages” (Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act, 1991: 4.f). This Act received a great deal of attention and was seen as not only deeply symbolic but also as representing a tangible response to the needs of ethno-cultural communities (Stasiulis, 1988). The Act has yet to be implemented.

The CHLI is just as necessary now as it was in 1991; perhaps even more so given Canada’s growing diversity and interest in languages as an economic advantage for individuals and businesses. Such an organization could assist the provinces with the various levels of language learning and the sharing of information. It could help to unify the divergent programming that has resulted from decentralized education (Alberta Education, 1997). A national institute would coordinate programs and initiatives, resources and knowledge in order to deal with the disconnectedness of students, teachers and programs from high school to post-secondary education.

The federal act to create the CHLI (see Appendix IV) gave specific details of its responsibilities, powers, funding, and organizational structure. It is now the time to implement this act to provide a core of theoretical and applied research on HLs, as well as a hub for communication between various levels of government, schools, communities, students and teachers. The national institute should be modelled on similar organizations in the United States such as the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition

[CARLA]⁴⁸, the Center for Applied Linguistics [CAL]⁴⁹, and the National Foreign Languages Institute [NFLI]⁵⁰.

One of these organization's most interesting initiatives is CARLA's Less Commonly Taught Languages [LCTL] program, which focuses on promoting the teaching of languages less commonly taught, but often which are spoken by a majority of people around the world (CARLA, n.d). One of the LCTL projects is a database of course offerings for schools in North America which facilitates searching by course types, levels, languages and institutions or state/provinces. All language learners, teachers, and researchers would greatly benefit from a similar database for Canada and the provinces, and such a resource should be developed in the immediate future.

Recommendation 17

That the federal government create and fund a national heritage language organization that follows with the same responsibilities and powers of the original act, and that it be given sufficient budget to carry out its mandate.

4.4.2. Support for Teachers

Teachers give a great deal of time and energy to their classes, students and subjects of instruction. They need more training to better meet needs of diverse student populations.

⁴⁸ The mission of CARLA "is to study multilingualism and multiculturalism, to develop knowledge of second language acquisition, and to advance the quality of second language teaching, learning, and assessment by: conducting research and action projects, sharing research-based and other forms of knowledge across disciplines and education systems, extending, exchanging, and applying this knowledge in the wider society" (CARLA, n.d).

⁴⁹ "The CAL is a private, non-profit organization: a group of scholars and educators who use the findings of linguistics and related sciences in identifying and addressing language-related problems. CAL carries out a wide range of activities including research, teacher education, analysis and dissemination of information, design and development of instructional materials, technical assistance, conference planning, program evaluation, and policy analysis" (CAL, n.d).

⁵⁰ The NFLC's Mission "is to improve the capacity of the US to communicate in languages other than English. We implement that mission through intensive and innovative strategic planning and development with globalized institutions, organizations and enterprises throughout the US" (NFLC, 2004).

As language instructors, teachers may have students from a variety of backgrounds and of a wide range of language proficiencies. HL learners often vary both in their proficiency levels and in the types of language skills they possess. Some may have a strong oral fluency but be unable to write; others may have much better listening skills than spoken ability. Regular studies in pedagogy at teachers' colleges do not always prepare teachers for the challenges they will face in a HL classroom.

Neither Alberta, British Columbia or Ontario require teachers to have teaching certification for out-of-school HL instruction. All teachers of in-school programs require teacher certification under regular provincial teaching requirements. In Ontario, it is estimated that "the numbers of international language instructors holding provincial certification range from 5 to 13 per cent" (Alberta Education, 1997: 31). It should be necessary that teachers for new language courses and bilingual programs have normal teacher certification requirements as established by the respective Ministry of Education. Thus provinces should look into creating certification programs. In Alberta, only one community college offers a HL teacher certification program (Alberta Education, 1997).

Recommendation 18

That provincial governments encourage colleges and universities to offer HL certification programs, though not require them for instructors, except in the case of in-school language teaching which should follow government guidelines.

Recommendation 19

That provincial governments provide professional development opportunities for HL teachers to build their knowledge of language acquisition, pedagogy, and their practical applications for the classroom.

4.5. Language Outside the Curriculum

Many of the activities under the federal and provincial multiculturalism policies have been about “project[ing] the multicultural reality of Canada” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988: 5.1.a). These activities have generally come down to the support of art, music, and films that showcase Canada as a multi-ethnic country while portraying various ethno-cultural experiences. As important as it is to raise awareness among the public of the concerns and experience of its multicultural communities, it is equally necessary that Canadians be given the opportunity to use their multilingual abilities. Presently, Canada and its provinces provide many services in a variety of languages and they should continue to do so. Language also needs to be an outlet for personal expression and means of communication. Canadians should be able to create, as well as enjoy multilingual programming, literature, film and music.

Recommendation 20

That all levels of government encourage multilingual broadcasting and close captioning in more languages; the CRTC should be encouraged to consider applications for multilingual networks.

Recommendation 21

That all levels of government support the public libraries (municipal, school and university) in Canada to acquire materials, including books, magazines, “talking” books, newspapers, and films, in languages other than French and English to meet the needs of its diverse communities.

Recommendation 22

That the grant-giving agencies accept and consider applications for grants for creative writing, film and music projects that are in languages other than French or English.

Recommendation 23

That all levels of government inform public and private companies of the benefits of having multilingual employees while also marketing Canadian linguistic assets internationally.

Recommendation 24

That federal institutions re-assess the pay scales for employees who speak a language other than French or English, particularly when those employees are called upon often to use their linguistic skills.

Recommendation 25

That federal institutions continue to produce publications in languages in addition to French and English.

Today, multiculturalism is one of the most basic features of Canadian identity. The respect and value Canadians hold for diversity is admired the world over. Language is inextricably connected with culture. Consequently, multiculturalism is inseparable from multilingualism. Yet, language has been nurtured, supported, or recognized by neither the federal or most provincial governments. Society is well-aware of the great rewards of bilingualism and polylingualism. Canadian governments, however, have not provided their citizens with the means to attain either. The children of immigrants continue to shift to English monolingualism within three generations. After years of language studies, many students leave with little more than ‘survival’ proficiency. Without the integration of languages into the lives of their speakers, cultural identity and, as a result, the ideals of multiculturalism will not be sustained. It is hoped that these recommendations will be given serious consideration and implementation so that we can finally give life to HLs and offer all Canadians both the opportunity and the capacity to shape the future of their communities and their country.

5.0. REFERENCES

- Alba, R., Logan, J., Lutz, A. & Stults, B. (2002). Only English by the third generation? Loss and preservation of the mother tongue among the grandchildren of contemporary immigrants. *Demography* 28(3), 467 – 484.
- Alberta. (1981). *New Policy Directions on Cultural Diversity in Alberta*. Calgary: Alberta Culture.
- Alberta. (2000). *Framework for Alberta's International Strategies*. Retrieved November 12, 2004, from http://www.iir.gov.ab.ca/international_relations/pdfs/3.1.1-%20AB_International_Strategies.pdf
- Alberta. (2004, October 6). *Government acting on Learning Commission recommendations*. Retrieved February 1, 2005, from <http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/news/2004/October/nr-CommissionProgress.asp>
- Alberta Cultural Heritage Act. 1984, c.A-17.5.
- Alberta School Act. R.S.A. 1970, c.329.
- Alberta Education. (1988). *Language Education Policy for Alberta*. Edmonton: Alberta Education.
- Alberta Education. (1997). *Trends and Issues in Language Education: A discussion paper: Draft*. Retrieved January 20, 2005, from <http://ednet.ednet.gov.ab.ca>
- Alberta Education. (2003, December 4). *Government supports 84 commission recommendations*. Retrieved January 20, 2005, from <http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/commission/response/recom.asp>
- Alberta Education. Alberta's Commission on Learning. (2003). *Every Child Learns, Every Child Succeeds : Report and Recommendations*. Retrieved November 12, 2004, from <http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/commission/PDF/CommissionReport.pdf>
- Alberta Education. (2005). *Learning Languages in Alberta: Language Initiative overview. The Language-Learning Requirement*. Retrieved January 20, 2005, from <http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/default.asp>
- Alberta Japan Office. (n.d.). *The Alberta Advantage Abroad*. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from <http://www.altanet.or.jp/>
- Alberta Learning. (1995). *Japanese Language and Culture 10-20-30 (Senior High)*. Retrieved November 12, 2004, from http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/k_12/curriculum/bySubject/languages/japan.pdf
- Alberta Learning. (2000). *Enhancing Language Learning: A Survey of Second Language Program Enrolments*. Edmonton, Alberta Learning.

