



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
LIMITED

E/CONF.61/L.37  
17 March 1972

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SECOND UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE  
STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES  
London, 10-31 May 1972  
Item 10 (b) (iii) of the provisional agenda

THE TREATMENT OF GENERIC TERMS IN  
THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, CANADA

Paper submitted by the Government of Canada\*

I. THE PROBLEM

The publishers of Canadian maps, atlases and charts find themselves of late confronted with the prospect of having to devise ways and means of meeting the challenge of bilingualism. Impending legislation is in the air which may well result in a demand for total - or near total - bilingualism in many if not all of the nation's maps, atlases and charts. In French and English terms, this would affect all geographical nomenclatures, label or descriptive terminology and marginal textual information incorporated in current national topographical maps.

The map maker would in fact be faced with the need to cope with demands (emanating for the most part from Québec) for provision, at a national level, of what must either be a twofold system of maps and charts, of all areas, in separate linguistic, orthographic and typographic formats (at all scales), or, alternatively, a series of single bilingual maps and charts containing dual translations, dual transliterations (into either English or French phonetic forms) of all names and other related information in the aforementioned formats and scales for each individual publication. Either course presents great problems of time and expense. The problem of hammering out a new policy, acceptable to both sides, is one which deserves, therefore, all the qualified attention it can get. This analysis of the situation, will, hopefully, do just that.

---

\* Prepared by Michael B. Smart, Executive Secretary, Ontario Geographic Names Board, Canada.

While it may be conceded that it is not too difficult to produce a series of unilingual maps in each of the official languages at scales as small as 1:2,000,000, it is quite another matter when scales of 1:25,000 or 1:50,000 are concerned. A small scale series does not present a map publisher with any great problem of translation, because, in contrast with maps at very large scales, only a proportionately small number of place and feature names need be translated, retransliterated or otherwise altered to the satisfaction of the linguistic group concerned. A very different situation exists with map editions at the larger scales mentioned where the provision of geographical nomenclature data alone accounts for approximately 38 per cent of the map's production cost. Nomenclature provision at this level must, of necessity, be backed up by a vast amount of toponymic research before the required degree of accuracy acceptable to both official language groups can be provided - let alone maintained.

## II. OBJECTIVES

In anticipating such difficulties in the near future, the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names commissioned in 1971 a study of place name generics by way of examining a proposal made a few years ago by the Québec member advocating the elimination of a large number of repetitious generic names from maps. While this was ostensibly made in the interests of easing the financial burden of bilingual translation, since a simple operation would delete a vast number of names which would otherwise have to be translated, the study which ensued led to results both surprising and revealing. It was soon obvious that the implications of such a scheme - carried to logical conclusions - would affect an entire area of toponymy not wholly understood or even taken into account by nomenclature authorities in Canada. In the final analysis, the geographical generic emerges more secure than ever. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate why.

Particular attention is focused on generic elements in map nomenclature whose continuing existence in name form has come into question. It has been suggested that the cartographic idea conveyed by a name (that is the generic) can be just as well communicated by a standard map symbol. This presupposes, if the argument is understood correctly, that a map symbol for lake is as effective as a map medium in conveying the idea of LAKE, LAC, SEE, MERE, LOUGH, LOCH etc., as an integral part of a place name, as a name itself. The following pages categorically disprove this notion - with all due respect to the symbolists.

It is their argument that little real purpose is served the bilingual map user in retaining topographical generic names any longer. It is further suggested that their elimination through symbolization can only be regarded as a large step forward in solving the current CPCGN dilemma over linguistic priorities. To give an example: the assumed function of such common-place geographical generic names as POND or ÉTANG, CREEK or RUISSEAU - repeated as they are a thousand times over on map after map - might understandably be taken to be the communication of the idea of pond or creek and nothing more. If so - the same idea or concept can most certainly be communicated by a conventional map symbol without the awkward disadvantage of being linguistically exclusive at the same time. One can understand why a map maker who must attempt to placate the two language groups should wonder why maps in a bilingual country need be cluttered up at all with so much generic terminology.

