

(b) The correct form of the name is given in brackets after the incorrect form; or

(c) The correct form is not given at all.

We think that, disregarding the differences in treatment, none of the cases cited can be considered acceptable, because even the names in brackets must represent geographical information and thus must reflect national characteristics of the territory concerned.

In this regard, we regard as realistic the recommendations contained in resolutions 29 and 31 of the London Conference,<sup>3</sup> in which the need is emphasized for placing maximal limits on the use of exonyms.

<sup>3</sup> *Second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names*, vol I, *Report of the Conference* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E 74.I 2), chap. III

This question is not only of a formal nature; it can imply much more important things. The names used, according to their manner and time of origin, often are associated with periods of subjugation of our territories in the near or distant past. Such names thus communicate incorrect information to non-Yugoslav users of these maps and atlases, because they do not reflect the objective picture of national possession of the populations that live on those territories.

In general, the problem of abolishing (or strictly limiting the use of) exonyms has become more and more current because many of the countries that have achieved independence tend also to express their national identity by having their own geographical names.

## A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE BILINGUAL TREATMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES ON CANADIAN MAPS

Report presented by Canada\*

### Résumé

Pour donner suite à une demande faite en 1960 par les éditeurs de cartes terrestres, cartes marines et nomenclatures toponymiques pour le compte du Gouvernement canadien, concernant l'élaboration d'une politique nouvelle et moderne en matière de noms géographiques qui puisse satisfaire les exigences linguistiques des deux groupes nationaux fondateurs du Canada dans la présentation des noms et des légendes sur les cartes, le Comité permanent des noms géographiques canadien a entrepris des recherches qui ont abouti à la formulation de cette politique en 1970. Les principes directeurs ci-après ont été adoptés en 1976 :

a) Un moratoire est imposé en ce qui concerne la traduction des noms géographiques officiels au Canada utilisés pour les cartes terrestres, les cartes marines et les nomenclatures toponymiques du Gouvernement canadien quand cette traduction n'est pas reconnue comme officielle à l'intérieur des limites politiques de la province ou du territoire intéressé;

b) A l'intérieur de ces limites provinciales et territoriales, compatibles (chaque fois que cela est possible) avec le principe territorial de la dénomination géographique, un seul nom sera reconnu comme officiel par le Gouvernement canadien pour tout détail géographique ou lieu habité quel qu'il soit. Les noms "Rivière des Outaouais" et "Ottawa River" sont donc l'un et l'autre officiels à l'heure actuelle pour le même détail. Le premier est reconnu au Québec, le second dans l'Ontario. Les deux sont reconnus par le Canada;

c) L'application de cette politique est limitée dans ses effets aux cartes topographiques et planimétriques, aux cartes hydrographiques, aux nomenclatures toponymiques et autres publications du Gouvernement canadien qui ont surtout pour objet la représentation des faits plutôt que la traduction, officielle ou non, de noms géographiques officiels.

Cette politique ne s'applique pas aux autres publications cartographiques du Gouvernement, telles que l'atlas national, qui normalement utilisent les traductions intégrales ou partielles des noms géographiques en conformité avec les normes linguistiques et orthographiques agréées pour les publications scolaires et universitaires, ainsi que pour les services de presse, de radio et de télévision qui travaillent dans les deux langues officielles. La nouvelle politique met l'accent sur le facteur politique plutôt que sur le facteur linguistique dans le traitement des noms concernant les régions anglophones et francophones, accordant par là la priorité aux limites des provinces et non pas aux frontières linguistiques.

Cette politique constitue néanmoins un pas important vers l'élaboration d'une future politique fondée sur la langue qui reflétera plus équitablement qu'il n'est possible de le faire actuellement la répartition territoriale des deux langues officielles.

### Resumen

En respuesta a una petición hecha en 1960 por los editores de mapas, cartas y nomencladores del Gobierno canadiense para que se adoptara una política nueva y actualizada en materia de nombres geográficos que satisficiera las exigencias lingüísticas de los dos grupos nacionales fundadores del Canadá en la presentación de la nomenclatura y los textos de los mapas, la Comisión Permanente de Nombres Geográficos emprendió estudios

\* The original text of this paper, prepared by Michael B. Smart, Executive Secretary, Ontario Geographic Names Board, Canada, appeared as document E/CONF 69/L 88.

que desembocaron en la formulación de una política de ese tipo en 1970. En 1976 se adoptaron las directrices siguientes:

a) Se aplaza toda nueva traducción de los nombres geográficos oficiales canadienses utilizados en los mapas, las cartas y los nomenclátors del Gobierno canadiense cuando no se reconozca como oficial esa traducción dentro de los límites políticos de la provincia o el territorio de que se trate;

b) Dentro de dichos límites provinciales o territoriales, que se ajusten (cuando sea posible) al principio territorial de la denominación geográfica, en todo momento el Gobierno del Canadá reconocerá como oficial sólo un nombre para designar cualquier accidente geográfico o núcleo poblado. Por ello, en la actualidad *Rivière des Outaouais* y *Ottawa River* son los nombres oficiales del mismo accidente. Uno se reconoce en Quebec y el otro en Ontario. Ambos están reconocidos en el Canadá;

c) La aplicación de la política se limita en sus efectos a los mapas topográficos y planimétricos, las cartas hidrográficas, los nomenclátors y otras publicaciones del Gobierno del Canadá dedicadas principalmente a la representación objetiva más que a la traducción, oficial o no, de los nombres geográficos oficiales.

La política no se aplica a otras publicaciones cartográficas del Gobierno, como el atlas nacional, que normalmente utilizan traducciones totales o parciales de los nombres geográficos de acuerdo con las normas lingüísticas y ortográficas autorizadas para las publicaciones escolares y universitarias, así como para la prensa, la radio y la televisión que emplean ambos idiomas oficiales. La nueva política insiste más en el factor político que en el lingüístico en su tratamiento de los nombres de las zonas de habla inglesa y francesa, concediendo así prioridad a los límites provinciales más que a los idiomáticos.

La política constituye, sin embargo, un paso importante hacia la formulación de una política futura basada en los idiomas que reflejaría la distribución territorial de los dos idiomas oficiales más equitativamente de lo que es posible en la actualidad.

