

The Paradox of the Vatican.

Continued from page 2.

room, but, unless his Holiness is ill, he finds him already up, and reading his breviary, as was his custom through his long parochial life. At six o'clock Pius X. says Mass in a simple little oratory, served by two Monsignori. After having prayed for a while in the little chapel, the Pope has his early breakfast, which consists of a cup of coffee and rolls and butter, and directly afterwards, if the weather is fine, he walks in the great gardens of the Vatican for an hour or so.

The Vatican gardens cover many acres of ground, and contain, besides flower gardens, orchards, and vineyards, several small villas or summer houses, and a long and winding carriage drive, constructed by Leo XIII. The late Pope was in the habit of being carried down for his daily drive in great pomp, preceded by his Swiss soldiers, and followed by Papal chamberlains and Noble Guards. Leo XIII. sat alone in the seat of honour in his carriage, with a chamberlain opposite to him; two servants stood behind, and four Noble Guards on horseback followed their officer riding beside the window of the carriage. Pius X., says the author we follow, takes long walks in the gardens, often alone, seeking the quietest and most unfrequented paths, and sometimes stops to talk familiarly with the gardeners and any workmen whom he happens to meet.

At nine o'clock the Pope is in his study, where he receives his Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, then the heads of the great Congregations through which the Church is ruled, and then other visitors. The audiences of Pius X. are of the simplest character, and surrounded with the least possible etiquette. In old days the splendid reception rooms were full of chamberlains, guards, and attendants, but now only a few servants and a Monsignora or two are to be seen. The present Pope receives people of every class, even the most humble, and sometimes poor peasants from his native village of Riese are to be seen there, in garments anything but suited to a court ceremony.

Punctually at one o'clock Pius X. dines. Since the seventeenth century it has been a rule for the Pontiff to eat alone, but Pius X., says the London "Standard," sometimes invites his private secretary or other members of his household to join him, and on being respectfully remonstrated with for this breach of etiquette, cheerfully replied that as Urban VIII. had the right to make this rule, he, Pius X., had an equal right to abolish it. Pius X. eats simply and most frugally, and the Pontiff's meals differ little from those that were served to the parish priest of Sulzano. When Pius X. was first elected he was astounded at the number of servants in the Papal kitchen, and exclaimed, "Surely it is not necessary to have seven cooks in order to make me a little soup!"

After supper the Pope goes to bed, and is generally in bed by half-past ten. In all the arrangements of his life Pius X. uses the same humble simplicity. The author of the book already mentioned says that under the Pope's predecessors there were Monsignori who were paid so much a month, and had rooms in the Vatican, whose sole duty was to hold the Pope's hat when he went out in the Vatican gardens, or who carried the stick or umbrella of the Pontiff, and there were others whose functions were hardly more important. All these sinecures have been inexorably abolished by Pius X., notwithstanding the lamentations and protests which his action caused. He has discouraged elaborate services and decorations in the churches, and ordered a return to the old Gregorian music. In everything Pius X. has shown the transparent sincerity and simplicity of his character, and a simple piety that never hesitates for a moment to do what seems to him right, whether the action be polite or reverse.

Everyone has heard that when the Patriarch of Venice went to Rome for the conclave he had so little remembrance of the result that he bought a return ticket. He long kept it, says Rene Lara, author of a recent study of Pius X. in "McKure's." Many an entreaty to part with the little piece of cardboard had no effect upon the spiritual head of the church until at last the King of Greece begged so hard that he secured the prize,

The Twentieth Century is Canada's.

Continued from page 37.

declares that there is enough coal in the Crow's Nest Pass region alone to yield 4,000,000 tons a year for 5000 years. The other declares that there is enough coal to yield 10,000,000 tons a year for 7000 years. Value that coal at two shillings a ton—which is absurd. Add that value to the national wealth of Canada in miners' wages, shareholders' returns, rail and ship freight; and one does not need to state the figures. And this is but one of its Western coal fields. There are still unexplored seams along the Saskatchewan, on the Peace River, and down the Mackenzie. Nature seems to have made a provision that is almost providential—that in those regions barren of fuel in forest, the earth should contain almost exhaustless resources of coal. New fields are now being exploited in the interior of Northern British Columbia. Canada's hard times are past. As Laurier says—the twentieth century belongs to Canada, industrially, at least.