Anderssen, E., & Valpy, M. (2003, July 6). Face the nation: Canada remade. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/series/newcanada/news/three.html>

Baker, C., & Jones, S.P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baron, D. (2001). Language legislation and language abuse: American language policy through the 1990s. In R.D. Gonzales & I. Melis (Eds.) *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement. Volume 2 History, theory and policy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1 – 4.

Berry, J., Kalin, R. & Taylor, D. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Beynon, J. & Toohey, K. (1991). Heritage language education in British Columbia: Policy and programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 47 (4), 606-616

Beynon, J., Ilieva, R., Dichupa, M. & Hirji, S. (2003). “Do you know your language?” How teachers of Punjabi and Chinese ancestries construct their family languages in their personal and professional lives. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2(1), 1 – 27.

Bialystok, E. (1988). Levels of bilingualism and levels of linguistic awareness. *Developmental Psychology* 24, 560 – 567.

Bissoondath, Neil. (1994). *Selling illusions: The cult of multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books.

Blanchfield, M. (2002, December 21). Canadian attitudes on immigration hardening against Muslims. *The Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved January 12, 2005, from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=271937851&sid=3&Fmt=3&clientId=3916&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Bodi, M. (1993). The changing role of minority languages in Australia: The European and Asia-Pacific nexus. In J. Mathias & P. Thomas. *Developing minority languages*, 410 – 418.

Breitkreuz, C. (1997). Reform Party: Federal funding for multiculturalism a needless expense. In A. Cardozo & L. Musto (Eds.). *The battle over multiculturalism: Does it help or hinder Canadian unity?* Ottawa: Pearson-Shoyama Institute, 46 -48.

British Columbia Heritage Language Association. (2002). *Second language education in British Columbia*. Retrieved May 01, 2004, from <http://www.bchla.org/about/pdf/factSheet.03.pdf>.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *K-12 Curriculum and Learning Resources (Integrated Resource Packages)*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp>

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1989). *Enabling Learners: Working Plan #1 1989-1999*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1990a). *Enabling Learners: Working Plan #2 1989-1999*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1990b). *Enabling Learners: Working Plan #3, 1990-1999: A Plan to Implement Policy Directions : A Response to the Sullivan Royal Commission on Education*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1990c). *Highlights: Year 2000: A Framework for Learning*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1990d). *Year 2000: A Curriculum and Assessment Framework for the Future*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (1994). *Language Education Policy*. Victoria: Queen's Printer.

British Columbia. Ministry of Education. (2004). *Curriculum – Integrated Resource Packages*. Retrieved January 5, 2004, from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/irp.htm>

British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Human Rights. (1994). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1993/1994*. Victoria: Multiculturalism BC.

British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration. (1996). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1995/1996*. Victoria: Multiculturalism BC.

British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration. (1997). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1996/1997*. Victoria: Multiculturalism BC.

British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration. (1998). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1997/1998*. Victoria: Multiculturalism BC.

British Columbia. Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration. (1999). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1998/1999*. Victoria: Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration.

British Columbia. Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services. (2001). *2000-2001 Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia*. Victoria: Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism.

British Columbia Multiculturalism Act, R.S., 1996, c. 321. Retrieved October 2, 2003, from http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/stat/M/96321_01.htm

- Brown, J. (1994, October 3). House of Commons. *Debates*. (Hansard). 35th Parliament, 1st Session. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://collection.nlc-bnc.ca/100/201/301/hansard-e/35-1/102_94-10-03/102GO1E.html
- Brown, J. (1997). Independent MP: Culture as an individual responsibility. In A. Cardozo & L. Musto (Eds.). *The battle over multiculturalism: Does it help or hinder Canadian unity?* Ottawa: Pearson-Shoyama Institute, 54 – 59.
- Brummet, A.J. (1989). *Policy Directions A Response to the Sullivan Royal Commission on Education by the Government of British Columbia*. Vancouver: Queen's Printer.
- Brunn, M. (1999). The absence of language policy and its effects on the education of Mexican migrant children. *Bilingual Research Journal* 23(4), 319 – 344.
- Bublick, Renate. (1978). *The development of the Ontario Heritage Languages Program: A case study of the interaction of administration, political and ethnic group interests in the making of public policy*. Unpublished master's thesis. McMaster University.
- Burnaby, B. (1996). Language policies in Canada. In M. Herriman & B. Burnaby (Eds.). *Language policies in English-dominant countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 159-219.
- Caldas, S.J. & Caron-Caldas, S. (2002). A sociolinguistic analysis of language preferences of adolescent bilinguals: Shifting allegiances and developing identities. *Applied Linguistics* 23(1) 490 – 514.
- Came, B. (1990, June 25). Accents of conflict: The melting pot menaces linguistic minorities. *Maclean's* 103, 77-78.
- Canada. House of Commons. Standing Committee on Multiculturalism. (1987). *Multiculturalism: Building the Canadian Mosaic. Report of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism*. (Issue No.5). 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session, 1986-87. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (1982). Retrieved December 11, 2004, from http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/const/annex_e.html#I
- Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. (1975). *First Annual Report of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism*. Ottawa: Minister of State for Multiculturalism.
- Canadian Education Association. (1983). *Heritage language programs in the school system*. Toronto: CEA Information Service.
- Canadian Ethnocultural Council. (1988). *The other Canadian languages: A report on the status of heritage languages across Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Ethnocultural Council.
- Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act [Not in force], 1991, c.7. Retrieved October 10, 2003, from <http://www.canlii.org/ca/sta/c-17.6/whole.html>

- Canadian Heritage. (1993). *Diversity: Meeting the government commitment. 1992/1993 annual report on the operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act*. Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (1995). *1993-1994 Annual Report on Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (Catalogue No. Ci95-1/1-1994). Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (1996). *1994-1995 Annual Report on Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (Catalogue No. Ci95-1/1-1996). Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (1997). *1995-1996 Annual Report on Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (Catalogue No. Ci95-1/1-1996). Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (2001a). *Annual Report on Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act 1999-2000*. (Catalogue No. Ci95-1/2000). Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (2001b). *Non official languages - Table 3.3 Population with Mother Tongue Other than English or French, Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/pubs/census2001/5_e.cfm
- Canadian Heritage. (2002a). *Annual Report on Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act 2001-2002* (Catalogue No. 95-1/2002). Ottawa: Canadian Heritage.
- Canadian Heritage. (2002b). *Multiculturalism: The Metropolis Project*. Retrieved November 30, 2003, from http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/pubs/metropolis_e.cfm
- Canadian Heritage. (2003). *Language in Canada 2001 Census – The Non-Official Languages*. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/lo-ol/pubs/census2001/5_e.cfm
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act, R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.). Retrieved October 2, 2003, from <http://www.canlii.org/ca/sta/c-18.7/whole.html>
- Carey, S. (1997). Language management, official bilingualism and multiculturalism in Canada. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 204 – 223.
- Castonguay, C. (1998). The fading Canadian duality. In J. Edwards (Ed.). *Language in Canada*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CBC News. (2003, December 4). *Canada's newcomers: Immigration patterns*. Retrieved December 4, 2004, from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/immigration>
- CBC News. (2005, February 23). *Goodale delivers 5-year plan*. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from <http://ottawa.cbc.ca/regional/servlet/View?filename=oc-budget20050223>
- Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition [CARLA]. (n.d). *Less Commonly Taught Languages*. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/lctl>

Center for Applied Linguistics [CAL]. (n.d). *About CAL*. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/admin/about.html>

Centre for Research and Information on Canada [CRIC]. (2003). *A New Canada? The Evolution of Canadian Identity and Attitudes to Diversity. A Presentation of Results from: THE CRIC-Globe and Mail Survey on the New Canada*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from http://www.cric.ca/pwp_re/new_canada/new_canada_2003_slides_eng.ppt

Chen, R. S. (2004, February 28). *Problems and perspectives in TCFL, TCSL and TCHL*. Address to Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives Colloquium, Comparative Approaches to Second Language Teaching.] University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

Cho, G. & Krashen, S. (1998). The negative consequences of heritage language loss and why we should care. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan. *Heritage language development*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates, 31 – 40.

