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Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report on investigations of the food habits of a number of families in Pittsburg, Pa., made in 1894-1896 by Miss Isabel Bevier, professor of natural science in the Pennsylvania College for Women at Pittsburg. The report includes six dietary studies, a study of the composition and cost of bread in Pittsburg, and a bakery experiment.
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The samples were prepared for analyses in the laboratory of the Penusylvania College, where some of the analyses were also made. The major part of the analytical work was carried on in the laboratory of the special agent in charge of nutrition investigations at Middletown, Conn.
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## nutrition Investigations in pittsburg, PA., 189 $\psi^{-1896 .}$

## THE DIETARY STUDIES.

The investigations here reported include studies of (1) six dietaries; (2) the composition and prices of baker's bread in Pittsburg; and (3) the composition of bread and the changes which the materials undergo in baking.

The dietaries studied were those of families of men in professional life, mechanies, and day laborers. The range in financial condition was from comparative affluence to actual poverty. The inquiries regarding bakers' bread included observations of the composition and selling price of ten specimens as ordinarily sold in the city. The studies of flour and bread included the composition and cost of the flour and other materials used in baking, the composition of the bread, and the losses of materials during the process of fermenting and baking.

## PURPOSE AND PLAN.

The purpose of the studies was to obtain information regarding the condition of living and especially concerning the hygienic and pecuniary economy of the food of people of different classes, more particularly those of limited incomes. The data sought were (1) the income of the family; (2) the outlay for rent and food; and (3) the kind, quality, and quantity of food materials consumed. From these data it is possible by comparison with recognized standards to judge whether the families studied were properly nourished and whether they were wise in their selection and purchase of food; also to point out, in many instances, where a different selection would have furnished a more nutritious and less costly dietary.

The plan here followed is the same as has been explained in accounts of previous investigations carried on under the direction of the United States Department of Agriculture. It may be briefly stated as follows: From the sum of the different food materials on hand at the begiming of the study and those received during the experiment the amounts remaining at the end were subtracted. This gave the
amount of each material actually used. The amounts of the nutritive ingredients were estimated from the amount thus obtained and the composition of each material, as shown by actual analysis, or as assumed from the average of analyses of similar food materials. The animal and regetable materials in the waste (bread crumbs, bits of meat, prepared food of different sorts, ete.) were separated as accurately as possible and analyzed. This waste did not include the inedible portion (i. e., refuse) of the food, such as bones, shells, skins, seeds, etc. The mutrients in the waste subtracted from those of the food gave the amounts of uutrients actually eaten. Account was kept of the meals taken by the different members of the family and by visitors. A record was also kept of all beverages, condiments, etc., purchased.

As a rule a woman requires less food than a man, and the amount required by children is still less, varying with the age. It is customary to assigu certain factors which shall represent the amount of nutrients required by children of different ages, and by women, as compared with an adult man. The various factors which have been adopted are as follows:

Factors used in calculating meals consumed in dietary studies.

> One meal of woman equivalent to 0.8 meal of man at moderate muscular labor. One meal of boy 14 to 16 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.8 meal of man. One meal of girl 14 to 16 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.7 meal of man. One meal of child 10 to 13 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.6 meal of man. One meal of child 6 to 9 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.5 meal of man. One meal of child 2 to 5 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.4 meal of man. One meal of child under 2 years of age equivalent to 0.3 meal of man.

These factors are based in part upon experimental data and in part upon arbitrary assumptions. They are subject to revision when experimental evidence shall warrant more definite conclusions. By the use of these factors the number of meals actually taken by each member of the family is calculated into the equivalent number of meals for an adult man. In this way the total number of meals taken by the family is finally expressed in terms of meals per man, and by dividing this latter value by the number of meals taken per day (usually three) the equivalent number of days for one man is obtained. The total nutrients of the food eaten divided by this equivalent number of days for one man gives the amounts of nutrients "per man per day."

## DIETARY STANDARDS.

The results of the dietary studies are compared with the results of similar studies made elsewhere, and with the dietary standards for man under different conditions of muscular activity. These so-called dietary standards are for the most part based upon the observed facts of food consumption. The standards ${ }^{1}$ which are given below are based upon the assumption that the body requires for its nourishment enough protein to replace all the nitrogenous substances consumed in the body

[^0]and enough energy (fuel value) to supply the demand for heat and for muscular and other work. All the nutrients yield energy, but protein alone can build tissue. Therefore a dietary standard is expressed in its simplest form in terms of protein and energy (fuel value). .

The proposed American standards, which are somewhat more liberal than those given by European authorities, are as follows:

Standards for daily dietaries (Atwater).

|  | Protein. | Fuel value. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grams. | Calories. |
| Man without muscular work Man with light musenlar work | 109 112 | 2,700 3,000 |
| Man with moderate muscular work | 125 | 3, 500 |

These standards are to be understood simply as tentative estimates of the protein and energy required. They are in no sense to be considered as final.

## CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF FOOD MATERIALS USED.

In the first three dietary studies samples of the more important food materials were analyzed, and the percentage composition of the samples was assumed to represent that of the material eaten in the dietary. Serenteen specimens were analyzed in comnection with dietary No. 43, six with dietary No. 128, and eight with dietary No. 129. No analyses were made in connection with the last three dietary studies (Nos. 189, 190, and 191). In erery case when a food material was not analyzed its composition was calculated from the average analyses of similar materials. ${ }^{1}$

The following food materials were analyzed in connection with the studies:
145.2 Beef, neck.-For boiling. No bone. Used in dietary No. 128.
304. Beef, rump.-For boiling. No bone. Used in dietary No. 129.
197. Beef, rib roast.-Unusually fat. Total weight of sample, 9 pounds; refuse, 1.75 pounds. Price, 15 cents per pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
237. Beef, round steak.-Total weight of sample, 4.31 pounds; refuse, 0.5 pound. Price, 15 cents per pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
275. Beef, round steak.-No hone. Used in dietary No. 128.
276. Beef, round steak.-No lone. Used in dietary No. 129.
341. Beef, shoulder clod.-For pot roast. Weight of sample, 6 pounds; no refuse. Price, 12 cents per pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
58. Beef, short steak.-Sample, 1.18 pounds. No hone. Price, 10 cents per pound. Used in dietary No. 43.

[^1]
## 10

411. Beef, kidneys.-Total weight, 1.56 pounds; refuse, 0.31 pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
412. Beef, lirer.-Used in dietary No. 129.
413. Teal cutlets.-Weight of sample, 2.84 pounds; refuse, 0.06 pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
414. Calf's lirer.-Weight of sample, 2.09 pounds; refuse, 0.09 pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
415. Lamb, leg.-Weight of sample, 7.12 pounds; refuse, 0.5 pound.
416. Pork, loin roast.-Used in dietary No. 129.
417. Pigs' kidneys.-Used in dietary No. 129.

Lard.-Bought from a farmer-100 per cent pure. Used in dietary No. 43.
Butter.-Fox River creamery. Used in dietary No. 43.
Butter.-Used in dietary No. 128.
Butterine.-Three pounds for 50 cents. Used in dietary No. 129.
Milk.-The first sample was taken in connection with dietary No. 43, the second with dietary No. 128, and the third with dietary No. 129.
5014. Buckwheat flour.-Used in dietary No. 43.
5026. Corn meal, yellow.-Used in dietary No. 43.
5311. Wheat flour.-Used in dietary No. 43.
5079. Rolled oats.-Used in dietary No. 43.
5573. White bread.-Weight, 3.06 pounds. Cost, 9 cents. Used in dietary No. 128.
5574. Bread, "home-made."-Baker's bread. Weight, 2.28 pounds. Cost, 7 cents. The family usually bought stale bread. This, however, was a fresh loaf. Used in dietary No. 129.
Sugar, granulated.-Used in dietary No. 43.
Sugar, coffee.-Used in dietary No. 128.
6521. Lima beans, dried.-Used in dietary No. 43.

In Tables 1, 2, and 3 is shown the percentage composition of the different food materials described above. Table 1 shows the composition, as purchased, of such of the foods as contained refuse. Table 2 shows the composition of the edible portion of the different foods. With the exception of the materials given in Table 1, these foods contained no refuse or inedible material, and consequently the analyses given for the edible portion represent also the composition as purchased. In Table 3 the composition of the edible portion of the food materials is calculated to the water-free basis.

Table 1.-Composition, as purchased, of such food materials as contained inedible matter or refuse.

| Kind of food material. | Reference No. | Refuse. | Water. | Protein. | Fat. | Ash. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fuel } \\ & \text { value per } \\ & \text { pound. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beef: |  | Per cent. | Percent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Calories. |
| Rib roast. | 197 | 19.4 | 38.2 | 13.2 | 28.7 | 0.5 | 1,455 |
| Round steak | 237 | 11.6 | 64.3 | 18.6 | 4.6 | . 9 | 540 |
| Kidneys. | 411 | 19.9 | 63.1 | 14.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 340 |
| Veal: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cutlets | 1029 | 2.1 | 73.8 | 19.6 | 3. 3 | 1.2 | 505 |
| Liver. | 1122 | 4.3 | 69.3 | 18.9 | 6.3 | 1.2 | 620 |
| Lambleg. | 1505 | 7.0 | 48.2 | 16.0 | 28.0 | . 8 | 1,480 |

Table 2.-Composition of fresh, edible portion of food materials analyzed. ${ }^{1}$

| Kind of food material. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Refer- } \\ & \text { ence No. } \end{aligned}$ | Water. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. | Ash. | Fuel vahe per pound. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANIMAL FOOD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boiling piece, neck, free from bone | 145 | Per cent. 69.3 | Per cent. 20.9 | Per cent. 8.7 | I'er cent. | Per cent. 1. 1 | Calories. 755 |
| Boiling piece, rımp..... | 304 | 43.1 | 22.4 | 33.3 |  | 1.2 | 1,820 |
| Rib roast. | 197 | 47.4 | 16.5 | 35.5 |  | . 6 | 1,810 |
| Ronud steak | 237 | 72.7 | 21.0 | 5.2 |  | 1.1 | 610 |
| Round steak, free from |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 275 | 65.2 | 20.9 | 12.7 |  | 1.2 | 925 |
|  | 276 | 61.9 | 21.0 | 16.0 |  | 1.1 | 1,065 |
| A verage |  | 66.6 | 21.0 | 11.3 | ......... | 1.1 |  |
| Shoulder clod. | 341 | 69.0 | 18.8 | 11.2 |  | 1.0 | 820 |
| Short steak. | 58 | 67.7 | 19.8 | 11.5 |  | 1.0 | 855 |
| Kidness. | 411 | 78.7 | 17.6 | 2.4 |  | 1.3 | 430 |
| Liver ... | 415 | 75.0 | 18.8 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 535 |
| Veal: Cutlets | 1029 | 75.4 | 20.1 | 3.3 |  | 1.2 | 515 |
| Liver. | 1122 | 72.4 | 19.8 | 6. 6 |  | 1.2 | 645 |
| Lamb: Leg | 1505 | 51.8 | 17.2 | 30.1 |  | . 9 | 1,590 |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loin roast | 2025 | 41.1 | 15.8 | 42.3 |  | . 8 | 2, 080 |
| Kidners | 2137 | 76.1 | 17.2 | 5.5 100.0 |  | 1.2 | 550 |
| Lard.. |  | 7.0 |  | 100.0 89.5 |  | 3.5 | 4, ${ }^{4}, 275$ |
| Do |  | 10.3 | 1.0 | 86.9 |  | 1.8 | 3,6*5 |
| Butterine |  | 10.0 | . 5 | 86.1 |  | 3.4 | 3, 640 |
| Milk |  | 88. 0 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.6 | . 7 | 300 |
| Do |  | 87.7 | 3.2 | 2. 6 | 5.8 | . 7 | 275 |
| Do |  | 88.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 5.3 | . 7 | 280 |
| Buckwheat flour | 5014 | 12.3 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 80.7 | . 6 | 1,650 |
| Corn meal. | 5026 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 1.5 | 78.4 | . 7 | 1,675 |
| Flour, wheat | 5311 | 9.5 | 14.4 | 1.3 | 74.4 | . 4 | 1,705 |
| Rulleil oats. | 5079 | 1.8 | 16.9 | 7.8 | 71.8 | 1.7 | 1, 980 |
| White bread | 5573 | 34.6 | 9.2 | . 5 | 54.3 | 1.4 | 1,200 |
|  | 3574 | 35.8 | 9.7 | . 7 | 52.6 | 1.2 | 1,185 |
| Arerage |  | 35.2 | 9.5 | . 6 | 53.4 | 1.3 | 1,155 |
| Sugar, granulated. |  | 1.4 |  |  | 98.6 |  | 1,835 |
| Sugar, cottee -...... |  | 4. 6 |  |  | 95.4 |  | 1,775 |
| Beans, Lima, dried. | 6521 | 12. 2 | 12.8 | 1.9 | 69.5 | 3.6 | 1,645 |

${ }^{1}$ With the exception of Nos. $197,237,411,1029,112$, and 1505 , these analyses also represent the composition of the foods as purchasel.