\*

\* \*

#### THE DOUBLE NAME DILEMMA

At a meeting of the General Assembly of the *Société du Parler Français au Canada* in Quebec City in 1907, *Société* president, the Rev. Camille Roy, in a brief to the Geographical Board of Canada, delivered a strongly worded objection to the just-announced intention of that body to authorize a double geographical nomenclature for the Province of Quebec. In effect, a double name standard was being proposed for French Canada. The Board, established 10 years earlier by Order in Council as the first national organization to control geographical names in Canada, was to endorse simultaneous recognition of both French and English geographical names

for the same rivers, lakes, islands, villages and towns in the province. The policy, in its various forms and modifications, was to last 70 years.

Quebec's argument against adoption and imposition of such a policy was as persuasive as it was fair. The importance of not losing sight of the territorial- or local-usage principle in mapping and charting geographical names and geographical name information (nature and extent of features named etc.) was stressed in the most convincing terms. The recording and official approval of names of topographical and hydrographic features firmly established in current local or regional usage as essential cartographic references should not, it was argued, be subject to the prejudicial treatment of one linguistic group. In 1907, cartographic toponymy at the federal level was dominated, as it had been since 1763, by the English-speaking group. Until very recently this continued to be the case. The current situation is one in which the French-speaking group has assumed—in fact, has reassumed—the dominant position in the Province of Quebec.

#### GALLICIZATION OF QUEBEC TOPONYMY

Large numbers of geographical names of English-Scottish-Irish-Welsh origin for places and features in present-day Quebec have, for generations, been an integral part of the cultural landscape of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence valleys, the southern Laurentians and the Eastern Townships (none of which, of course, is today so named in the Province). Such names persist in local usage in spite of the fact that in recent years they have lost their official identity entirely in matters of administration and government. None appears in its original form any longer on contemporary documents authorized by the Province of Quebec.

Notwithstanding this fact, and the attendant loss of identity, the traditional names continue to be the only geographical references acceptable to a sizable portion of the English-speaking (and indeed the French-speaking) population; among the English-speaking population must be included many of the Amerindians and most if not all of the Inuit (Eskimos) in the north.

With the demotion of English in Quebec in 1977 (with the passage of Language Bill 1 by the new *Partie Québécois* government) to the same status as Naskapi, Cree and Italian in toponymic matters, and implementation of recent provincial government directives relating to and specifically designed for the gallicization of all media of administration, instruction and the like, the effect on English toponymy has been predictable. Unlike Cree or Inuit, which do not enjoy official status in Quebec or elsewhere in Canada, English is—with the exception of Quebec—official throughout the provinces and territories.

Ontario treats its Amerindian toponymy (largely Ojibway and Cree) as Quebec deals with its English toponymy now (i.e. since the proclamation of French as the official language in that province). Anglo-Saxon-based geographical names have thus become an en-

dangered species in their own country. Their demise east of the Riviere des Outaouais appears imminent.

The Amerindian and Inuit toponymies differ from the European in being oral and unwritten. For that reason they have been orthographically organized by the latter into two main notation systems, one French and one English. Fluctuations in and migrations of the real linguistic boundaries in Canada between the two founding European traditions have called for numerous phonemic modifications in the aboriginal names: Waswagami becomes Ouasouagami, Kinoje becomes Kinosheo and so on. Maps and charts reflect the political evolution of Canada in many ways. Toponymy provides insight into the manner in which the country's native geographical names have been recorded—or rerecorded—by the two European races for their respective user groups. All of which is quite apart from translation and deletion of the unwritten traditional forms, which was done everywhere in favour of European nomenclature—traditional and otherwise—and which tends to be the usual course of events in any case. It does provide toponymy with its fascinating dimensions and the historical or research toponymist with his *raison d'être*.

English has, therefore, joined Cree, Montagnais, Naskapi and the various other unofficial languages of Quebec in having its toponymy organized into a cartographic form acceptable to the French-speaking Quebecois user group. In the process of being relegated to this level, large numbers of geographical names having their roots in the linguistic traditions of Cook, Wolfe, Hearne, Frobisher, MacKenzie, Thompson and Fraser are either translated out of existence and thus off the map entirely (specific plus generic) or in part (generic only). For example, a stream known as Bonnie Brook in Quebec would be transmogrified as Ruisseau Bonnie. While Ontario does not any longer do the same with its French names it continues to do very much the same thing (as do all the Provinces) with what are designated unofficial languages (Ojibway, Cree, Iroquois, Seneca, Greek, German, Ukrainian etc.) The Cree name "Kwastikamosipyi" thus becomes anglicized as "Kwastigam Creek", for example. A standardized English orthography (with minor variations in various cultural regions of Canada) is employed in transcribing Ojibway and Cree into forms communicable to English-speaking Ontario map users.

French toponymy used to be subjected to the same forms of linguistic alteration and transmogrification in Ontario (as it probably still is in many parts of Canada) as is now being meted out to its Anglo-Saxon counterpart in most of French Canada. In other words, arbitrary translation of ostensibly descriptive or translatable English nomenclature proceeds apace. Feature names and unincorporated populated place names are stripped of their generic elements and provided with what the official translation authority deems to be approximate French equivalents. Toponymic policy in this regard has recently been reversed in Ontario. The result has been equal treatment for French and English toponymy. French names are now recognized and are shown in accordance with the orthographic norms (accents, apos-

trophes, hyphens etc.) appropriate to that linguistic tradition, wherever so indicated by local usage. Elsewhere the two traditions appear to be going in different directions.

Quebec is restoring its long-submerged toponymy. This is immediately evident to the traveller in its road signs, train and bus schedules, post offices and, of course, maps. In the process it has perforce rescinded and is rescinding, has hybridized and is hybridizing, other toponymic traditions in its own image, just as the English did to the French and the French to the Huron and Iroquois. In so far as English toponymy in Quebec is concerned, its non-translated, non-hybridized form has largely vanished or is vanishing from contemporary official maps, road signs, banks, post offices and train and bus timetables.

The future cartographic existence of English toponymy will in fact be limited to atlases, encyclopaedias and histories—if even there. Otherwise there remains only the oral tradition. It will be a new experience for English toponymy in Canada.

