

mately 38% of users appeared to be children and students.

INTERESTS

Interest profiles are not significant at this stage. The subject matter of enquiries varied widely and no single subject or subject area was raised with significant frequency. To illustrate this phenomenon in national perspective, December correspondence was grouped into broad categories (according to the method established by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development).

Documentation, Research, Methodology	6%
eg: election statistics, archives, census materials, etc.	
Chemistry, Physics, Earth Sciences	6%
eg: pollution, geography, maps, etc.	
Biology, Nutrition, Pathology	3%
eg: flora, fauna, etc.	
Agriculture	2%
eg: forestry, farming, etc.	
Industry	8%
eg: advertising, grants to businesses, charters, etc.	
Labour	3%
eg: public service employment, immigrant labour, etc.	
Economics	9%
eg: tourism, pensions, taxation, etc.	
Culture and Society	20%
eg: drugs, education, ethnic groups, etc.	
Administration - Politics	25%
eg: MPs, legislation, government depts, etc.	
History	2%
Foreign countries	7%
Information Canada	4%
General information on Canada	5%

It is apparent that no single subject or group of subjects appears with significant frequency. This scattering effect renders any more detailed analysis, such as subject breakdowns by geographic area, meaningless.

FEEDBACK

In addition to the handling of enquiries, the Centre, as a part of the Information-In Branch of the Department, has a responsibility for recording the attitudes and opinions expressed by individual users for the purpose of providing Parliament with another source of feedback.

The low volume of feedback obtained during the first month indicates insufficient public awareness of this new function. The limited input and the wide diversity of subject areas limit the statistical significance. The feedback, noted below, can be construed only as a report of the opinions of 64 Canadians as expressed through the National Enquiry Centre during the month of December.

30 comments were received on the subject of Information Canada itself.

- 11 expressions of gratitude and commendation.
- 7 suggestions for physical improvements to the facility at 171 Slater [postal address in Ottawa].
- 2 complaints on the enquiries service: specifically from students expecting a "home-work service".
- 2 complaints on the concept of Information Canada generally.
- 8 complaints about the publishing division: 5 regarding servicing of orders, and 3 regarding price of publications.

15 comments on government information in general.

- 6 suggestions: 1 for a magazine for distribution to Canadians abroad.
- 1 for wider distribution of constituency maps.
- 2 for improved government telephone and emergency listings.
- 1 that Information Canada sell the publications of the "Canadian Council of Resource Ministers".
- 1 for improving information materials on pollution.
- 1 improve access to government information.
- 1 poor communications between government and people.
- 1 poor communications with Western Canada.
- 3 complaints on time taken by departments to respond to requests for information.
- 2 complaints on delays in issuing adequate copies of government reports.
- 1 complaint regarding inadequate publicity for the Committee on Constitutional Reform.

MISCELLANEOUS FEEDBACK

- 1 Old age pension - too low
- 1 Auditor General - preserve his powers
- 1 Pollution - suggestion for special "anti-pollution" bond issue
 - complaint on noise pollution at Uplands Airport
- 1 Wheat - not enough being sold
- 1 People's Republic of China - favours recognition
- 1 Election procedures - favours party labels on ballots
- 1 Public service salaries - too low
- 1 National Arts Centre - tickets too expensive
- 1 Historic sites (Louisbourg) - claims it reflects anti-French bias