Chrétien, J. (2003, July 12). *Immigration and Multiculturalism in Canada*. [Address to Progressive Governance Summit.] London, United Kingdom. Retrieved December 14, 2004, from http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/default.asp?Language=E&Page=pmarchive&Sub=NewsReleases&Doc=proggovt.papet.20030712_e.htm

Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC]. (2000). *The arrival of the Europeans: Forging our legacy. Canadian Citizenship and Immigration 1900-1977*. Retrieved January 25, 2005, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/departement/legacy/chap-2a.html>

Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC]. (2002). *Facts and Figures 2002: Immigration Overview*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC]. (2003a). *Annual Report to Parliament on Immigration*. (Catalogue no. Ci1-2003). Retrieved May 1, 2004, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pub/immigration2003.html>

Clews, R. (2000). *Constructing anti-racist social work from perspectives of 'other' in a Canadian rural context: Sensitizing concepts and stories from diverse people*. [Address to Joint Conference of the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work]. Montreal, PQ. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from http://www.anthro.umontreal.ca/varia/beaudetf/proceed/ftp_files5/Clews.pdf

Commissioner of Official Languages. (1971). *First Annual Report 1970-1971*. (Catalogue No. SF1-1971). Ottawa: Information Canada.

Commissioner of Official Languages. (1983). *Annual Report 1983*. Ottawa: Commission of Official Languages.

Communications Security Establishment [CSE]. (n.d). *Paul Sargent Memorial Scholarship for Foreign Language Studies*. Retrieved October 10, 2003, from <http://www.cse-cst.gc.ca/en/documents/careers/rules.pdf>

Constitution Act, 1867. Retrieved December 11, 2004, from http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/const/c1867_e.html#pre

Constitution Act, 1982. Retrieved December 11, 2004, from http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/const/annex_e.html#I

Consulate General of Japan at Calgary. (2003). *Japan-Canada Economic Relations*. Retrieved January 5, 2005, from <http://www.calgary.ca.emb-japan.go.jp/english/economic/ab.html>

Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Council of Ministers of Education Canada [CMEC]. (2004). *Explore: Learn French... et l'aventure*. Retrieved January 31, 2005, from <http://www.jexplore.ca/english/program.html>

Cummins, J. (Ed.). (1983). *Heritage language education: Issues and directions*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Cummins, J. (Ed.). (1984). *Heritage languages in Canada: Research perspectives*. Report of the Heritage Language Research Conference. May 1984. Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.

Cummins, J. (1994a). Heritage language learning and teaching. In J.W. Berry & J.A. LaPonce (Eds.). *Ethnicity and culture in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Cummins, J. (1994b). *The role of language maintenance and literacy development in promoting academic achievement in a multicultural society*. Paper written for the Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994.

Cummins, J. (1998). *Immersion Education for the Millennium: What We Have Learned from 30 Years of Research on Second Language Immersion*. Retrieved October 12, 2004, from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/strategies/immersion2000.html>

Cummins, J. & Danesi, M. (1990). *Heritage languages: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Danesi, M. (1993). Literacy and bilingual education programs in elementary school: Assessing the research. *Mosaic* 1(1), 6-12.

Davies, W. (1977, March 29). Throne Speech. Legislature of Ontario.

Dawson, D.J. (1981). The politics of Ukrainian bilingual education in Alberta. In M.R. Lupul (Ed.). *OSVITA: Ukrainian bilingual education*. Edmonton, University of Alberta Press, 231 – 245.

Duffy, A. *Class struggles: Public education and the new Canadian*. Retrieved January 11, 2005, from http://www.atkinsonfoundation.ca/files/Duffy_web.pdf

Edmonton Chinese Bilingual Education Association. (2004). *A brief history about the program*. Retrieved January 25, 2005, from <http://www.ecbea.org/program.html>

Elcock, W. (2003, October 16-18). *The John Tait Memorial Lecture* [Address to Canadian Association for Security and Intelligence Studies Conference]. Vancouver, BC. Retrieved September 10, 2003, from http://www.csis-scrs.gc.ca/eng/miscdocs/director20031017_e.html

Fairclough, N. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9, 739 – 763.

Feliciano, C. (2001). The benefits of biculturalism: Exposure to immigrant culture and dropping out of school among Asian and Latino youths. *Social Science Quarterly* 82(4), 865 – 879.

Feuerverger, G. (1991). University students' perceptions of heritage language learning and ethnic identity maintenance. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 47(4), 660 – 667.

Fish, Stanley. (1997). Boutique multiculturalism, or why Liberals are incapable of thinking about hate speech. *Critical Inquiry* 23, 378 – 395.

Fishman, J. (Ed.). (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. (2000). Reversing language shift: RLS theory and practice revisited. In G. Kindell & M.P Lewis. *Assessing ethnolinguistic vitality: Theory and practice. Selected papers from the third international language assessment conference*. Dallas: SIL International, 1 – 25.

Fleras, A. & Elliot, J.L. (1992). *The challenge of diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.

Frideres, J. (1998). Language in Alberta: Unilingualism in practice. In J. Edwards (Ed.). *Language in Canada*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 447 – 459.

Garcia, M. (1985). Family and offspring language maintenance and their effects on Chicano college students' confidence and grades. In E. Garcia & R. Padilla (Eds.). *Advances in bilingual education research*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 226 – 243.

Geva, E. & Salerno, L. (1986). *Heritage languages in preschools: A national survey*. Ottawa: Multiculturalism Directorate.

Grande, T. (1987). Legislature of Ontario. *Debates*. (Hansard). 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from <http://hansardindex.ontla.on.ca/hansardeissue/33-2/1037.htm>

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency? The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Policy Report 2000-1*. Retrieved December 2, 2004, from <http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Docs/HowLong.pdf>

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board. (n.d.). *Community and continuing education. International languages – Pathway to learning*. Retrieved January 12, 2005, from http://69.2.216.89/cce_public/page.aspx?top=55&pageid=202

Harley, B. (1993). Instructional strategies and SLA in early French immersion. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 245-259.

Hayday, M. (2001). Confusing and conflicting agendas: Federalism, official languages and the development of Bilingualism in Education Program in Ontario, 1970 – 1983. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 36(1), 50 – 79.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Herriman, M. & Burnaby, B. (Eds.). (1996). *Language policies in English-dominant countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hinton, L. (2001a). Federal language policy and indigenous languages in the United States. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. London: Academic Press, 39 - 44.

Hinton, L. (2001b). Involuntary language loss among immigrants: Asian-American linguistic autobiographies. In J.E. Alatis, & A. Tan (Eds.). *Language in our time: Georgetown University Round Table in Language and Linguistics, 1999*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 203-252.

Hinton, L. (2003, September 19). *How teaching endangered languages differs from teaching world languages*. [Addressed at Lansdowne Lecture Series.] University of Victoria. Victoria, BC.

Hinton, L. & Hale, K. (Eds.). (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. London: Academic Press.

Hobbs, C., Lee, I. & Haines, G. (1991). Implementing multicultural policy: an analysis of the heritage language program 1971 – 1981. *Canadian Public Administration* 34 (4), 1-7.

Hornberger, N.H. (1997). *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hornberger, N.H. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant and international perspectives. *Language in Society* 27, 439 – 458.

Hudson, M.R. (1987). Multicultural, Government Policy and Constitutional Enshrinement – A Comparative Study. In Canadian Human Rights Foundation. *Multiculturalism and the Charter*. Agincourt, ON: Carswell, 59 -122

Hulsen, M., De Bot, K., & Weltens, B. (2002). “Between two worlds.” Social networks, language shift, and language processing in three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153, 27 – 52.