The idea is developed in this paper that peoples or nations of the Anglo-Saxon tradition embody their tangible and terrestrial environment of hill, dale and green in their toponymy, while a nation belonging to a Latin tradition makes itself the content of its geographical nomenclature. In France, this is seen to be especially true of the toponymy of her towns and cities - in Quebec, both town and countryside names are shown to lean overwhelmingly towards national (in the French sense of that word) commemoration and glorification - the land, as geographical environment, is conspicuously absent.

Through an inquiry into some of the "whys" and "hows" of the traditions involved, this paper considers possible ways and means of coping with what appears to be an arbitrary programme of attrition which has as its aim the removal of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celtic toponyms from the official maps of the land - especially from areas within the present political boundaries of Québec - and this in spite of the fact that both English and French Canadian toponymists seem to agree on the principle that prime consideration should be accorded local usage in settled areas in determining which names shall appear as official nomenclature on the maps of the nation.

For example, a name such as Saint-Luc-de-Laval is not only an intrinsically different type of place name to that of Smoky Hollow Mountain, but the process by which it was officially established and made part of the local record through map and gazetteer, is as significant in understanding the French Canadian's interpretation of what constitutes and what determines local usage - as opposed to that understood by the English speaking Canadian - as is the process by which the latter name acquired official status on the map through purely local sources and generation. One tradition moves logically from map to land, the other from land to map. The two may never meet. The genesis of a toponym's generic element follows a similar course.

This linguistic and cultural dichotomy is examined in detail, and, in so doing, the psychology of the two toponymic traditions - one the obverse of the other - made more comprehensible. It is argued that while one tradition tends to invest its geography, inclusive of features within it which others have cultural claim to, with its nationality, the other, in contrast, regards its geography, that is its terrestrial environment, as a source of inspiration not only for its purely local place and feature names, but also for the official names of its roads, streets, boroughs, residential suburbs, houses, clubs, parks and, ultimately, even its cemeteries. That the two traditions call for separate treatment goes without saying. As to how dual treatment is to be translated into policy, is another matter - and a subject which this paper pursues to its final conclusions in the pages that follow.

### III. FACTORS

The Ontario Geographic Names Board (OGNB) has been invited to state its position with regard to the proposal, that, in the interests of bilingualism, the generic form be eliminated from as many geographical names as possible on Canadian maps. On the understanding that "generic" in this sense refers to the descriptive element found in most geographical feature and place names, such as

CREEK in Coldwater Creek or CORNERS in Hemlock Corners, and that all topographic generics of this form are involved (that is not only the very common LAKE, RIVER, CREEK and the like), the Ontario Board has decided, after due consideration, against the elimination proposal. In point of fact, OGNB policy has been such that every effort continues to be made to determine which generic names are actually in use for given places and features, and to record and submit these for official approval. With these premises in mind, this paper advances a number of compelling reasons in support of the Ontario Board's current procedures dealing with topographic generics, in the hope that the recommendations which ensue shall be carefully considered in the formulation of a new national names policy.

Basically, the overruling consideration behind the OGNB position is the fact that in English place and feature names, the site element remains an inseparable part of any true toponym. "Topos" and "place", after all, mean the same thing. In spite of their sometimes long evolution from purely verbal and descriptive feature forms to inhabited place name terms - and to surnames and frequently back to place names again - relatively few Anglo-Saxon toponyms have ever lost their place or topographic element. The place or site generic remains the immemorial link with the land.

Significantly, such is not the case with the majority of toponyms in French Canada. Other priorities and other traditions - quite foreign to the Celtic, Teutonic or even Amerindian traditional sense of empathy with the land - prevail. It is this central fact which accounts for the facility with which most French Canadian toponyms can be shorn of their geographical elements, namely LAC, RIVIÈRE, RUISSEAU, MONT, ÉTANG etc. without any significant effect on their intrinsic meaning in the cultural landscape. Not so in English - with the exception of a proportionately smaller number which belong to a tradition more akin to the prevailing form in French Canada.

Another reason for the OGNB stand against any proposal ostensibly designed to eliminate place generics from the map is that such a procedure clearly contravenes the Board's policy of according prime consideration to local usage - which includes local generics. English, in its verbal and written form - unlike French - or Italian for that matter - is governed by popular usage - a continuing process - and one exemplified by the fact that the language defers to no authoritative linguistic academy. In a similar logical context, England, and regions of the world settled by her people, quite unlike France and lands colonized by Frenchmen, also has a common law, i.e. an unwritten law of the land laying claim to ancient usage derivation. Correspondingly, the referendum versus the edict approach to what constitutes usage underlies the generic names issue just as it does in matters determining juridical or linguistic norms.