TABLE 3.-Composition of water-free substance of edible portion of food materials.

| Kind of food material. | Reference No. | Nitrogen. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. | Ash. ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beef: Animal food. |  | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. |
| Boiling piece, neck, free from bone. | 145 | 11.13 | 68.2 | 28.3 |  | 3.5 |
| Boiling piece, rump.................. | 304 | 6. 38 | 39.4 | 58.6 |  | 2.0 |
| Ril) roast | 197 | 5. 11 | 31.3 | 67.6 |  | 1.1 |
| Round steak | 237 | 12.67 | 77.0 | 19.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Round steak, free from boue | 275 | 9. 68 | 60.0 | 36.7 |  | 3.3 |
|  | 276 | 9. 15 | 55.2 | 42.0 |  | 2.8 |
| Average |  |  | 64.1 | 32.6 | .......... | 3.3 |
| Shoulder clod. | 341 | 9. 91 | 60.7 | 36.1 |  | 3.2 |
| Short steak | 58 | 9.79 | 61.1 | 35.7 |  | 3.2 |
| Kidneys. | 411 | 12.87 | 82.9 | 11.1 |  | 6. 0 |
| Liver | 415 |  | 75. 4 | 15.5 | 4.1 | 5.0 |
| Veal: Cutlets | 1099 | 13.10 | 81.6 | 13.6 |  |  |
| Liver | 1122 | 10.65 | 71.7 | 23.9 |  | 4.4 |
| Lamb: Leg | 1515 | 5.86 | 35.6 | 62.5 |  | 1.9 |

TAble 3.-Composition of water-free substance of edible portion of food materials.-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Reference No. | Nitrogen. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohre drates. | Ash. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AMIMAL FOOD-continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pork: |  | Per cent. | Percent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. |
| Loin roast | 3025 | 4.11 | 26.8 | 71.9 |  | 1.3 |
| Kidners | 2137 | 11.02 | 71.9 | 22.9 |  | 5.2 |
| Lard.... |  |  |  | 100.0 96.2 |  | 3.8 |
| Do. |  |  | 1.1 | 96. 9 |  | 2. 8 |
| Butterine |  |  | . 6 | 95.6 |  | 3.8 |
| Milk.. |  |  | 25.0 | 30.9 | 38.3 | 5.8 |
|  |  |  | 26.0 | 21.1 | 47.2 | 5.7 |
| Do. |  |  | 24.4 | 25.2 | 44.5 | 5.9 |
| vegetable food. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buckwheat flour. | 5014 | ........... | 5. 9 | 1.4 | 92.0 | . 7 |
| Corn meal... | 5026 |  | 10.3 | 1.7 | 87.3 | . 7 |
| Flour, wheat | 5311 |  | 15. 9 | 1.4 | 82. 2 | . 5 |
| Rolled oats.. | 5079 |  | 17.3 | 7.9 | 73.1 | 1.7 |
| White bread. | 5573 |  | 14.1 | . 8 | 83.0 | 2.1 |
| Do | 5574 |  | 15.1 | 1.1 | 82.0 | 1.8 |
| Average | ...-...... | ......--.. | 14.6 | 1.0 | 82.5 | 1.9 |
| Sugar. granulated. |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |
| Sugar. coffee..... |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |
| Beans, Lima, dried. | 6521 |  | 15.6 | 2.1 | 77.8 | 4.5 |

## DETAILS OF THE DIETARY STUDIES.

The details of the six dietary studies follow, with such comments and suggestions for improvement in each case as seemed desirable or warranted.

DIETART STEDY OF A LAWIER'S FAMILT (N゙o. 43).
The first of the dietary studies here reported was made in the winter of 1895 in the family of a lanyer in comfortable circumstances. The family consisted of the aged grandmother, the father and mother just past middle age, two married daughters with the husband of one of them, two daughters between 12 and 20 years of age, a son about 18 years old, and the maid servant, a woman about 30 . There were also numerous visitors. The father suffered from dyspepsia, and as he had a special diet he was not included in the study; the son-in-law was engaged in business; the boy was attending school.

The study began February 25, 1895, and continued 30 days.
The number of meals takeu was as follows:


In the following tables are recorded the kind and amount of the different foods purchased, wasted, and eaten, together with their composition and cost:

Table 4.-Food materinls and tahle and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 13.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight nsed. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |  | Total food material. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| ANIMAL FOOD. <br> Beef: |  |  | Percent. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rib, no bone ${ }^{1}$ | $16.5$ | 35.5 | Percent. | \$2. 36 | $5,300$ | $85$ | $\begin{array}{r} r a m s . \\ 1, s 81 \end{array}$ | (r゙ams. |
| Ronnd, no bone ${ }^{1}$ | 21.0 | 5. 2 |  | 2. 40 | 6.945 | 1,458 | 361 |  |
| Rimmp, no bone. | 16.8 | 25.6 |  | . 58 | $\because, 265$ | 380 | 580 |  |
| Shoulder clod ${ }^{1}$ | 18.. | 11. 2 |  | . 95 | 3, 760 | 707 | 421 |  |
| Short steak ${ }^{1}$ | 19.8 | 11.5 |  | . 40 | 1. 840 | 364 | 212 |  |
| Tenderloin steak | 14.8 | 27.3 |  | . 44 | 1.1C0 | 163 | 300 |  |
| Dried and smoked | 31.8 | 6.8 | 0.6 | . 25 | 455 | 144 | 31 | 3 |
| Kidners, edible portion | 17.6 | 2.4 |  | . 30 | 1. 845 | $3: 5$ | 44 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 7.68 | 23.510 | 4,416 | 3. 830 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 2.55 | 6,390 | 1,263 | 429 |  |
| Lamb: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chops, no bone | 17.6 | 23.3 |  | . 92 | 2,200 | 387 | 623 |  |
| Leg, no bone ${ }^{3}$. | 17.2 | 30.1 | ...... | 1.00 | 3,005 | 517 | 904 |  |
| Roast, no bone | 17.6 | 28.3 |  | 1.11 | 3,200 | 563 | 906 |  |
| Stew.. | 15.5 | 19.1 |  | . 22 | 1,200 | 186 | 229 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.25 | 9,605 | 1,653 | 2,662 |  |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ribs | 14.1 | 25.6 |  | . 55 | 1,985 | 280 | 509 |  |
| Bacon | 9.2 | 61.8 |  | . 06 | 170 | 16 | 105 |  |
| Ham, no b | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | . 19 | 625 | 97 | 244 |  |
| Ham. | 13.3 | 33.4 |  | . 12 | 470 | 63 | 157 |  |
| Sansage | 12.8 | 45.4 | . 8 | . 24 | 875 | 112 | 397 | 7 |
| Lard. |  | 100.0 |  | . 14 | 6,505 |  | 6,505 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 1. 30 | 10,630 | 568 | 7,917 | 7 |
| Fish. salmon.............. | 13.5 | 8. 1 |  | . $\pm 0$ | 1,215 | 164 | 198 |  |
| Egrs (15.9 per cent shell) | 14.9 | 10.6 | ....-..... | 3.75 | 10,775 | 1. 605 | 1,142 | ---.-.----- |
| Butter ${ }^{1}$. |  | 89.5 |  | 8.54 | 13, 510 |  | 12,091 |  |
| Cheese. | 26.0 | 34. 2 | 2.3 | . 20 | -625 | 163 | 214 | 14 |
| Milk ${ }^{1}$ | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4. 6 | 4. 76 | 55, 125 | 1. 672 | $\sim, 062$ | 2. 563 |
| Cream | 2.5 | 18.5 | 4.5 | 5.00 | 18.305 | 458 | 3,386 | 824 |
| Total animal food |  |  |  | 37.43 | 150, 290 | 11, 962 | 33, 831 | 3,411 |
| VEGETABLE FOUD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cereals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barley | 9.3 | 1. 0 | 71. 6 | . 03 | 365 | 34 | 4 | 283 |
| Bnckwheat flour ${ }^{1}$ | 5. 2 | 1.2 | 80.7 | . 61 | 11, 110 | 578 | 133 | 8. 966 |
| Corn meal ${ }^{1}$ | 9.3 | 1.5 | 78. 4 | . 17 | 3,940 | 566 | 59 | 3, 089 |
| Flour, wheat | 14.4 | 1.3 | 74.4 | 2.17 | 41, 050 | 5,911 | 534 | 30, 541 |
| Rice | 7.8 | . 4 | 79.0 | . 25 | . 1,520 | 118 | 6 | 1,201 |
| Rolled oats ${ }^{1}$ | 16.9 | 7.8 | 71.7 | . 42 | - 3,090 | 52.2 | 241 | 2, 216 |
| Bread, baker | 9.5 | 1.2 | 52.8 | . 55 | 5,105 | 485 | 61 | $\because .69 .5$ |
| Macaroni.. | 11.7 | 1.6 | 72. 9 | . 09 | 340 | 40 | 5 | 248 |
| Total |  |  |  | 4.29 | 66,520 | 8,054 | 1, 043 | 49,239 |
| Sugars: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sugar, granulated |  |  | 98.6 | 2.07 | 18,825 |  |  | 18,561 |
| Sugar, brown ............ Molasses (New Orleans) | 2.7 |  | 95.0 68.0 | . .07 | 1,425 3,175 | 86 |  | 4, 204 2. 159 |
| Total |  |  |  | 2. 63 | 26,425 | 86 |  | 24,924 |

${ }^{1}$ Analyzed in conuection with this dietary.

Table 4.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 43-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohy drates. |  | Tital food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |
| VEGETABLE FOOD-continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vegetables: | Pcret. | Perct. | Pcreent. |  | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. |
| Beans, dried | 22.3 | 1. 8 | 59.1 | \$0. 26 | 3, 035 | 677 | 55 | 1,793 |
| Beans, Lima, dried ${ }^{1}$ | 14.0 | 1.9 | 70.1 | . 14 | 1,275 | 178 | 24 | 891 |
| Cabbage, edible portion .- | 2.1 | . 4 | 5. 8 | . 18 | 1,930 | 40 | 8 | 112 |
| Corn, canned.......... .... | 2.8 | 1.3 | 19.3 | . 52 | 1,825 | 51 | 24 | 352 |
| Lettuce. | 1.1 | . 3 | 2. 7 | . 04 | 285 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Onions, edible portion .... | 1. 7 | . 4 | 9.9 | . 10 | 535 | 9 | 2 | 53 |
| Peas, canned................ | 3.6 | . 2 | 9.8 | . 70 | 5,175 | 186 | 11 | 507 |
| Potatoes ( 29.9 per cent refuse) | 2.1 | . 1 | 18.0 | 1.66 | 35,855 | 753 | 36 | 6,454 |
| Sweet potatoes ( 24.9 per cent refuse) | 1. 8 | . 7 | 27.1 | . 37 | 3,795 | 68 | 27 | 1,028 |
| Tomatoes, canned.......... | 1.2 | . 2 | 4. 0 | . 47 | 6, 045 | 72 | 12 | 1, 242 |
| Total |  |  |  | 4.44 | 59, 755 | 2, 037 | 200 | 11,443 |
| Fruits, etc.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oranges, pulp | . 8 | . 6 | 10.7 | 1. 20 | 2, 440 | 19 | 15 | 237 |
| Prunellas.... | 2.0 | . 7 | 58.6 | . 30 | 905 | 18 | 6 | 530 |
| Total | , | . | --- - | 1.85 | 4,820 | 44 | 31 | 917 |
| Total vegetable food. |  |  |  | 13.21 | 157, 520 | 10,221 | 1,274 | 86.523 |
| Total food |  |  |  | 50.64 | 307, 810 | 22, 183 | 35, 105 | 89, 9:34 |
| W aste ............................ | 10.2 | 15.8 | 24.6 | -...... | 14,795 | 1,509 | 2,338 | 3,639 |

${ }^{1}$ Analyzed in connection with this dietary.
Table 5.-Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritire ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 43.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Total food. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food mate. rial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo-hydrates. |  | Food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo-hydrates. |  |
| per man per day. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Per ct. | l'er ct. | Per ct. | Perct. |  |
| Beef, veal, and mutton | 174 | 32 | 31 |  |  | 12.8 | 33.1 | 19.7 |  | 26.5 |
| Pork, lard, etc. | 47 | 3 | 35 |  |  | 3.5 | 2.6 | 22.6 |  | 2.6 |
| Fish, etc. | 5 | 1 |  |  |  | . 4 | . 7 | . 3 |  | . 8 |
| Eggs | 47 | 7 | 5 |  |  | 3.5 | 7.2 | 3.3 |  | 7.4 |
| Butter | 60 |  | 53 |  |  | 4.4 |  | 34.4 |  | 16.9 |
| Cheese | 3 | 1 | $\pm$ |  |  | . 2 | . 7 | . 6 |  | . 4 |
| Milk. | 245 | 7 | 9 | 11 |  | 18.1 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 2.9 | 9.4 |
| Cream | 81 | 2 | 15 | 4 |  | 5.9 | 2.1 | 9.6 | . 9 | 9.9 |
| Total animal food. | 6062 | 53 | 149 | 15 | 16.5 | 48.8 | 53.9 | 96.4 | 3.8 | 73.9 |
| Cereals. | 293 | 36 | 5 | 217 |  | 21.6 | 36. 3 | 2.9 | 54.8 | 8.5 |
| Sugars and starches. | 117 |  |  | 110 |  | 8. 6 | . 4 |  | 27.7 | 5.2 |
| Vegetables | 263 | 9 | 1 | 50 |  | 19.4 | 9.2 | . 6 | 12.7 | 8.8 |
| Fruits. | 21 |  |  | 4 |  | 1.6 | . 2 | . 1 | 1.0 | 3.6 |
| Total vegetable food | 694 | 45 | 6 | 381 | 5.8 | 51.2 | 46.1 | 3.6 | 96.2 | 26.1 |
| Total food | 1, 356 | 98 | 155 | 396 | 22.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 6. -Nutrients and potential energ! in food purchascd, rejected, aud caten per man per day in dietury study No. 43.

