

to have priapism. (This paper will be found among our original communications.)

Dr. OSLER remarked that he did not see any good physiological grounds for supposing that the individual mentioned in the report was necessarily incapable of having an erection, as this act was, in a measure, independent of the brain, and, as shown by Goltz, could be excited reflexly in animals whose spinal cords were cut in the dorsal regions. The erector centre is believed to be situated in the lumbar cord. Physiologists very generally believe that there is no satisfactory evidence of the connection of the cerebellum with the sexual functions; indeed the experiments of Eckhard go to show that the central stimuli exciting the act of erection pass not along the cerebellar peduncles, but down the crura cerebri, *i.e.*, they proceed from the cerebrum.

Dr. F. W. CAMPBELL stated that he had under his care for the past year and a-half a case of Dementia, due to softening of the brain, and which had, in its early stage, been seen by Dr. Howard. This patient had for months past been so bad as to pass his feces involuntary, and yet during that time he had frequent satisfactory intercourse with his wife—whom, in fact, he had impregnated.

Dr. H. HOWARD, in defending his paper, said: "In reply to Dr. Osler's remarks I can very well understand that a man may be paralyzed in the lower extremities from disease or injury of the lumbar portion of the spinal cord, and yet be capable of cohabitation; for a man suffering from general paralysis can have an erection of the penis, and for the simple reason that in neither cases does it follow that there must be disease of the cerebellum, as there is in consecutive chronic dementia. I say the lower portion of the spinal cord may suffer from disease, and no injury result to the nervi-evigen-tes, for its connection with the cerebellum is not through the spinal cord, but by means of the splan-ic, or great sympathetic, and its ganglia, at least according to such physiologists as Eulenburg, Gutman and Lövan, no mean authorities.

I therefore maintain that, when the cerebellum is diseased, as we find it is in chronic dementia, it being what we might call the *entia* of the nervi-evigen-tes, the consequence will be impotency, at least in so far that it would be

impossible to have an erection of the penis. And this fact is fully borne out by my own experience."

With regard to bloody flux as a result of irritation of the cerebellum, he considered it to be a feasible theory (for the reasons already given), even though post-mortem examination failed to find an exciting cause, for we all know that we had much yet to learn in pathological examinations. The microscope had not yet revealed to us, by any means, every thing in the human brain, although wonders had been accomplished by its use. He did not think that ulcers in the intestines was a satisfactory explanation for the cause of the hæmorrhage in the case alluded to for Dr. Osler had at various times called the attention of the members of the Society to ulcerated intestines in typhoid fever where there had been no bloody flux.

In reply to Dr. Hingston, he said that there must be a great distinction drawn between the dement and the imbecile, the latter was due to congenital malformation of the brain in part or whole, or arrest of brain development after birth, consequently many imbeciles wanting in intellect, and consequently reason, had their emotional organization perfectly sound, and, not having reason to control their animal impulse, were erotic imbeciles and dangerous to society. But such cases were not analogous to the dement, who not only lost his reason from disease, but also had his emotional organization from the same cause, exhausted and atrophied. He, however, recognized the fact that there could be intellectual dementia previous to having the cerebellum engaged in the disease, then there would be a form of dementia, without its being necessarily accompanied with impotency or exhaustion or atrophy of the emotional organization, and such probably was the case mentioned by Dr. F. W. Campbell. He remembered seeing the man Dr. Campbell alluded to, and given the opinion that it was softening of the brain, but if he did not express it, he meant of the intellectual portion of the brain, that is, some portion of the cortical substance with its cells. In conclusion, he had heard nothing that he felt would justify him in altering his opinion as already expressed.

The meeting then adjourned.

MONTREAL, April 9th, 1880.

The ordinary meeting was held this evening,