

In this combined number of Volume 15, we have published papers dealing with a variety of subjects which encompass both the marine and land areas adjacent to the Atlantic seaboard. Our first submission by C.M. TUCKER presents an excellent survey on the Quaternary history of St. Pierre et Miquelon, the two French-owned islands lying off the south coast of Newfoundland. This paper is most significant in drawing correlatives of Quaternary events in eastern Canada. The second paper is by B. DEONARINE who has carefully presented a physical and statistical description of the foraminiferal distribution in two marsh regions of Atlantic Canada. Our third paper is by M.A. ROED who has compiled a considerable amount of diverse geological and engineering information for an analysis on the geomorphology of Forillon National Park in the Gaspé region of Quebec. As part of this study was directed toward environmental aspects, a large input on engineering concepts was involved. Finally we close this volume with a review on marine surficial geology in the Canadian offshore, and its relation to engineering hazards. Because this subject was originally addressed nationally, and to maintain the integrity of the presentation we have decided to retain the small portion on the Pacific coast margin as was requested by the organizers of the Canadian Marine Geotechnical Society.

In order to compensate for a delayed publication schedule, we are producing the second and third number of this volume as a single book. Also, we shall be publishing volume 16 - with the three numbers entitled - as a single book so that our new editors can commence their duties with volume 17 on a regular schedule of publication. We are including the titling of all numbers, so that we can account for them and, also, the new editors may resume publishing without having to deal with the inconsistency of missing numbers.

With reference to new editors, we also have a new policy and title for the magazine. On April 1, 1981 Dr. Ron.K. Pickerill and his colleague Dr. George Pajari, both of the University of New Brunswick will be the co-editors of MARITIME SEDIMENTS AND ATLANTIC GEOLOGY. They will implement the new policy, which is published in this number of MARITIME SEDIMENTS under Policy and Scope. Volume 17, No. 1 will be their first production and from this date forward, all contributors are advised to send their copy directly to these editors.

Our new magazine will have increased scope, as a matter of policy, and this should lead to a wider coverage of Atlantic and Appalachian geology. The marine area will be covered as usual, including any sedimentological research regardless of its location on land or sea in our area of coverage. But most important will be the introduction of a new system of reviewing papers. This will permit grant holders to publish with us as their papers will pass through the referees, as explained in Policy and Scope. However, we are still in a position to accept research notes and a variety of other material that will be reviewed independently of the referees.

The aspect of referees for the purpose of reviewing papers is sound, but the implementation is not in universal accord. Many authors would like to know who the referee is because of personal interests (naturally), and because the referee may not be that knowledgeable on specific subjects. Such an assignment can be made if the editors are in unfamiliar territory but even so, the question of anonymity arises. In courts of law, a person charged with an offence has the right to know, if not face his accuser. Why is it so different with these reviewers who can shatter a personality utterly and still remain anonymous. In Canada, a Human Rights Act has been legislated to circumvent this occurrence on review boards so that all comments and reviewers must be known. We agree with the new editors, that the reviewers should sign their names but not necessarily as having agreed with the contents of the document. We personally like to see the name of the reviewer, and have never refused an author our own review. In this way, the author, who has laboured over the research at least knows who is addressing him. Were he to present his work in public he would immediately hear and see his critic. Why not have something similar for reviewers, rather than secrecy. After all, it is not a question of personal and confidential information, but rather a premeditated exposure of scientific facts and ideas. So if we are going to hear from both sides, then let us see who both sides are.

B. R. PELLETIER, Editor