${ }^{1}$ Estimated.
Discussion of results.-The amount of nutrients per man per day actually consumed by this family agree very closely with averages of the food consumptiou of professional and business men as found in other dietary studies in the United States. The average of nine dietary studies of families of professional men in Connecticut ${ }^{1}$ shows rather more protein ( 107 grams ) and about the same fuel value ( 3,430 calories). The dietary of a teacher's family in Indiana ${ }^{2}$ showed a daily consumption of 106 grams protein and a fuel value of 2,780 calories, while two dietaries of professional men in Chicago ${ }^{3}$ showed 104 grams of protein and 2,805 calories of energy. The tentative standard above quoted for a man with light muscular labor calls for 112 grams of protein and a fuel value of about 3,000 calories.

The income of this family was such that economy of diet was not a necessity. Nevertheless in some ways they lived quite economically. This was shown more particularly in their selection and purchase of vegetable food.

Meat was eaten in quite large quantities. Indeed, one-third of the total protein was furnished by beef, veal, and mutton. Of these meats 87 pounds were purchased at a cost of $\$ 13.50$, or at an average of $15 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. As a rule the better cuts of meat were purchased, but not the highest-priced cuts. Contrasted with this family may be cited the family in dietary No. $1 \geqslant 9$ (see p. 22), who expended but $\$ 1.92$ for 30.6 pounds of beef, or an average of $6 \frac{1}{3}$ cents a pound.

A large variety of vegetable and cereal food products was used. The cereals naturally furnished the largest return of nutrients for a given expenditure. Wheat flour, buckwheat flour, corn meal, and rolled oats were the most important articles amoug the cereals, and these four materials furnished collectively as much protein as was contained in the beef, veal, and mutton eaten, and at the same time yielded two and one-third times the energy furnished by these meats.

[^2]In other woras, 87 pounds or meat cost $\$ 13.50$ and furnished 7,332 grams of protein with 94,400 calories, while $130 \frac{1}{2}$ pounds of cereals cost but $\$ 3.37$ and furnished 7,377 grams of protein and 223,000 calories.

This family baked their own bread, thereby effecting a considerable saving from a financial standpoint. One hundred and four and threequarters pounds of bread was made from 64 pounds of fiour. The cost of the flour was $\$ 1.54$ ( 2.4 cents a pound). In bakery experiments carried on in New Jersey ${ }^{1}$ it was found that the shortening, yeast, and other ingredients used in making bread cost on an average 30 cents per dollar's worth of flour. In the study of the cost of bread in Pittsburg (see p.43) the cost of the ingredients other than flour was 20 cents per dollar's worth of flour. Forty-five cents would probably be ample allowance for the cost of the shortening and yeast used in this study. In New York City there are public ovens where bread is baked for 1 cent a loaf. The actual cost of fuel would probably not be more than half this amount. The average weight of a loaf may be taken as not far from $1^{3}$ pounds. Fifty cents for the cost of fuel needed to bake 64 pounds of bread is probably a liberal allowance. The total cost of the $104 \frac{3}{4}$ pounds of bread would thus be about $\$ 2.60$, or $2 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. This family paid 4.9 cents a pound for the small amount of baker's bread used. In dietary No. 129 stale bread was purchased for $2 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a pornd, which was probably as cheap as homemade bread.

Considerable quantities of dried beans were used by this family. The legumes give not only a pleasing variety to the diet, but they are very important, and, in the case of the dried seeds, an economical source of protein.

There are certain vegetable food materials which may be considered as staple articles in all households, whether of the poor or the well-todo. Such are the cereal products-sugar, potatoes, and perhaps beans and peas. Besides these staple articles, a greater or less variety of other food materials is found, according to the habits of living and the circumstances of the family. Green vegetables, such as corn, cabbage, tomatoes, cucumbers, lettuce, etc.; and the fruits, apples, bananas, oranges, and the like, give relish and variety to the food, but do not add especially to the amount of nutrients. ${ }^{2}$ For example, a pound of flour will furnish 0.11 pound of protein and 1,650 calories of energy, a pound of dried beans furnishes 0.22 pound of protein and 1,590 calories, while a pound of cabbage furnishes 0.02 pound of protein and

[^3]about 150 calories of energy, and a pound of oranges furnishes 0.01 pound of protein and 160 calories of energy.

In Table 7 are given the proportions of digestible nutrients and fuel values in 15 of the more important food materials used by this family. The actual cost per pound of these foods is also shown. It is probable that the nearest whole number represents, as a rule, the price charged:

Table 7.- Cost per ponnd and amounts and fuel ralue of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary stndy No. 43.

| Kind of food ma. terial. | Actual <br> cost <br> per pound. | Nutrients and energy in 1 pound. |  |  |  | Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pro- <br> tein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fnel value. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fuel value. |
| Beet: | Cents. | Pound. | Pound. | Pound. | Calories. | Pound. | Pound. | Pounds. | Calories. |
| Rilus | 15.0 | 0.120 | 0.255 |  | 1,300 | 0.08 | 0.17 |  | 865 |
| Round . . . . . . | 15.0 | . 196 | . 047 |  | 565 | . 13 | . 03 |  | 375 |
| Shoulder clod. | 11.5 | . 184 | . 109 |  | 800 | . 16 | . 10 |  | 700 |
| Teal, chops........ | 18.0 | . 159 | . 084 |  | 650 | . 09 | . 05 |  | $36^{\circ}$ |
| Lamb, roast | 15.0 | . 164 | . 261 |  | 1,405 | . 11 | . 17 |  | 935 |
| Eges. | 13.3 | . 122 | . 086 |  | 590 | . 09 | . 06 |  | 445 |
| Butter | 28.0 |  | . 868 |  | 3,665 |  | . 31 |  | 1,310 |
| Milk.. | 3.9 | . 029 | . 036 | 0. 046 | 290 | . 07 | . 09 | 0.12 | 750 |
| Wheat flour | 2.4 | . 122 | . 012 | . 729 | 1,635 | . 51 | . 05 | 3.04 | 6,805 |
| Rollerl oats | 6.2 | . 144 | .070 | . 702 | 1,870 | . 23 | . 11 | 1.13 | 3. 015 |
| Bread, baker's..... | 4.9 | . 081 | . 011 | . 517 | 1,160 | . 16 | . 02 | 1.06 | 2. 365 |
| Sugar, granulated. | 5.0 |  |  | . 966 | 1,795 |  |  | 1.93 | 3,595 |
| Beans, dried ....... | 4.2 | . 161 | . 016 | . 593 | 1,470 | . 38 | . 04 | 1.41 | 3. 500 |
| Potatoes | 1.5 | . 013 |  | . 120 | 245 | . 09 |  | . 80 | 1,64. |
| Oranges | 10.0 | . 008 |  | . 043 | 80 |  |  | . 01 | $8)$ |

The digestible nutrients stated in the above table were calculated from the total nutrients by use of the following factors:

Calculated coefficients of digestibility of nutrients in different classes of foods.

|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Animal foorls. | Per cent. 98 | Per cent. 97 | Per cent. 100 |
| Cereals and starches | 85 | 90 | 98 |
| Sugars .......... |  |  | 100 95 |
| Vegetables and fruits | 80 | 90 | 95 |

These factors are based upon the results of recent digestion experiments with men having a mixed diet, and while they are not to be taken as an exact measure of the digestibility of different food materials, it is probable that they represent with a fair amount of accuracy the relative digestibility of different classes of foods.

It will be seen from Table 7 that flour and dried beans were the cheapest sources of protein and that butter and sugar furnished practically no protein. Butter and sugar, however, are valuable sources of energy. Oranges contain little protein and are low in fuel value, but are undoubtedly valuable for the sake of variety and perhaps for some tonic effect which they may exert. Wheat flour is not only the cheapest
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source of protein but also of energy. The meats, at the prices paid, were comparatively costly.

The above comparison shows the value of a number of foods on the basis of their composition aud fuel value. The individual preference and the income of a family must govern the amount in which many of the food materials furnishing little actual nutritive material should be used. It is not the purpose of this and similar investigations to limit choice in this matter, but rather to furnish data for comparison, leaving deductions to be drawn by those interested. The pleasure dericed from a varied dietary may more than offset the difference in cost, within limits, if absolute economy need not be practiced.

DIETARY STEDY OF A MILL WORKMAN'S FAMILY (No. 128).
This study was made with a Polish family living in the Polish section of the city, and dependent upon the iron mills for their support. The study was carried on in the winter of 1896 .

The family consisted of the father, 57 , and the mother, 47 years of age; four sons, aged 19, 13, 10, and 8 years, respectively; and two daughters of 16 and 6 years. The children were all born in this country.

The father was not a skilled workman, and had been out of employment for some time, but just previous to the beginning of the study had secured work at $\$ 1.25$ per day. The oldest son had also been idle until a short time before, when he had found work at like wages. The older of the two girls was employed in a cigar factory and earned about $\$ 7.50$ per week. The mother did all the housework and all the seming for the family.

This family of eight persons occupied two front rooms on the second floor of a tenement house, paying $\$ 5$ a month rent. Although their surroundings were dirty the rooms were kept clean and neat.

There was at the time of the study an old grocery bill for \$25, which was being gradually reduced.

[^4]
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In the following tables are recorded the kind and amount of the different foods purchased, wasted, and eaten, together with their composition and cost :

Table 8. -Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 128.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight nsed. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy drates. |  | Total food material. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| ANIMAL FOOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stew meat, mostly nerk. no bone ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Perct } \\ 20.9 \end{array}$ | Per ct. $8.7$ | Perct. | \$1.00 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grams. } \\ 7,810 \end{array}$ | Grams. $1,6: 32$ | $\underset{680}{G r a m s .}$ | Grams. |
| Ronnd, no bone ' . . . . . . . . . | 20.9 | 12.7 |  | 1.6.5 | 8,305 | 1. $7: 6$ | 1, 0.5 $\frac{1}{4}$ |  |
| Bologna sausage | 18.0 | 19.7 |  | . 30 | 1,445 | $\because 60$ | 285 |  |
| Suet............ | 4.8 | 79.9 |  |  | 140 | 7 | 112 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 2.95 | 17, 700 | 3.635 | 2, 131 |  |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steak | 11.7 | 36.0 |  | . 53 | 2, 480 | 290 | - $8: 13$ |  |
| Yigs' feet. no bone | 16.1 | 14.8 |  | . 20 | 3, 035 | 489 | 449 |  |
| Ham. smoked, no bone | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | . 45 | 1.4.0 | 217 | 547 |  |
| Ham, boiled, no bone...... | 18. 2 | 37.0 |  | 1. 65 | 3, 970 | 723 | 1. 469 |  |
| Bacon............ | 9.2 | 61.8 |  | . 46 | 1. 960 | 180 | 1,211 |  |
| Hearl-cheese | 18.6 | 24.0 |  | .15 | 810 | 151 | 194 |  |
| Lard. |  | 100.0 |  | . 90 | 3,440 |  | 3,440 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 4.34 | 17,095 | 2, 050 | 8, 203 | ........... |
| Fish: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salmon, cammed............ | 20.7 | 10.8 | 1.2 | . 30 | 1, 850 | 177 | 231 92 |  |
| Total |  |  | .-... | . 50 | 2.315 | 708 | 323 |  |
| Eggs, withont shell | 14.9 | 10.6 | .......-.. | . 99 | 2, 735 | 407 | 290 |  |
| Butter ${ }^{1}$-.......... | 1. 0 | 86.9 |  | 3. 08 | 5, 480 | 55 | 4,762 |  |
| Chreese, whole milk | 26. 0 | 34.2 | 2.3 | . 16 | 470 | 122 | 161 | 11 |
| Cheese. Limburger | 23. 0 | 29.4 | . 4 | . 12 | 270 | 62 | 80 | 1 |
| Milk '............ | 3.2 | 2.6 | 5. 8 | 1.20 | 19,305 | 618 | 502 | 1,119 |
| Total animal food. |  |  |  | 13.34 | 65, 370 | 7,657 | 16.452 | 1,131 |
| VEgETABLE FOOD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cereals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barley | 9.3 | 1. 0 | 77.6 | . 03 | 25.5 | 24 | 2 | 198 |
| Flour. | 11.3 | 1.1 | 74. 6 | . 20 | 2,555 | 289 | 28 | 1,906 |
| Oatmeal | 15.6 | 7.3 | 68.0 | . 05 | 455 | 71 | 33 | 310 |
| Rice | 7.8 | . 4 | 79.0 | . 05 | 455 | 36 | 2 | 359 |
| Bread | 9.2 | . 5 | 54.3 | 3. 30 | 44,395 | 4, 084 | 222 | 24, 107 |
| Cake | 7. 0 | 8.1 | 63.4 | . 49 | 2, 565 | 180 | 208 | 1, 626 |
| Pie | 4.7 | 9.5 | 39.5 | . 45 | 2.585 | 121 | 246 | 1,021 |
| Total |  |  |  | 4.57 | 53,265 | 4,805 | 741 | 29,527 |
| Sugars: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Singar, coffee ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 95.4 | 1. 07 | 8, 210 |  |  | 7,833 |
| Molasses .... | 2.7 |  | 68.0 | . 15 | 1,755 | 48 |  | 1, 193 |
| Total |  |  |  | 1.22 | 9,965 | 48 |  | 9,026 |
| Vegetables: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beans.. | 22. 3 | 1.8 | 59.1 | . 30 | 2, 350 | 524 | 42 | 1,389 |
| Catsup........................ | 1.5 | . 2 | 12.3 | . 10 | 215 | 3 |  | 26 |
| Peas ......................... | 24.1 | 1.1 | 61.5 | . 01 | 115 | 28 | 1 | 71 |
| Onions...-................... | 1.5 | . 4 | 8.9 | . 04 | 1. 205 | 18 | 5 | 107 |
| Potatoes ( 23.4 per cent refuse) | 2.1 | . 1 | 18.0 | 1.55 | 48,335 | 1. 015 | 48 | 8,700 |
| Tomatoes, canned.......... | 1.2 | . 2 | 4.0 | . 20 | 1,620 | 19 | 3 | 65 |
| Total |  | ........ | -.-.-. - . | 2.20 | 53, 840 | 1.607 | 99 | 10.358 |

