

ROUP—A NEW REMEDY.

*Editor Review :*

I WISH to draw the attention of poultry-keepers to a comparatively new remedy for some forms of roup, so called, which is at once easily applied, efficacious, and cheap. When fowls are affected with what might be called the diphtheretic form of roup, the indications of which are—purplish appearance of throat and mouth, membranous growth in throat, fever, prostration, and death in a few hours or days, the fumes of burning calomel will I believe, be found the best remedy yet used. I merely want to put this as a suggestion. I have found it of value myself, and if it helps some brother poultryman out of a predicament with roupfowls shall feel well repaid for writing.

A convenient way to administer it might be to make a tent over roost with old carpets or other material, or place fowls to be operated upon in a box, then take a small quantity of calomel say enough to go on a five cent piece for each dozen hens, put it upon a piece of iron or other material heated very hot and place in such a manner that the fumes will be breathed by fowls. This can be repeated every three or four hours if severity of case demands it.

Fumes of burning sulphur would answer the same purpose, but are apt to smother fowls which danger is absent when calomel is used. Possibly some member of the medical profession can suggest a still better manner of administration. The advantages of above treatment are, avoidance of handling of fowls which is sometimes very dangerous to human life through infection, ease of application, cheapness, and last but not least, effectiveness.

This treatment would be of comparatively little value for treatment of the catarrhal form of roup, indicated by swelled face, watery discharge from eyes, mucous discharge from nostrils and later from eyes, sneezing, etc.

I think it a pity that we have not a better understanding as to what really constitutes a case of roup. You cannot read a poultry journal without coming across frequent mention of roup but what a number of diseases are included in that term, all the way from a simple cough, through swelled head, choked nostrils and throat, canker, even to inflammation of bowels as I have read in a recent article. And in the same publication will be found any number of cures for roup, contributed or advertised. Some of these are calculated to reduce inflammation, others to kill germs, others to act as general tonics. Some authorities class roup as an infectious disease principally caused by filthy surroundings, confusing it with canker, others call it a case showing simply

watery eyes or inflamed nostrils a case of roup. Now I think this is all wrong and if such confusion exists among authorities as to the diagnosis of the disease termed roup, then the sooner we do away with the term and substitute one or more suitable terms and definitions the better. A roup cure that might give very good satisfaction as a cure for catarrh might be utterly valueless when there occurred the membranous formation in the throat, either in conjunction with catarrh or alone. The following case will illustrate this point.

A poultry keeper having had a number of birds die with what he was told was roup wrote to a prominent poultry journal for a cure for roup. The recommendation of this editor was to bathe the head and swab out the mouth and throat frequently, with a liniment composed of one part vinegar or acetic acid and three parts glycerine (probably a capital cure for "swelled face.") This was done but with no success as far as saving birds was concerned. Now these birds showed all the symptoms of diphtheria and probably could have been cured if some treatment that would kill the germs of diphtheria had been used. I am advising this simply as an amateur. Probably some older hand at the business can throw further light on the subject and give much more valuable suggestions.

I did not intend to ask you for so much of your valuable space but I believe if you could induce some expert inquiry into the subject of roup and devise better means of combating this prevalent disease, you would earn the undying gratitude of the community.

Yours truly,

Toronto.

G. J. LOVELL.

LATE NOTES.

Mr. J. H. Paton is not breeding double-combed buff Leghorns as his ad. in last issue would lead prospective buyers to suppose. A misprint in the description of cockerel No. 2 gave him two—or more—combs.

We notice the Wagner Incubator Co. now offer a fifty egg machine for the modest sum of nine dollars and fifty cents. If the hatcher will do what the maker claims—and we don't doubt it—it should be popular.

Mr. W. G. Lovell, Galt, has 27 chicks, partridge Cochins and black Leghorns, hatched January 7th. He has them in a greenhouse and they are doing nicely, pullets now well feathered.