Governed by the same logical tradition is the analogous procedure of raising English words used in the vernacular to official status and position in the dictionary. Words (like names) observed and recorded in popular usage are recorded in the addenda. After a suitable period of exposure in print and depending upon whether they do or do not receive official approval, they are incorporated within the body of the dictionary. A comparable tradition governs the evolution of the Anglo-Saxon toponym from its unrecorded place in the oral tradition to its approved status on the map as an official name.

#### IV. THE PLACE OF GENERICS IN TOPONYMY

The proposal that total elimination of place name generics be considered as a national policy could hardly have arisen in an area dominated by Anglo-Saxon and Amerindian toponyms. Emphasis in the Anglo-Saxon place name is on place and in the French, on name. The exception in French is the "toponyme descriptif" such as Anse à l'Orme, similar to Parry Sound or the Ojibwa Nottawasaga. ANSE, SOUND and SAGA represent water feature generics.

With emphasis placed upon the commemorative name element in French Canadian nomenclature, it is understandable that an argument against terrestrial generics on the grounds that they are redundant should find favourable response in French Canada. Particularly so at a time when great numbers of historically fixed Anglo-Saxon place and feature names are being submerged in translation or have disappeared completely from map and signpost.

In general, nineteenth and twentieth century toponyms in French Canada stress the commemorative name only. This is, however, a usage quite at odds with place names dating from the exploration and colonization period (sixteenth to seventeenth centuries); or for that matter with most names on modern maps of rural France. Compared to place names which stress the geographical concept, French Canadian toponyms tend to function as place name memorials to national heroes and saints. In topographic terms they make little sense, but like French street names they were not intended to make that sort of sense in the first place. In short: where Anglo-Saxon usage normally uses a name to describe a lake, hill or village - in French Canadian usage the same lake, hill or village would be used to commemorate a name.

Significantly, most feature and place names on rural Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon (off Newfoundland) are not of this genre. The fact that these islands - unlike Québec - retain their cultural links with France may account for the fact that Québec's place names no longer are "toponymes descriptif". Similar to their Anglo-Saxon, German, or Amerindian counterparts, "toponymes descriptif" are names in which the specific element (oak, burnt, mud, smoky) qualifies the place element (point, creek, lake, hollow). These names are not the rule in rural Québec, though a proportionately small number such as Le-Long-Sault, Rapide-Blanc, or Pointe-aux-Trembles indicate that toponymy was once otherwise inspired in French Canada. In the latter example, the specific element TREMBLES (aspen) qualifies the place element POINTE. Had the descriptive (that is the topographic) approach to place naming not given way in French Canada to the memorial and nationally commemorative, the current discussion dealing with the feasibility of doing away with geographical generic names (river, lake, brook, pond, hill etc.) on Canadian maps may never have arisen. The arguments advanced for their elimination would hardly have been seriously considered either.

A French toponym such as Île-à-l'Orme belongs to the same descriptive naming tradition as the English Island Pond or Church Hill. It is neither nationalistic nor patronymic. A Sainte-Émélie-de-l'Énergie on the other hand, represents an entirely different approach altogether.

The very existence on modern maps of such names as Laprairie, Trois-Rivières, Bout-de-l'Île, Rivière-des-Prairies and so on bears witness to the early habitant's essentially visual approach to his new territory - and by the same token - his descendants' obvious departure from it. The shift in focus from place to name identification seems to go hand in hand with geopolitical events in late eighteenth century New France which brought about the transfer of French Canada to the English crown. The ensuing struggle for national and linguistic identity found expression in a national toponymy as a medium of cultural sublimation. Though the right to one's own tongue was guaranteed constitutionally, the land itself and the old seigneurial system passed from French political control. French place and feature nomenclature - which was in large measure retained - was transformed, in that it disassociated itself from the land and its topography. Honorific place names thus became an early vehicle of French Canadian cultural nationalism.