[^5]Table 8.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 12s-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { cost. } \end{aligned}$ | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |  | Total food ma terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| VEGETABLE FOOD-continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fruit, etc.: Apples | Per ct. 1.4 | Ferct. 3.0 | Per ct. 57.6 |  | Grams. 1, 020 | Grams. | Grams. 31 | Grame. |
| Jam.... | 1.1 |  | - 77.1 | \$C.05 | 1, 570 | 14 6 |  | 587 410 |
| Prunes | 2.0 | . 7 | 58.6 | .10 | 400 | 8 | 3 | 234 |
| Total | ......... | ........ | ......... | . 34 | 1,990 | 28 | 34 | 1,261 |
| Total regetable food. | ........ | ......... | ......... | 8.33 | 119, 060 | 6, 488 | 874 | 50,172 |
| Total food | ...... | ......... | ........... | 21.67 | 184, 430 | 14,145 | 17,326 | 51,303 |
| Accessories : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coffee... <br> Tea |  |  |  | . 51 | 1, 080 |  |  |  |
| Salt. |  |  |  | . 04 | 740 |  |  |  |
| Yeast. |  |  |  | . 02 | 15 |  |  |  |
| Pepper |  |  |  | . 05 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Mnstard |  |  |  | . 10 | 280 |  |  |  |
| Tinegar |  |  |  | . 08 | 855 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  | ........... | 1.22 | -........ | ...... |  |  |
| Total cost of food and accessories. |  |  |  | 22.89 |  |  |  |  |
| Waste: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vegetable(breadcrumbs) | $\begin{array}{r} 13.5 \\ 7.4 \end{array}$ | 47.3 3.8 | 40.0 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 945 \\ 1,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128 \\ & 133 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 447 \\ 69 \end{array}$ | 720 |
| Total maste. |  |  |  | ...... | 2. 745 | 261 | 516 | 720 |

' Analyzed in connection with this dietars.
Table 9.- Treights and percentages of food materials and nutritice ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 128.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food material. | Pro- tein. | Fat. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carbo- } \\ & \text { hy.- } \\ & \text { drates. } \end{aligned}$ |  | Food material. | Pro- tein. | Fat. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carbo- } \\ & \text { hy:- } \\ & \text { drates. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| PER MAN PER DAy. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Per ct. | Perct. | Per ct. | Per ct. | Perct. |
| Beef, real, andmutton | 106 | 22 | 13 |  |  | 9.6 | 25.7 | 12.3 |  | 13.6 |
| Pork, lard, etc....... | 102 | 12 | 49 |  |  | 9.2 | 14.5 | 47.3 |  | 20.0 |
| Fish, etc....... | 14 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 1.2 | 5.0 | 1. 9 |  | 2.3 |
| Eggs... | 16 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1.5 | 2.9 | 1.7 |  | 4.6 |
| Butter | 33 |  | 29 |  |  | 3. 0 | . 4 | 27.5 |  | 14.2 |
| Cheese | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  | . 4 | 1.3 | 1.4 |  | 1.3 |
| Milk | 116 | 4 | 3 | 7 |  | 10.5 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 5.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total animal } \\ & \text { food............. } \end{aligned}$ | 391 | 46 | 99 | 7 | 8.0 | 35.4 | 54.1 | 95.0 | 2.2 | 61.5 |
| Cereals. | 319 | 29 | 4 | 177 |  | 28.9 | $3+.0$ | 4.3 | 57.6 | 21.1 |
| Sugars and starches.. | 60 |  |  | 54 | .... | 5.4 | . 3 |  | 17.6 | 5.6 |
| Tegetables Fruits. | $\stackrel{322}{12}$ | 10 | 1 | 62 |  | $29.2$ | 11.4 | . 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 20.2 \\ & 2.4 \end{aligned}$ | 10.2 1.6 |
| Total regetable food. | 713 | 39 | 5 | 300 | 5.0 | 64.6 | 45.9 | 5.0 | 97.8 | 38.5 |
| Total food. | 1,10t | 85 | 104 | 307 | 13.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 10.-Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 1:S.


Discussion of results.-As regards surroundings and income the family studied in this dietary may be taken as fairly representative of a large class of very poor foreign laborers in Pittsburg. The family was undernourished. Even as compared with the amounts of nutrients ordinarily required by persons of sedentary habits their diet was scant. To bring it up to the tentative standard for a man with muscular work would have required 50 per cent more protein and 40 per cent more energy; to bring it up to the tentative standard for a man without muscular work would have required 20 per cent more protein and the same proportional increase of energy.

A considerable amount of thrift was shown, but more skill in marketing rould have obtained more nutrients for the same outlay of money. Round steak was purchased in considerable guantities at the low price of 9 cents a pound. The meat thus obtained had very little waste and contained a large proportion of protein. Beef for boiling was purchased for 5 cents a pound, and was doubtless just as mutritious as sirloin steak at 18 or 20 cents a pound. Beef stew meat and berf round, pigs' feet, smokel herring, herring, bread, beans, and potatoes were all very economical foods. These eight materials furnished $i 3$ per cent of the protein and 50 per cent of the fuel value. The cost was 39 per cent of the whole, not including the accessories. Boiled ham, canned salmon, eggs, butter, cheese, milk, parsley, and jami were more or less expensive. These eight materials furnished 18 per cent of the protein and 23 per cent of the fuel value. The cost was 32 per cent of the whole. Fish is a valuable source of protein, but as it contains but little fat its fuel value is small. The camed salmon used by this family was not economical, the smoked herring was rery
economical. The herring is one of the fer oily fishes, and consequently its fuel value is greater than that of most fish. It also contains a large amount of protein.

The food which furnished the least nutriment in proportion to its cost was the boiled ham. Although under ordinary circumstances its use would be justifiable, the means of this family were so limited that it was a more costly food than they could afford. This ham was carried in the dinner pail for luuch, and was purchased daily at a cost of 19 ceuts per pound. Butter, also, formed a heary item of expense, oneseventh of the total cost of the food being for this one article. Twentyfive and a half cents a pound may not be high for creamery butter such as this family purchased, but they would have obtained much more actual food if they had spent but half as much for butter and bought more flour, bread, beans, or potatoes. Of course, some butter is desirable not only for the fat it contains, but also for the relish it gives the food and for the sake of variety in food materials. The point to be emphasized is, that in cases where the income is so small that bare subsistence is a difficult problem, some more economical food material might be substituted for a portion of the butter.

The cost per pound, the digestible nutrients as calculated by the factors given on p. 17, and the fuel value of the different food materials are shown in the following table:

Table 11.-Cost per pound and amounts and fuel value of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary study No. 128.

| Kind of food material. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Actual } \\ \text { cost } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { pound. } \end{gathered}$ | Nutrients and energy in 1 pound. |  |  |  | Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohydrates. | Fuel value. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fuel value. |
| Beef: | Cents. | Pound. | Pound. | Pound. | Calories. | Pound. | Pounds. | Pound. | Cal 1 ries. |
| Stew meat Round |  | 0.176 .202 | 0.073 .121 |  |  | $0.15$ |  | $0.35$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,270 \\ 995 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Bologna sau- } \\ \text { sage........... } \end{gathered}$ | 9.4 | .87 .176 | . 191 |  | 1,130 | . 20 |  | .23 .19 | 1,205 |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ham, boiled... | 18.8 | . 178 | . 359 |  | 1. 845 | . 19 |  | . 09 | 98. |
| Head-cheese.. | 8.5 | . 183 | . 233 |  | 1, 325 | . 27 |  | . 21 | 1,555 |
| Fish, herring, smoked $\qquad$ | 5.9 | 339 | . 145 |  | 1. 245 | . 25 |  | . 57 | 2, 105 |
| Egas................ | 14.2 | . 126 | . 089 |  | 1. 610 | . 06 |  | . 09 | -1:30 |
| Butter | 25.5 | . 010 | . 843 |  | 3.575 | . 33 |  |  | 1,400 |
| Milk | 2.8 | . 031 | . 025 | 0.058 | 270 | . 09 | 0. 21 | . 11 | 970 |
| Flour | 3. 6 | . 096 | . 010 | . 730 | 1. 580 | . 03 | 2. 03 | . 27 | 4, 385 |
| Oatmeal | 5. 0 | . 133 | . 064 | . 669 | 1, 760 | . 13 | 1.33 | . 27 | 3, 520 |
| Bread. | 3.4 | . 078 |  | . 532 | 1,135 |  | 1.56 | . 23 | 3,340 |
| Sugar, coftee | 5. 9 |  |  | . 954 | 1, 775 |  | 1.61 |  | 3, 010 |
| Beans.. | 5.8 | . 178 | . 016 | . 561 | 1,442 | . 03 | . 97 | . 31 | 2, 495 |
| Potatues | 1.1 | . 013 |  | . 130 | 265 |  | 1.18 | . 12 | 2, 420 |

DIETARY STUDY OF I MILL WORKMAN゙S FAMILY (No. 129).
This dietary study was made with an English family in very poar circumstances. The family consisted of the father and mother, a married daughter and her husband, three younger daughters, one son, and an infant. The father; 43 years of age, was a thin, delicate man, with
an apparent tendency toward consmption. Severe colds frequently prevented him from working, and during the study he lost eight days ou this accomnt. He was a blacksmith by trade; his usual wages were \$1.25 per day. The mother and the married danghter. 18 years old, were strong and healthy, as was also the son-in-law. The latter was 27 years old and earned $\$ 1.25$ per day in an iron mill. The dangliters, aged 13 and 7 years, respectively, and the 10 -year-old boy were all weak and sickly. The two youngest children, a girl 4 years old, and an infant aged $i$ months, were strong and robust.
The family paid $\$ 6$ a month in advance for rent of three rooms.
The study began January 24, 1896, and continued 29 days.
The number of meals taken was as follows: Meals.
Two men .......................................................................... . . . 173
Two women ( 173 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equivalent to $\ldots . .$.

