

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

DEAR SIR:

I have just read the most recent addition [*sic*] of the Canadian Veterinary Journal, and unfortunately, it didn't take me long. My criticism is not meant to be personal, but I have not been impressed with our National Journal.

My interests are oriented somewhat, toward small animal medicine and surgery, but I believe, there are very few veterinarians who find a great deal in the journal, regardless of their field of work. The Journal, I realize, is attempting to cover a very diversified profession [*sic*], and it is difficult to do each division justice, but, it should be a stimulating force behind the profession in Canada and elsewhere. At present I can't even get enough stimulation to read it.

More specifically with regard to small animal medicine and surgery, a review of the last six months yields only three small animal articles. Three of the editions have no articles dealing with this important phase of veterinary medicine.

The question now arises—on whose shoulders should the blame fall, for the lack of articles. I have no idea, how many articles, are submitted, and how they are edited, but if there are not enough quality articles submitted, why are practitioners not approached, and encouraged for contributions? I would like to draw your attention to the number of articles that have come from the small animal department, of the Ontario Veterinary College in the last six months — NONE — Every facility is available, yet, there seems to be a reluctance to contribute articles, which I know they are capable of producing. Is the profession apathetic, or the editors of the Journal? I think both are to blame, and an improvement in the Journal, with concurrent stimulation of interest, would do a great deal, for the profession in this country.

We need something to get the ball rolling—to get veterinarians reading their Journal with interest—and thus stimulate contributions.

In my opinion, the steps which should be taken to improve the Journal are:

1. More practitioner [*sic*] oriented articles—The Masters thesis [*sic*] will not keep the practitioner interested.

2. More articles—this will increase ex-

pense, but I am sure we are all willing to pay more if we get good reading material.

3. Recurrent articles and panel discussions, such as in Modern Veterinary Practice, or J.A.V.M.A.—“Clinico Pathologic Conference”, and “What is Your Diagnosis”.

4. Editorials and guest editorials;

Here is an excellent chance for many respected members in the profession and those associated with it, to express their thoughts. Not a month should go by without an excellent editorial column.

5. Practitioner columns—such as “Practitioners Notebook”, as in Snall [*sic*] Animal Clinician, where articles could be published that don't really warrant a complete layout.

6. Periodic listings of Literature available, such as “Literature Index” of the Journal of Small Animal Practice. This could be worked out with the Ontario Veterinary College library.

I must admit ignorance concerning the organization and editing of the Journal, and I realize and commend the efforts which have been put into this periodical. I want to encourage more effort, so that we will have a journal that every veterinarian will want to read, to contribute to, and is a tribute to the Veterinary Profession in Canada.

Yours Respectfully,
P. D. McCUTCHEON,
2642 St. Clair Avenue E.,
Toronto 16, Ontario.

Editor's Note: We agree with Dr. McCutcheon on several points.

The C.V.J. encourages submission of articles from practitioners. All submitted articles are sent to qualified reviewers and the decision to publish, return to the author for revision, or reject, is based primarily on their opinion.

The following is a breakdown of the articles on small animal medicine which have been published in the Journal since its inception.

We would like to increase the number of pages in the C.V.J. but our financial position at the present time will not permit this. Although the Journal fee for members of the C.V.M.A. is \$3 per year, the actual cost of printing and mailing the Journal is \$15 per year.

	Articles published in C.V.J. on Small Animal Medicine		Percentage of articles submitted by O.V.C. faculty members
	Total	O.V.C.	
Volume 1-1960	33	12	36.4%
Volume 2-1961	35	8	22.8%
Volume 3-1962	19	3	11.1%
Volume 4-1963	8	1	12.5%
Volume 5-1964	10	3	30%
Volume 6-1965	7	0	0%
TOTAL	102	27	26.7%

ABSTRACTS

Hogh, P. (1965). Enterotoxemia in piglets due to *Clostridium perfringens* Type C. Preliminary report. Nord. Vet. Med. 17, 1-8. (Da.e.g.)

Enterotoxaemia due to Type C has been diagnosed, for the first time in Denmark, in unweaned piglets from two farms on Zealand. Clinically, the disease appeared as a rapidly fatal haemorrhagic enteritis. The intestinal contents were toxic to mice on i/v injection. By neutralization tests (intradermally on g. pigs) the toxin was determined as Type C. From the intestinal contents Type C was isolated. Attempts to find the source of infection failed, but in one herd Type C was isolated from a rectal swab from a sow, 10 of whose 12 piglets had died. Attention is drawn to the satisfactory results obtained by active immunization of sows (Szent-Iványi and Szabó, 1956) or passive immunization of new-born piglets (Field and Gibson, 1955).

Reprinted from "The Veterinary Bulletin", Vol. 35, No. 6, June, 1965.

Beveridge, W. I. B., Mahaffey, L. W., and Rose, M. A. (1965). Influenza in horses. Vet. Rec. 77, 57-59.

In the autumn of 1963 there was a widespread outbreak of respiratory disease in horses in England, caused by Influenza A/equi/1. Antibodies against this virus were present in horse sera which had been collected as far back as 1948, also in sera

collected from two zebras at the Whip-snade Zoo in 1960. No antibodies against Influenza A/equi/2 were found in the sera of English horses. In a more recent note (Vet. Rec. 77, 404) Rose reported preliminary findings that an outbreak which commenced in Newmarket in mid-March, 1965 was caused by a virus identical with or closely related to A/equi/2/ Miami 63.

Reprinted from "The Veterinary Bulletin", Vol. 35, No. 6, June, 1965.

Singh, K. V., Bohl, E. H., and Sanger, V. L. (1964). Encephalomyelitis of pigs produced experimentally by a porcine enterovirus. Cornell Vet. 54, 612-628.

Pathogen-free, colostrum-deprived pigs were infected orally with two porcine enteroviruses, ECPO-5 and ECPO-6, simultaneously. Both viruses multiplied in the intestinal tract but only ECPO-6 localized and propagated in the brain and spinal cord, causing encephalomyelitis and hind leg paresis. Oral or intracerebral administration of EPCO-6 virus alone produced similar symptoms after 7-9 days. Virus was isolated from the brain and spinal cord and in low titre from the blood. Lesions and clinical signs produced by the ECPO-6 virus resemble those described for the 180/4 virus of Sibalin and Lannek (V.B. 30, abst. 2905).

Reprinted from "The Veterinary Bulletin", Vol. 35, No. 6, June, 1965.