It goes without saying that a nationally inspired nomenclature, i.e. one laid down arbitrarily in written form - presents great problems of integration with one topographically inspired, i.e. based on a close cultural interrelationship with the land. With French and English accorded equal status as official languages in Canada, a bicultural policy in toponymy is unavoidable - perhaps resulting in two official names in the gazetteer and one on the map. A unilingual policy in Québec leaves one with few alternatives.

Teutonic and Latin nomenclature traditions have their roots in very different cultural environments - a fact readily demonstrated by the street names which a people use for their cities and towns. A glance at any map of a French city or town reveals a galaxy of name variations based on heroic, historical and canonical themes - all expressive of a national character having little in common with the ethos embodied in Anglo-Saxon toponymy - be it of a residential suburb or wilderness glen.

French streets usually carry names descriptive of anything but themselves. An English street, on the other hand, often bears a name descriptive of its topography, historical associations or destination. Names such as Upper Ground, Lower Marsh, London Wall, Skinner's Lane, Cornhill, Dover Street and Bath Road are typically English and, as a type of place name have been adopted everywhere in the English speaking world.

The tradition of using street nomenclature in the commemorative sense is the norm in French towns and cities - a usage which may date from the Revolution and its code of arbitration in nomenclature based on written law, as opposed to the pre-revolutionary toponymy of the countryside.

#### V. THE NON-ROLE OF THE PLACE GENERIC IN FRENCH URBAN NOMENCLATURE

A nation's metropolitan nomenclature - in providing a clue to type and character of names given to street and square - also gives one considerable insight into a nation's hierarchy of values and some measure of the degree of empathy which it has vis-à-vis its physical environment - at least in toponymic terms.

Names with rural connotations are not unusual within the urban fabric of English towns and cities - being simply toponymic survivals of former peripheral village communities absorbed into the urban fabric in the outward course of urbanization. Such names have not often survived in French urban nomenclature - having been submerged in a sea of name memorials. There are of course the usual exceptions - Montréal has its rue du Marché-Bonsecours. However, normal usage in French towns and cities tends to be overwhelmingly nationally commemorative rather than place descriptive. Unlike France, Québec has carried this memorial - and sometimes political - tradition in names into its countryside. It is this fact of Canadian usage which presents the sub-committee with little alternative but to opt for a dual policy regarding generics.

Geographical generics are as essential to the one tradition as they are not to the other - consequently, a generic elimination programme disastrous to Ontario would scarcely affect most Québec toponyms. Descriptive toponyms such as Stone Bridge or Hardwood Ridge would be doomed - St. Emile-de-Montcalm or Louis-de-France would not (unless the canonical generic itself were purged).

The theme central to this paper is one concerned with understanding the nature of the cultural unconformity dividing the two official toponymic traditions in this country. An example of such a variation in nomenclature tradition is obvious to anyone who cares to compare French Canadian place names with place name usage in similar landscapes in other French speaking parts of the world. Significant to the present discussion is the fact that a naming tradition typical of French towns and cities in Europe should have been transplanted - not only to the urban environments of French Canada - but to the countryside. It is precisely here - in the countryside (a wilderness) that the Commission de Géographie du Québec and the Ontario Geographic Names Board have jurisdiction (municipal areas are governed by other statutory authorities).

As already indicated, the pattern of geographical feature and populated place names on the islands of Pierre-et-Miquelon is significantly dissimilar to that of Québec as to invite further comparisons. One notes considerable affinity between the type of toponyms used on the French Islands and those of nearby Newfoundland. Both are predominantly descriptive.

While most landscapes settled and named by English speaking settlers follow the same toponymic pattern, this does not seem to follow with the French in Québec. As far as the rural areas are concerned, French Canadian toponymy possesses a unique character. Its imputed political-national origins seem clear. In this regard Pierre appears to belong to the pre-revolutionary tradition of rural France as did pre-1763 New France.

## VI. TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP AND NON-TOPOGRAPHICAL TOPONYM

The low status, topographically speaking, of terrestrially descriptive generics in French Canada is a feature to be reckoned with in the formulation of any national policy for geographical names on Canadian maps. A policy which seems to be aimed at the elimination of the vast number of repetitious and easily

translated generic names - especially those considered replaceable by cartographic symbol - may in the final analysis create more problems than it sets out to solve. This is particularly true if any degree of consistency of "follow-through" is applied. Where does one draw the line? Easily translated and symbolized generics as LAKE, CREEK, RIVER, MARSH, etc. may indeed seem more effective as symbols rather than as names, particularly where bilingual maps are concerned. However, it is quite another matter, when these very generics form the integral part of a feature or place name.