The story of Canada's timber wealth is the same. Two thousand miles long is its belt of uncut timber-to-day, comprising 1,500,000,000 acres divided into three great belts, which cannot be described here. To put it briefly—according to Dominion authorities—Canada's timber area is four times greater than the timber area of the United States, three times greater than the timber area of Russia, twice as great as the timber area of all Europe. And this source of national wealth is practically untapped. In the west, not more than \$400,000 worth of lumber is exported a year. In the east—though no figures are obtainable—at a guess, as much again; in all, a yearly revenue from its forests about equal to the gold from the Yukon. But this seven or eight million is a mere bagatelle to the revenue that will accrue from Canadian forests when the enormous limits recently bought by American capitalists in British Columbia are worked.

In thus enumerating the causes of Canada's present wonderful prosperity, I have not mentioned its manufactures, which have increased in number from thirty at the time of confederation to 75,000 to-day; or its railways, which have grown from two short lines of 2000 miles to three trans-continental lines with numerous branches totalling 23,000 miles. Nor have I mentioned its fisheries and dairying and fruit growing. These industries are not peculiar to Canada. They are sources of wealth common to other nations, that grow as the farms and the mines and the forests develop; but in the wheat lands and mines and forests, Canada has a wealth peculiar to herself.

The greatest problem confronting Canada in the immediate future is the shortest route to Europe by Churchill, Hudson Bay. For twenty years this has been mooted, but now 100 miles of the railway to the Bay are actually laid. Five years, at the least, will see trains running from the grain-growing areas of the west to Hudson Bay. What does this mean? It means that Churchill is nearer the shippers of the Western States as a route to Europe than New York is by 1500 miles. But the success of the route hinges on the navigability of the Straits—a distance of 450 miles. That is a point too controversial to be settled here.

If the development of resources in the twentieth century brings the same national expansion as the development of the same resources has brought about in the United States in the nineteenth century, Canada's future is that of a New Nation. And if it flies the British flag while American capital develops its resources, there may yet be that commercial compact of an Anglo-Saxon brotherhood of which idealists have dreamed.

DR. G. MARCHESINI

SURGEON.

Has commenced the practice of his profession in Auckland, and can be consulted at his private residence,

"BALBIENIE,"

CORNER OF PRINCES AND ALFRED STREETS.

Opposite Albert Park.

Telephone 3140.

OUR BABIES.

(By **HYGEIA**.)

Published under the auspices of the Society for the Health of Women and Children.

"It is wiser to put up a fence at the top of a precipice than to maintain an ambulance at the bottom."

HYGIENE OF MOUTH AND TEETH.

IN LAST year a very important address, bearing on dental hygiene, was delivered by Dr. Sim Wallace at the annual meeting of the British Dental Association, held at Birmingham, and Dr. Wallace's views received the hearty support of leading representatives at the Congress. The paper is one of such general interest and importance that I should have liked to reproduce it practically unbridged; but lack of space prevents this, and I therefore give the following condensation.

In order to make the matter clearer and simpler for the general reader a few liberties have been taken with the text—especially in the direction of substituting simple popular words for scientific terms:—

Address by Dr. Sim Wallace.

"Most of us must often have wondered why it is that so many professional people seem to take little interest in the hygiene of the mouth, for the mouth is admittedly the great entrance portal of disease. The natural self-cleansing processes of the mouth are, as a rule, unknown, and instead of aiding these self-cleansing processes procedures are advocated which would really appear to have been deliberately invented to ruin the perfection of the mouth and its functions at the earliest possible age. We, of course, as dentists see what actually takes place, and are painfully aware of the havoc wrought in children's mouths and teeth at and before the age of six."

NOTE BY "HYGEIA."