Ingram, D.E. (1994). Language policy in Australia in the 1990s. In R.D. Lambert. *Language planning around the world: Contexts and systematic change*. Washington D.C.: National Foreign Language Center, 69 – 110.

International Language Educators’ Association. *Background on international languages*. Retrieved January 12, 2005, from <http://x.ilea.ca/files/ilprogrambenefits.pdf>.

Jedwab, J. (2000). *Ethnic identification and heritage languages in Canada*. Montreal: Les Éditions Images.

Jernudd, B. (1971). Notes on economic analysis for solving language problems. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd. *Can language be planned?*, 263 – 276.

Jernudd, B.H. & Das Gupta, J. (1971). Toward a Theory of Language Planning. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd. *Can language be planned?*, 195 - 215.

Justus, M. (2004). Immigrants in Canada’s cities. In C. Andrew (Ed.). *Our diverse cities* 1. 41 - 47.

Kalinowski, T. (2002, October 25). ESL programs decline as need rises. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved October 10, 2004, from Canadian Reference Centre database. <http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rch&an=6FP3480997576>

Kaplan, R. (1997). Preface. *Palam qui meruit ferat*. In W. Eggington & H. Wren. *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralism challenges*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, xi – xxv.

Kaplan, R. & Baldauf, R.B. Jr. (1997). *Language Planning: From policy to practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kelley, N. & Trebilcock, M. (1998). *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kess, J.F. (1999). Multiculturalism, multilingualism and language maintenance: A case study in Slovene. In L. De Decker. *Is multiculturalism possible? Victoria perspectives*. Victoria, BC: Centre for Studies in Religion and Society, University of Victoria.

Kess, J.F. (2003, November 27). *Multiculturalism without multilingualism? Bilingualism without biculturalism? The essential paradox of Canadian language policies*. [Address to Department of Linguistics Colloquium Series.] University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

- King, R. (1998). Language in Ontario. In J. Edwards (Ed.). *Language in Canada*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 400 – 415.
- Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Québec: Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme.
- Kontra, M., Phillipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Várady, T. (Eds.). (1999). *Language: A right and a resource*. Budapest: Central European in University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1998). Heritage language development: Some practical arguments. In S. Krashen, L. Tse & J. McQuillan (Eds.). *Heritage language development*. Culver City, California: Language Education Associates, 3 - 14.
- Krashen, S. (1998b). Language shyness and heritage language development. In S. Krashen, L. Tse & J. McQuillan (Eds.). *Heritage language development*. Culver City, California: Language Education Associates, 41- 49.
- Kymlicka, W. (1997, November 2). *Immigrants, multiculturalism and Canadian citizenship*. [Addressed to Symposium Social Cohesion Through Social Justice.] Canadian Jewish Congress. Ottawa. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from http://www.ccmacanada.org/urban/diversity_equity/Immigrants%20and%20.pdf
- Library of Parliament, Research Branch. (1999). *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Retrieved April 14, 2004, from <http://parl.gc.ca/information/library/PRBpubs/936pubs/936-e.htm>
- Lieberson, Stanley. (1970). *Language and ethnic relations in Canada*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lindholm, K.J. & Aclan, Z. (1991). Bilingual proficiency as a bridge to academic achievement: Results from bilingual/immersion programs. *Journal of Education* 173(2), 99 – 113.
- Luo, S. & Wiseman, R.L. (2000). Ethnic language maintenance among Chinese immigrant children in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 24, 307 – 324.
- MacMillan, C.M. (2003). Federal language policy in the Canada and the Quebec challenge. In P. Larrivée (Ed.). *Linguistic conflict and language laws*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 87 - 117.
- Manitoba Education, Citizenship & Youth. (n.d.). *Languages: International and Heritage*. Retrieved January 11, 2005, from <http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/ks4/cur/languages>
- Marchese, R. (2000, April 26). Legislature of Ontario. *Debates*. (Hansard). 37th Parliament, 1st Session. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://www.ontla.on.ca/hansard/37_parl/session1/Committees/gengov/g009.htm.
- Martorelli, V. (1990). *The development of heritage language policy in Ontario and Alberta: A comparative study*. Unpublished master's thesis. York University.

Maurais, J. & Morris, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Languages in a globalising world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mukherjee, D. (2003). Role of women in language maintenance and language shift: focus on the Bengali community in Malaysia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 161, 103 – 120.

Multiculturalism BC. (1994). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1993/94*. Vancouver: Multiculturalism BC.

Multiculturalism BC. (1995). *Report on Multiculturalism, Government of British Columbia – 1994/95*. Vancouver: Multiculturalism BC.

Multiculturalism & Citizenship Canada. (1989). *Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act: Annual report 1988/1989*. (Catalogue No. Ci95-1/1989). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Multiculturalism & Citizenship Canada. (1990). *Operation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act: Annual report 1989/1990*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Natarajan, G. (1991). *Heritage language education in the Niagara region*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brock University.

National Foreign Language Center. (2004). *About NFLC*. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from http://www.nflc.org/aboutus/about_nflc.asp

No'Eau Warner, S. L. (2001). The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. London: Academic Press, 133 - 144.

Nunberg, G. (2001, December 9). The answer is on the tip of our tongues. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from January 20, 2004, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&contentId=A11575-2001Dec7¬Found=true>.

O'Bryan, K.G., Reitz, J.G. & Kuplowska, O.M. (1976). *Non-official languages: A study in Canadian multiculturalism*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Official Languages Act. R.S., 1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.)

Ontario. (1988). *Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism*. (Catalogue No. CA2ONCR: 1988O56).

Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. (1974). *Annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism 1974*. (Catalogue No. 74-5009). Toronto: Queen's Printer.

Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. (1975). *Annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism 1975*. (Catalogue No. 74-5009). Toronto: Queen's Printer.

- Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. (1977). *Annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism 1976/77*. Toronto: Queen's Printer.
- Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. (1978). *Annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism 1977/78*. Toronto: Queen's Printer.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1987). *Proposal for Action: Ontario's Heritage Languages Program*. (Catalogue No. ON04502). Toronto: Queen's Printer.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1990). *International Languages Curriculum Guideline: Part A: Policy and Program Considerations, Intermediate and Senior Divisions 1990*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education and Training.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (1999). *Ontario Secondary Schools: Grades 9 to 12. Program and Diploma Requirements*. (Catalogue No. 98-007). Toronto: Queen's Printer. Retrieved July 13, 2004, from www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/curricul/secondary/oss/oss.pdf.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2004). *Classical and International Languages: The Ontario Curriculum, Grades 9 and 10*. (Catalogue No. 98-097). Retrieved May 1, 2004 from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/curricul/secondary/classic/classful.html>
- Ontario Royal Commission on Learning. (1994). *For the Love of Learning*. Toronto: Queen's Printer. Retrieved October 11, 2004, from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/abcs/rcom/full/royalcommission.pdf>
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Toronto: Saunders.
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Politics and the English language*. Retrieved February 3, 2005, from <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79e/part42.html>
- Orwen, P. (2003, April 9). Students could miss French immersion. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved January 21, 2004, from Canadian Reference Centre database <http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rch&an=6FP0306192306>
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Bernhard, J.K. & Freire, M. (2001). Struggling to Preserve Home Language: The Experiences of Latino Students and Families in the Canadian School System. *Bilingual Research Journal* 25(1-2). Retrieved July 16, 2004, from <http://brj.asu.edu/v2512/pdf/ar7.pdf>
- Pearl, E. & Lambert, W.E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs* 76, 1- 23.
- Peddie, R.A. (1991). Coming - Ready or not? Language policy development in New Zealand. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 15, 25 - 42
- Pendakur, R. (1990). *Speaking in tongues: Heritage language maintenance and transfer in Canada*. Ottawa: Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