A cartographic symbol must not usurp such names. One needs only to consider some of the generic variations in popular usage, namely GLEN, VALE, BURN, TARN, BUTTE, SLOUGH, MUSKEG etc. Clearly far more is involved in a place or feature name than physiographic or man-made feature description. Some places and features have qualities and historical associations that can only be communicated in a name - never in a mere symbol. Topographical generics are the basis of Anglo-Saxon toponymy. The implementation of a non-generic policy for official maps in Québec would mean the ruin of many Anglo-Saxon place names. In view of the status of the generic name in the rest of the country, the likelihood of such a policy being implemented nationally is considered to be remote.

Perceived in its deeper psychic and social context, the real content of Québec toponymy is French Canada. In English (or even Amerindian or Eskimo) Canada, it is the land. Similarly, in French urban toponymy it is clearly the nation. Paris demonstrates this graphically in its street nomenclature. The city is a geographical register of folk heroes, saints and national events. Toponymy in such a context has precious few links with topography.

In total contrast to the place descriptive street names of London, French urban names, as typified by Paris, appear as a maze of chauvinistic commemorations and memorials. The tradition of investing one's geography with nationality lives on in Québec, though unlike France, the custom extends beyond the artificial features of town and city and takes in the places and features of the rural and wilderness landscape.

The Gallic detachment from things terrestrial is attested to (at least since the Revolution) in his choice of designation for street and square. In marked contrast, the Anglo-Saxon's choice of name for the same feature bears witness to the bond he consciously preserves with the land. Commemorative nomenclature exists to be sure, but it is far from being the rule.

Both traditions co-exist in Québec. Whether they will be permitted to continue to do so, however, is a moot point.

Even the most cursory study of Parisian street nomenclature reveals a pattern, style and type of name usage which places the Latin (or Gallic) and Teutonic traditions in opposite camps. The dominance of the personal and national in Latin usage speaks for itself.



English street names, and English river, mountain, lake, hill, and valley names become quite meaningless, and intrinsically placeless designations once they are deprived of their place elements. Such topographically detached names constitute the norm in Québec. There toponymy tends to be regarded as a logical expression of the national image. While such usage may be considered acceptable and logical in the Québec milieu, any such procedure which strips the descriptive generic from Anglo-Saxon toponymy completely deprives it of its territorial identity and meaning. Such an eventuality must be resisted.

No more effective illustration of the bicultural hiatus in name usage between French and English Canada exists than that of London and Paris - the cultural main springs of the two Canadian traditions under discussion. Paris reveals a genre of street and boulevard names remarkable in their conformity to type. So does London, Melbourne, Toronto and Auckland.

#### VII. NOMENCLATURE AS NATIONAL HISTORY

Consider Paris. Begin, for argument's sake, at Place du Trocadero and proceed in a northeasterly direction towards Montmatre. Such a cross-city traverse takes in names such as avenue du Président Wilson, place d'Iéna, place de l'Alma, avenue Montaigne, avenue de Champs Élysées, place de la Concorde, rue de Rivoli, rue St. Roch, avenue de l'Opéra, rue Sainte-Anne, rue Gramont, boulevard de Italiens, rue Lafitte, rue Bourdal, rue des Martyrs and so on. All manifestly non-topographical. No need therefore for topographical generics.

#### VIII. NOMENCLATURE IN THE TELLURIC IMAGE

A similar study of the road and street nomenclature of metropolitan London reveals a very different usage and one typical of the Anglo-Saxon world. London streets carry names that can boast of a purely local evolution, having sprung from local usage. Rarely are they designations that have been imposed or laid down by rule of law. Their immemorial role as linguistic translators of place and cultural contacts with the past has been explored by British archaeologist Jacquetta Hawkes:

There is a sense in which the ordering of speech has a direct effect... on the land. Names could be attached to all those features of the countryside that attracted men's attention or were of significance in their lives. Mountains, rivers, springs, places where reindeer congregated, where a giant mammoth had been trapped or a famous hunter killed. Above all, places associated with ancestral spirits, gods and heroes. Place names are among the things that link men most intimately with their territory. As the generations pass on these names from one to the other, successive tongues wear away the syllables just as water and wind smooth the rocks; so closely, indeed, that often place names outlast the language that made them, remaining as evidence of the former presence of dispossessed or submerged peoples....

