

There is a Keeley Institute in Connecticut, but Mrs. Franklin was far from being enthusiastic in its praise. I may add that from other and different sources I learned that the Keeley treatment is not making headway in the east and that it has disappointed the expectations raised regarding it a few years ago. It is not in use in any of the inebriate hospitals visited by me.\*

I left Hartford at 7 p.m. and reached New York at ten o'clock. The next day (Thursday) I had an interview with Dr. Mason, after crossing over to Brooklyn twice. Dr. Mason is enthusiastic with regard to the success of the farm colony plan for the care and treatment of habitual drunkards. He has large experience in the treatment of these cases and he speaks very hopefully as to the results. I called twice to see the Secretary of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Soldiers but I failed to meet him. I failed also to see the Secretary of the New York Prison Association as he was at Albany watching some attempted legislation adverse to the intermediate sentence system.

On Friday I went to Fort Hamilton to visit the Inebriate Hospital there but the resident physician was away. On my return in the afternoon I visited the Wayside Home for Inebriate Women, 253 Bridge Street, Brooklyn. I did not meet the lady attending physician but I had a very satisfactory interview with the matron, Miss Knowles. The average number of inmates is fifty. I left New York by the night train and reached Hamilton Saturday evening where I spent Sunday, reaching Toronto Monday noon.

In addition to my visitation to American institutions I visited the Homewood Retreat, Guelph, where I had a very profitable interview with Dr. Lett, the superintendent. I also visited Lakehurst Home at Oakville and the Keeley Institute, Sherbourne Street, Toronto. I may add that I am corresponding with the medical proprietor of Bellwood Asylum, Quebec, and with Dr. Norman Kerr, the English authority on inebriety. I have the third edition of his text-book on inebriety which is the standard authority on alcoholism and opium inebriety.

With regard to the question of efficiency of treatment in inebriety, the results of my inquiries are as follows: Between 80 and 90 per cent. remain sober for periods varying from a few weeks to several months but that only 35 per cent. are permanently cured. Out of 10,000 cases treated at the Washington Home, Boston previous to 1885, 34 per cent. had remained total abstainers for over ten years. Dr. Mason, of Brooklyn, followed the history of 600 cases for ten years and 34 per cent. were still sober men. From correspondence with Hon. Mr. Eustis, ex-Mayor of Minneapolis, Minnesota, I learn that about two years ago some fifty-seven discharged prisoners from the county workhouse were given medical treatment for inebriety and that at the end of a year and a half only one half had relapsed, although many, if not most of them, had been convicted for drunkenness several times—one of them twenty-eight times. But I must stop.

It was my intention, as an outcome of this investigation, had time permitted, to present for consideration some practical recommendations, firstly, with regard to the establishment of a reformatory or hospital for inebriates in Ontario; secondly, with regard to the medical treatment of inebriate prisoners at the Central Prison; thirdly, with regard to the care and treatment of

---

\*From the Annual Report of the Walnut Lodge Hospital, Hartford, Conn., I learn that in 1896 over 50 per cent. of the cases received had been patients at Keeley Institutes, and that 30 per cent. had been under treatment at so called "Gold Cures," not Keeley Institutes, thus making a total of 80 per cent. or over that had received some form of the Gold Cure treatment.