

*Impairment - Physical Effects
of Alcohol*

WHAT OF THE DRINK CURES?

CORA FRANCES STODDARD.

WHAT EFFECT has prohibition had on "drink cures" in the United States? was a question which came to the Scientific Temperance Federation a few months ago. This was a flourishing business a few years ago.

To answer the question, an inquiry pursued by the Scientific Temperance Federation for some four months has now secured information concerning 144 private and 4 semi-philanthropic institutions, a total of 148. Ninety-one (91) of them are definitely reported as "closed," "defunct," "out of business" by postal authorities, former owners, or local investigators; 14 more could not be found by postal authorities, a total of 105 which have disappeared from a list of 144 concerning which precise information was secured. One institution reported that it no longer receives alcoholic patients. Only 16 of the 38 private institutions still receiving alcoholics are solely for inebriates; formerly there were at least 100. The remaining 22 institutions are general private hospitals or sanatoria. Several managers of these hospitals stated frankly that they did not care to receive alcoholic patients and only occasionally did so. In addition are the 4 semi-philanthropic institutions which have a reduced number of patients.

The list of institutions used for making this inquiry was compiled from information obtained from several sources. Letters were sent to every State Board of Health in the United States asking for names and addresses of such institutions in their states. References which they gave to other state boards or possible sources of information were followed up to the end. Lists were obtained from the United States Public Health Service, from the American Medical Association Council on Medical Hygiene and Hospitals, from the National Committee on Mental Hygiene. In the end, 244 institutions known to have accepted alcoholic patients were listed. Information was obtained concerning 146.

Letters were sent directly to the institutions with a stamped return envelope enclosed. In addition individual letters were sent to correspondents in many cities asking them to look up institutions.

The following question was asked the institutions:

"Would you be willing to inform us whether the proportion of alcoholic patients you receive has increased or diminished or remained stationary since prohibition, giving, if you are willing to do so, the number of total admissions and of alcoholic admissions for six or seven years. If yours was a prohibition state, it would be helpful to have figures for two or three years before state prohibition. The institutions will be referred to in the report by number only, so that statistics will be confidential so far as identification with any institution is concerned."

The reports and letters received are all filed. Extracts from replies are

appended, the institutions being referred to by number, as promised in the inquiry, as the information given concerned private business.

DECREASE IN THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS

The accompanying table shows at a glance the status of the institutions concerning which inquiries were made and information received.

	KEELEY INSTITUTES	NEAL INSTITUTES	GATLIN INSTITUTES	MISCEL- LANEOUS	TOTAL
Number listed	17	62	5	154	*238
No report	2	—	—	92	94
Out of business	10	60	1	20	91
Could not be found.....	—	—	4	10	14
In business—					
Inebriates only	5	1	—	10	16
Inebriates a part of patients.....	—	1	—	21	22
Discontinued receiving alcoholics...	—	—	—	1	1

The largest number of deceased institutions was found in the group of the Keeley, Neal and Gatlin class. Of the 84 pre-prohibition institutes listed from this group, 71 are reported as discontinued, and 4 could not be found. Only 7 of them remain in business; and one of these is used as a general hospital admitting an alcoholic patient only occasionally.

Nineteen other private institutions have gone out of business; 10 more could not be found at the addresses from which they had advertised or been reported to medical authorities.

Although the report deals primarily with the private "drink cure" institutions, details are also included concerning 6 former State Hospitals for inebriates which were named by correspondents. Only one of these remains, and this, a small one for women, is connected, as formerly, with another state institution. In the same state, the hospital for men inebriates has been closed and the treatment of such men assigned to another state hospital. Alcoholic patients with mental disorders are treated as usual in the insane hospitals. These report a decrease in cases of alcoholic insanity.

PRESENT NUMBER OF PATIENTS

A smaller number of patients since prohibition became effective is the report of the majority of existing private institutions for inebriates. Details concerning this point will be found in the institutional reports appended. A summary is given here.

Of the 38 non-philanthropic institutions receiving alcoholic patients:

22 report reductions in the number of alcoholic admissions, the reduction being described in terms ranging from "somewhat less" to "almost nothing to do."

3 see little or no change, but have so few cases, or cases of such a special class, that the proprietors say that the number would not be much influenced either way by prohibition.