The inevitable result will be the disappearance of English lake, river, island, village and town names from maps, charts, gazetteers, commercial establishments (hotels, restaurants etc.), assessment rolls, electoral lists, letterheads, administrative and related official documents, legal descriptions, the press, radio and television.

The admonitions of the Société du Parler Français au Canada against just such a state of affairs seem to have fallen on deaf ears on both sides of the linguistic fence. Most likely, the 1907 recommendations and views of the Société were for years judged unworkable in the face of the continuing difficulties plaguing Canadian map and chart production agencies as they tried to equate local and official usage for cartographic referencing purposes while coping with the political vicissitudes of the day.

Viewed against this background, the 1907 Quebec position can be seen to have gained in stature. It has lost none of its impact or relevance. In fact, its message would appear more compelling than ever. Establishment in 1971 of the Sub-Committee (later the Advisory Committee) for the Study of a National Policy for Geographical Names on Canadian Maps under the aegis of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names (CPCGN)<sup>1</sup> was the federal Government's response to new legislation and to a new political climate that made it mandatory for future Canadian maps to be as acceptable to the French-Canadian map user as they had been to English-Canadian users for generations. Henceforward, maps would have to serve both languages. The question was: How?

The sub-committee was forced to meet head-on the long-imposed double standard in geographical naming fathered by the Geographical Board. As a result of that confrontation, and mindful of Quebec's growing independence in matters of language, especially toponymy, the Committee dismantled the 70-year-old policy of

<sup>1</sup> Established by Order-in-Council in 1961 as successor to the Geographical Board of Canada (1897-1948)

recognizing two names for virtually every major geographical feature and place in Canada. Ratification of its recommendations for a politically acceptable language policy for Canadian maps came from the CPCGN in 1976 at its Annual Meeting in Winnipeg. Unfortunately, however, dismantlement of an English-dominated dual-nomenclature policy for Canadian features and places (particularly Quebec's) did not come in time to ward off establishment in Quebec of a French-only policy for that province.

Both policies represent over-reactions to the previous toponymic order. Both contravene the fundamental tenet of cartographic toponymy that wherever possible, and only except where there are convincing reasons to the contrary, the local or territorial usage should prevail in determining what name should be adopted as official in any jurisdiction for any feature or place at a given time. One can only assume that convincing reasons of a political, linguistic and cultural nature exist in present-day Quebec to account for the fact that current Quebec policy has moved so far from the position espoused in 1907; there probably is no alternative.

#### THE QUÉBÉCOIS POSITION IN 1907

The Société du Parler Français au Canada brief of 1907 to the Geographical Board of Canada underscored the following points:

(a) If implemented (as it was), the Geographical Board dual-name formula would result in toponymic chaos and confusion in Quebec and across Canada;

(b) The position of the Société should be taken into account by the Geographical Board of Canada in any decision rendered by that body concerning the official treatment of French toponymy in Canada that would authorize adoption of a double geographical nomenclature standard for Quebec. The Quebec of 1907 was a much smaller province than it is today—it greatly increased its geographical area in 1912 with the acquisition of the District of Ungava (later known as New Quebec). The new territory brought with it thousands of Amerindians and Inuit whose second language was, and still is, English;

(c) The Société was adamant in its determination to resist the idea of a two-tiered geographical nomenclature being authorized and implemented for use in the Province, arguing—convincingly—that place and feature names, like personal names, are proper names. As proper names they are, by definition, untranslatable. The generic elements of such names are only translatable in an unofficial context. Thus, "Lac" in Lac Seul (Ontario) and "River" in Lost River (Quebec) cannot be regarded as interchangeable parts or components of a name (as distinct from M., Mme., Mr., Mrs., Ms., Herr, Frau, Señor or Señora etc.). Geographical entities, unlike people, tend to stay where they are; they are topographically locked in. Their generics should be treated accordingly;

(d) It was also noted that one consults an atlas if the question to be answered is not "What is the official

(locally recognized) name of this feature?" but "What is the nature of this feature?" Generics are translated for that precise reason. The Canadian geographical name Davis Strait (between Baffin Bay and the Labrador Sea) emerges as *Davisstrasse* or *Detroit de Davis* in German and French text publications. This is perfectly reasonable; the non-English speaker needs to know that the feature depicted is a strait and not a sound or inlet. Official documents, in contrast, restrict themselves (at least they should) to official nomenclature only. Deliberately excluding a locally established name from an official map (either in part or entirely) is bad enough, but to replace it with another, which is meaningless to the community concerned, is infinitely worse. It makes as much cartographic sense as giving the map user a swamp for a lake or an apple orchard for a cemetery. Proper names don't translate: Joseph Green is not the same as, nor can it be associated with, its Italian counterpart, Giuseppe Verdi. The same can be said of the Danish-German Hans Hansen, which becomes an entirely different name when rendered in its Slavic form, Ivan Ivanovich (or Ivanovic). In each example the one name is the linguistic equivalent of the other. On a passport, however, only one can be official. Encyclopaedias and historical texts, like atlases and unlike official maps, are neither expected nor obliged to use proper names. They don't;

(e) It was the Société's view in 1907 that geographical names, generic as well as specific, should be retained in their original form, whether of English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh or other origin; this applied equally to names of French origin. There was thus no reason to create a double nomenclature. These views were recorded by the General Assembly in Quebec City as part of the Special Committee's report and official statement on the subject, dated 9 May 1907.

#### THE NEW NATIONAL POLICY

The Advisory Committee's draft recommendations 69 years later were submitted by Committee Chairman Smart to the CPCGN Annual Meeting at Winnipeg. The CPCGN adopted the policy recommendations as presented.