- Pennycook, A. (2002). Mother tongues, governmentality and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 154, 11 – 28.
- Phinney, J.S. (1989). Stages in ethnic identity in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 9, 34-49.
- Portes, A. & Schauffler, R. (1994). Language and the second generation: Bilingualism yesterday and today. *International Migration Review* 28(4), 640 – 661.
- Raschka, C., Wei, L., & Lee, S. (2002). Bilingual development and social networks of British-born Chinese children. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153, 9 – 25.
- Read, Julia. (1996). Recent developments in Australian late immersion language education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17(6), 469-484
- Reilly, B. (1998). Democratic levers for conflict management: Language policy in multi-ethnic societies. In P. Harris & B. Reilly (Eds.). *Democracy and deep-rooted conflict: Options for negotiators*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 1998. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from www.idea.int/publications/democracy_and_deep_rooted_conflict/ebook_chapter4_7.html.
- Richards, M. (1991). Heritage language programs in Canada. *Reflections on Canadian Literacy* 9(3-4), 170 – 174.
- Romaine, S. (2002). The impact of language policy on endangered languages. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4(2), 1-28. Retrieved November 16, 2003, from <http://www.unesco.org/most/v14n2romaine.pdf>.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996). *People to people, nation to nation: Highlights from the report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. (Catalogue No. Z1-1991/1-6E). Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1965). *A Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. (Catalogue No. Z1-1963/1-3). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1967). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Book I: The Official Languages*. (Catalogue No. Z1-1963/1-5/1). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1968). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Book II: Education*. (Catalogue No. Z1-1963/1-5/2). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1969). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Book III: The Work World*. (Z1-1963/1-5/3). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

- Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1970). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingual and Biculturalism. Book IV: The Cultural Contribution of other Ethnic Groups*. (Z1-1963/1-5/4). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Rudner, M. (2002). The globalization of terrorism: Canada's intelligence response to the post-September 11 threat environment. *Canadian Issues* 4, 24 – 29.
- Runte, R. (1995). Learning languages in the context of Canada's many cultures. *Mosaic* 2(4), 8 – 11.
- Schiffman, H. (2000). *Ling 540: Language policy: Introductory remarks*. Retrieved April 1, 2004, from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/polintro/polintro.html>.
- Schrauf, R.W. (1999). Mother tongue maintenance among North American ethnic groups. *Cross-Cultural Research* 33(2), 175–192.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smolicz, J.J. & Secombe, M.J. (2003). Assimilation or pluralism? Changing policies for minority language education in Australia. *Language Policy* 2, 3 – 25.
- Snow, C. & Hakuta, K. (1992). The costs of monolingualism. In J. Crawford (Ed.). *Language loyalties*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 384 – 394.
- Sokolowski, J. (1999). *Language and Education: Canada and Alberta*. [Address to Seminar for Administrators of Programs for Educational Cooperation.] Retrieved December 2, 2004, from <http://www.sgci.mec.es/usa/seminario/pdf/seminario1999/report17.pdf>
- Stasiulis, D.K. (1988). The symbolic mosaic reaffirmed: Multiculturalism policy. In K.A. Graham (Ed.). *How Ottawa spends 1988/89: The Conservatives heading into the stretch*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 81 – 111.
- Statistics Canada. (2001a). *Canadian statistics: Population by knowledge of official language, by provinces and territories (2001 Census)*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo15a.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2001b). *Canadian Statistics - Population by mother tongue, by province and territories (2001 Census)*. Retrieved January 18, 2005, from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo11c.htm>.
- Statistics Canada. (n.d). *Canadian Statistics - Population by knowledge of official language, by provinces and territories (2001 Census)*. Retrieved November 11, 2004 from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo15a.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2002a). *Canadian Statistics - Population by mother tongue, by census metropolitan areas (2001 Census)*. Retrieved November 11, 2004 from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo12a.htm>.

Statistics Canada. (2002b, December 10). Census of Population: Language, mobility and migration. *The Daily*. Retrieved November 11, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/021210/d021210a.htm>

Statistics Canada. (2002c, December 10). 2001 *Census: Analysis Series. Profile of Languages in Canada: English, French and many others*. (Catalogue no. 96F0030XIE2001005). Retrieved November 11, 2004, from <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/Products/Analytic/companion/lang/pdf/96F0030XIE2001005.pdf>

Statistics Canada. (2003a). *Ethnic Diversity Survey: Portrait of a Multicultural Society*. (Catalogue No. 89-593-XIE). Retrieved November 11, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/89-593-XIE/89-593-XIE2003001.pdf>

Statistics Canada. (2004a). 2001 *Census Technical Report: Languages*. Retrieved December, 1 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/92-383-XIE/free.htm>

Statistics Canada. (2004b, March 22). Student reading performance in minority-language schools. *The Daily*. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/040322/d040322a.htm>.

Stein, C.B. (1986). *Sink or swim: The politics of bilingual education*. New York: Praeger.

Strom, H. E. (1971, July 16). *A New Cultural Policy for the Province of Alberta*. [Address at the Alberta Multicultural Conference]. Edmonton, AB.

Sullivan, B.M. (1988). *A legacy for learners: Report of the Royal Commission on Education*. Victoria: Queen's Printer.

Swain, M. (2004). *The output hypothesis: Research and theory*. [Address at Landowne Scholar Lecture Series.] University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1991). Heritage language children in an English-French bilingual program. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 47, 635 - 641.

Tavares, A. (2000). From heritage to international languages: Globalism and Western Canadian trends in heritage language education. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 32(1), 156 – 172. Retrieved March 24, 2004, from <http://80-search.epnet.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/direct.asp?an=3975289&dh=afh>

Thorburn, T. (1971). Cost-benefit analysis in language planning. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd. *Can language be planned?*, 253 – 265.

Toronto Catholic District School Board. (n.d.). *Special programs*. Retrieved January 12, 2005 from <http://www.tcdsb.org/curriculum/internationallanguages.html>

- Trudeau, P.E. (1971, October 8). *Announcement of Implementation of Policy of Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework*. Canada. House of Commons Debates, pp 8545-8. Retrieved 22 December 2004, from <http://collections.ic.gc.ca/albertans/speeches/trudeau.html>
- Tse, L. (1998). Ethnic identity formation and its implication for heritage language development. In S. Krashen, L. Tse & J. McQuillan (Eds.). *Heritage language development*. Culver City, California: Language Education Associates, 15-30.
- UNESCO. (1994). *Tolerance: Threshold of peace: A teaching/ learning guide for education for peace, human rights and democracy*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved December 1, 2004, from http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/34_57.pdf
- Valdés, G. (2001). Bilingual individuals and the language-based discrimination: advancing the state of law on language rights. In R.D. Gonzáles & I. Melis (Eds.). *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement: Volume 2 History, Theory and Policy*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 140 - 170.
- Veltman, C. (1988). *The future of the Spanish language in the United States*. Washington, DC: Hispanic Policy Development Project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 485)
- Veltman, F. (1983). *Language shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Ward, John. (2002, December 10). Census Shows More Canadians With A Mother Tongue Other Than English, French. *Canadian Press Newswire*. Retrieved September 10, 2004, from <http://www.asu.edu/educ/epsl/LPRU/newsarchive/Art1608.txt>
- Warren, J.P. (2003). The history of Queec in the perspective of French language. In P. Larrivée (Ed.). *Linguistic conflict and language laws*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 57 – 86.
- Watt, D. & Roessingh, H. (2001). The dynamics of ESL drop-out: Plus ça change. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 58(2), 203-22. Retrieved December 10, 2004, from Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts Database.
- Watts, R.L. (1970). *Multicultural societies and federalism*. Ottawa: Information Canada.
- Weiner, G. (1990). Minister's Message. In Multiculturalism & Citizenship Canada. *Together: A newsletter about multiculturalism today* 1(2), 2 – 3.
- Wesche, M. (1993). French immersion graduates at university and beyond: What difference has it made? In J. Alatis (Ed.). *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1992: Language, Communication and Social Meaning*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Wiley, T. (1996). *Literacy and language diversity in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wilson, W.H. & Kamanā, K. (2001). “Mai Loko Mai O ka ‘Īini: Proceeding from a Dream”. The ‘Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. London: Academic Press, 147 – 176.
- Wodak, R. (1995). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In J. Verschueren, J. Östman & J. Blommaert (Eds.). *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Philadelphia : J. Benjamins, 204 – 210.
- Wu, H. (2004, February 28). *Content serves language vs. language serves content – On Pedagogy in beginning level Chinese as a second/foreign language*. [Address to Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives Colloquium, Comparative Approaches to Second Language Teaching.] University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.
- Yee, D.S. & Sodhi, S. (1991). Resource guide for heritage language instruction: An annotated listing of projects supported by multiculturalism and citizenship. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 47(4), 712-785.
- Yoon, K.K. (1996). A Case Study of Fluent Korean-English Bilingual Speakers: Group Membership and Code Choices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(3), 395 – 407.

