

it would, I fear, be asking too much to expect the Editor of this *Journal* with its wide—and hence relatively unspecialized—scope to publish ninety-seven correlation tables which would themselves occupy some twelve pages. A fuller analysis of the material is in progress under the auspices of the Scottish Council for Research in Education, and on completion it is hoped to publish all the relevant data.

Whether "ability" or "acquirement" is the more important character is a very controversial matter into which I must firmly decline to be dragged. As one of my colleagues has put it: "The examinations seem to be reliable tests, but *what* we are examining I don't know." I doubt whether this analysis can help us very much to clear up this particular point.

May I take this opportunity of correcting several arithmetical errors that crept into the correlations and to apologize for their occurrence.

1929-30: medicine/pharmacology, $r = 0.45$ not 0.50 ; medicine/therapeutics, 0.48 not 0.39 ; surgery/bacteriology, 0.54 not 0.59 ; surgery/pharmacology, 0.47 not 0.42 ; surgery/medicine, 0.55 not 0.49 .

1930-1: pathology/bacteriology, 0.50 not 0.45 ; therapeutics/bacteriology, 0.45 not 0.50 .

1933-4: medicine/therapeutics, 0.50 not 0.55 ; medicine/surgery, 0.55 not 0.60 .

A number of minor errors amounting to less than 0.05 have occurred, but as they do not materially affect the argument it is scarcely worth detailing them here.—I am, etc.,

Pathology Department, University
of Edinburgh, Dec. 29, 1936.

W. GILBERT MILLAR.

A Milk Epidemic

SIR,—About the middle of November an epidemic of dysentery in Hong Kong was reported under prominent headlines in the newspapers in England. Details which have come recently by post show that the epidemic was caused by unpasteurized milk. The twenty-three patients who fell ill on November 8 and 9 were all drinking unpasteurized milk from one depot of one dairy. The epidemic ended rapidly on pasteurization of the milk supply. The organism was Shiga's bacillus. The cases were almost all young European children. There were seven deaths among the twenty-three.

About ten years ago there was an epidemic of typhoid in Hong Kong, and the medical officer of health was satisfied that it was caused by unpasteurized milk from one dairy. It is to be hoped that Hong Kong will insist on the continued pasteurization of its milk supply before a milk epidemic of cholera is added to its troubles, and that Bournemouth and other places will sit up and take notice.—I am, etc.,

Hassocks, Dec. 29, 1936.

C. M. HEANLEY.

The New Journal Typography

SIR,—May I, through you, be allowed to congratulate the Journal Committee, Mr. Stanley Morrison, Mr. Eric Gill, and all others concerned in the very great improvement in the *Journal*? In my humble opinion—as a constant reader of it for many years—the results of the thought and care that have been given towards the improvement are in every way admirable.

I suppose that the striking red omega, surrounding the staff and serpent of Aesculapius, is meant to suggest that the *Journal* will still continue to expound the last word in things medical and surgical.—I am, etc.,

St. Ives, Hunts, Jan. 3.

E. W. GOODALL.

SIR,—May I send congratulations on the new and greatly improved appearance of the *British Medical Journal*. The changes are to the good in every way, and happen to coincide, if you will permit me to say so, with a particularly readable and well-edited issue of the *Journal*.—I am, etc.,

Par, Cornwall, Jan. 2.

CHARLES SINGER.

SIR,—You have given your subscribers to-day a splendid New Year's gift, and as one who has struggled for years with a typographical problem (but without achieving signal results) I offer my heartiest congratulations. You have set a new standard and have achieved a brilliant result; it is easy to see that the "Times New Roman" has outstanding merits, but it is quite another thing to employ the new type intelligently and effectively. With best wishes for your new format.—I am, etc.,

JOHN RICKMAN,
Editor, *British Journal of Medical
Psychology*.

London, N.W.1, Jan. 2.

SIR,—May the editor of a much smaller professional weekly journal congratulate you most sincerely on the new format of the *British Medical Journal*? Only those who have actually thought out a revised lay-out know the months of work involved and the amount of co-operation required from the printers. I personally find the new type attractive, and, as you say, it is so much clearer and larger than the old, though the same sized body is used.—I am, etc.,

HILARY M. BLAIR-FISH, S.R.N.
Editor, *The Nursing Times*.

St. Martin's Street, W.C.2, Jan. 2.

SIR,—Those of us whose advancing years are plagued with progressive presbyopia will be deeply indebted to the Journal Committee, its board of management, and the editorial staff for the changes which have been introduced with the New Year. The type is admirable and easily legible, even in its smallest form. The *Times* has accustomed us to the aesthetic appeal of a plain type for headings, without any frills. The *British Medical Journal* has done well to follow its example in this respect. May I also congratulate you on the external appearance of the *Journal*, the colour and lay-out of the cover and Mr. Eric Gill's device on the front page being especially effective.

I have, however, one criticism to offer which has nothing to do with the new type. On page 33 of your issue of January 2 you print a note for contributors for their guidance as to bibliographical references. The system is excellent. If we ever have the temerity to write an article with references the number of the volume of each publication is to be inserted. What are we to do if we refer to the *British Medical Journal*? Is it not a pity that with this new issue and this New Year the *Journal* has not been issued as a new series, this being the first issue of volume Number 1.—I am, etc.,

Cardiff, Jan. 2.

RALPH M. F. PICKEN.

** We can only find space for a few of the many letters of congratulation which readers are kind enough to send. In reply to Professor Picken's question, references to the *British Medical Journal* should give the page number and year, and the numeral 1 or 2 to indicate the half-yearly volume of that year.—ED., *B.M.J.*