The language policy addresses itself to the Canadian cartographic establishment. In so doing it has been specifically designed

(a) To bury the idea of a double name standard for Canada once and for all;

(b) To accord long-overdue recognition to the primacy of the territorial (local usage) principle;

(c) To attempt to create some semblance of name standardization for the nation, even if more time is required before the gap between local and official usage can be bridged in certain areas; and

(d) To provide the cartographers responsible for compiling data for federal map and chart production with guidelines necessary for negotiating routine problems of name translation and political-linguistic jurisdiction.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for the Study of a National Policy

for Geographical Names (1976), the CPCGN has adopted the following policy as official for all federal agencies concerned with procedures governing field collection, office treatment, cartographic compilation, revision and up-dating of geographical nomenclature and related information required for the production of topographic and planimetric maps, hydrographic charts and gazetteers by the Government of Canada:

(a) A moratorium is imposed on all further translation of official geographic nomenclature in Canada used for Canadian maps, charts and gazetteers where such translation is not recognized as official within the political boundaries of the province or territory concerned;

(b) Within said provincial and territorial boundaries, consistently—wherever possible—with the territorial principle of geographical naming, one name only shall be recognized as official at any one time by the Government of Canada for any geographical feature or populated place within said provincial or territorial jurisdictions. The names Rivière des Outaouais and Ottawa River are, for example, both official at the present time for the same feature. One is recognized in Quebec, the other in Ontario. Both are recognized by Canada;

(c) Implementation of this policy is restricted in its effect to topographic and planimetric maps, hydrographic charts, gazetteers and all other publications of the Government of Canada concerned primarily with factual representation rather than translation, symbolization or other interpretation of official geographic nomenclature. As such it does not apply to other cartographic publications of the Government of Canada, such as the national atlas, which employ full or partial translations of geographical names as required of (and consistent with) linguistic and orthographic norms of those instructional and educational media (school and university publications, press, radio, television etc.) which serve both official languages of Canada.

#### ISOPLETH *versus* CHOROPLETH

Implementation of the above guidelines by the Government of Canada shall ensure a degree of toponymic credibility and national standardization for Canadian maps, charts and gazetteers not previously attainable. In the past, the users of federal maps and charts formerly would find themselves equipped with names that very often bore little correspondence with those used and officially recognized at the local and provincial level while users of provincial cartographic publications found themselves equally confused when trying to use federal and provincial maps; the current arrangement emphasizes standardization. The new policy should do much to ensure that a locally recognized geographical nomenclature (used for road signs, rail, bus and air service timetables, post offices, fire, health and law enforcement and the like) is provided the map and chart purchaser who correctly assumes he is being provided with that in the first place. To not record local nomenclature in the form in which it exists makes as much sense as refusing to record such other local features as roads, portages or rapids.

Much of what used to be provided in English in connexion with maps of Quebec will in future be relegated to English text atlases and other non-official publications. The function of such documents is not the representation of official names *per se* so much as their official translation for purposes of education, instruction or illustration in whatever language is required.

CPCGN endorsement of the "one name per feature per jurisdiction" formula may very well represent Canada's single most significant step in the field of national name standardization taken since the Second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names was convened in London in 1972.

#### BACKGROUND

The Advisory Committee (then still referred to as the Sub-Committee) was established in 1971 on the recommendation of the former Chief, Toponymy Division, Surveys and Mapping (Canada), G. F. Delaney. Mr. Delaney, whose distinguished career in the field of cartographic toponymy is well known to participants of this Conference, noted several years ago that extensive research on his part into the history of translation of geographical names had not led him to any conclusion that could be considered an improvement on what he had maintained for many years: that "the best statement on this whole subject is contained in the brief which was presented to the former Geographical Board of Canada in 1907 by the Société du Parler Français. In this the principle that the utmost effort should be made to avoid the establishment of a dual geographic nomenclature in Canada was most clearly enunciated."

Delaney took exception to the then (1969) actions of the Commission de Géographie du Québec and "sundry translators in and out of Government" who had, he pointed out, "gone a long way toward the destruction of this principle, although in fairness we have to recognize that there has been a natural growth of this duality by reason of ordinary usage in spoken French".

Delaney agreed that not much could be done about reversing this trend "except to try to influence key figures such as translators toward the recognition that a geographic name differs from a word or a grammatical expression" and concluded that "if they would entertain this concept they might be less inclined to translate names simply because they might be translatable."

#### FORMATION OF A SUB-COMMITTEE

High on the agenda of the 1970 Ottawa Annual Meeting of the CPCGN was the recommendation of the Surveys and Mapping Branch (Canada) that consideration be given a position paper prepared by G. F. Delaney, in his capacity as CPCGN Executive Secretary, entitled "A new policy for geographical names on federal maps". The paper advanced the idea that a new national policy for the treatment of geographical names on Canadian maps was not only necessary but long overdue. Political change in the country was forcing cartographic

agencies to face up to the new bilingual and political priorities of the day. The paper emphasized the urgent need to formulate a new national directive for the official treatment of geographical names in a bilingual context. A Sub-Committee formed in April 1970, and consisted of the following six members:

Executive Secretary, CPCGN (Canada) G. F. Delaney;  
Consultant to Director of Surveys and Mapping (Canada), Brigadier L. J. Harris;  
Secretary, Commission de Géographie (Quebec), J. P. Poirier;  
Provincial Archivist (New Brunswick), H. A. Taylor;  
Chief Translator, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (Canada), L. Verreault; and  
Executive Secretary, Ontario Geographic Names Board, M. B. Smart.

The Ontario member was elected Chairman and C. Millette of CPCGN was elected Secretary.

#### *Terms of reference*

The Committee's terms of reference were:

- (a) To review existing policies endorsed by federal and provincial agencies responsible for toponymy;
- (b) To review the major problems that would be encountered in map production if present policies were to remain unchanged;
- (c) To review the conclusions and recommendations of the 1970 Delaney paper presented to the Ottawa CPCGN annual meeting;
- (d) To prepare a final paper that would serve as guide for national policy on geographical names, taking into account the bilingual character of the country and special problems due to the predominant use of one language in any one province; and
- (e) To submit its findings to the next annual meeting of CPCGN at Regina in 1971.

#### *Area of Sub-Committee disagreement (1971)*

Eight recommendations of the National Policy Sub-Committee were drafted and submitted at Regina. Of that number the following two (8.7 and 8.8) represent the minority view of the Sub-Committee:

*Recommendation 8.7.* The specific part of each geographic name should be regarded as a proper name based on current local usage<sup>2</sup> and that translation of descriptive names be discouraged.

*Recommendation 8.8.* Generic terms in geographical names should be [recorded] in accordance with the predominant text of the map,<sup>3</sup> and that hybrid names resulting be accepted.

<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding that Quebec and Ontario both officially subscribed to the territorial principle in geographical naming, each acknowledged the political necessity of recognizing decisions recorded in the gazetteer of the other Province (whether or not these were supported by local usage). Ideally, local and official names should be the same. However, until such time as this was possible, both Ontario and Quebec agreed to restrict recognition to gazetteer listings only.

