

REDEMPTION FOR INEBRIATES.

INEBRIETY is in some subjects an actual disease. So is the insatiable craving for opiates. Many a poor wreck of humanity who is loathed and condemned for habitual drunkenness is really incapable of resisting the inordinate desire for drink. And the same is true in regard to the victim of the opium, morphine or cocaine habit.

Some of these unfortunates inherit the appetite which destroys them and the feebleness of will that renders them incapable of conquering it. They are to be greatly pitied. Others have acquired the propensity to indulgence in stimulants or opiates, and, while still to be pitied, are to a large extent to be blamed. But the hereditary weak-willed inebriate should be rather an object of compassion than of condemnation.

The habitual partaker of intoxicants who could but will not refrain from debasing himself, when moral suasion and religious teaching have failed may be left to his vice and his shame. But the unfortunate inheritor of an ancestor's infirmity or wickedness should be treated as one diseased and helped if possible to health and honor.

There have been many homes for inebriates and other institutions established to cure the drinking habit, in which some degree of success has been achieved. But the only treatment we know of which has proven really efficacious and of lasting effect, is the double chloride of gold remedy, used and, we believe, discovered by Dr. Leslie E. Keeley of Dwight, Illinois.

It may be thought that this is an advertising endorsement. That would be a great mistake. We do not know the Doctor, he does not advertise in this paper, or in any other, so far as we know, and we have had no dealings or communication of any kind with him or his institution. But we have learned of most remarkable cures effected by his treatment, and we mention them as a matter of public interest and of benefit to dipsomaniacs.

We have been led to do this by the representations of a lady residing in this city, who has personally witnessed the restoration to sobriety and respectability of a number of unfortunates who went to Dwight in advanced stages of delirium. The occasion of her sojourn there was the case of her own son, who had become a helpless slave to the morphine and cocaine habit, and whose body was covered with the marks of hypodermic punctures. He was on the verge of softening of the brain and was one of the worst cases undertaken by the Doctor.

It was therefore six weeks before he was thoroughly restored and fit to be entrusted with self-command. During that time this lady saw tottering inebriates come there and depart sound, sober and full of gratitude, with a supreme aversion instead of a craving for strong drink.

The medicine chiefly used is called the double chloride of gold, and we understand can be obtained with full directions for use at home, but the patient has to furnish a complete account of his case. The better way is to take the treatment under the physician's care.

We have seen accounts in several eastern journals of cures effected on inebriates, written by the recovered patients, some of them educated and talented physicians, who bear the strongest and most grateful testimony to the Doctor's system and treatment. This appears to be his only kind of advertisement.

The case of a young man in this city who has been restored to respectability and usefulness, though once a confirmed drunkard, has appeared in the columns of the *Herald*. We add this testimonial for the sole purpose of showing that dipsomania is really a disease and that it can be cured, and of thus giving comfort and hope to those afflicted creatures who are more to be pitied than censured.

Some of the brightest minds in the land have been darkened and destroyed by drink, and Utah has not been without illustrations of this fact. There are men here now who but for the apparently unconquerable habit of intoxication would be ornaments to society and kind-hearted, lovable useful members of the family circle, yet are now disgraced and shunned and looked upon as past redemption. If there is a chance for them—and the remedy we have described appears to offer it, would it not be true charity to help them reach it? The cure and reformation of hundreds of such unfortunates appears to be an established reality, and it ought to be known wherever the demon of drink has found a victim.

IN A BAD BOX.

OUR readers have fresh in mind, no doubt, the alleged "blood atonement" episode of the farcical examination before Judge Anderson about twenty months ago. A "Liberal" tool of the "Liberal" faction, went on the stand and swore that in 1862 he saw a man named William Green murdered in cold blood because he had left the "Mormon" Church and that his money might be seized. He gave time and

place and circumstances and made a great sensation.

It was such a surprise and such a novelty that at first the refutation of the story appeared to be difficult. There was "Liberal" glorification that, at last, a genuine "blood-atonement" case had been found. But these *Tribune* blood-and-thunder stories never stand long when dates and names are given. And when witnesses enough were at length obtained to utterly disprove the story, so that the Judge declared no more rebutting testimony was needful, the wretched "Liberal" witness Wardell was looked upon as a hopeless lunatic or a measureless perjurer. Soon after, the man alleged to have been murdered, hearing of the statement, made an affidavit totally upsetting all Wardell's sworn evidence, and, though a seceder from the "Mormon" Church, giving testimony which totally swept away the charge against it.

We refer to this little piece of "Liberal" discomfiture, which is well known and authentic history, because the *Tribune* has a story something similar, only more ancient and with names and dates and means of identification left out. That is quite shrewd, because it renders refutation more difficult. After telling its tale of horror, on the authority of "a man who is well known"—one of the *Tribune's* conventional tricks, it sums it up in this way:

"And so we see the fact was this: It was determined to kill an inoffensive man; the man delegated to perform the assassination could not do it; because the man had saved his life. When he reported what he had done, three men of the gang, with some generosity left in their hearts, approved the act, and it was a case where four men then had refused to obey counsel. They had committed a mortal offense, and the only way to save their souls was by taking their lives, which was accordingly done."

That is very definite, is it not? "So we see the fact is," etc. No, we don't see any "fact." We only see one of the *Tribune's* cooked up scraps of alleged ancient history, told by some anonymous person who is thus pointedly described:

"In or about the News office there is no one who would dispute his word."

Well, who ever he is, if he exists at all, we do dispute his word, if he said what the *Tribune* alleges. But that paper is so addicted to garbling and twisting and transforming what people say, that we do not believe anybody told the story in the shape in which it appears.

But why is this gruesome and goty tale told to-day? Would you believe it, rational reader, it is to justify her publication, in the *Tribune*, of the lying letter called the "Red Hot Address,"