7 mention an increase in the number; of these, one each says that the increase is "slight"

*In addition are 4 semi-philanthropic institutions.

or "too small to be of any significance;" two think the increase is due to the closing of other institutions while theirs have remained open, and in one case, special attention has been given to this class of patients. Three give statistics which show that the total average number of patients received by the three institutions in years immediately preceding prohibition totaled 199; in the two prohibition years, 232; an increase of 33 patients for the 3 institutions.

6 institutions give no exact information. Of these two have a few patients but do not want them. Two express personal dissatisfaction with prohibition, its enforcement, results and look; but give no information asked for from their institutions—one being unable to do so, while the other does not answer in any way the question whether he is receiving more or fewer patients under prohibition. One institution still receives a few; thinks that drunkenness has probably decreased, and, therefore, what cases there are appear more conspicuous.

All of the four semi-philanthropic institutions have a smaller number of patients since prohibition, despite the disappearance of the many other institutions. Their numbers, however, may possibly continue relatively high for some time because of the diminished number of institutions and because confirmed drinkers who continue to use alcoholic drinks can find treatment there at comparatively small expense. They are all situated in or near large cities where the large number of such drinkers will be found.

Of the six former State Hospitals for Inebriates, five have been discontinued and the buildings converted to other uses. The patients of one of these hospitals are treated at a state insane hospital. The number is less than one-fourth of that before prohibition. The sixth institution is a small one carried on in connection with another state hospital and also receives a much smaller number of alcoholic patients than before prohibition.

The reports received show decided and substantial reduction both in the number of institutions treating alcoholic patients and in the total number of patients.

It is evidently not true, as claimed, that there is more drinking than ever under prohibition. If this were so, one would expect to find the ranks of the institutions full, and a larger number of patients. But this is not the case, taking the country as a whole.

The institutions which give statistics of more patients now than before prohibition are small ones and the slight increase which their statistics show does not offset the decrease shown in other and larger institutions, and that even greater decrease of alcoholics represented by the disappearance within a few years of over 100 institutions for the treatment of alcoholism.

Details from the institutions now receiving patients are appended.

GATLIN INSTITUTES

There were 5 Gatlin Institutes on the list compiled.

Postal authorities reported of 3 "not found;" of 1, "defunct."

No reply was received from the fifth institute, and a local correspondent finds that it disappeared from the city directory after 1918.

KEELEY INSTITUTES

The writer was able to secure a list of 17 of these institutes. There were probably more, but the management gives out no general information.

Of the 17 institutes, no information has been obtained concerning 2; ten (10) were reported closed by postal or state officials or by local investigators; 3 are open but with apparently decreased business; 2 are open and having about the same amount of business as formerly, which one of these managers says is probably due to the closing of many of the institutions; those which remain receive patients who formerly would have entered some of the closed Institutes.

The following details are given of the institutions reported as open.

Keeley 1. Prohibition has materially affected the business, as fewer persons drink immoderately, although there are still many "who ought to have treatment."

Keeley 2. "While we do not believe there is as much drinking as formerly, we account for the fact that we receive as many patients now as before Prohibition went into effect by the fact that a number of Keeley Institutes have closed, and we draw patronage from the localities which were served by the other institutions."

This institution is in a state which had had a state prohibition law for a decade or more before national prohibition, and for this reason also was less likely to show much change after national prohibition.

Keeley 3. This institution makes no official statement; a correspondent residing in the state writes:

"Officials of the institution have refused to make statements. But two years ago the big Keeley Institute was sold to the United States government and has been used since as a hospital for soldiers. The Institute moved into smaller building with accommodations for several dozen patients. Soon after the change was made, I visited _____ (the city where this institute is located) and was informed that there were about nine patients in the institution."

Keeley 4. The following table was reported by the institution in a state which had had state prohibition since Jan. 1, 1916. The table gives the number of alcoholic patients admitted and their percentage of all admissions:

	ALCOHOLIC PATIENTS	PERCENTAGE OF ALL PATIENTS ADMITTED
1914	34	45%
1915	34	46%
1916	41	54%
1917	25	33%
1918	28	32%
1919	41	34%
1920	29	28%
1921	36	47%
1922 (6 mos.)	13	34%

Keeley 5. My informant living in the same city writes:
"We are informed that the business has decreased to a considerable extent, and that it mainly consists now of week-end visits from wealthier drinkers."

Notes of information on some of these institutions which have gone out of business are the following:

Keeley 6. "The location has been sold to the Federal Government. The place will not be reopened, I am informed."

