

Hemisphere. For Canada, prehistory ends and history begins, generally, with European immigration and settlement, times that vary widely for areas adjacent to the three bordering oceans.

Canadian archaeology divides roughly into three periods of development—that prior to 1945, the first postwar decade, and the interval since 1955. The prewar period, reaching back before Confederation, sheltered a small band indeed, and those pioneers might, in most cases, be called amateurs, since formal training in Canadian archaeology did not exist and archaeology as a scientific discipline was only slowly evolving from mere antiquarianism. Those early workers had many backgrounds. Some, like Diamond Jenness, T. F. McIlwraith and Philleo Nash, were trained in general anthropology; others, and among the best, were self-taught researchers, like Wintemberg, Boyle, Nickerson and Ganong. For example, Nickerson was a railroad worker who did remarkably advanced field work in Manitoba, and Ganong, in Nova Scotia, was better known for the family chocolate company. Institutional centres were few indeed: McIlwraith taught at the University of Toronto; Boyle worked for the Royal Ontario Museum; and Jenness, Smith, Wintemberg and Leechman served long years in the National Museum of Canada. In addition to those employed in Canada, others from Britain, the United States and Denmark carried out vital research projects in Canada. It was a slow start with humble resources but such men laid the quiet foundation for a larger revealing of Canada's past.

In the 1945-55 period, expansion began. J. N. Emerson began teaching archaeology at the University of Toronto; K. E. Kidd launched his Ontario archaeological research for the Royal Ontario Museum; Charles E. Borden began his on-going work in British Columbia; Richard S. MacNeish and, later, T. E. Lee joined the National Museum of Canada; Wilfred Jury continued his work in southern Ontario; and Henry B. Collins, of the Smithsonian Institution, began a series of arctic projects co-sponsored by the National Museum of Canada. Nevertheless, in 1955 there were still only six people professionally employed in Canada as specialists in Canadian prehistory. A career in Canadian archaeology seemed scarcely more profitable than a career in poetry. A few Canadian students, however, trickled down to the United States where excellent doctoral training, now necessary as archaeology matured, was available and where students could compete for fellowships, then non-existent in Canada.

By 1955 the boom was rumbling in Americanist archaeology and soon it echoed in Canada. Between 1956 and 1967, the number of specialists in Canadian prehistory increased from six to over 30; courses are now given in some 15 universities and the number of museum-employed prehistorians shows a similar increase. The National Museum contains more archaeologists than did all Canada a decade ago. Further, Canadian archaeologists doing research in other countries are also increasing in number. Also, as may be expected, there are now far more funds available for research—not nearly enough but a happy contrast to the pittance of 20 years ago. Salaries and research support facilities have increased as Canadians began to realize the richness and worth of their older heritage and the signs seem to suggest a still-expanding demand. For example, the once sporadic trickle of publications has become a dependable stream of knowledge. Those who went south to graduate school have quite often returned and Canadian archaeology has been vitalized and enriched by the many United States archaeologists who have accepted Canadian positions to carry a large part of what is still very much a pioneer field. It is fair to note that in 1967 the first Canadian doctorate in Canadian archaeology was granted, and fitting that this occurred at Toronto where T. F. McIlwraith had sustained archaeology for 40 professorial years.

Being a pioneer research field, Canadian prehistory contains a provocative and heterogeneous host of research problems. And, too, there are problems of another sort such as inadequate funds, a pinching shortage of qualified scientists, weak antiquities legislation, inept administration of funds from overlapping agencies and the desperate demands for salvage excavation of sites being destroyed by natural agencies such as erosion and by other