Child, 7 years old ( 87 meals $\times 0.5$ meal of man), equivalent to..... 44
Child, 4 years old ( 87 meals $\times 0.4$ meal of man), equivalent to..... 35
Infant, 7 months old.......................................................... . . 26
Total number of meals taken, equivalent to .................... 521
Equivalent to 1 man 174 days.
The amount and composition of the food purchased, wasted; and eaten, together with its cost, are shown in the following table:

Table 12.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 129.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Wreight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |  | Total food ma. terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carboliy. drates. |
| ANIMAL FCOD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef: <br> Chuck | Per ct. 15.7 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 10.2 \end{array}$ | Peret. | \$0.40 | Grams. 3, 160 | Grams. 496 | Grams. 322 | Grams. |
| Round, no bone | 21.0 | 16.0 |  | $\$ 0.40$ .75 | 3,820 | 496 802 | 611 |  |
| Rump ${ }^{1}$... | 22.4 | 33.3 |  | . 28 | 2, 300 | 515 | 766 |  |
| Fore shank | 12.3 | 7.3 |  | . 20 | 1,763 | 217 | 129 |  |
| Lirer ${ }^{1}$. | 18.8 | 3.9 | 1.0 | . 15 | 1,800 | 339 | 70 | 18 |
| Leberwurst ${ }^{2}$ | 12.2 | 20.2 | 15.4 | . 14 | 1,035 | 126 | 209 | 160 |
| Total | ..... |  |  | 1.92 | 13,880 | 2,495 | 2,107 | 178 |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loin, no bone '... | 15.8 | 42.3 |  | 1.95 | 9, 235 | 1,459 | 3,906 |  |
| Ham. smokerl, no bone | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | 1.15 | 5,670 | 879 | 2,217 |  |
| Ham, boiled. | 18.2 | 37.0 |  | . 10 | 325 | 59 | 120 |  |
| Bacon. | 9.2 | 61.8 |  | . 05 | 215 | 20 | 13:3 |  |
| Pigs' feet | 10.0 | 9.3 |  | . 15 | 1,715 | 172 | 159 |  |
| Kiduey ${ }^{1}$ | 17. 2 | 5.5 |  | . 11 | 1, 200 | 206 | 66 |  |
| Sausage .......... | 12.8 | 45.4 | . 8 | . 05 | , 340 | 44 | 154 | 3 |
| Lard, unrendered | 1.1 | 94.0 |  | . 26 | 1,5\%0 | 17 | 1,438 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.82 | 20, 230 | 2,859 | 8, 193 | 3 |
| Orsters. | 6.1 | 1.4 | 3.3 | . 10 | $5 \because 5$ | 32 | 8 | 17 |
| Butterine | . 5 | 86.1 |  | 1. 45 | 3. 910 | 20 | 3, 3ti6 |  |
| Cheese. | 26.0 | 342 | 2.3 | . 50 | 1.860 | 483 | 636 | 43 |
| Milk ${ }^{1}$ | 2.9 | 3.0 | 5.3 | . 80 | 14,745 | 428 | $44^{2}$ | 781 |
| Total animal food. |  | ....... |  | 8.59 | 55,150 | 6, 314 | 14,752 | 1,022 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Analyzed in counection with this dietary. ${ }^{2}$ From foreigu aualyses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 129-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. |  | Total food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. |
| VEGETABLE FOOD. |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Cereals: | Perct. | Perct. | Per ct. |  | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. |
| Flour | 11.3 | 1.1 | 74.6 | \$0.44 | 9. 810 | 1,108 | 108 | 7,318 |
| Rolled oats | 16.9 | 7.2 | 66.8 | . 02 | 235 | 48 | 21 | 190 |
| Bread ${ }^{1}$ | 9.7 | . 7 | 52.6 | 2.45 | 46.755 | 4, 535 | 327 | 24,593 |
| Cake. | 7.0 | 8.1 | 63.4 | . 20 | 2. 660 | 186 | 215 | 1,6.7 |
| Pie | 4.7 | 9.5 | 39.5 | . 38 | 3,720 | 175 | 353 | 1,469 |
| Rolls | 9.6 | 5.2 | 57.3 | . 20 | 2, 660 | 256 | 138 | 1, 524 |
| Sugar.. |  |  | 100.0 | 1.30 | 10,455 |  |  | 10,455 |
| Total |  |  |  | 4. 99 | 76,345 | 6. 308 | 1,162 | 47,236 |
| Vegetables: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beans .. | 22.3 | 1.8 | 59.1 | . 06 | 580 | 129 | 11 | 343 |
| Jieans, Lima............... | 15. 9 | 1.8 | 67.1 | . 15 | 1,330 | 212 | 24 | 892 |
| Cabbage (16 per cent ref- | 2.1 | . 4 | 5.8 | . 15 | 4.590 | 97 | 18 | 266 |
| Carrots ( 21.8 per cent ref- use) | 1.1 | . 4 | 9.2 | . 05 | 670 | 7 | 3 | 62 |
|  | 1.4 | . 1 | 3.0 | . 05 | 200 | 3 |  | 6 |
| Onious................ | 1.5 | . 4 | 8.9 | . 12 | 3,445 | 52 | 14 | 306 |
| Parsnips ( 25 per cent ref- use) | 1.7 | . 6 | 16.1 | . 05 | 655 | 11 | 4 | 105 |
| Potatoes ( 34.6 ner cent ref- <br> use) | 2.1 | . 1 | 18.0 | . 66 | 21, $215^{\circ}$ | 446 |  | 3,818 |
| Water cress ${ }^{2}$ | 3.8 | . 9 | 8.9 | . 05 | 115 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| Ruta-bagas ( 23 per cent refuse). | 1.3 | . 2 | 8.5 | . 05 | 2,180 | 28 | 5 | 185 |
| - Total |  |  |  | 1.39 | 34,980 | 990 | 101 | 5. 993 |
| Fruit, etc.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apples | 1.4 | . 4 | 12.4 77.1 | . 10 | 1,715 365 | 4 | 7 | 212 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | ..... | ....... | .. | . 15 | 2, 080 | 11 | 7 | 493 |
| Total regetable food. | ........ | ........ | ......... | 6.53 | 113,405 | 7,309 | 1,270 | 53, 722 |
| Total food |  |  |  | 15.12 | 168, 555 | 13,623 | 16,022 | 54.744 |
| Accessories: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tea...... <br> Coffee |  |  |  | .71 .15 | 865 270 |  |  |  |
| Salt... |  |  |  | . 08 | 1,540 |  |  |  |
| Mustard. |  |  |  | . 18 | 440 |  |  |  |
| Teast. |  |  |  | . 02 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 1.14 | 3, 14n |  |  |  |
| Total cost of food and accessories. |  |  |  | 16. 26 |  |  |  |  |
| Waste: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal ${ }^{1}$....... | 6.9 | 41.3 |  |  | 565 | 39 | 233 |  |
| Vegetable (bread crumbs) ${ }^{1}$ | 6.4 | 4.2 | 31.3 | ........ | 715 | 46 | 30 | 224 |
| Total waste |  |  |  | ........ | 1,280 | 85 | 263 | 224 |

[^6]Table 13.-Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritire ingridients per man per day in dietary study No. 132.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total fool. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food mate. rial. | Pro. tein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. |  | Food mate. rial. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Carbo- } \\ & \text { hy:- } \\ & \text { drates. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| per man per day. | Grame. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Perct. | Jeret. | Perct. | leret. | l'erct. |
| Beef. real, and mutton. | 80 | 14 | 12 | 1 |  | 8.2 | 18.3 | 13.2 | 0.3 | 12.7 |
| Pork, lard, etc ......... | 116 | 16 | 47 |  |  | 12.0 | 21.0 | 51.1 |  | 25.3 |
| Fish, etc...... | 3 |  |  |  |  | . 3 | . 2 |  | . 1 | . 6 |
| Butter. | 22 |  | 20 |  |  | 2.3 | 1 | 21.0 |  | 9.6 |
| Cheese | 11 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 1.1 | 3. 6 | 4.0 | . 1 | 3.3 |
| Milk. | 85 | 3 | , | 5 |  | 8.8 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5.3 |
| Total animal food.......... | 317 | 36 | 85 | 6 | 4.9 | 32.7 | 46.3 | 92.1 | 1.9 | 56.8 |
| Cereals. | 379 | 36 | 7 | 212 |  | 39. 1 | 46. 3 | 7.3 | 67. ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 24.4 |
| Sugars and starches | 60 |  |  | 60 |  | 6. 2 |  |  | 19.1 | 8.6 |
| Yegetables... | 201 | 6 |  | 34 |  | 20.8 | 7.3 | . 6 | 10.9 | 9.2 |
| Fruits.. | 12 |  |  | 3 |  | 1.2 | . 1 |  | . 9 | 1.0 |
| Total regetable food $\qquad$ | 652 | 42 | 7 | 309 | 3.8 | 67.3 | 53.7 | 7.9 | 98.1 | 43.2 |
| Total food. | 969 | 78 | 92 | 315 | 8.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 14.-Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and caten per man per day in dietary study No. 129.

| Kind of food. | Weights and fnel value. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo-hrdrates. | Fuel value. |  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo. hy. drates. | Fnel value. | Cost. |
| per man per day. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food purchased: Animal | Grams. | Grams. 85 | $\underset{6}{\text { Grams. }}$ | Calories. 965 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cents. } \\ 4.9 \end{gathered}$ | Perct. | Perct. 92.1 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 1.9 \end{array}$ | Perct. | Perct. |
| Vegetable .... | 42 | 7 | 309 | 1,505 | 3.8 | 53.7 | 7.9 | 98.1 | 61.0 | 43.2 |
| Total | 78 | 92 | 315 | 2,470 | 8.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Beverages, condi men's, etc......... |  |  |  |  | . 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waste: <br> Animal |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vegetable | 1 |  | 1 | 10 |  | 3 | 1.5 .1 | . 5 | 3 |  |
| Total | 1 | 2 | 1 | 30 | ....... | . 6 | 1.6 | . 5 | . 9 | ...... |
| Food actually eaten : Animal | 36 | 83 |  | 945 |  | 46.0 | 90.6 | 1.9 | 38.4 |  |
| Vegetable...... | 41 | 7 | 308 | 1,495 |  | 53.4 | 7.8 | 97.6 | 63.7 |  |
| Total | 77 | 90 | 314 | 2, 440 | $\ldots$ | 99.4 | 93.4 | 99.5 | 99.] | ...... |

Discussion of results.-This family had the smallest income of any reported, and, as shown by the results of the investigation, were the most poorly nomished. In many ways they were economical, and obtained more for the same amount of money than has often been found to be the case with families in similar circumstances. When they could get together enough money to buy a sack of flour they baked their own bread; otherwise they bought baker's stale bread in small quantities. Instead of butter they used butterine, at 16.8 cents a pound, or lard.

Little can be said with reference to improvement of this dietary. The cost per man per day ( 0 cents) is exceedingly low.

The cost per pound, and the amounts and the fuel value of digestible nutrients of 1 pound and 10 cents' worth of fifteen of the more important food materials used are shown in the following table:

Table 15.-Cost per ponnd and amounts and fuel ralue of the digestible mutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary study -10. 129.

| Kind of food ma-terial. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Actual } \\ \text { cost } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { pound. } \end{gathered}$ | Nutrients and energy in 1 pound. |  |  |  | Nutrients and energ $\delta$ in 10 cents ${ }^{*}$ worth. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fuel } \\ & \text { ralue. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy drates. | Fuel value. |
| Beef: | Cents. | Pound. | Pound. | Pounds. | Calories. | Pound. | Pound. | Pounds. | Calories. |
| Chack | 5.7 8.7 | $0.15 \pm$ | 0.099 |  | ${ }^{705}$ | 0. ${ }^{27}$ |  |  | 1,235 |
| Rump. | ${ }_{5.5}$ | -220 | . 323 |  | 1,770 | . ${ }^{.23} 9$ | . .17 |  | 3, ${ }_{3}^{1,160}$ |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loin .......... | ${ }_{8.8}^{8.7}$ | . 141 | . 373 |  | 1,835 | . 17 | . 43 |  | 2, 110 |
| Butterine ........ | 16.8 | . 006 | . 835 |  | 3,535 |  | . 50 |  | ${ }_{2}$ |
| Cheese | 12.2 | .25.5 | . 332 | 0.023 | 1,920 | 21 | . 27 | 0.02 | 1,575 |
| Milk | 2.5 | . 028 | . 029 | . 053 | 275 | . 11 | . 12 | . 21 | 1,090 |
| Flour | 2.0 | . 096 | . 010 | . 731 | 1,580 | . 48 | . 05 | 3. 66 | 7, ¢05 |
| Bread | 2.5 | . 082 | . 006 | 516 | 1,140 | . 33 | . 12 | 2. 06 | 4,550 |
| Pastry | 4.0 | . 051 | . 064 | -459 | 1, 220 | . 13 | . 16 | 1.15 | 3, 045 |
| Sugar. | 5.6 |  |  | 1.060 | 1,860 |  |  | 1.78 | 3.320 |
| Beans | 5.0 | . 142 | . 016 | . 613 | 1,480 | 28 | 03 | 1.23 | 2,960 |
| Cabbage | 1.2 | . 014 |  | . 047 | 115 | 12 |  | 39 | 940 |
| Potatic ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . 9 | . 011 |  | . 112 | 230 | . 12 |  | 1.24 | 2, 535 |

As will be seen by reference to the above table, the family used goorl judgment in their selection and purchase of food, and the smallness of the diet could be remedied with difficulty, unless, as mas pointed out for similar cases in the report of dietary studies in New York City, ${ }^{1}$ the amount of regetable foods, such as flour, meal, beans, peas, and potatoes purchased, should be increased and the amount of auimal foods correspondingly diminished. At the prevailing market prices, generally speaking, certain of the regetable foods furnish a cheaper source of nutrients than do the animal foods, and in such an instance as this, where, in spite of the most judicious marketing, there was insufficient nourishment, some of the auimal foods could have been advantageously replaced by vegetable foods.

