

We close Volume 14 of MARITIME SEDIMENTS with three diverse subjects as shown in the reports submitted for publication. The first deals with long-continuing studies on Foraminiferida along the Atlantic seaboard by K. Hooper. The present work centres around Sherbrooke, Nova Scotia and is typical of Professor Hooper's diligence to his task. Our second paper emphasizes the relationship between hydrodynamic environments and sediment texture. In this study J. Thibault has analyzed the effects of biological and oceanographic processes within the geologic milieu and has used this to distinguish sub-environments. Our final paper is a study on the interpretation of wood fragments and tree remains buried during Wisconsinan times. We were pleased to receive the illustrative material supporting this truly fine study by F. Hyland, W.B. Thompson, and R. Stuckenrath Jr.

A continuing cry of MARITIME SEDIMENTS, over the years has centred on the need for funding of scientific research. The immediate victims of this financial plight are the researchers, the educators, and the students. Down the line lies the next flight of sufferers: the resources institutions (both primary producer and manufacturer) as they fail to achieve innovative measures that would ensure survival to themselves as entities, and to their employees as the human part of our culture - and this would include the institutes of higher learning. But the group hardest struck by a parsimonious approach to research funding is the government of which holds to such policies, and the people that government leads.

MARITIME SEDIMENTS salutes a writer for the Toronto GLOBE AND MAIL who, in her column, reported on the urgency of science leaders and educators to organize for the purpose of submitting petitions to government to support their work. Within this lobby-like framework, the consequence of neglect are stressed. Our magazine also singles out a writer for the Ottawa CITIZEN who, in his brief article, eloquently underscored the desperate need for the government to support scientific research on the basis of "an investment for the future." In this dire case, as we previously stated, the public in the long run is the loser. And the long run may only be a decade or so away. The government or industry must buy, borrow or rent the developing technology that properly belongs to a technological nation, because of budgetary commitments. But the real solution lies deeper. Consider for a moment the results of a budget cut at any jurisdictional level. Usually it is the programs of the young, such as those of school children, which are affected first. As a result our entire national future is jeopardized - indeed without the children, there is no future. Harried administrators are unable to perceive beyond the short term, or are unable to respond in such a manner that the long term may not be so bleak. Similarly in an adult society, the research program commonly bears the brunt of a budgetary attack. Is that because science is considered a luxury, and its support is similar to the giving of toys to children? Is that because commerce is so significant that its eminence dwarfs and obscures other programs? Does the real reason lie in socio-economic commitments to political constituencies? Or is it a reflection of the fact that elected government officials themselves lack an education in science, or even an appreciation of research needs and goals and its subsequent good to the community. Perhaps all factors are involved, but one thing is certain: scientists must continue to press for their recognition and needs to ensure that proper and rightful development of academic and industrial technologies is carried out with the human resources within the jurisdiction of their country. Otherwise the national innovative lamp may dim and extinguish, and may never shine again - except at inordinate cost.

B. R. PELLETIER, Editor