A name can become a part of the character of a place, and, when caught up in the art of its people, can assume a life and significance of its own. The Forest of Arden, Benbulbin, the River Duddon, Wenlock Edge or Flatford Mill, they are all strands woven into our culture. Count these peoples fortunate who, like ourselves, have been able to keep the warp threads of the fabric long their histories in one piece. (Anglo-Saxon) place names, although much changed by passage across English tongues, have survived to be fixed at least in the neat lettering and regular spelling of the Ordnance Survey maps.

The rich variety of geographical generics in London's street names is in sharp contrast to their conspicuous absence in the French capital. They in fact form part and parcel of a tradition that has been exported to every suburb and countryside in the English speaking world - including most of Ontario.

An examination of a large scale map of central London, in the manner of the French example, presents one at once with a different orientation in names. A journey from Hammersmith to St. Paul's Churchyard yields the following cross section of English generics: Hammersmith Broadway, Hammersmith Road, Kensington Court, Kensington High Street, Kensington Gardens, Kensington Road, Hyde Park Gate, Kensington Gore, Knightsbridge, Hyde Park Corner, Park Lane, North Row, Oxford Street, Piccadilly Circus, Haymarket, Leicester Square, Long Acre, Covent Garden, Aldwych, the Strand, Temple Bar, Fleetstreet, Ludgate Circus, and Ludgate Hill, to name only the obvious ones. All manifestly topographical. All meaningless without their geographical generics and none commemorative in the French chauvinistic sense.

The richness of English in such generics is amply borne out in an example culled from London - an example which illustrates particularly well the range and flexibility of the topographic generic in English urban toponymy. With reference to the name Westbourne (itself a "toponyme descriptif" in origin), we find in West London the following site variations linked to this one name: Westbourne Avenue, Bridge, Crescent, Drive, Gardens, Grove, Grove Terrace, Park Road, Place, Road, Street, Terrace, Terrace Road, Park Villas and so on. Corresponding examples of such precision in generic usage hardly exist in the French tradition. Cartographic symbols accordingly make for more sense to a French map user.

English speaking urban areas within Québec have their: Beaverhall Hill, Bowling Green, Lakebreeze Road, Sunny Acres, Beaconsfield Court, Oakridge Drive, Spruce Crescent, Sunnyside Avenue etc. Beyond the built up urban areas the tradition carries on in the countryside in Glen Sutton, Cold Spring, Oak Lake, Lake View, Garden Hill, Highland Grove, Rocky Point etc. No policy proscribing geographical generics can, in the name of cartographic symbolization, hope to avoid interfering with such names.

The OGNB maintains its present policy of bringing into line the contemporary written and cartographic names record with the contemporary spoken record on the ground. This is in keeping with the referendum as opposed to the edict approach to

name proposals and changes - Anglo-Saxon procedure since time immemorial. In the modern context, district foresters, postmasters, township clerks, and similarly placed persons serve as spokesmen for the local record. On this point of principle and procedure, it would seem inevitable, as well as logical, that English and French Canadian names boards be expected to function independently.

The root of the generic issue is cultural - even emotional - and one not easily resolved by academic or logical analysis. Even within Anglo-Saxon toponymy itself, some considerable degree of flexibility needs be allowed for local generics. Witness the use of GLEN, RAVINE, DELL, DALE, VALLEY, HOLLOW, DINGLE, COMBE, COOMB or BOTTOM for a geographical feature identified simply as "valley" in gazetteers.

On the question of local generic usage the Ontario Board proposes that the current gazetteer listing under "Feature" (as it appears in the 1962 edition and its supplements) be headed "Local generic" or even "Local and legal generic" if the present column of feature generics is retained in a new edition. The Newfoundland hydrographic feature Pool's Island Tickle would accordingly be listed as TICKLE and not as CHANNEL (as it is currently). It is the latter form which constitutes local usage. If the CPCGN rules, or recommends, that a Newfoundland TICKLE be classified as a CHANNEL, and a POND as a LAKE, then by the same logic, Ontario's Blue Mountain is a HILL. British Columbia and Alberta members would certainly concur. Far better, therefore, that the local generic be recognized on its own merits. Definitions and explanations would be comprehensively dealt with in the foreword.