<sup>3</sup> Neither Quebec nor Ontario clearly understood at the time the meaning and implication of the phrase "predominant text of the map"

The following six National Policy Sub-Committee recommendations, tabled at Regina, represent the majority view of the group:

*Recommendation 8.1.* All maps at scales of 1:2,000,000 and smaller should be published separately in English and French;

*Recommendation 8.2.* All maps at scales of 1:1,000,000 and larger (1:250,000, 1:125,000, 1:25,000 etc.) should be published in one edition only with surround (marginal) information, legends and other explanatory data in both English and French;

*Recommendation 8.3.* The specific part of geographical names shown on maps referred to in recommendation 8.2 should be in the form approved by the provincial name authority having jurisdiction;

*Recommendation 8.4.* The geographical names authorities in all provinces should formally recognize both English and French forms of names that have established usage and both should be included in CPCGN gazetteers;

*Recommendation 8.5.* On the larger-scale maps referred to in recommendation 8.2, any geographical names that are applied to continuous features forming or crossing provincial boundaries should be given in both French and English forms for the same feature, in whatever manner deemed cartographically expedient;

*Recommendation 8.6.* To the greatest extent possible, "labels" or "descriptive terms" should be supplanted by symbolization on the larger-scale maps (1:125,000, 1:50,000 etc.) referred to in recommendation 8.2. Accordingly:

(a) A comprehensive glossary, explaining such symbols, should be added to the marginal surround of such maps;

(b) This glossary should be in English and French;

(c) When "labels" cannot be symbolized, the "label" should be written in both English and French.

It should be noted that the 1971 Regina Report emphasized such cartographic factors as map scales, margins, legends, map texts, continuous features forming or crossing provincial boundaries, cartographic problems regarding space, map labels or descriptive terms, symbols and glossaries. In contrast, the 1976 National Policy emphasizes such jurisdictional and linguistic factors as political jurisdiction, sovereignty and the problem of official names as against local usage considerations.

It was this shift, from an emphasis on cartographic considerations and priorities to an emphasis on jurisdiction and language, that finally enabled the Advisory Committee to achieve, in 1976, the consensus necessary for formulation and ratification of the new policy. The draft policy accorded CPCGN approval at Winnipeg in 1976 now represents the federal Government's official position on treatment of the two official languages in recording geographical names for maps, charts and gazetteers produced by Canada.

At the time of its final meeting in August 1976, the

National Policy Advisory Committee consisted of the following eight members:

- Director, Map Production Directorate (Canada), T. H. Kihl;
- Secretary, Commission de Géographie (Quebec), J. R. Poirier;
- Consultant to the Director-General of Surveys and Mapping (Canada), L. J. Harris;
- Former Executive Secretary, CPCGN (Canada), G. F. Delaney;
- Executive Secretary, CPCGN (Canada), J. A. Rayburn;
- Executive Secretary, Ontario Geographic Names Board (Chairman), M. B. Smart;
- Director-General, Terminology and Documentation, Secretary of State (Canada), P. le Quellec; and
- Terminologist, Secretary of State (Canada), L. Boisvert

#### HIGHLIGHTS OF NATIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S WORK, 1971 TO 1976

##### *1971 report to CPCGN*

In 1971 the Committee submitted its report, containing the eight recommendations above, to the CPCGN annual meeting in Regina. The CPCGN response (i.e. its instructions to the Sub-committee) was as follows:

- (a) The Sub-committee was to reconsider its report and recommendations in light of the fact that six of the recommendations were majority and two were minority views;
- (b) Criticisms were invited from Committee members;
- (c) The sub-committee was instructed to reconvene in order to implement items (a) and (b);
- (d) The CPCGN proposed that persons outside the Committee be asked to proof-read the redrafted report prior to its publication.

##### *Other items*

These were as follows:

- (a) L. Verreault, Chief Translator, Surveys and Mapping (Canada), proposed a two-tiered report, in which one part would be geared to needs of the map-maker and one to the needs of the toponymist. In effect, this has been done. Sections 1 and 2 of the New Policy specifically concern the map-maker; Section 3 does not, in so far as it concerns the atlas, encyclopaedia and school map publisher, who is not obligated to use official geographical names;
- (b) Brigadier L. J. Harris, Consultant to the Director, Surveys and Mapping (Canada), recommended a study of the Chief Translator's suggestion of separating the problem into two parts, one specifically cartographic and the other toponymic. He thought this would provide a politically acceptable report. In light of item (a) above, Brigadier Harris has been proved correct;
- (c) British Columbia endorsed the recommendation that separate cartographic treatment be accorded English

and French toponymic traditions. Section 2 of the New Policy provides for this;

(d) Newfoundland objected to recommendation 8.4, which supported double naming in what are indisputably unilingual areas of that province. The province, therefore, would not accord recognition to official use of "Saint-Jean" as an alternate name and designation for what is known and recognized locally, nationally and internationally as the city of St. John's, Newfoundland;

(e) Brigadier Harris identified three options which he considered open to producers of small-scale (1:250,000 and smaller) maps of the topographical series (NTS) produced by the Government of Canada. These he based on a survey of views held by Members of the Permanent Committee:

- (i) The first option was production of two editions (one English and one French);
- (ii) The second was production of one edition, showing double names (one English and one French as in "Great Whale River/Poste-de-la-Baleine");
- (iii) The third option was to produce a single edition, showing the name, name-specific, name-generic and linguistic form as given in the provincial gazetteers

Brigadier E. D. Baldock, the former director of the Directorate of Map Production (Canada), argued convincingly for adoption of the third option in February 1960. The idea for the Sub-Committee had originated with the Directorate of Map Production and was contained in Brigadier Baldock's 1960 memorandum calling for investigation into the feasibility of producing a single map to serve the requirements of both official languages. The New Policy, in accordance with Brigadier Baldock's views, endorses the third option.

At a special meeting convened in January 1972 by Surveys and Mapping (Canada) it was pointed out that, for reasons that may have been overlooked in the original Regina report, aeronautical charts could not and should not be included in recommendation 8.1. Accordingly, the Branch requested that the wording of the recommendation be so amended.