In addition to other food materials, this family consumed 8.4 pounds round steak, 22.4 pounds pork loin, 0.7 pound boiled ham, 0.5 pound bacon, 1.2 pounds orsters, and 4.1 pounds cheese, costing $\$ 3.45$. If for these materials they had substituted 9 pounds beef rump, 47.5 pounds flour, 10 pounds oatmeal, 17 pounds beans, and 94.4 pounds potatoes, which could also have been purchased for $\$ 3.45$, the total cost of the diet would have remained unchanged. The family, however, would have obtained 101 grams of protein and $3,1 \cong 0$ calories per man per day, instead of is grams protein and 2,465 calories which were furnished by the daily diet actually eaten.

[^7]This family expended 57 per cent of the total cost of their food for meat and other animal foods, and these furnished but 46 per cent of the protein and 39 per cent of the energy. In other words, if they had eateu somewhat less beef, pork, and butterine and more beans, peas, flour, and oatmeal, they would have gotten more actual nutriment for the same money without materially lessening the attractiveness of the diet, provided proper care was taken in the preparation of the food.

DIETAR STUIV OF A BOILER TENDER'S FAMILY (No. 189).
This dietary study was made in an English family, consisting of the father, mother, and five children, the eldest about $\$$ years of age. The father, a healthy man 32 years of age, was boiler tender in an office building and earned about 82 a month. The mother, a woman of 28 years, seemed well but had not been very strong since the birth of the last child. The children were all born in this country. The three oldest, boys of 8,6 , and 4 years of age, were healthy and apparently well nourished. A girl of 2 seemed rather delicate, but the youngest child, a girl of 3 months, was rery robust.

During the hard times the husband had been out of work and had contracted some debts. The payment of these debts was taking all the spare money at the time the study was made. The family paid \&6 a month rent for three rooms, but were looking forward to the time when. they could move into a tenement of four rooms at a rent of $\$ 9$.
The study legan January 12, 1897, and continued 8 days.
The number of meals taken was as follows:
Meals.
Маи ............................................................................. 24
Woman ( 24 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equivalent to .................... 19
Two children, 6 and 8 years old ( 48 meals $\times 0.5$ meal of man), equiva-
lent to........................................................................ 2
Two children, 2 and 4 jears old ( 48 meals $\times 0.4$ meal of man), equivalent to 19
Infant, equivalent to ..... 7
Total number of meals taken, equivalent to ..... 93
Equivalent to 1 man 31 days.

In the following table are recorded the kind and amount of the different foods purchased, wasted, and eaten, together with their composition and cost:

Table 16.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 183.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. |  | Total foodmaterial. | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| ANIMAL FOOD. <br> Beef: <br> Fore shank ( 1.5 per cent refuse). <br> Steak. shoulder | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 19.6 \\ 19.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 11.6 \\ 11.3 \end{array}$ | Perct. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0.45 \\ .40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grams. } \\ 2,655 \\ 1,535 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grams. } \\ 520 \\ 296 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grams. } \\ 308 \\ 173 \end{gathered}$ | Grams. |
| Total <br> Teal chops ( 16.3 per cent refuse) | 19.4 | 10.4 |  | .85 <br> .25 | $\begin{array}{r}4,190 \\ 580 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 816 <br> 113 | $\begin{array}{r}481 \\ 60 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | .......... |

Table 16.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 189-Cont'd.


[^8]Table 17.- Weights and percentages of food materials and mutritire ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 189.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food material. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbo. hydrates. |  | Food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo. hydrates. |  |
| PER MAN PER DAY. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Perct. | Perct. | Ferct. | Per ct. | Perct. |
| Beef, real, and mutton | 154 | 30 | 17 |  |  | 7.5 | 20.3 | 10.1 | Perct. | 15.9 |
| Pork, lard, etc | 156 | 20 | 76 |  |  | 7.5 | 13.5 | 43.9 |  | 15.9 |
| Fish, etc...... | 26 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 |  | 2.2 |
| Eggs.. | 7 | 1 | 1 |  |  | . 3 | . 7 | . 4 |  | 1.5 |
| Butter | 54 |  | 45 |  |  | 2.6 |  | 25.8 |  | 10.7 |
| Milk. | 429 | 14 | 17 | 21 |  | 20.5 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 3.1 | 13.0 |
| Total animal food | 819 | 67 | 158 | 21 | 13.2 | 39.6 | 45.1 | 91.1 | 3.1 | 59.2 |
| Cereals .......... | 625 | 69 | 14 | 429 |  | 30.3 | 46.9 | 8.1 | 62.8 | 23.3 |
| Sugars and starches | 125 452 | 11 | 1 | 12.5 | . | 6.0 22.0 | 7.7 | . 8 | 18.4 12.4 | 6.8 6 |
| Fruits . | 44 |  |  | 23 |  | 2.1 | . 3 |  | 3.3 | 43 |
| Total vegetable food $\qquad$ | 1,246 | 80 | 15 | 662 | 9.1 | 60.4 | 54.9 | 8.9 | 96.9 | 40.8 |
| Total food | 2, 065 | 147 | 173 | 683 | 22.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 18.-Nutrients and potential energ! in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 189.

${ }^{1}$ The quantity of waste was so small as to amount to practically nothing per man per day.
Discussion of results.-The family previously studied (dietary No. 129) mas undernourished. This family went to the other extreme, since, on the assumption that their food requirements were the average of people in like circumstances, they consumed more than the dietary standards show to be necessary. None of the family was at very active labor, and it is probable that 110 or 115 grams of protein, with a fuel value of 3,000 to 3,300 calories, roonld have amply supplied their wants and neerls. It would seem that the daily amount of protein consumed ( 147 grams) was not far from 30 per cent in excess of what was required, and the fuel value ( $\overline{5}, 010$ calories) 70 per cent in excess.

Had they purchased smaller amounts of the same food materials at the same price the total expense might have been reduced from a fourth to a third.

The selections of food materials mere made with considerable judgment, and the prices were, in general, moderate. Meats were purchased by the day, but all other foods were procured in large quantities.

The actual prices paid are shown in the following table. which also gives the amounts and fuel value of digestible nutrients in 1 pound and 10 cents' worth of fifteen of the more common food materials used:

Table 19.-Cost per pound and amounts and fuel ralue of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary study No. 189.

| Kind of food material. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Actual } \\ \text { enst } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { pound. } \end{gathered}$ | Nutrients and energy in 1 pound. |  |  |  | Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. | Fuel ralue. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro. } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fuel } \\ & \text { ralue. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Beef: | Cents. | Pound. | Pound. | Pound. | Calories. | Pound. | Pound. | Pounds. | alories. |
|  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  | 0. 25 | 0.14 |  | 1,075 |
| Steak. shoulder | 11. 8 | . 189 |  |  | 810 | . 16 | . 09 |  |  |
| Veal, chops........ | 16.3 | . 160 | . 083 |  | 650 | . 10 | . 05 |  | 39. |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steak | 10.1 | . 147 | . 367 |  | 1, 825 | . 14 | . 37 |  | 1,810 |
| Butter.. | 20.0 | . 120 | . 800 |  | 1, 3,315 | . 13 | . 39 |  | 1. 885 |
| Milk | 3.1 | . 032 | . 039 | 0.050 | 320 | . 10 | . 13 | 0.16 | 1. 025 |
| Flour | 2.7 | . 097 | . 010 | . 736 | 1,590 | . 36 | . 04 | 2. 73 | 5,890 |
| Rolled | 5.0 | . 141 | . 065 | . 655 | 1,755 | . 28 | . 13 | 1.31 | 3. 510 |
| Rice. | 9.4 | . 066 | . 004 | . 776 | 1,585 | . 07 |  | . 83 | 1.685 |
| Bread | 3.1 | . 080 | . 011 | . 519 | 1. 160 | . 26 | . 03 | 1.67 | 3. 140 |
| Pastry | 9.4 | . 053 | . 087 | . 542 | 1,475 | . 06 | . 09 | . 58 | 1. 570 |
| Beans, bak | 4.9 | . 055 | . 028 | . 186 | 565 | . 11 | . 06 | . 38 | 1. 155 |
| Potatoes | . 9 | . 013 |  | 141 | 285 | . 14 |  | 1.57 | 3,180 |
| Apple butter. | 9.5 | . 009 | . 001 | . 573 | 1. 085 | . 01 |  | . 60 | 1, 140 |

Beef shank, flour, oatmeal, and bread were the cheapest sources of protein and (with the exception of the beef shank) of energy also. Ten per cent of the total expenditure was for butter. although the price per pound was not very ligh. If less butter had been eaten, the cost of the food would hare been diminished and the excessive fuel value of the diet would have been lowered. A pecuniary saving was not undesirable since, although the circumstances of this family were much better than those of Nos. 128 and 129, they found it difficult to "make both ends meet." The total income was about $\$ 42$ a month. The expenditures were $\$ 9$ for rent and $\$ 29$ for food and beverages, leaving but 84 per montl for other expenses.

It is perhaps unwarranted to draw the deduction that this family were habitually supplied with an excess of nutrients, for it is doubtful if their ordinary living habits are accurately portrayed in the dietary study. The time covered by the investigation was very short. It was planned to continue it for one month, as was done in the majority of the dietary studies. At the end of eight days the mother refused to permit the continuance of the investigation. The excuse given was that the neighbors were convinced that it was a scheme to see how much it
actually cost for a man to live, in order that his wages might be reduced, and so in order to keep on good terms with her neighbors she must discontinue the study. It was thought, however, by those having charge of the study that the family had eaten rather more than usual to make a good showing, and that they could not afford to keep, it up. Perhaps both reasons influenced the decision to discontinue the study.

While the data thus obtained are not as satisfactory and reliable as in the other studies here reported, they are still of considerable interest. It is evident that the woman understood how to purchase food adrantageously and showed good management in the kitchen, otherwise the amount of nutrients could never have been purchased for the price paid.

## DIETAR STUDF OF A DECORATOR'S FAMILI (No. 190).

This dietary study was made in a S wiss family in quite comfortable circumstances. The family consisted of the father, mother, and three children. The father, a healthy man $4 t$ years of age, was a house decorator and in business for himself. His income was estimated to be \$8t a month. They paid $\$ 13$ a month rent for a four-room honse with garret, cellar, and laundry. Everything about the place was very neatly kept.

The mother, a rather frail moman of 36 years, was an Austrian by birth, but came to this country when a child. She was a good manager, and had at one time, when her husband was ont of work for over a year, supported the family by doing washing. The children-a girl of 15 , and two boys, aged 12 and 2 , respectively-were all in good health.

[^9]The tables which follow give in detail the amount and composition of the food purchased, wasted, and eaten, together with its cost.