In any purge of geographical, chorological or topographical generics, especially one pursued with the degree of thoroughness implied above, not only would Anglo-Saxon toponyms face ruin and extinction, but so would those bearing a similar relationship to the land. These being, in Ontario, those names inherited for the most part from the Cree and Ojibwa.

The OGNB reaffirms its resolution to retain in Ontario, on principle, geographical generics in descriptive place and feature nomenclature and, that these linguistic contacts with our present and past geographical environments not be eliminated from map or gazetteer for the cartographic or cultural reasons mentioned in this paper. On the contrary, they should receive special consideration as inherited characteristics of our multinational past. Our landscapes would be impoverished without them.

In this regard, the OGNB also proposes to adopt, and implement, with the assistance of authorized persons in the field, a policy according official approval to local forms of populated place and topographic feature generics in established usage. In the Blue Mountain example cited above, an escarpment feature near Collingwood (Ontario) is known locally as a MOUNTAIN. This being so, the generic (or common topographical term) used should be recorded (as it is in this case) - in spite of the fact that in Western Canada such a designation would appear ludicrous.

In a related field of terminology, such legal generics as VILLAGE (INCORPORATED); TOWN (MUNICIPAL); RURAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT etc. might also be eliminated from future gazetteers. If this were done, there would then be little reason to include LEGAL (as suggested) in the feature generic column. As proposed last year by the Secretary of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, the generic term COMMUNITY might well be used in future for all incorporated places. Involvement with confusing municipal terminology would thereby be avoided. These designations are not considered by the Ontario Board to be geographical names in any traditional physiographic or topographic sense, and the Board accordingly expresses complete agreement to the proposal that they be so classified.

On the strength of conclusions derived from this paper's research, in the matter of formulating a national policy on geographical generics applicable to both official linguistic traditions of this country, it is recommended that:

(1) It be recognized that the case for or against geographical generics is essentially a cultural and emotional one. Little, therefore, is to be gained by the arbitrary imposition of a purely logical and objective solution;

(2) It be recognized that there is a place for cartographic symbolization on maps in situations where inordinate use of map space for repetitious and translatable bilingual terminology calls for it. Nevertheless, there is no justification for stereotyped symbols used indiscriminately in substitution for nomenclature representing established and respected linguistic and historical links between people and land;

(3) It be recognized that English and French Canadian toponymic traditions require separate treatment;

(4) Geographical, chorological and topographic generics not be taken out of their original choronymic or toponymic context - such procedures only result in destroying the meaning of the place name altogether.

As implied throughout this paper, the probability that the Commission de Géographie de Québec will implement new policies detrimental to the interests of Anglo-Saxon traditions in the province must be taken into account. As argued, this would be the logical course for an autonomous board to take, working exclusively, and defensively, within the French Canadian nomenclature tradition. Though legislation exists which promises fair treatment, the prospects of it becoming law, remain, at the time of writing, uncertain.

In conclusion, one can only trust to the belief that some of the arguments presented in this paper have not fallen on deaf ears and will, hopefully, serve to impress upon the Québec Board, in particular, and the Permanent Committee, the importance of understanding the true function of the geographical generic in place names of Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic origin. This is especially important today in areas of Québec where such names still exist and are in use locally - having so

far survived attempts at rescission or alteration through partial or complete translation. For example, a tributary of the West River in Southern Québec known as the East Branch, is now toponymically extinct as Rivière de l'Est, for this "translation" has recently been approved by the Québec Board and the new name now appears in the recent topographic editions. Needless to say, as long as the English speaking population survives in the area, the names West River and East Branch will also survive - even if only in the spoken tradition. It is self-evident that names which have their beginnings in the original Scottish-English settlements of this country must be kept beyond the grasp of political interests opposed to them if anything of our early colonial place names' heritage is to be preserved for posterity.

Maps may have to reflect the political realities of the day, but surely not at the very high price of forfeiting a people's right to what is essentially a non-political record of its own cultural past.