This abrupt passage from the state of crisis to one of absolute well-being does not obtain in every instance, the effect sometimes merely amounting to relief, short of total subsidence. When patients have had to be given injections several days following, the results of the second and third injections have seemed more effectual than the first. In any event a patient who reacts to a given dose invariably remains sensitive to that dose without any tendency to tolerance, consequently we are not called upon to increase the dose in order to obtain the same effect. In one instance the patient has been employing the remedy for the last four years, and the effect has in no wise diminished.

Although it is necessarily somewhat difficult to estimate the efficacy of a remedy in such a capricious disease as asthma, I think we are entitled to conclude from our experience that not only does it, in favorable cases, afford immediate relief, but it seems to lengthen the interval between subsequent attacks. This is also Borchardt's opinion, and his view is that this effect is due to the pituitary constituent.

The most remarkable instance from this point of view is that of an elderly lady 60 years of age, who had been having extremely severe attacks for the last 30 years, at least once a month. She had a daily injection for three days following, which on each occasion relieved her instantly, and since then, for upwards of eighteen months, she has not had a single real attack, at most a little bronchial whistling.

Apart from these successful cases we had five in which the treatment proved altogether inoperative. One of them was that of a patient with typical essential asthma who had had attacks ever since childhood. This patient obtained no relief whatever even after taking six daily consecutive injections, although he is forthwith relieved by inhaling the fumes of antiasthmatic powder.

A friend informs me that in the case of a girl with typical asthma eleven daily injections afforded no relief at all. When the first injection fails to exert a beneficial influence it is, in our opinion, undesirable to push the remedy. It may be that in these unbenefited cases a larger dose would produce the desired effect, but personally we have never given more than one c.c.

Patients who have been obliged to have recourse to morphine to obtain relief are unanimous in preferring the adrenalino-pituitary injection. Comparing the effect of the morphine injection to that of this mixture, one of them said his impression was that morphine abolished his individuality without acting on the attack, whereas our injection seemed to act on the attack without impinging upon his individuality.

As far as our experience goes, these injections do not seem to expose the patient to any undesirable collateral consequences. Dr. O. Weiss, for