[^10]Table 20.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 190.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |  | Total food ma terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| Beef: ANIMAL FOOD. | Perct. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chuck (4.8 percent refuse) | Perct. 19.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.6 \end{aligned}$ | Perct. | \$0. 63 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grains. } \\ 2,875 \end{array}$ | $\underset{546}{G r a i n s .}$ | $\underset{362}{ }$ | Grams. |
| Neck ${ }_{\text {Rib ( }}$. 4.9 per cent refuse). | 13.9 | 11. 9 |  | . 12 | -655 | 91 909 | 78 |  |
| Rib ( 44.9 per cent refuse) Steak, shoulder ( 8.3 per | 17.0 | 26.6 |  | . 50 | 1. 760 | 299 | 468 |  |
| cent refuse)............. | 16.1 | 9.8 |  | 10 | 425 | 68 | 42 |  |
| Steak.porterhonse......... | 18.2 | 20.3 |  | 1. 05 | 2,990 | 544 | 607 |  |
| Shank ( 10.3 per cent refnse) | 19.8 | 11.5 |  | . 86 | 4. 705 | 932 | 541 |  |
| Liver pudding '............ | 20.9 | 5. 0 | 1.6 | . 07 | 465 | 96 | 24 | 7 |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.33 | 13.875 | 2, 576 | 2, 122 | 7 |
| Veal: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chops (13.7 percent refuse) | 19.4 | 10.4 |  | . 20 | 540 | 105 | 56 |  |
| Cutlet (2.8 per cent refuse) | 20.8 | 9.9 |  | . 15 | 465 | 97 | 46 | .... |
| use) | 20.2 | 6.2 |  | . 50 | 1,520 | 307 | 94 |  |
| Sliank (1.2 per cent refuse) | 19.9 | 4.6 |  | . 30 | 1,095 | 218 | 50 |  |
| Shoulder (4.8 per cent ref- use) $\ldots$.................... | 20.1 | 8.2 |  | . 23 | 1,810 | 162 | 66 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 1.38 | 4. 430 | 889 | 312 | ....... ... |
| Lamb: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chops, shoulder ( 15 per cent refuse) | 17.5 | 29.7 |  | . 20 | 790 | 138 | 235 |  |
| Chops. ribs (li.6 per cent refinse) | 17.6 | 28.3 |  | . 10 | 270 | 138 48 | 76 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | . 30 | 1,060 | 186 | 311 | ........... |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bacon...................... | 8.9 | 62.5 |  | . 10 | 365 | 33 | 228 |  |
| Chopis, fat ( 11.8 per cent refuse). | 12. 2 | 45.0 |  | . 18 | 635 | 77 | 286 |  |
| Chops (11.6 percent refuse) | 16.7 | 31.3 |  | . 35 | 1,320 | 220 | 413 |  |
| Ham (12.4 per cent refuse) | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | 1.05 | 3,775 | 585 | 1,476 |  |
| Shauk (23.1 per cent refuse) | 15.5 | 29.4 |  | . 42 | 2, 600 | 403 | 764 |  |
| Shoulder, smoked (5.5 percent refuse) | 15.8 | 32.5 |  | . 15 | 1. 250 | 198 | 406 |  |
| Steak ........... | 11.7 | 36.0 |  | . 10 | 365 | 43 | 131 |  |
| Sansage | 12.7 | 44.2 | 1.1 | . 52 | 2, 245 | 285 | 992 | 25 |
| Lard... |  | 100.0 |  | . 44 | 2, 060 |  | 2, 060 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.31 | 14,615 | 1,844 | 6, 756 | 25 |
| Oysters. | 6.0 | 1.3 | 3.3 | . 10 | 595 | 36 | 8 | 19 |
| Eggs (11.5 per cent refuse) | 15.0 | 11.0 |  | . 67 | 1,875 | 281 | 206 |  |
| Butter |  | 82.4 |  | 1.60 | 2,995 |  | 2, 468 |  |
| Milk. | 3.3 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 2.15 | 32, 590 | 1,075 | 1, 304 | 1,629 |
| Total animal food....... | ....... | ...... |  | 12.84 | 72,035 | 6,887 | 13, 487 | 1,680 |
| Cereals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barley . | 9.3 | 1.0 | 77.6 | . 03 | 285 | 26 | 3 | 221 |
| Corn meal | 9.3 | 2.4 | 74.9 | . 05 | 940 | 87 | 23 | 704 |
| Flour. wh | 11.4 | 1.1 | 75.1 | 1.14 | 19,480 | 2, 221 | 214 | 14,630 |
| Rice | 7.8 | . 4 | 79.2 | . 05 | 255 | 20 | 1 | 202 |
| Bread. | 9.4 | 1.2 | 53.0 | . 28 | 3, 955 | 372 | 48 | 2. 097 |
| Bread, rye | 9. 9 | - 6 | 54.5 | . 04 | 710 | 70 | $\pm$ | 387 |
| Cake. | 6.9 | 8.7 | 62.0 | . 10 | 580 | 40 | 50 | 360 |
| Crackers, oyster | 10.1 | 10.6 | 71.6 | . 03 | 200 | 20 | 21 | 143 |
| Total |  |  |  | 1. 72 | 26, 405 | 2,856 | 364 | 18,744 |
| Sugar. |  |  | 100.0 | . 15 | 1,245 |  |  | 1,245 |
| Vequetables: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beans, dried. | 23.4 | 1.8 | 59.1 | . 08 | 1. 375 | 308 | 25 | 812 |
| Beets ( 6.4 per cent refuse) | 1.5 | . 1 | 9.8 | . 10 | 3, 090 | 46 | 3 | 303 |
| Cabbage (12.8 per cent refase) | 1.9 | 3 | 5.7 | . 21 | 5,895 | 112 | 18 | 336 |
| Coru, cauned................ | 2.8 | 1.3 | 19.3 | . 30 | 1,770 | 50 | 23 | 341 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Composition assumed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 20.-Food materiuls and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 190-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |  | Total food material. | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| Vegetable food-continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vegetables-Continued. Onions (17 per cent ref- use) | Per ct. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 0.4 \end{array}$ | Per ct. 10.2 | \$0.03 | $\underset{20}{\substack{\text { Grams. } \\ \hline}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (irams. } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | Grams. | Grams. <br> 20 |
| Peas, canned............. | 3.6 | . 2 | 9.8 | . 09 | 595 | 22 | 1 | 58 |
| Pickles ................... | 6 | . 3 | 3.4 | . 04 | 765 | 5 |  | 26 |
| Potatoes (15.5 per ceut refuse) (...................... | 2.2 | . 1 | 18.8 | . 52 | 21,625 | 476 | 22 | 4, 065 |
| Potatoes, sweet ( 25.6 per cent refuse) | 1.8 | 7 | 27.4 | . 18 | 4. 155 | 75 | 29 | 1,138 |
| Soup greens. $\ldots$............. | 4.2 | . 6 | 6.3 | . 01 | 15 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Turuips refuse) ( 27.0 per cent | 1.3 | . 2 | 8.1 | . 05 | 920 | 12 | 2 | 74 |
| Turnips, Swedish (31.4 per cent refuse) | 1.3 | . 2 | 8.1 | . 05 | 1,985 | 26 | 4 | 161 |
| Catsup ........... | 1.5 | . 2 | 12.3 | . 04 | 300 | 4 | 1 | 37 |
| Chili samee ${ }^{1}$ | . 6 | . 3 | 3.4 | . 40 | 965 | 6 | 3 | 33 |
| Sauerkraut | 1.7 | . 5 | 3.8 | . 10 | 1,335 | 23 | 6 | 51 |
| Total. |  |  | .... | 2. 20 | 44, 990 | 1,169 | 140 | 7,456 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apples ( 6.3 per cent refuse) | . 4 | . 5 | 15.2 | . 60 | 22, 985 | 92 | 115 | 3,493 |
| Bananas (19.6 per cent refuse) | 1.2 | . 7 | 22.0 | . 28 | -2,730 | 33 | 19 | 600 |
| Oranges ( 10.8 per cent refuse) | . 8 | . 6 | 9.7 | . 10 | 1, 010 | 8 | 6 | 98 |
| Lemons ( 37.4 per cent ref nse) | 1.0 | . 9 | 8.3 | . 05 | 260 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| Peaches, canned ............. | . 5 | . 2 | 7.5 | . 34 | 1,940 | 10 | - | 145 |
| Plum butter ${ }^{1}$. | 1.2 | . 1 | 58.5 | . 61 | 3,315 | 40 | 3 | 1,939 |
| Total |  |  |  | 1.98 | 32, 240 | 186 | 149 | 6, 297 |
| Total regetable food. |  |  |  | 6.05 | 104, 880 | 4, 211 | 653 | 33, 742 |
| Total food |  | .-..... | ......... | 18.89 | 176, 915 | 11,098 | 14,140 | 35,422 |
| Accessories: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coffee ... |  |  |  | . 25 | -. 300 |  |  |  |
| Pepper |  |  |  | .10 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Salt.. |  |  |  | . 01 | 3,120 |  |  |  |
| Vinegar |  |  |  | . 03 | 465 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | . 52 | 5, 935 |  |  |  |
| Beef: WAste. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chuck | 19.0 | 12.6 |  | . 10 | 470 | 89 | 59 |  |
| Rib (trimmings) | 11.8 | 25.0 |  | . 15 | 540 | 64 | 135 |  |
| Shank | 19.8 | 11.5 |  | . 13 | 710 | 141 | 82 |  |
| Liver pudding ${ }^{1}$ | 20.9 | 5. 0 | 1.6 | . 19 | 125 | 26 | 6 | 2 |
| Yeal: Shank................Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chops | 16.7 | 31.3 |  | . 01 | 25 | 4 | 8 |  |
| Ham. | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | . 02 | 60 | 9 | 24 |  |
| Total animal waste <br> Potatoes. |  |  |  | . 62 | 2,005 | 348 | 317 | 2 |
|  | 2.2 | . 1 | 18.8 | . 01 | 625 | 13 | 1 | 118 |
| Total waste |  |  |  | . 63 | 2,630 | 361 | 318 | 120 |

17059-No. $\dot{\text { - }}$

Table 21.-Weights and percentages of food materials and mutritice ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 190.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Food } \\ \text { ma. } \\ \text { terial. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tin } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbo hydrates. |  | Food material. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbo-hydrates. |  |
| PER MAN PER DAY. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Per ct. | Perct. | Per ct. | Per ct. | Perct. |
| Beef, seal, and mutton | 202 | 38 | 29 |  |  | 10.9 | 32.9 | 19.4 |  | 26.7 |
| Pork, lard, etc . | 152 | 19 | 70 |  |  | 8.3 | 16. 6 | 47.8 | 0.1 | 17.6 |
| Fish, etc. | ${ }^{6}$ | 1 |  |  |  | . 3 | . 3 |  |  | . 5 |
| Eggs | 19 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 |  | 3. 6 |
| Butter | 31 |  | 26 |  |  | 1.7 |  | 17.5 |  | 8.5 |
| Milk | 340 | 11 | 13 | 17 |  | 18.4 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 4.6 | 10.9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total ani } \\ & \text { food .... } \end{aligned}$ | 750 | 72 | 140 | 17 | 13.3 | 40.7 | 62.0 | 95.4 | 4.7 | 67.8 |
| Cereals | 275 | 30 | 4 | 195 |  | 14.9 | 25.7 | 2.6 | 52.9 | 9.5 |
| Sugars and starches | 13 |  |  | 13 |  | 25. 7 |  |  | 3.5 | 1.4 |
| Vegetables | 469 | 12 |  | 78 |  | 25.5 | 10.6 | 1. 0 | 21.1 | 11.7 |
| Fruits | 336 | 2 | 1 | 66 | 6.3 | 18.2 | 1. 7 | 1.0 | 17.8 | 10.6 |
| Total regetable food | 1, 093 | 44 | 7 | 352 | 6.3 | 59.3 | 38.0 | 4.6 | 95.3 | 32.2 |
| Total food | 1,843 | 116 | 147 | 369 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 22.-Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 190.

| Kind of food. | Weights and fuel value. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fuel value. |  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo hydrates. | Fuel value. | Cost. |
| PER MAN PER DAY. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food purchased: Animal. | Grams. 72 | $\underset{146}{G r a m s .}$ | Grams. 17 | Calories <br> 1, 665 | Cents. | Perct. 62.0 | Perct. 95.4 | Perct. 4.7 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 49.8 \end{array}$ | Perct 67.8 |
| Vegetable ... | 44 | 7 | 352 | 1,690 | 6.3 | 38.0 | 4.6 | 95.3 | 50.2 | 32.2 |
| Total | 116 | 147 | 369 | 3,355 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Bererages, condiments, etc .......... |  |  |  |  | . 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waste: Animal | 4 | 3 |  | 45 |  | 3.1 | 2.3 |  |  | 3.3 |
| Vegetable |  |  | 1 | 5 | -..... | . 1 |  | . 3 | 2 |  |
| Total | 4 | 3 | 1 | 50 | ...... | 3.2 | 2.3 | . 3 | 1.5 | 3.3 |
| Food actually eaten : Animal | 68 | 137 | 17 | 1,620 |  | 58.9 | 93.1 | 4.7 | 48.5 | 64.5 |
| Vegetable ........ | 44 | 7 | 351 | 1, 685 |  | 37.9 | 4.6 | 95.0 | 50.0 | 32.2 |
| Total. | 112 | 144 | 368 | 3, 305 |  | 96.8 | 97.7 | 99.7 | 98.5 | 96.7 |

Discussion of results.-Considerable thrift and good management was evident in this family. The amounts of nutrients and energy in the food, while hardly up to the tentative standard for a man at moderate manual labor. which calls for 125 grams of protein and 3,500 calories fuel value, were nearly the same as the average of nine dietary studies made among mechanics' families in Connecticut. ${ }^{1}$ As previously stated, the average income of the man was estimated at $\$ 84$ per month. The food for the family of five cost $\$ 20$ and the rent was $\$ 13$ a month, or a total outlay for food and rent of $\$ 33$. The sum expended for food

Was very reasonable. Skill was shown in the choier and purchase of food materials. The variety of meats was large, including seven different cuts of beef, five of veal, one of lamb, and seven of pork. All were, however, purchased at very reasonable prices. There was considerable variety also in the vegetable foods obtained.