Keeley 7. "The institute began to decline in 1916 and quit entirely in 1918."

Keeley 8. "The institute in this city went out of business immediately on the adoption

of the prohibition law. I was told by the parties who owned the property and regarded the institute as an investment that there was absolutely no doubt in their minds that prohibition did it. 'Our investment vanished.' The business began to go down very soon after the County Option Law went into effect and completely disappeared on the enactment of the Volstead Law."

Keeley 9. "The Keeley Institute in this city was closed immediately after the state went dry, January, 1, 1919."

NEAL INSTITUTES

There were formerly 62 Neal Institutes in the United States. Only 60 are left, according to the statement of the manager of one of the two remaining. In another city, a brother of Mr. Neal occasionally treats a patient, placing him in a general sanitarium.

Of the two institutions left, one is mainly devoted to general hospital service and receives only occasionally an alcoholic case. This is in a state where there has been state prohibition since 1916.

The other institute is in a former wet state and very wet city. It receives from one to three cases a month.

My informant writes that the proprietor of the Neal Institute says that "the return of beer and wine would bring back the old drunkenness. His cured patients never began again on hard liquor, but on beer."

NEW USES FOR OLD CURES

A little information has been given as to new uses for former Keeley and Neal Institutes. Thus it is learned that in some cases the buildings are now used as "an apartment house," a "home for children," a "rooming house," etc. In some cases, new half-million dollar government buildings or business buildings have been erected on the former sites of institutes which have gone out of business.

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS SOLELY FOR ALCOHOLIC AND DRUG ADDICTS

The following paragraphs are from the letters from the ten private institutions reporting which receive alcoholic and drug addicts only. In this and the succeeding sections the former "wet" or "dry" status is indicated or the state in which the institution is situated, as this may throw some light on the facts reported.

No. 1. In 1912 this institution "treated about 250 patients, mostly for alcoholism. This number remained the same till 1914. After 1914, the number decreased until in 1920 the number did not exceed 75, and at the present will run about 60 patients a year; 20 per cent of these are drug patients. So it can be safely said that the drink cases have dropped from 250 to 50 per year. The average number of patients in the institution at one time will be 5. Prohibition in the state has had much to do with the decrease in patients." The state became "dry" in 1918.

No. 2. In a former "wet" state. The number of alcoholics has decreased about 25 per cent.

No. 3. An eastern institution, one of three remaining in a non-prohibition state where there were formerly twelve institutions and a state hospital for inebriates. Since the letter of the proprietor was written, the institution has gone out of business and the property has been sold.

"Our business of treating inebriety has gradually decreased since the prohibition

policy was adopted until we have almost nothing to do. Drug cases have also decreased since till there is little of that also to do."

No. 4. An institution in the same state as the preceding. The number received during the past six years is given in the accompanying table. These figures must be read in light of the fact that this institution is one of only two small special institutions remaining in a state where there were formerly twelve and a big state hospital for the treatment of this class of cases.

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30—	TOTAL ADMISSIONS	ALCOHOLIC	PER CENT ALCOHOLIC
1917	90	67	74.6
1918	71	52	74.6
1919	95	75	77.7
1920	69	39	56.5
1921	92	76	82.6
1922	121	95	78.5

No. 5. A middle western institution in a prohibition state. The superintendent does not answer the question as to the comparative number of patients now and before prohibition, but expresses personal dissatisfaction with prohibition and claims that everywhere people are drinking who never drank before.

No. 6. In a large formerly very wet eastern city. The proprietor "is unable to give the exact number of cases treated" in the absence of the official having the records in charge, but thinks "the number is about the same, certainly not less." He draws a gloomy picture of the situation, thinks conditions are worse, and the prospect for the future generation a gloomy one. The head of another institution in the same state (No. XXI) holds a diametrically opposite view as to the future.

No. 7. Middle west, same state as Number 5. The proprietor writes that he is "unable to give definite data as to whether alcoholic cases I have received in my institution have increased or diminished or remained stationary since National Prohibition." Gives his opinion that the proportion of alcoholic patients has decreased and of morphin addicts increased.

No. 8. From a correspondent in a middle western formerly wet city where this institution is located:

"I talked with the management of the ——— and they do not hesitate to declare that their business in dealing with inebriety has been very largely cut down." They made this statement frankly in spite of the fact that they believe there is as much drinking now as ever."