At the same meeting Surveys and Mapping (Canada) announced that it favoured a single bilingual map (a single document showing one name per feature or place, either in French or English) and recommended that the mechanics of making such a map be investigated.

The New Policy confirms the soundness of both recommendations.

##### *The linguistic boundary debate*

An argument was submitted to the 1972 annual meeting of the CPCGN in Halifax, Nova Scotia, for serious research into the feasibility of adopting a linguistic boundary solution for cartographic problems involving language and decisions concerned with the compilation of cartographic information in Canada for maps, charts and gazetteers produced by Canada.

The argument was carefully considered by CPCGN Executive Secretary G. F. Delaney, but was rejected by

the CPCGN in favour of a political solution, which at the time was considered more realistic in light of current developments in Quebec concerning language and independence generally in all matters cultural, administrative, toponymic and political.

The New Policy, while not guaranteeing that decisions reflect local usage, does guarantee that the decisions do represent official opinion in the jurisdiction concerned.

#### *Elements of the linguistic boundary reconsidered*

The Argument put forward by the Sub-Committee chairman was that *de facto* isoplethic linguistic boundaries for use in delimiting geographical areas of spoken language (based on Swiss, Austrian and Belgian experience) would provide the Canadian Government with cartographic guidelines (amenable to revision with every census) that would effectively remove the impasse and misunderstanding that had, until the adoption of the 1976 policy, complicated the official recording and treatment of French and English geographical nomenclature in Canada.

The Sub-Committee chairman pursued the argument that only through a complete change of direction, culminating in the adoption of an isoplethic (as opposed to a political-boundary) formula and rationale (based on the territoriality of official languages as opposed to the then and present choroplethic policy, which recognized only their jurisdictionality) would it be possible to clear away the confusion and the many contraventions of the territorial or local usage principle resulting from long adherence to the double name standard. The central issue was and is choice of language, not names. It was generally agreed that resolution of such an issue should not be a cartographer's responsibility. The chairman also predicted that compilation of a national map showing *de facto* (i.e. isoplethic) linguistic boundaries of areas where census and other local data indicate that one or the other official language predominates, would provide the cartographer and cartographic technician with a workable and expeditious means of determining which language (and generic) to use in situations where he is presented with an English and a French name for the same feature or place. At the present time the cartographer is merely aware of the political or choroplethic boundaries which, in contrast with the true language boundary, only inform one that within a given area, one official language (in the case of Quebec) is the official medium of administration and instruction (of which maps are a part). Delimiting on a map the territorial distribution of a language for purposes of equitably recording geographical names within that area in that language for citizens of a country who normally speak that language would appear to be a logical way of doing things. It is also fundamental to good mapping in that it is the function and responsibility of the map-maker to record and represent all relevant and essential topographic, hydrographic and cultural data pertinent to an area. Such information usually takes the form of roads, lakes, fields and names.

The Sub-Committee chairman pointed out that in some other countries there were as many official languages

within the national borders as Canada has provinces and territories. He noted also that these same countries appear to have been successful in bringing their multi-lingual areas into some semblance of cartographic order through what seems to be a judicious combination of the linguistic-boundary and the territorial principles.

The Chairman argued further that a positive step in the direction of mapping the actual territorial limits and transition zones of Canada's two official languages would be a positive step towards accelerating the processing of names in English/French bilingual areas. In simple terms, this would mean the elimination of much of the time currently spent determining which language to use for which name in which area.

Under the New Policy, which is based on the choroplethic or jurisdictional boundary, the compiler of a topographical map of an area in Quebec need inquire no further than the Quebec gazetteer for determination of language and generic. He will be aware that such information will not always agree with local sources as to the correct language and generic to be used. But in so far as official maps are committed to the dissemination of data that is official, he has little alternative but to record as given. The territorial principle may assert itself at a later date.

Adoption of the New Policy of 1976 reinforces the need for closer co-operation between regional geographical names authorities and the federal Government. The federal mapping and charting agencies require provision of more information than ever before on official language usage at the local level outside Quebec. It is the responsibility of the provincial authorities to furnish that information.

Determination of the language to be used for a geographical name in New Brunswick or Manitoba without the co-operation of a provincial nomenclature authority can be a time-consuming business. Unfortunately, the fact of the matter is that, faced with current automated and computer-assisted technological constraints on time available for map compilation and production, map-makers can no longer spend that sort of time on toponymy. Aerial photography and digital technology have paved the way for the photogrammetrist and the cartographic toponymist, who together now provide the means for accelerating the input of cartographic data for map production.

The latter appeared on the cartographic scene in very recent years (compared to the photogrammetrist). The cartographic toponymist came into being as a technological necessity with the demise of the ground-based survey. With the phasing out of the topographic surveyor as an integral part of the topographical survey process, map-makers lost their link with toponymy. The "on-the-ground" contact with local residents, officials, Amerindians, Inuit, foresters, farmers and the like has disappeared. Maps began to appear with up-to-date topography and out-of-date toponymy. The public response wasn't long in coming.

Photography provides data only on visible phenomena; toponymy must "play it by ear". New and vastly

accelerated mapping and map revision schedules in contemporary map production demand commensurately sophisticated means of providing, maintaining and processing toponymic data fast enough to meet the new technology's demands for accurate, up-to-date information. The old ways of mapping, not to mention map-making, are obsolete.

The new policy accelerates provision of name data through further restriction of the cartographic technician's name-collecting responsibilities to consulting the nearest gazetteer or provincial board decision list. New name information unlisted in that form (which can be considerable following major toponymic surveys) must be provided by the board or commission responsible for the jurisdiction in question.

If determination of the language spoken in a given area should not be a cartographer's responsibility, it is most certainly not a cartographic technician's. Yet in the absence of seven decades or longer of a language policy for Canadian maps based on the territorial principle, linguistic decisions affecting geographical names continued—indeed must continue—to be made every day by cartographers. Such decisions are allegedly made on the basis of a map's so-called "text", which, if loosely defined as the predominant language of the description or label information within a map's neat lines (not its margins or surround), must invariably be English—even in the heart of Quebec. Evidence aplenty can be found in any map library.