APPENDIX I: CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM ACT

Canadian Multiculturalism Act

R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)

An Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada

[1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July, 1988]

Preamble

WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada provides that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination and that everyone has the freedom of conscience, religion, thought, belief, opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association and guarantees those rights and freedoms equally to male and female persons;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canadians;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada and the *Official Languages Act* provide that English and French are the official languages of Canada and neither abrogates nor derogates from any rights or privileges acquired or enjoyed with respect to any other language;

AND WHEREAS the *Citizenship Act* provides that all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice, enjoy equal status, are entitled to the same rights, powers and privileges and are subject to the same obligations, duties and liabilities;

AND WHEREAS the *Canadian Human Rights Act* provides that every individual should have an equal opportunity with other individuals to make the life that the individual is able and wishes to have, consistent with the duties and obligations of that individual as a member of society, and, in order to secure that opportunity, establishes the Canadian Human Rights Commission to redress any proscribed discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin or colour;

AND WHEREAS Canada is a party to the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, which Convention recognizes that all human beings are equal before the law and are entitled to equal protection of the law against any discrimination and against any incitement to discrimination, and to the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, which Covenant provides that persons belonging to ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion or to use their own language;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada;

NOW, THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

SHORT TITLE

Short title 1. This Act may be cited as the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*.

INTERPRETATION

Definitions 2. In this Act,

"federal institution"
«institutions fédérales»

"federal institution" means any of the following institutions of the Government of Canada:

(a) a department, board, commission or council, or other body or office, established to perform a governmental function by or pursuant to an Act of Parliament or by or under the authority of the Governor in Council, and

(b) a departmental corporation or Crown corporation as defined in section 2 of the *Financial Administration Act*,

but does not include

(c) any institution of the Council or government of the Northwest Territories or of the Legislative Assembly or government of Yukon or Nunavut, or

(d) any Indian band, band council or other body established to perform a governmental function in relation to an Indian band or other group of aboriginal people;

"Minister"
«ministre»

"Minister" means such member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada as is designated by the Governor in Council as the Minister for the purposes of this Act.

MULTICULTURALISM POLICY OF CANADA

Multiculturalism policy 3. (1) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to

(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;

(b) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future;

(c) promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to that participation;

(d) recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;

(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;

(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada

to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;

(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;

(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;

(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada; and

(j) advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.

Federal
institutions

(2) It is further declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada that all federal institutions shall

(a) ensure that Canadians of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement in those institutions;

(b) promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the continuing evolution of Canada;

(c) promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the understanding of and respect for the diversity of the members of Canadian society;

(d) collect statistical data in order to enable the development of policies, programs and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada;

(e) make use, as appropriate, of the language skills and cultural understanding of individuals of all origins; and

(f) generally, carry on their activities in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MULTICULTURALISM POLICY OF CANADA

**General
responsibility
for coordination**

4. The Minister, in consultation with other ministers of the Crown, shall encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada and may provide advice and assistance in the development and implementation of programs and practices in support of the policy.

**Specific
mandate**

5. (1) The Minister shall take such measures as the Minister considers appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may

(a) encourage and assist individuals, organizations and institutions to project the multicultural reality of Canada in their activities in Canada and abroad;

(b) undertake and assist research relating to Canadian multiculturalism and foster

	scholarship in the field;
	(c) encourage and promote exchanges and cooperation among the diverse communities of Canada;
	(d) encourage and assist the business community, labour organizations, voluntary and other private organizations, as well as public institutions, in ensuring full participation in Canadian society, including the social and economic aspects, of individuals of all origins and their communities, and in promoting respect and appreciation for the multicultural reality of Canada;
	(e) encourage the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the multicultural heritage of Canada;
	(f) facilitate the acquisition, retention and use of all languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Canada;
	(g) assist ethno-cultural minority communities to conduct activities with a view to overcoming any discriminatory barrier and, in particular, discrimination based on race or national or ethnic origin;
	(h) provide support to individuals, groups or organizations for the purpose of preserving, enhancing and promoting multiculturalism in Canada; and
	(i) undertake such other projects or programs in respect of multiculturalism, not by law assigned to any other federal institution, as are designed to promote the multiculturalism policy of Canada.
Provincial agreements	(2) The Minister may enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province respecting the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada.
International agreements	(3) The Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into an agreement or arrangement with the government of any foreign state in order to foster the multicultural character of Canada.
Responsibilities of other Ministers	6. (1) The ministers of the Crown, other than the Minister, shall, in the execution of their respective mandates, take such measures as they consider appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada.
Provincial agreements	(2) A minister of the Crown, other than the Minister, may enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province respecting the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada.
Canadian multiculturalism advisory committee	7. (1) The Minister may establish an advisory committee to advise and assist the Minister on the implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to multiculturalism and, in consultation with such organizations representing multicultural interests as the Minister deems appropriate, may appoint the members and designate the chairman and other officers of the committee.
Remuneration and expenses	(2) Each member of the advisory committee shall be paid such remuneration for the member's services as may be fixed by the Minister and is entitled to be paid the reasonable travel and living expenses incurred by the member while absent from the member's ordinary place of residence in connection with the work of the committee.

Annual report (3) The chairman of the advisory committee shall, within four months after the end of each fiscal year, submit to the Minister a report on the activities of the committee for that year and on any other matter relating to the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada that the chairman considers appropriate.

GENERAL

Annual report 8. The Minister shall cause to be laid before each House of Parliament, not later than the fifth sitting day of that House after January 31 next following the end of each fiscal year, a report on the operation of this Act for that fiscal year.

Permanent review by a Parliamentary committee 9. The operation of this Act and any report made pursuant to section 8 shall be reviewed on a permanent basis by such committee of the House, of the Senate or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established for the purpose.

APPENDIX II: BRITISH COLUMBIA MULTICULTURALISM ACT**British Columbia Multiculturalism Act**

[RSBC 1996]

Definition

1 In this Act, "**council**" means the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism continued as the Multicultural Advisory Council under section 4 (1).

Purposes of the Act

2 The following are the purposes of this Act:

(a) to recognize that the diversity of British Columbians as regards race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry and place of origin is a fundamental characteristic of the society of British Columbia that enriches the lives of all British Columbians;

(b) to encourage respect for the multicultural heritage of British Columbia;

(c) to promote racial harmony, cross cultural understanding and respect and the development of a community that is united and at peace with itself;

(d) to foster the creation of a society in British Columbia in which there are no impediments to the full and free participation of all British Columbians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of British Columbia.

Multiculturalism policy

3 It is the policy of the government to

- (a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the racial and cultural diversity of British Columbians,
- (b) promote cross cultural understanding and respect and attitudes and perceptions that lead to harmony among British Columbians of every race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry and place of origin,
- (c) promote the full and free participation of all individuals in the society of British Columbia,
- (d) foster the ability of each British Columbian, regardless of race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry or place of origin, to share in the economic, social, cultural and political life of British Columbia in a manner that is consistent with the rights and responsibilities of that individual as a member of the society of British Columbia,
- (e) reaffirm that violence, hatred and discrimination on the basis of race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry or place of origin have no place in the society of British Columbia,
- (f) work towards building a society in British Columbia free from all forms of racism and from conflict and discrimination based on race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry and place of origin,
- (g) recognize the inherent right of each British Columbian, regardless of race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry or place of origin, to be treated with dignity, and
- (h) generally, carry on government services and programs in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of British Columbia.

Multicultural Advisory Council

4 (1) The Advisory Council on Multiculturalism is continued as the Multicultural Advisory Council.

(2) The council consists of the members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

(3) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may set the terms of office of the members of the council.

(4) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may designate a member of the council as chair and one or more other members as vice chair.