No. 9. The proprietor of this institution in a former very wet state, sends statistics of admissions for 7½ consecutive years. He supplies data also as to admissions of drug addicts.

	ADMISSIONS				TOTAL
	MEN		WOMEN		
	ALCOHOLIC	DRUGS	ALCOHOLIC	DRUGS	
1915.....	48	10	10	10	78
1916.....	31	10	5	2	48
1917.....	37	8	3	2	50
1918.....	26	8	4	3	41
1919.....	17	*21	1	*15	54
1920.....	32	15	2	4	53
1921.....	38	11	1	2	52

*This illustrates the fact noted elsewhere of the increase at first in drug addicts when enforcement of new narcotic drug laws enacted in 1918 made it more difficult for the drug addict to secure the drugs and therefore led many to seek treatment or cure. As this stricter enforcement of narcotic drug laws became effective in 1919 many persons not knowing the facts thought the addicts revealed by it were due to prohibition of alcoholic liquors.

No. 10. In a state which had a prohibition law about a year before national prohibition became effective. The proprietor writes:

"I have been operating a sanitarium for more than thirty years, and have treated thousands of alcoholic patients. Up to the time Prohibition went into effect, I would treat from 40 to 50 every month. Since prohibition has been in force, and especially the past two years, I do not have 4 or 5 per month."

Following are reports as to the number of alcoholic patients from 22 institutions which have received both alcoholic and non-alcoholic patients:

No. I. A former wet state. "I have carried no advertising for alcoholics for the past five or six years. However the physicians in ——— and ——— continue to send such cases to me. Since Prohibition the number of such cases has been about double in number and in worse condition. But as I do not cater to such cases, the number before or since prohibition has been too small to be of significance."

No. II. A southern former prohibition state. The institution "has not received alcoholic cases for some time. Records are not complete and would not help you at all."

No. III. Eastern wet state. "Very seldom admit any alcoholic patients these days. They are growing less."

No. IV. In a state which had prohibition for two or three years before national prohibition. "The number of alcoholic patients has markedly increased since Federal Prohibition. It is impossible to state, however, whether this has anything to do with prohibition, as although this hospital has cared for this type of cases for the last twelve years, special attention has been given to those people in the last two years, which probably accounts for the number of admissions. Also, a great number of the so-called 'alcoholic cures' advertising places have closed, which may account for the increased number of applicants."

No. V. The number is "somewhat less, but not what it should be. All old offenders." A western former wet state.

No. VI. A prohibition state for years. "Diminished to a minimum. Had no case for six months."

No. VII. Number "decreased; only one during the past year," in this institution in a middle west former wet state.

No. VIII. "Number of cases much less." In a former wet state.

No. IX. Has "a very little work to do with alcoholics; do not average one case a month. Record lost in a recent fire, but should judge there was no difference in number admitted." A state which has had prohibition for many years.

No. X. This institution and Nos. XI and XII are all in the same state, which formerly was a large producer of alcoholic liquors.

The proprietor of No. X thinks the proportion of alcoholic cases has slightly increased since national prohibition, due to the character of the liquors used.

No. XI. In the same state as X and XII. The number of alcoholic admissions has diminished. The type of alcoholic is about the same as before prohibition."

No. XII. In the same state as X and XI. Treats a few chronic alcoholics in the course of the year of the better class, not those usually confined under restraint in mental hospitals. Personal opinion is that the general amount of drunkenness is not as much as formerly, but what occurs is more observed and "hence, probably exaggerated."

The writer believes "That finally the prohibition law will prove of great benefit to the country at large and should be supported."

No. XIII. In a state that had prohibition several years before national prohibition. "Could give the number of inebriates received for a period of years" but does not think "there

would be anything very definite in this as I do not care to receive inebriates. I haven't cared to have them for the past two years."

No. XIV. The number admitted remains quite stationary. About 15 patients a month admitted; has seen "no material change for the past ten years." The state has had state prohibition for longer than that period.

No. XV. In the same formerly wet state as No. VI. Only rarely accepts an alcoholic patient. Thinks that the cases are fewer in number.

No. XVII. Number applying for treatment increased; gives figures only beginning with 1918:

1918, 103	1919, 103	1920, 147	1921, 123
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

In 1922 thinks number will be about the same as 1921 if the present rate continues. State prohibition went into effect about eight months before National Prohibition so that statistics for 10 months of 1918 cover the only non-prohibition period of the four years. Proprietor is disappointed in prohibition enforcement in his state.

