

banks, projected last winter, for Paris, London, Berlin and New York was not entirely without foundation. Though the Pope was not cognizant of this banking enterprise, yet his administrator Fanchi, was the head and front of it. The dispatches fully explain how the first bank was started in Paris, and how the Pope became acquainted with the scheme, the result being the dismissal of Fanchi.

The Peter's Pence tribute is a very old institution in the Roman Catholic church. Originally the western kingdoms of Europe contributed sums of money to the Roman pontiff in memory of St. Peter, whose successor the Pope is believed to be by Catholics. The annual tribute idea first originated in England as far back as 721. Though historians differ as to the exact date, yet all admit that the custom prevailed long before the Norman conquest. The tribute consisted in the payment of a silver penny, by every family possessing land or cattle of the yearly value of 80 pence, and it was collected during the five weeks between St. Peter's and St. Paul's day and August 1st. In the reign of Henry VIII the tax was abolished, in England.

This tax, it appears, prevailed in almost all the western countries except in Ireland. In the bull by which Adrian the Fourth granted Ireland to Henry the Second of England, the consideration is stated to be one penny for every family resident in that island. Henry was authorized to collect this tribute and at the same time bring the natives of that country within the true Christian fold. Whether Rome dominated the Irish Church previous to this is a disputed point.

During the reformation period and long after, the collection of Peter's Pence was abandoned, except as voluntary contributions. In 1848 the custom was revived in consequence of an address by Pius IX. to the faithful all over the world. Collection boxes were placed in all the churches, specially for the reception of the voluntary offerings of the people. This money was forwarded annually to Rome. Last year the sums sent from the various countries aggregated \$2,500,000. Falchi's mal-administration dissipated \$1,000,000 of this sum, and that is the reason why we have heard so much about Peter's Pence in the newspapers during the past few weeks.

BUYING OFF A FIRE BUG.

THE people of Middle Haddam, Conn., have recently been visited with a number of disastrous fires. A fellow named Peterson was suspected of being the incendiary. He was ac-

cordingly arrested and tried, but the court failed to convict. The evidence, however, brought forth in the public mind the conviction that Peterson was the man, and despairing of obtaining relief from the law they have hit upon the plan of buying the scoundrel off, and are now raising a popular subscription which they propose to give to the supposed fire fiend if he will leave the town.

This will make men smile whose experiences in the wild and woolly west date back a few years. It was not very long ago, considered a very mild rebuke to men enjoying public suspicion of being regular peace disturbers, to give them leave to quit the town that had thus lost its affection for them. The mere liberty to go without delay was under such circumstances considered a boon of fortune so inestimable that money was no object.

EDUCATION AND WOMEN.

KATE FIELD has been reading a characteristic lecture to American girls on the subject of education. Kate is much disturbed in her mind lest the pursuit of higher education by young women will detract from their qualities as housewives. Without discussing the merits of her admonitions now, we suspect that had she made them public a little earlier in her career they would have taken better among the girls. It is our belief that the average young woman of America, if disposed, could teach Kate Field more truths about competent housewifery than she has ever yet thought of or ever will. As for education damaging womanhood, it is all nonsense. There is nothing in pure learning to degrade anybody. If a woman is by nature coarse and brazen, education may make her brazenry more conspicuous. But the probabilities are that it will tend to tone down her effrontery and render her less self-opinionated.

The woman who has not the strength of faculty to receive the higher branches of learning, simply will not receive them, no matter what her opportunities may be. She will toy with books for a season, precisely as the young man does under the same circumstances, and then will drop them forever, and whatever she was before her school experience she will be after, with the difference that some of her weaknesses will have been developed, which otherwise might not have been exposed quite so soon.

If, for instance, a woman is a natural born slave of vanity, tampering with books, is likely to make books the associate of her weakness, and she will manifest it by rendering herself a

common laughing-stock through her exhibitions of bookishness. If this same shallow person had turned her attention to light society, her vanity would very likely have exhibited itself in the eccentricities of her dress, or some other idiotic fad of the period. We reassert, therefore, that while education makes truly great minds very much greater, it has not the power to do real harm to anybody.

WHY GAMBLING CAN'T BE STOPPED.

SOMEbody has been raising the question of gambling in the army. Captain Gerlech of Fort Snelling was asked a few days ago, what he thought about it, and he answered simply that gambling was common. He never saw a military post that by any sort of maneuvers had accomplished anything in stopping or even checking it.

This is sad, to be sure. We wonder if Captain Gerlech ever enquired whether gambling was common in the posts he had visited or made any effort to stop it. His words are quite suggestive of an officer who is not concerned particularly whether soldiers gamble or not. We wonder if Captain Gerlech ever gambles. If he does then it is clear why he never saw a military post that did not indulge in the practice.

A man who is always soaked in whisky is usually of the opinion that all humanity are guzzlers, and that whisky is a necessary evil. So with all the rest who themselves indulge in practicing the vice or the crime against which they are presumed to be examples. The probabilities are that the army does not contain a hundred officers who are not habitual gamblers, and that is the reason they can't stop it. The public have the best of reasons to believe that nine-tenths of the civil offices likewise are filled with expert gamblers. Either this is so or else the leading newspapers of the country deserve to be prosecuted by the government for falsely attributing habits of lawlessness to its public servants.

While the head men of the nation are being continually paraded before the country as principals of this, that and the other "big game" and their disreputable indulgence is invariably related as a capital joke, and the people continue to vote for such men for office, what moral right have we to complain against the army officers, the soldiers or any one else for gambling? What moral right has a prosecutor who gambles to stand before a jury as the accuser of one who has violated the gambling laws. What moral right has the man who elected the prosecutor