So long as Quebec remains within the Canadian federation, French will probably continue to be recognized as the other official language in matters of instruction and administration throughout Canada. In this regard it is interesting to note that the Province of Ontario now accords full recognition to French toponymy and French orthography for provincial maps of Ontario. In short, French toponymy now has parity with English toponymy. Unless Quebec does secede, there is little likelihood that a new language policy regarding treatment of French in that province will need to be written. Popular opinion, faced with secession, may no longer even support the idea of linguistic parity or equality with French across what is left of the country, any more than it did in certain provinces following the conscription crisis of 1917, in which case the cartographic establishment will find the present names policy obsolete. Linguistic boundaries, most probably, would be re-assessed in terms of other linguistic groups. Priority would go to the territorial principle, to mapping *de facto* rather than *de jure*. An officially unilingual country needs no linguistic boundaries.

#### POSTSCRIPT AND COMMENTARY: THE 1977 POLICY

The following points should be noted regarding the 1977 Policy endorsed by the CPCGN for the treatment of Canada's two official languages on Canadian maps:

- (a) The Board's Policy is a political solution;
- (b) It does not insist on local usage as prerequisite;
- (c) It does ensure that an official Canadian map, chart

or gazetteer contains nomenclature that is official—pure and simple;

(d) The *Gazetteer of Canada* (including the Quebec edition) is recognized as being the national register of official geographical names in Canada;

(e) The cartographer and cartographic technician are no longer required to make final decisions determining language for geographical names on Canadian maps;

(f) With final authority and responsibility for determination of official language and approval of official names entirely vested in the provincial or territorial names boards, commissions or committees (where and when such organizations exist and are in place), there is a clear obligation on the part of such authorities to provide and maintain name data for provincial and federal surveys, mapping and charting agencies concerned with the production of topographical maps, hydrographic charts and gazetteers;

(g) Equally clear is the role of the CPCGN in co-ordinating all federal agencies concerned with toponymy (such as the Topographical Survey Directorate, the Canadian Hydrographic Service and the Department of National Defence) and all information on toponymy provided by the provincial (and potential territorial) geographical name organizations already in place;

(h) In some parts of Canada the political, rather than the linguistic, boundary is the ultimate determinant as to whether a geographical name will appear cartographically in French or English, whereas in areas outside of Quebec local usage has been and will continue to be the basis for making that decision;

(i) The emphasis on local usage (in deciding which official language shall be used for names) places final administrative and executive responsibility for that information on the provincial authority and its official mapping and charting agencies;

(j) Brigadier L. J. Harris of Surveys and Mapping (Canada) argued in 1972 that the central problem facing those responsible for treating geographical names and texts on federal maps of Canada in two official languages was to find the necessary ways and means "to fulfill the language requirements of the two founding races in the presentation of names and texts on maps, while recognizing historical factors, to the extent that it is necessary in practice, is required in the interest of the cultures and is economically feasible". Harris recognized two aspects of the problem: treatment of names on a map; and choice of single name where two different names occur, one in each of the official languages;

(k) In 1976, Jean R. Poirier of the Commission de Géographie du Québec pointed out with regard to the national policy proposal to publish one edition of the federal Government small-scale (1:2,000,000 and smaller) map series that, responding to the need to expedite the formulation of a new language policy for maps, the Smart Committee raised the question whether it might not be advisable to follow the lead of Ontario and Quebec, both of which subscribed to the one-edition formula and not to the French/English editions approach then in force. It is M. Poirier's view that the only feasible way to have a

single-edition map of Canada would be to have linguistic policies that would "make greater efforts to find parallel solutions" rather than to implement "superimposed bilingualism". M. Poirier explained that the term "parallel geographic name" referred to any unofficial form of a geographical name (as in "Lake St. John" (Quebec), whose official name is "Lac Saint Jean"). If the two forms, ("Lac Saint Jean" and "Lake St. John") were both official, this would be "superimposed bilingualism" (the 1907 Geographical Board position). M. Poirier illustrated his point by making reference to official maps of such non-unilingual states as Belgium and Switzerland, where "parallel solutions" have been employed and "superimposed bilingualism" avoided whenever and wherever possible. A recommendation to this effect was made by the United Nations at its First Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names in Geneva in 1967. The Quebec Board Secretary argued further that, in his view, any possibility of producing a single-edition map of Canada is difficult to imagine if the above recommendation and rationale are not taken into consideration. M. Poirier concluded his observations with the statement that the translation of names into French for French editions of maps, and into English for English editions of maps, was a very poorly recommended toponymic policy and one that ran counter to United Nations recommendations on the standardization of geographical names;

(l) Maps and charts of countries and parts of countries made by other countries tend to be exonymic in content, as they are designed for user groups native to the country that compiled and published them in the first place. Such maps usually appear as atlases and school maps, or form parts of text books, encyclopaedias and the tourist or travel literature of one country by another (examples include American-made and -sponsored publications, maps and charts of Europe or the Soviet Union and publications by cartographic organizations in Europe or the USSR of the United States of America. A map or atlas of the Soviet Union made in a French-speaking part of the world and used by governmental agencies and academic institutions in French-speaking countries, for example, would show the name "Golfe de l'Anadyr" for a feature in the Bering Sea; a map made in the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand or Canada (outside of Quebec) would show the same feature as "Anadyrski Gulf". Only the Soviet publication would be expected to show the actual name in its locally recognized and officially approved form (i.e. the Cyrillic original of the name, which would be transliterated into English as "Anadyrskij Zaliv". "Zaliv" (gulf) is part of the original and official name. "Gulf", "Golfe de" and "Golf" ("Anadyrgolf" is the German exonym) are the English, French and German generic equivalents respectively;

(m) The Chairman of the Advisory Committee made a strong case for a linguistic boundary solution in 1972 as a way around the bilingual impasse then confronting Canadian Government map- and chart-makers. Though his solution was dropped in favour of a political solution, the old problem persisted until ratification of the New Policy of 1976, incorporating the idea of a "one-name-

per-feature-per-jurisdiction" formula. In view of contemporary political priorities in Canada regarding language and national unity perhaps the idea of determining a name's "linguistic" form by relating it to the actual official language spoken in the area in question is, in the year 1977, somewhat premature.

## CONCLUSION

In bringing this discussion to a close, it would be useful to consider the principles and procedures of geographical naming adopted by some of the longer-established and more experienced countries in the field. Switzerland is a classic example. Trilingual Switzerland (Switzerland actually has more than three languages, but only three are official at the federal level) managed to cope with cartolinguistic problems, of the sort that long plagued Canadians, generations before Canada existed. Their solution, however, is not a political one.