No. XVIII. "We avoid alcoholic and drug patients whenever possible. Have one or the other only once in four or six months." A formerly wet state.

No. XIX. Treats nervous diseases and alcoholic drug addictions. The number of admissions is given, except for 1919 and 1921, when the proprietor was in the war service. The same formerly prohibition state as No. XIV, which may explain the relative stability of the numbers admitted.

NUMBER OF ALCOHOLICS TREATED				
1915, 34	1916, 34	1917, 24	1920, 48	1921, 43

No. XX. In a former wet and liquor producing state. "We do not have many of these cases—perhaps three or four in a year, but we see and hear about them outside of the institution." The proprietor thinks that the previous immoderate drinkers are still drinking, and what they drink is especially injurious.

No. XXI. Receives "very few alcoholic patients. In 1917 we received 3; in 1918, one; 1919, two; 1920, none; 1921, one; 1922, one." In a state without state prohibition.

No. XXII. A small institution in the same formerly eastern wet state as Nos. 6 and XV. "Our business is of such a type that it would not be influenced much as long as intoxicants can be obtained in any way." Hence he sees little difference in the number of admissions, and no difference in the type of inebriety. He does "not expect to see much change till the old and chronic alcoholics have had a chance to die off. It will then be found that the younger generation will not have acquired the habit to the extent that this generation did. The new recruits are not being made under these conditions as they were before prohibition."

SEMI-PHILANTHROPIC INSTITUTIONS

The statistics of the two Washingtonian Homes are taken from their published annual reports for 1921.

CHICAGO WASHINGTONIAN HOME

Statistics of admissions:

1916, 1,114	1917, 995	1918, 733	1919, 567	1920, 125	1921, 171
-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

The annual report for 1921 says:

"The decline in 1919 might be attributable to the war, but the decided decline in 1920 could hardly be said to be from that cause but rather to the war-time regulation followed by Constitutional Prohibition, and the fact that the Madison Street property was closed March 1, 1920, and the institution moved to the site of the Martha Washington Home, and the latter was not prepared to receive more than a few men until there was extensive remodeling of the building. . . .

"We might reasonably conclude that there would be an increase in admissions hereafter

because so many of the institutions for the cure of inebriates have closed their doors within a year or two. Washingtonian Home may, therefore, draw for the patronage from a much larger territory. During the years just closed, 21 of the men admitted were from outside the city of Chicago, one even coming from Montana. . . .

Age of Patients. "As bearing on the trend of the matter under consideration we would do well to refer to the ages of the patients admitted for several years. [Relates that beginning with 1917 and 1918 there were fewer men under 30 years than formerly]. The increase in patients in 1921 is made up almost exclusively of men over the age of 40 years and particularly between the ages of 50 and 60."

"These figures only apply to the men's department. The record of the *Women's Department* ought to be more of a criterion of the true situation, not being diminished by war and closed part of the time.

Women admitted:

1918, 106	1919, 78	1920, 47	1921, 39
-----------	----------	----------	----------

BOSTON WASHINGTONIAN HOME

The admissions for a dozen years have been as follows:

1910..... 854	1914..... 998	1918..... 756
1911..... 775	1915..... 953	1919..... 565
1912..... 946	1916..... 1,061	1920..... 410
1913..... 939	1917..... 1,053	1921..... 694

Through this period up to Oct. 31, 1918 the State had a hospital for the treatment of alcoholics which was admitting annually on the average about the same number as the Washingtonian Home. It continued to receive patients during the remainder of 1918 and 1919 but had them cared for elsewhere. Now the State hospital is a United States government institution for injured soldiers.

This is doubtless one reason why the number of patients at the Washington Home in Boston, as in Chicago, showed an upward trend in 1921.

There were formerly in Massachusetts, not only a State hospital for inebriates, a Keeley Institute and a Neal Institute, but also ten smaller private institutions receiving this class of patients.

At the present time in Massachusetts there are only the Washingtonian Home and two private hospitals for the treatment of inebriates.

OTHER PHILANTHROPIC INSTITUTIONS

Institution A. Near New York City. Gives the figures for admissions for six consecutive years. There appears to be a continued upward trend in 1922.

