

perature, filth, contamination and menstrual detritus, etc., have no effect on the reaction. Many innocent men have been executed, and many guilty criminals have escaped justice because the medical profession were not equal to the task of absolutely identifying human blood.

DaCosta, in *Clinical Hematology*, quite recently issued by B. Blakiston's Son & Co., of Philadelphia, gives full instructions for the performance of the test of Bordet : " The blood serum of an animal subcutaneously injected with the blood of another animal of a different species rapidly develops the property of agglutinating and dissolving the erythrocytes similar to those injected, but has no effect upon blood derived from any other source. The blood of a rabbit thus anti-serumized against human blood is diluted 100-fold with distilled water or normal salt solution, and 0.5 cubic centimeter employed. When the human blood is added at ordinary room temperature a distinct cloudy precipitate is formed, which is increased in turbidity by exposure to a temperature of 37°C. No change occurs on adding the serum to the blood of other animals; twenty-three specimens having been tested, with the single exception of the monkey, and in this instance the reaction was delayed and incomplete, and in no way comparable to the cloudiness produced by the mixture of human blood with its anti-serum. Old, dried, and even putrefied blood, diluted 1 to 100 with normal salt solution, reacts typically, and characteristically positive results have been obtained with human blood mixed with equal volumes of diluted blood of sheep, oxen, horses and dogs. Specimens were frozen 10°C. below zero for two weeks without in any way affecting the reaction. Blood mixed with menstrual urine, or such contaminating fluids as soapy water, responded promptly and typically."

Such a discovery is particularly gratifying, since neither the laity nor the legal profession could ever appreciate why we could not be ready to identify human blood. The complicated spectral test, which was only employed by experts possessing expensive equipments of instruments, is relegated to medical history. This distinguished and authoritative author has declared the test a specific test any physician may preform it, but we wonder if the general practitioner will get vouchers from the court for expert testimony? We rejoice in the advance of science, but we could hope that the labours of noble medical men might be made more remunerative to themselves and the profession.