

work, the doctor says among other things:

It is the peculiarity of the nagger to enormously exaggerate everything, even if she does not invent her grievances. Forgedfulness on the part of a husband is annoying, as it is in anyone; but it is not a crime. A continual stream of scolding, lasting three or four hours, over the failure to post a letter, will cause any man to consider the effect disproportionate to the cause. If the husband is healthy, if he is not cursed with a highly nervous organization, what happens? The first thing is that any love he may have ever had for his wife dies, drowned in the flood of words. Having murdered his love for her, the wife keeps up the nagging; he speedily begins to look on her as being a nuisance; from this to dislike and then to positive hatred is not a long journey. If there be children, the husband may continue to live with her for their sake, but it is an awful home in which to bring up children. * * * While he may not lift his finger to her, he will invariably become brutal, except in such cases as I shall hereafter mention. In such a contest the woman has no chance. He may not be, he probably is not, able to give the rapier-like thrust of sarcasm which comes so easily to her, but he can use the bludgeon of abuse and profanity with terrible effect. The nervous condition the woman has created in herself by her nagging, itself renders her powerless before this weapon of her husband. Such a family is a hell on earth. It was the son of such a household who said in the simplest and most matter-of-fact way when he heard of a wedding, "Another life-quarrel commenced!" What a comment on his parents!

The exceptions of men who do not become brutal which Dr. Edson suggests are those docile husbands who are nervous, "highly strung, to use a common phrase, and generally exceedingly affectionate." Of this class the doctor cites instances of where they become subjects of melancholia, completely denuded of every ambition, by the ceaseless irritation of the wife's tongue; and one case he cites of a nervous husband being driven to an asylum by the nagging of his wife.

Turning from his sympathy for the husband, the infliction on children by such a mother receives attention. It is pointed out that often the child's physical health is ruined; but the mind is injured still more. It is intimated that, owing to the constant exaggeration which is inseparable from nagging, the child does not get a chance to understand judgment; its mind grows one-sided; "the constant, unceasing injustice warps the better nature. The dumb anger induced through so many years stimulates the growth of passion in the mind of the child; in time it becomes absolutely unable to do justice to others, simply because its sense of justice, naturally strong in all children, is destroyed. Just as tyranny makes tyrants of those tyrannized over when they in turn have power, so the injustice of nagging kills the sense of justice. Then, too, in order to shield itself from the intolerable torture, the child naturally resorts to lies. It is not to be blamed for this, for, as the exaggeration of nagging is almost invariably nothing but falsehood, the little one cannot know any better."

It may be that many will recognize as an extreme view that which the New York writer gives of a too prev-

alent habit; yet its existence to any extent is but the evil in modified form. A wife who is a chronic fault-finder or scold cannot have the perfect confidence of even the best of husbands. And while it is no justification of the wrong-doing of one person to point out the faults of another, yet wives can, in fairness to themselves, make the assertion that all the nagging is not on their side. There are husbands whose churlishness and snappishness at home is as constant and marked as is their affability and politeness in society. And in the case of either one or both parents being addicted to the baneful practice, its effect on children is injurious to the extreme degree.

Dr. Edson confesses that he knows of no remedy for the evil he so sharply denounces, unless it should be in "public opinion," which at best is a very ineffectual remedy for such a disorder. In that code which inculcates pure morals, honor, truth and justice—true Christianity—there is, however, perfect means for the eradication of all such evils. That Gospel which teaches that each should love his neighbor as he loves himself, requires that patience, kindness, love and forgiveness should control in the family relation; that when the wife and husband find cause to express their grievance in sharp words, controlling desire and readiness to forgive restrain all excess and encourages repentance of the act complained of, and inspires confidence in the sense of justice possessed by each other.

There are times when reproof—and sharp reproof at that—is a necessity; but there is no occasion in the teachings of religion when the giver of such reproof is justified in prolonging it in anger or extending it to spitefulness. This is true not only in families but in broader organizations. The teaching of the Divine Master is that needed reproof should be invariably followed by showing forth an increase of love, lest the reproofed one should esteem the other as an enemy. This instruction is a powerful plea not to scold; persons in authority, husbands and fathers, wives and mothers, do not scold! To permit rebuke and reproof, which often is a righteous necessity, to be degenerated into that condition of chronic anger and almost constant nagging which constitutes scolding, is a direct violation of the fundamental principles which underlie all Christian teaching.

WHY WE WANT FREE SILVER.

The St. Louis *Republic* of January 19 contains the following, which may be set down as a brief and effective presentation of the almost universal Utah view of the topic discussed:

PLAZA HOTEL, New York,
Jan. 22, 1895.

To the Editor of the Republic:

I trust that it is never too late to ask and expect justice from a wrong paper like the *Republic*.

Inclosed is a clipping of a matter which is going the rounds of the press, and for the origination of which I suppose the *Republic* is responsible. I beg to say to you that the purported quotation from me is altogether incorrect. I never expressed nor entertained such a

narrow view of the silver question as would be indicated by this reference to the selfish interest of the miners. If the utterly puerile and indefensible reasons said to have been advanced by me for free coinage were the real reasons in behalf of that reform or rather restoration, it would deserve to fail, and its advocates would deserve the condemnation of your paper and the copying exchanges.

I am not interested in free coinage in order that the "silver mines may be operated without loss," but for broader and better reasons. I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, because I believe that without it civilization is marching backward. I believe that the interest of the cotton planter is more seriously assailed by the present price of silver than the interest of the silver miner; that the interest of the farmer is more injuriously affected than the interest of the silver miner; that the condition of the debtor and eventually the interest of the creditor are more at stake than the interest of the silver miner. Silver mining may be unprofitable; but in Utah we fancy that we are enjoying much greater average prosperity in our mining towns than is being enjoyed by the average towns of Missouri or any other Mississippi valley state.

FRANK J. CANNON.

THE UTE BILL.

The full text of the Ute removal bill as it passed the Senate and probably will pass the House is to hand, so that a former inquiry may be answered. In its first section it provides that the treaty of Nov. 13, 1883, by which the Southern Utes went on to their present reservation in southwestern Colorado, shall be annulled, and the treaty of June 15, 1880, so far as it can be made applicable, shall be carried out. Section two arranges for the allotment, by the secretary of the interior, to such Indians as he may deem qualified, of agricultural land in severalty within the boundaries of the present reservation, and provides that Indians taking allotments shall retain their interest in all tribal property. Section three disposes of Indians not qualified to receive land in severalty, by setting apart as a reservation that portion of the present reserve in Colorado west of the range line between townships thirteen and fourteen west of the New Mexico principal meridian, and also all of townships thirty-one and thirty-two of ranges fourteen, fifteen and sixteen west in New Mexico, the line north and south being about forty miles east of the western line of Colorado and New Mexico; the new reservation is thus considerably less than half the size of the old one. Section four provides for the opening, six months after the bill becomes a law, of that part of the reservation not allotted or retained for the Indians, and for the sale thereof and of improvements thereon. Section five directs that of the money received from such sale \$50,000 shall go in ten annual payments to the Indians, equally distributed among them; \$20,000 to be handled by the secretary of the interior, to invest the same in sheep to be apportioned equally to the Indians; to Ignacio, head chief, to Buckskin Charley, chief of the Moaches, and to Mariano, chief of the Weeminuche, \$500 each; to Tapucke and Tabewatch, chiefs of the Capotes, \$250 each; the