

NOTES ON THE GLACIAL MAN CONTROVERSY
(AS REGARDS ONTARIO).

BY COL. C. C. GRANT.

Read before the Geological Section, March 22nd, 1895.

Since the discoveries of human implements in Trenton drift gravel beds by Dr. Abbott, the late Miss Babbitt, and others, an unnecessarily angry discussion has been going on for years in the States respecting Glacial Man on this continent. Personally the locality is unknown to me, so I prefer to abstain from any remarks on this particular find. If man existed here in the ice age (viz., in North America), as a hunter he would naturally follow the different animals driven Southward by the great ice sheet as it approached. Now, where should we look for evidence of man's existence then? Where but in places which contain terminal Moraines, derived from the continental glacier? We can hardly expect to find it elsewhere, since all human records would probably be obliterated wherever the moving mass passed over.

Even admitting that Dr. Abbott may be mistaken (a circumstance many eminent men deny), some of us may feel we are indebted to the scientific pioneers who first called attention to a very important and highly interesting subject, which some carping critics themselves neglected.

The writings of another glacial geologist (Professor Wright) we cannot afford to lose sight of, whose views coincide with Abbott's. The most formidable opponent these are likely to encounter is the archæologic geologist, W. H. Holmes. He describes how he went systematically to work in opening up trenches in the undisturbed portion of the gravel beds in question without obtaining a trace of an "art relic." "Relics of art," he states, "were found upon the surface and in such portions of the talus as happened to be exposed. Nothing in the gravels in place, and we closed the trench with the firm conviction that it was absolutely barren of art." After all, the