The following is adapted from a recent address by Dr. Pickering, Professor of Dentistry, Otago University:—Decay of teeth is largely due to errors of diet commencing in the mother before the birth of her offspring, and extending over the first 12 years of her child's life. It is just during this period that a medical man's advice is most often sought as to the suitability or otherwise of articles of diet, and he then has opportunities of pointing out authoritatively the injurious effects of common dietetic errors. This gives the doctor a great power to lessen the prevalence of dental disease. Knowing what is beneficial and what is deleterious to teeth, and putting this knowledge into practice, he will be fulfilling the general principles of correct dietetics—for it might be stated in general terms that "what is best for the teeth is best for the rest of the alimentary system." Further, I need scarcely point out that what is best for the alimentary system—that is, for the proper nutrition and growth of the body—is best for the whole human organism, both body and mind. See "Feeding and Care of the Baby," pages 133 to 139.

Dr. Wallace's Address.

(Continued).

It has been shown that in some towns in England where accurate statistics have been taken, that each child has on the average about nine carious teeth at the age of six years. (Note.—Professor Pickering says that on the average he finds the teeth of children in the Dominion even worse than those at Home, due, he thinks, mainly to the excessive consumption of sweets.) It is not possible to say that the bad state of children's teeth results from failing to carry out the advice as to feeding, which has generally been given up to the present time, for it is common knowledge that children brought up most carefully according to what has been regarded as the orthodox regime, have their teeth as carious as those children who have but little care bestowed upon them.

The cardinal error of the past half-century has been the advocacy of milk, "mash," and soft food generally, instead

of insisting that a due proportion of hard, dry, or tough foods should be given from infancy onwards. Naturally, the cottage child who happens to be fortunate enough to be given bones and crusts forms better jaws and teeth than the pampered child of wealthier parents brought up on specially-prepared soft foods.

The more care parents bestow on their children the better, provided the care is sensible and in the right direction, but nothing is more injurious than the common perverse form of care directed towards shielding them from necessary work and exercise, not only for teeth and jaws, but for all the muscles of the body; not only for the muscles, indeed, but for every organ and tissue of the body. The child who is given insufficient work for the structures of the mouth is too often the child who is pampered and coddled all round, guarded from cool air and cold water, muffled from head to foot, kept in doors during rainy weather, and allowed to dawdle about instead of being encouraged to walk and play vigorously.

Bad Teeth Due to Bad Feeding Habits.

"It is not enough to recognise that the system currently advocated will bring about the destruction of the teeth, and then to blame fate or the depravity of the human constitution. Nor is it sufficient to advocate that children should be taken to the dentist every six months. This practise is obviously necessary, and will always remain a wise precaution, however much things are improved; but it should be distinctly realised that teeth do not decay except when a faulty dietetic regime has brought the mouth into an unhealthy state. The unhygienic regimen should be rectified immediately, for an unhealthy state of the mouth not only spoils the teeth, but tends to ruin the child's general health as well.

Last Food at Meals.

"There has been of late an enormous amount of investigation as to the so-called nutritive values of foods. This, of course, is important, but there is another equally important question—namely, Is the food, broadly speaking, hygienic? Is it such as to conduce to health? The nutritive value of a pound of putrid meat may be about as much as the nutritive value of a pound of fresh meat; but from a hygienic point of view it may have a totally different value. So too the value of food which lodges and ferments in the mouth is quite different from that of food which is digested in the stomach. In general, the chemical composition, or so-called 'nutritive value' of ordinary food has less influence on the state of the teeth than has the structure or consistency of food. Will it give enough exercise to jaws and glands? Will it leave the mouth 'clean' or 'dirty'? It is with regard to the value of certain articles of diet from the latter point of view that I intend to speak.

"Now, it is obvious that the hygienic state of the mouth, in so far as it depends upon foods, depends more especially on what is taken towards the end of the meal, for it is the food that remains or lodges in the mouth after the meal is over, which ferments and causes the disastrous results to the teeth. It is the disastrous results, therefore, not a matter of indifference, whether a meal be finished with food which leaves the mouth clean or leaves it dirty. And, overlooked though it may have been, some foods do leave the mouth clean and some leave the mouth dirty—or, rather, do not leave it at all until they have undergone fermentation or putrefaction in the mouth. This is a simple, obvious, and important point."

For the finish of a meal nothing is better than a piece of raw, ripe apple; while nothing is worse than sweets, chocolates, or biscuits. (See "Feeding and Care of the Baby," page 130 "Apple Rule.")

We shall conclude Dr. Sim Wallace's article next week.