(5) Members of the council are entitled to be reimbursed for reasonable travelling and out of pocket expenses incurred by them as members of the council.

Role of the council

5 (1) The role of the council is to advise the minister on issues respecting multiculturalism and to perform any other duties or functions specified by the minister.

(2) The council may make bylaws

(a) respecting the calling and conduct of its meetings, and

(b) creating and appointing council members to committees of the council and setting out the powers and duties of those committees.

Reports

6 (1) The council must make an annual report to the minister.

(2) In addition to the report referred to in subsection (1), the council must, at the request of the minister, report on specific matters, in the manner and at the times required by the minister.

Additional reports

7 (1) On or before May 31 of each year, every ministry and every government corporation within the meaning of the *Financial Administration Act* must submit an annual report to the minister setting out the initiatives that it has undertaken in the reporting period to promote the policies referred to in section 3.

(2) The minister must prepare an annual report respecting, for the fiscal year for which the report is prepared,

(a) the administration and implementation of this Act, and

(b) the activities of the council.

(3) The minister must lay the report referred to in subsection (2) before the Legislative Assembly during the session next following the end of the year for which the report is made.

Application for grants

8 (1) A not for profit organization may apply to the minister for a grant under this Act for a program.

(2) An application for a grant must

(a) set out the nature of the program for which the grant is requested, and

(b) provide any other information and records the minister may require.

Minister may provide grants

9 (1) The minister may set the criteria on which grant applications under this Act are to be assessed.

(2) On application, the minister may, in the minister's sole discretion, make a grant to an applicant under this Act out of money appropriated by the Legislature for that purpose if the grant application meets the criteria set under subsection (1).

(3) The minister may impose the terms and conditions on a grant made under this section that the minister considers appropriate.

(4) Before making a grant under subsection (2), the minister must ensure that the program in respect of which the grant application is made fosters or promotes one or more of the policies referred to in section 3.

Power to make regulations

10 The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations referred to in section 41 of the *Interpretation Act*.

APPENDIX III: ONTARIO POLICY ON MULTICULTURALISM

Ontario is a highly diverse society. Members of our community represent many cultures and many of them choose to maintain some or all of their traditions and pass them on to their children. The ability of many different cultures and races to thrive together strengthens our society and provides a richness of heritage and understanding that can benefit us all.

Ontario's multiculturalism policy is designed to encourage all people to celebrate and share their history, while participating fully in the economic and social life of the province. That policy states:

I. *The Government of Ontario acknowledges and welcomes the diversity of cultures in this province.*

II. *Our varied cultural backgrounds are a source of enrichment and strength.*

III. *The government is committed to ensuring that people of all cultures and races live as equal and responsible citizens in the province.*

IV. *Every person in Ontario is entitled to equal access and participation, and the person may choose to preserve or share aspects of his or her culture.*

V. *The goal of the government's multiculturalism policy is to ensure that individuals of all cultural heritages have equal opportunity to develop their individual potential.*

To that end, the government will promote greater knowledge, understanding, acceptance and celebration of our cultural diversity.

An extensive, systematic program of public education will encourage the people of Ontario to become more aware of the province's many cultures.

VI. *Government policies, appointments and programs will reflect the spirit of this policy.*

The government will actively seek out the ideas, views and concerns of individuals and cultural communities.

All government ministries will review and revise all current and future policies to ensure they reflect our policy on multiculturalism.

The government will reflect the spirit of this policy in its hiring practices and in its appointments to agencies, boards, commissions and similar groups.

VII. *General public services provided by the government will be sensitive to cultural values and traditions.*

All government ministries, agencies, boards and commissions will plan, design and deliver programs, services and initiatives which are accessible to all Ontarians.

The government will encourage other levels of government, as well as non-government committees, groups and organizations, to offer programs and services which are accessible to everyone.

Culture reflects the idea, beliefs, values, activities and knowledge of individuals who share historical, geographic, religious, racial, language, ethnic or social traditions.

Ontario's multiculturalism policy encourages us to celebrate our rich, cultural heritage and use its strengths to prosper and live in harmony. This policy will promote better understanding of our differences – and our similarities. It will also help us preserve the diverse, accepting, open society we value.

Ontario's multiculturalism policy will provide an opportunity for and responsible citizenship for all.

Ontario. (1988). *Ontario Policy on Multiculturalism*. (Catalogue No. CA2ONCR: 1988O56).

APPENDIX IV: CANADIAN HERITAGE LANGUAGES INSTITUTE ACT

Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act [Not in force]

1991, с. 7

An Act to establish the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute

[Assented to 1st February, 1991]

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

SHORT TITLE

Short title	1. This Act may be cited as the <i>Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act</i> .
-------------	--

INTERPRETATION

Definitions	2. In this Act,
"Board" « <i>conseil</i> »	"Board" means the Board of Directors of the Institute;
"Chairperson" « <i>président</i> »	"Chairperson" means the Chairperson of the Board;
"Executive Director" « <i>directeur général</i> »	"Executive Director" means the Executive Director of the Institute;
"heritage language" « <i>langues patrimoniales</i> »	"heritage language" means a language, other than one of the official languages of Canada, that contributes to the linguistic heritage of Canada;
"Institute" « <i>Institut</i> »	"Institute" means the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute established by section 3;
"Minister" « <i>ministre</i> »	"Minister" means such member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada as is designated by the Governor in Council as the Minister for the purposes of the <i>Canadian Multiculturalism Act</i> .

INSTITUTE ESTABLISHED

Institute established

3. In pursuance of the multiculturalism policy of the Government of Canada to preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada, as declared in paragraph 3(1)(i) of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, a corporation is hereby established to be called the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute.

PURPOSE OF INSTITUTE

Purpose

4. The purpose of the Institute is to facilitate throughout Canada the acquisition, retention and use of heritage languages by

(a) promoting, through public education and discussion, the learning of heritage languages and their benefit to Canada;

(b) providing the public with information about heritage language resources;

(c) developing programs to improve the quality of heritage language instruction;

(d) assisting in the production and dissemination of Canadian-oriented materials related to the study of heritage languages;

(e) assisting in the development of standards for the learning of heritage languages;

(f) conducting research into all aspects of heritage languages;

(g) establishing scholarly and professional links between the Institute and universities, colleges and other organizations and persons interested in the Institute's work;

(h) encouraging consultation in matters relating to heritage languages among governments, institutions, organizations and individuals interested in heritage languages; and

(i) undertaking any other activities in furtherance of its purpose.

POWERS OF INSTITUTE

Powers

5. (1) In order to carry out its purpose, the Institute has the capacity of a natural person and, in particular, the Institute may

(a) initiate, finance and administer programs and activities related to its purpose;

(b) support and implement the programs and activities of other governments, public and private organizations and individuals;

(c) acquire any money, securities or other property by gift, bequest or otherwise and hold, expend, invest,

administer or dispose of that property, subject to any terms on which it is given, bequeathed or otherwise made available to the Institute;

(d) expend any money appropriated by Parliament or any other government for the activities of the Institute, subject to any terms on which it is appropriated;

(e) publish or otherwise disseminate information related to its purpose;

(f) sponsor and support conferences, seminars and other meetings;

(g) establish and award scholarships and fellowships; and

(h) undertake any other activities that are conducive to the fulfilment of its purpose and to the exercise of its powers.

Capacity in Canada

(2) The Institute may carry on its activities throughout Canada.

Rights preserved

(3) No act of the Institute, including any transfer of property to or by the Institute, is invalid by reason only that the act or transfer is contrary to this Act or the by-laws of the Institute.

ORGANIZATION

Board of Directors

Management of activities of the Institute

6. (1) The activities of the Institute shall be managed by a Board of Directors consisting of a Chairperson and not more than twenty-one other directors, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, after the Minister has consulted with such governments, institutions, organizations and individuals as the Minister considers appropriate.

Qualifications of directors

(2) Persons appointed to the Board must have knowledge or experience that will assist the Institute in fulfilling its purpose.

Terms of office

(3) Members of the Board shall be appointed to hold office for terms not exceeding three years.

Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Role of Chairperson

7. (1) The Chairperson shall preside at meetings of the Board and may perform any other duties assigned by the Board.