After arguing on different cultural wavelengths for decades, English and French Canada have now adopted a national policy, based on a jurisdictional rationale, for the treatment of French and English geographical names on Canadian maps. This does not preclude the possibility that, at some future date, an agreement might not be reached that, like the Swiss and Belgian solutions, would be based on territorial rather than political considerations.

It would be a mistake to dismiss the Swiss experience as having little or no relevance in the Canadian context. Switzerland recognizes the territorial or local-usage principle as the first principle in toponymic situations. The problem, therefore, is mainly a question of solving geographical name and naming problems along an official language's geographical or territorial limits and in the transition zones between two main linguistic regions.

When considering a toponymic problem at the level of the smallest administrative unit (communes and *Gemeinden* in Switzerland's French and German-speaking cantons), it is often possible to recognize a distinct territorial separation between areas of French and German speech, especially in a rural setting. A linguistic mixture is more usually the case in cities and recently established industrial centres. Cities and industrial centres or areas are treated differently from rural areas as they are regarded as features *shared* by two or more linguistic jurisdictions in many instances. Bruxelles/Brussels, Ghent/Gand, Bern/Berne, Genève/Genf, Ottawa, Helsinki/Helsingfors are urban regions where double naming of such major features as main streets, squares, parks, canals, stations and harbours is possible and necessary.

Although communes and *Gemeinden* are free to resolve language problems as they see fit, certain principles are generally applied:

First, a choice of name from one or the other language is made at the commune or *Gemeinde* level;

Second, the language adopted for the name of the commune or *Gemeinde* itself in a transition zone is the mother tongue of the majority of its inhabitants, as

indicated in the latest official census. If, however, there is a significantly large language minority in a commune or *Gemeinde*, it is accorded special rights with regard to geographical names on highway signs on the borders of communes and *Gemeinden*, a linguistic minority exceeding 30 per cent being entitled to request that the name in question be written in both languages. We thus have Fribourg/Freiburg appearing on road signs at the approaches to that commune.

It should be noted at this juncture, however, that a name used in such an instance does not necessarily relate to, nor can it be presumed to be, the official name of or designation for a commune or *Gemeinde*. In the Canadian situation it is possible to foresee a similar development. The present official policy of recognizing one name per feature or place per political jurisdiction is unquestionably a step ahead for Canadian map-makers. One need only consider the former dual name policy situation which prevailed in many areas for very many years to

appreciate that. The double standard confused everybody and frustrated cartographers, mapping and charting establishments and the general public alike.

We may well see the day when English-speaking areas in what may or may not be an independent Quebec will retain, or at least have restored, their own ancestral and more recent geographical names. That is, of course, if the English-speaking communities themselves survive.

Road signs may very well one day appear on the outskirts of some communities in Quebec with double names (implying, it must be pointed out, as in the Swiss example, no official status for the second name). A highway sign carrying the double name Saint-Andre-Est/Saint Andrews East on the approaches to that community may not be seen for years to come. Such a development would, if realized, create a much-needed sense of balance in what has been for too long either an English-only or French-only situation. The new policy is, at the very least, a significant step in that direction.

## PROBLEMS OF STANDARDIZATION IN A MULTILINGUAL NATION Report presented by the Sudan\*

### PROBLEMS OF PLACE-NAME STANDARDIZATION IN THE SUDAN

The language situation in the Sudan is very complex. There are about 136 languages in the Sudan. Out of this total number 128 are African languages.<sup>1</sup> These languages belong to different families of African languages. Some studies have indicated that all families of African languages are represented in the Sudan except the Khoisan of South Africa.<sup>2</sup> This gives the Sudan a very high degree of linguistic diversity, a matter which is reflected in a multiplicity of phonological features and variations. Out of the number of languages cited above at least 114 languages are native to the Sudan. The other languages have entered the Sudan at different periods, some of them as recently as the 1960s. In fact, the language map of the Sudan is increasingly changing due to political instability and to such natural disasters as drought and famine, which afflict some of the neighbouring countries.

In order to understand the gravity of the problem of standardization of geographical names in a country like the Sudan, we must remember that settlements have emerged in different parts of the country. Such settlements have been given names in the local languages (114 in number) and possibly in some of the invading languages. These geographical names carry within them

the diverse phonological features of the Sudanese languages. Accordingly, whoever is writing down these names must be able to distinguish and represent accurately the sounds that are inherent in such names. A matter like this requires a certain degree of linguistic sophistication, and/or familiarity with the language concerned. Thus the first problem (and, indeed, the major problem) facing the writing of geographical names hinges on the acute linguistic diversity.

There are also different problems of policy, which are related to the question of linguistic diversity. Shall we produce maps in Arabic—the national language—or in English, the second principal language in the country and the language of wider international communication; or else shall we produce maps in the vernacular languages? It is clear that the third alternative (producing maps in the vernacular languages) has so far been ruled out. The Sudanese Survey Department has produced maps in both Arabic and English. This, however, produces the basic problem of how to reconcile the phonological systems of English and Arabic with the systems of local languages. It is clear that whether or not we produce maps in the vernacular languages, we cannot continue to ignore accommodating phonological features of vernacular geographical names into Arabic and English—the languages used in Sudanese maps.

In the following lines we cite some of the major problems of representing and writing Nubian place names in Arabic script. Professor Herman Bell, who has studied this problem, writes the following about the census report for 1960. He states that "unfortunately its entries are in Arabic script without the vowel markings. Even had the markings been given, the disadvantages of recording names in the five-vowel system of Nubian by means of the three-vowel system of Arabic script are

\* The original text of this paper, prepared by Sayyid Hurreiz, University of Khartoum, Sudan, appeared as document E/CONF 69/L 94

<sup>1</sup> Sayyid Hurreiz and Herman Bell, *Directions in Sudanese Linguistics and Folklore* (Khartoum, Khartoum University Press, 1975), pp 159–162

<sup>2</sup> R. Stevenson, "The significance of the Sudan in linguistic research, past, present and future" in Y. F. Hasan, ed., *The Sudan in Africa* (Khartoum, Khartoum University Press, 1971)