1916, 436	1917, 390	1918, 239	1919, 222	1920, 181	1921, 231
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

The average number of admissions for two last normal "wet" years (1916-17) was 413; of the two prohibition years 1920 and 1921 the average was 206.

Institution B. This institution in an eastern formerly wet city has the following record:

ADMISSIONS (MEN)

1916, 436	1917, 390	1918, 239	1919, 222	1920, 181	1921, 231
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Thus the average for the three wet years, 1916-1918, was 355; for the two dry years, 1920-21, it was 206. The 1922 figures show an upward tendency but are lower than the normal wet years.

STATE HOSPITALS

In the course of the inquiry, a record was made of six former state institutions for inebriates. All of these except two in Iowa are now being used for other

purposes, and the Iowa institutions are connected with other state hospitals.

Massachusetts State Hospital for Inebriates, formerly receiving about 900 patients a year, is now a Federal hospital for injured soldiers.

Minnesota had a state hospital for inebriates which was converted a few years ago into an institution for mental patients; though it still may and occasionally does receive an inebriate patient.

Georgia once had a state hospital, but "it has been closed for several years."

Connecticut State Hospital for Inebriates, newly established when national prohibition came into effect, ceased to function as a hospital for inebriates February 1, 1920, and is used as an integral part of the Norwich State Hospital.

Iowa State Hospital for Inebriates was closed in 1920 and sold to the Federal Government. Independence Hospital was designated, April, 1921, for the reception of male alcohol and drug addicts. The following tables of admissions are compiled from information furnished by state and hospital officials.

STATE HOSPITAL FOR INEBRIATES (MEN)		MT. PLEASANT IOWA HOSPITAL FOR INEBRIATE WOMEN		ALCOHOLISM ALONE	ALCOHOL DRUGS	DRUGS ALONE	TOTAL
YEAR ENDING		1ST AD-MISSIONS	READ-MISSIONS				
JUNE 30—							
1911	323						
1912	288						
1913	242	7	3	3	2	5	10
1914	263	12	—	9	—	3	12
1915	306	32	3	6	—	29	35
1916	*204	*27	*2	5	2	22	29
1917	180	12	2	4	1	9	14
1918	62	14	4	3	—	12	15
1919	24	10	—	2	4	4	10
1920	14	6	2	—	4	4	8
Hospital closed 1921		6	1	**	**	**	7
INDEPENDENCE STATE HOSPITAL.							
YEAR ENDING							
MARCH 31—							
1922	43						

*State prohibition beginning Jan. 1, 1916.

**Details not given.



PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD LEAGUE AGAINST ALCOHOLISM, WESTERVILLE, OHIO

ADDENDA

Additional information received as this report goes to press is included here.

Concerning the Keeley Institutes as to the number of which the author of this study was unable to get exact information from the parent Institute up to the time of writing the report, the following facts are now available, furnished by Dr. J. H. Oughton, head of the Dwight Institute, to Mr. D. King, to correct a published misstatement by another author. Dr. Oughton reports that twenty years or more ago there were 50 Institutes in operation. They were not real branches of the Dwight institution, but were furnished the remedy and instructions as to treatment. For various reasons, the war among them, many of these institutes were discontinued. Notes concerning individual institutes in the foregoing pages show that some at least of these disappeared with the coming of state prohibition. On January 1, 1920, according to Dr. Oughton, there were 14 institutes still in operation. At present there are 12. The number of patients at the Dwight Institute, he states, is larger than in 1920, but no figures are given as to the actual number treated now or in the pre-prohibition period. The compiler of this report learns from other sources that this institute is now occupying a far smaller building than in the pre-prohibition days.

One additional institution receiving inebriates as a part of its patients reports as this study goes to press:

No. XXIII. In the same state as No. XIV (p. 8): "This became a prohibition state over 10 years ago. Four years previous to prohibition our alcoholic admissions ran slightly under 25 per cent of our total. They now run somewhat under 5 per cent." With this additional information the revised summary (p. 2) is as follows:

	Private Institutions	Semi- Philanthropic
Institutions listed	271	4
No report	91	
Reported out of business	119	
Reported as not found	14	
In business—		
Inebriates only	23	4
Inebriates as a part of patients	23	
Inebriate patients discontinued	1	

Altogether 275 institutions were listed; information was secured concerning 184. Only 51 remain in business; of these, but 27 take inebriate patients only.

Corrections

On page 1 the last figures in paragraph 2 should be 148 instead of 146.