Election of Vice-Chairperson

(2) The Board shall elect one of its members, other than the Chairperson, to be Vice-Chairperson of the

Absence of Chairperson	Board. (3) In the event of the absence or incapacity of the Chairperson, or if the office of Chairperson is vacant, the Vice-Chairperson has and may exercise all the powers, duties and functions of the Chairperson.
Re-appointment	8. (1) A director, including the Chairperson, whose term of office has expired is eligible for re-appointment to the Board in the same or another capacity.
Resignation	(2) A director who wishes to resign shall notify the Board in writing to that effect, and the resignation becomes effective when the Board receives the notice of it or at the time specified in the notice, whichever is the later.
<i>Executive Director</i> Appointment	9. (1) The Executive Director shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, for a term not exceeding five years.
Consultation	(2) After the appointment of the first Executive Director, subsequent appointments shall be made only after the Minister has consulted with the Board on the appointments.
Role of Executive Director	(3) The Executive Director is the chief executive officer of the Institute and has supervision over and direction of the work and staff of the Institute and may engage such officers, employees and agents as are necessary for the proper conduct of the work of the Institute.
Acting Executive Director	(4) The Board may authorize a member of the Board or an officer or employee of the Institute to act as Executive Director in the event that the Executive Director is absent or incapacitated or the office of the Executive Director is vacant, but no person may act as Executive Director for a period exceeding sixty days without the approval of the Governor in Council.
Re-appointment	(5) An Executive Director whose term of office has expired is eligible for re-appointment in that capacity.
<i>Ex officio</i> member of Board	(6) The Executive Director is an <i>ex officio</i> member of the Board without a vote.
<i>Remuneration and Expenses</i> Fees of directors	10. The Chairperson and the other directors shall be paid such fees for their attendance at meetings of the Institute and for work performed for the Institute as are fixed by the Governor in Council.
Expenses	11. The Chairperson and the other directors are entitled to be paid such travel and living expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties under

this Act as are fixed by the Governor in Council.

Salary of Executive Director

12. The salary and any other remuneration to be paid to the Executive Director shall be fixed by the Governor in Council.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE AND MEETINGS

Principal office

13. The principal office of the Institute shall be in the City of Edmonton.

Meetings

14. (1) The Board shall meet at such times and places as the Chairperson may select, but it shall meet at least twice in each year, with at least one of the meetings at the principal office of the Institute.

Attendance at meetings

(2) The Deputy to the Minister, or a delegate thereof, is entitled to receive notice of all meetings of the Board and of any committees thereof and to attend and take part in, but not to vote at, those meetings.

COMMITTEES

Committees

15. The Board may appoint an Executive Committee from among the directors and may appoint advisory and other committees consisting, wholly or partly, of directors and persons who are not directors, under such terms and conditions as are fixed by by-law of the Board.

BY-LAWS

By-laws

16. The Board may make by-laws respecting

(a) the duties of the officers, employees and agents of the Institute;

(b) the remuneration and conditions of employment of the officers, employees and agents of the Institute, other than the Executive Director;

(c) the constitution of any committees appointed under section 15, the role and duties of the committees and the expenses, if any, to be paid to the members of those committees who are not directors;

(d) the procedure at meetings of the Board and its committees;

(e) the administration, management and control of the property of the Institute; and

(f) the conduct and management of the work of the Institute.

Not agent of Her Majesty	<p>GENERAL</p> <p>17. (1) The Institute is not an agent of Her Majesty and the Chairperson and the other directors and the Executive Director, officers, employees and agents of the Institute are not part of the public service of Canada.</p>
Part X not applicable	<p>(2) Part X of the <i>Financial Administration Act</i> does not apply to the Institute.</p>
<p>1991, c. 7, s. 17; 1993, c. 34, s. 45(F). Duty of care</p>	<p>18. (1) When exercising powers and performing duties under this Act, every director and officer shall</p> <p>(a) act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the Institute;</p> <p>(b) exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances; and</p> <p>(c) comply with this Act and the by-laws of the Institute.</p>
Reliance on statements	<p>(2) A director or officer is not liable for a breach of duty under subsection (1) if the director or officer relies in good faith on</p> <p>(a) financial statements of the Institute represented to the director or officer by an officer of the Institute or in a written report of the auditor of the Institute fairly to reflect the financial condition of the Institute; or</p> <p>(b) a report of a lawyer, accountant, engineer, appraiser or other person whose position or profession lends credibility to a statement made by that person.</p>
Disclosure of interest	<p>19. (1) A director or officer who</p> <p>(a) is a party to a material contract or proposed material contract with the Institute, or</p> <p>(b) is a director or officer of, or has a material interest in, any person who is a party to a material contract or proposed material contract with the Institute, shall disclose in writing to the Institute the nature and extent of the interest of the director or officer.</p>
Disclosure by-laws	<p>(2) The Board shall make by-laws respecting</p> <p>(a) the time when and the form and manner in which the disclosure required by subsection (1) shall be made; and</p>

(b) the limitation on the participation of a director or officer who has made a disclosure as required by subsection (1) in any proceedings respecting the contract that is the subject of the disclosure.

Power to indemnify

20. (1) The Institute may indemnify a present or former director or officer of the Institute or any other person who acts or acted at its request as a director or officer of another corporation of which the Institute is or was a shareholder or creditor, and the person's heirs and legal representatives, against all costs, charges and expenses, including any amount paid to settle an action or satisfy a judgment, reasonably incurred by the person in respect of any civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding to which the person is a party by reason of being or having been such a director or officer, if

(a) the person acted honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the Institute or other corporation; and

(b) in the case of any criminal or administrative action or proceeding that is enforced by a monetary penalty, the person had reasonable grounds for believing that the person's conduct was lawful.

Insurance

(2) The Institute may purchase and maintain insurance for the benefit of a director or officer and the director's or officer's heirs and legal representatives against any liability, cost, charge and expense incurred by the director or officer as described in subsection (1).

Registered charity

21. The Institute shall be deemed, for the purposes of the *Income Tax Act*, to be a registered charity within the meaning of that Act.

FINANCIAL

Payments to Institute

22. (1) The Minister of Finance shall, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pay to the Institute the following sums in the fiscal year in which this Act comes into force and in each of the subsequent four fiscal years, namely,

(a) eight hundred thousand dollars, to constitute the capital of an Endowment Fund to be invested and earn income to be expended for the purpose of the Institute; and

(b) an additional five hundred thousand dollars, to be expended for the purpose of the Institute.

Charges in accounts of Canada

(2) Amounts paid to the Institute under this section

shall be charged in the accounts of Canada to the account of the Department over which the Minister presides.

Additional amounts

(3) Nothing in this section precludes the Government of Canada from making additional payments to the Endowment Fund and to the Institute from time to time.

DISSOLUTION

Dissolution

23. If the Institute is dissolved,

(a) the capital of the Endowment Fund and any unexpended interest thereon, and

(b) any of the Institute's other property that remains after the payment of the Institute's debts and liabilities, or after making adequate provision for their payment, shall be transferred to the Government of Canada and to the governments of the provinces on a proportional basis having regard to their total contributions to the Institute.

AUDIT

Audit

24. The accounts and financial transactions of the Institute shall be audited annually by an independent auditor designated by the Board and a report of the audit shall be made to the Board.

REPORT

Report

25. (1) Within four months after the end of March of each year, the Chairperson shall submit to the Minister a report of the activities of the Institute during that year, including the financial statements of the Institute and the auditor's report, and the Board shall make the report available for public scrutiny at the principal office of the Institute.

Tabling of report

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of the report referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before each House of Parliament within the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the day on which the Minister has received the report.

REVIEW

Review by Minister

26. (1) As soon as possible after the fourth anniversary of the coming into force of this Act, the Minister, after consultation with the Board, shall evaluate and prepare a report on the Institute's activities and organization, including a statement of any changes that the Minister would recommend.

Tabling of report

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of the report referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before each House of Parliament within the first fifteen days on which that House is sitting after the report has been prepared.

COMING INTO FORCE

Coming into force

***27.** This Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council.

*[Note: Act not in force.]