The cost per pound and the amounts and fuel value of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of fifteen of the more important food materials used are shown in the following table:

Table 23.-Cost per pound and amounts and fuel rolue of the digestible mutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary study No. 190.

| Kind of food material. | Actual cost per <br> pound. | Nutrients and energy in 1 pound. |  |  |  | Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohydrates. | Fuel value. | Pro- tein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fuel value. |
| Beef: | Cents. | Pound. | Pound. | Pound. | Calories. | Pound. | Pound. | Pounds. | Calories. |
| Chuck | 9.5 | 0.177 |  |  |  | 0.19 | 0.12 |  |  |
| Ribs | 10.2 8.1 | . 132 | . 205 |  | 1, 110 | .13 .23 | . 20 |  | 1,110 |
| Teal, rib roast | 13.6 | . 179 | . 054 |  | 560 | . 13 | . 04 |  | 1,410 |
| Pork, han | 11.0 | . 133 | . 328 |  | 1,630 | . 12 | . 30 |  | 1,485 |
| Eggs . | 13.9 | . 126 | . 091 |  | 620 | . 09 | . 07 |  | 445 |
| Butter | 24.2 |  | . 799 |  | 3, 370 |  | . 33 |  | 1,395 |
| Milk | 3.0 | . 032 | . 039 | 0.050 | 320 | . 11 | . 13 | 0.17 | 1,060 |
| Flour, wheat | 2.7 | . 097 | . 010 | . 736 | 1,590 | . 36 | . 04 | 2.73 | 5,895 |
| Bread | 3.2 | . 080 | . 011 | . 519 | 1,160 | . 25 | . 03 | 1. 62 | 3, 625 |
| Beans, dried | 2.6 | . 179 | . 016 | . 561 | 1,445 | . 69 | . 06 | 2.16 | 5,55.5 |
| Corn, canned | 7.7 | . 222 | . 012 | . 183 | 430 | . 03 | . 16 | . 24 | 560 |
| Potatoes.. | . 9 | . 014 |  | . 149 | 305 | . 16 |  | 1.66 | 3, 378 |
| Chili sauce | 18.8 |  |  | . 032 | 60 |  |  | . 02 | 32 |
| Apples. | 1.1 |  |  | . 139 | 260 |  |  | 1. 26 | 2,355 |

DIETARY STUDY OF A GLASS BLOWER'S FAMILY (No. 191.)
This dietary study was made in an Irish family, consisting entirely of adults. The old mother, 70 years of age, was very frail, but all the other members of the family were strong and well. There were five children, three sons and two daughters, and one boarder, a man. The older of the daughters, a woman 40 years old, managed the house. The other, 31 years of age, cleaned cars, and was paid at the rate of $\$ 25$ a month for full time. During the month covered by the study she lost some time and earned only $\$ 21$. The two oldest sons, aged 34 and 37 years, respectively, were skilled glass blowers, but were idle at the time. They were addicted to drink. The youngest son, aged 28 years, was a street cleaner, and earned $\$ 1.50$ per day when employed. During the study ( 31 days) he earned $\$ 31$. The boarder was an iron worker. He paid $\$ 4.50$ per week for board and lodging.

The family paid $\$ 18$ a month rent for a house, but sublet a portion of it for $\$ 7$, making their actual rent $\$ 11$ a month for 5 rooms.
The study began January 14, 1897, and continued 31 days.
The number of meals taken was as follows:
Meals.
Men ................................................................................. . . . 334
Women ( 279 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equivalent to ................ 223
Total number of meals taken, equivalent to .................... 557
Equivalent to 1 man 186 days.

The amount and composition of the food purchased, wasted, and eaten, together with its cost, are shown in the following tables:

Table 24.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 191.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total. cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |  | Total food ma terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| ANIMAL FOOD. <br> Beef: <br> Chuck (11.3 per cent refuse) <br> Chuck, fat (11.2 per cent refuse). <br> Flank steak <br> Flank steak, fat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 19.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 12.6 \end{array}$ | Per ct. | \$0.88 | $\underset{3,9 ; 0}{G r a m s}$ | Grams. 753 | $\underset{499}{\operatorname{Grams}^{2}}$ | Grams. |
|  | 18.0 | 18.8 |  | 1. 26 | 6, 145 | 1,106 | 1,156 |  |
|  | 16. 1 | 19.0 |  | . 73 | 2, 080 | - 335 | 1, 395 |  |
| Plate. medium fat ( 26.2 per cent refuse) | 15.6 | 27.2 |  | . 23 | 725 | 113 | 197 |  |
|  | 15.7 | 29.1 |  | . 32 | 1,730 | 272 | 503 |  |
| Plate, lean ( 26.3 per cent refuse). | 14.6 | 18.8 |  | . 04 | 340 | 50 | 64 |  |
| Round steak, medium fat (1.8 per cent refuse) | 19.8 | 13.6 |  | . 75 | 2,660 | 528 | 362 |  |
| Round steak, fat ( 1.7 per cent refuse) | 18.9 | 22.3 |  | . 48 | 1,800 | 340 | 401 |  |
| Rump, medium fat (8.7 per cent refuse) $\qquad$ | 16.8 | 26.1 |  | . 56 | 2,705 | 454 | 706 |  |
| Rump, fat ( 8.6 per cent refuse) | 16.4 | 35.7 |  | . 28 | 1,440 | 236 | 514 |  |
|  | 16. 1 | 9.8 |  | . 50 | 3,135 | 505 | 307 |  |
| Sirloin steak ................ | 15.9 | 17.6 |  | . 07 | 285 | 45 | 50 |  |
| Sirloin, small end (6.1 per cent refuse) | 13.3 | 43.7 |  | . 50 | 1,760 | 234 | 769 |  |
| Plate, corned (10.8 per cent refuse) | 13.3 | 41.9 |  | . 09 | 395 | 52 | 165 |  |
| Rump, corned ( 9.9 per cent refuse) Tripe | 15. 3 | 23.3 |  | . 23 | 1,250 | 191 | 291 |  |
|  | 11.8 | 1.2 | 0.2 | . 50 | 2, 890 | 341 | 35 | 6 |
| Liver pudding ${ }^{1}$ | 20.9 | 5.0 | 1.6 | . 21 | 1,445 | 302 | 72 | 23 |
| Tot |  |  |  | 7.63 | 34,745 | 5,857 | 6,486 | 29 |
| Veal: Shoulder ( 14.2 per cent refuse) <br> Lamb: Shoulder (11.9 per cent refuse) | 20.1 | 8.2 |  | . 20 | 765 | 154 | 63 |  |
|  | 17.5 | 29.7 |  | . 10 | 435 | 76 | 129 |  |
| Pork: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). | 16.7 | 31.3 |  | . 97 | 4, 030 | 673 | 1,261 |  |
| Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). | 15.5 | 39.1 |  | . 18 | 410 | 64 | 160 |  |
| Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) | 15.8 | 32.5 |  | . 20 | 1,070 | 169 | 348 |  |
| Shank ( 10.8 per cent refuse) | 13.4 | 41.8 |  | . 53 | 2, 820 | 378 | 1,179 |  |
| Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) | 9. 8 | 68.0 |  | . 76 | 3, 120 | 306 | 2,122 |  |
|  | 12.7 | 44.2 | 1.1 | . 52 | 2, 335 | 297 | 1, 132 | 26 |
| Lard... |  | 100.0 |  | . 26 | 1, 275 |  | 1,275 |  |
| Tot |  |  |  | 3.42 | 15, 060 | 1,887 | 7,377 | 26 |
| Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) | 19.2 | 15.3 |  | 1.00 | 2,935 | ${ }_{5}^{63}$ | 449 |  |
| Fish: | 22.2 | 3 |  | . 09 | 440 | 98 | 1 |  |
| Codfish, shredde Mackerel, salt | 13.9 | 21.2 |  | . 19 | 555 | 77 | 118 |  |
| Mackerel, salt | 10.3 | 3.0 |  | . 30 | 1, 095 | 112 | 33 |  |
| Total |  |  |  | . 58 | 2, 090 | 287 | 152 |  |
| Eggs (13.7 per cent refuse).... | 15.0 | 11.0 |  | 1. 38 | 3, 995 | 599 | 439 |  |
| Butter. |  | 82.4 |  | 3.16 | 6, 675 |  | 5,501 |  |
|  | 3.3 | 4. 0 | 5.0 | 1.30 | 23, 865 | 788 | 955 | 1,193 |
| Milk....... | 4.3 | 4.0 | 5.0 | . 20 | 2,520 | 83 | 101 | 126 |
| Total animal food |  |  |  | 18.97 | 93, 085 | 10,294 | 21,652 | 1,374 |

${ }^{1}$ Composition assumed.

Table 24.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 191-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |  | Total food ma. terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbolydrates. |
| vegetable food. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cereals: | reret. | Perct. | Per ct. | \$0.08 | Grame. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. |
| F'lour | 11.4 | 1. 1 | 75.1 | 2. 23 | 39, 300 | 4,480 | 432 | 29, 512 |
| Flour, prepar | 10.1 | 1. 0 | 74.0 | . 05 | 1, 220 | 123 | 12 | 903 |
| Oats, rolled. | 16.6 | 7.2 | 66.9 | . 10 | 880 | 146 | 63 | 589 |
| Rice | 7.8 | . 4 | 79.2 | . 11 | 555 | 43 | 2 | 440 |
| liread | 9.4 | 1.2 | 53.0 | . 78 | 9,525 | 896 | 114 | 5,049 |
| Cakes, drop. | 7.6 | 14.7 | 60. 3 | . 07 | 240 | 18 | 35 | 145 |
| Crackers, soda... | 9.8 | 9.5 | 73.3 | . 07 | 440 | 43 | 42 | 323 |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.49 | 53, 535 | 5,877 | 733 | 37,064 |
| Sugars and starches: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sngar <br> Cornstarch |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 93.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.05 \\ .01 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,345 \\ 40 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 18,345 \\ 37 \end{array}$ |
| Total |  |  |  | 2. 06 | 18,385 |  |  | 18,382 |
| Vegetables: | 18.1 | 1.5 | 65.9 | 10 |  | 235 | 20 | 857 |
| Corn, canned. | 2.8 | 1.3 | 19.3 | . 10 | 625 | 18 | 8 | 121 |
| Celery (17.2 percent refuse) | 1.3 | . 1 | 3.8 | . 10 | 325 | 4 |  | 12 |
| Onions ( 10.1 per cent ref- use) | 1.7 | .4 | 10.2 | . 20 | 2, 255 | 38 | 9 | 230 |
| Potatoes ( 20 per cent refuse) | 2.2 | . 1 | 18.8 | 1.02 | 34,350 | 756 | 34 | 6, 458 |
| Potatoes, sweet (17.9 per cent refuse). | 1.8 | . 7 | 27.4 | . 21 | 2, 995 | 54 | 21 | 821 |
| Tomatoes, canned........... | 1.1 | . 2 | 3.8 | . 38 | 3, 835 | 42 | 8 | 146 |
| Turnips, Swedish (18 per cent refuse)................ | 1.3 | . 2 | 8.1 | . 10 | 4,335 | 56 | 9 | 351 |
| Catsup..... | 1.5 | . 2 | 12. 3 | . 57 | 2, 710 | 41 | 5 | 333 |
| Pickles | 6 | . 3 | 3.4 | . 10 | 425 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| Sanerkraut | 1.7 | . 5 | 3.8 | . 20 | 2, 780 | 47 | 14 | 106 |
| Vegetable soup | 2.9 |  | . 5 | . 20 | 3,855 | 112 |  | 19 |
| Total |  |  |  | 3.28 | 59, 790 | 1,406 | 129 | 9,468 |
| Fruit: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apples | 3 | . 4 | 11. 4 | . 73 | 18,780 | 56 | 75 | 2, 141 |
| Bananas | . 7 | . 4 | 13.2 | . 10 | 780 | 5 | 3 | 103 |
| Figs .. | 4.3 | . 3 | 74. 2 | . 15 | 610 | 26 | 2 | 453 |
| Lemon. | 7 | . 6 | 5.8 | . 01 | 60 |  |  | 3 |
| Peaches, dried ${ }^{1}$ | 2.9 |  | 63.3 | . 09 | 225 | 6 |  | 142 |
| Jelly ard jam ${ }^{1}$. | 1.1 |  | 77.2 | . 17 | 1,785 | 20 |  | 1,378 |
| A ppile and tomato butter.. | 1.2 | . 1 | 58.5 | . 46 | 2,355 | 28 | 2 | 1,378 |
| Total | ... |  | ----...-- | 1.71 | 24,595 | 141 | 82 | 5,598 |
| Total regetable food | .... | .-...-. | -.......... | 10.54 | 156, 305 | 7, 424 | 944 | 70,512 |
| Total food |  |  |  | 29.51 | 249, 390 | 17,718 | 22,596 | 71, 886 |
| Accessories: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raking powder |  |  |  | . 05 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Nutmeg |  |  |  | . 01 | 15 |  |  |  |
| Pepper |  |  |  | . 04 | 45 |  |  |  |
| Salt. |  |  |  | . 06 | 2, 665 |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | . 85 | 3,380 |  | .-. |  |
| Total cost of food and accessories $\qquad$ |  |  |  | 30.36 |  |  |  |  |
| WASTE. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ceer Chuck, 1at.. | 18.0 | 18.8 |  | . 07 | 325 | 57 | 61 |  |
| Round, fat. | 18.9 | 22.3 |  |  | 15 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Shonlder.. | 19.3 | 11.3 |  | . 01 | 40 | 8 | 5 |  |
| Rnmp, fat | 14.9 | 36. 3 |  |  | 15 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Corned .. | 15.3 | 23.3 |  | . 01 | 25 |  | 6 |  |
| Total. |  |  |  | . 09 | 420 | 74 | 80 | ........... |

${ }^{1}$ Composition assumed.

Table 24.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 191-Cont'd.

| Kind of food material. | Composition. |  |  | Total cost. | Weight used. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy. drates. |  | Total food ma- terial. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohydrates. |
| WASTE-continued. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pork: Perct. Per ct. Per ct. Grams. Grams. Grains. Grams. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$0.01 | 25 | 4 |  |  |
| Bacon | 9.8 | 68.0 |  | . 01 | 25 | 2 | 17 |  |
| Total |  |  | ......... | . 02 | 75 | 9 | 35 | ........... |
| Poultry: ChickenFish: Whitefish | 19.2 | 15.3 |  | . 01 | 25 | 5 | 4 |  |
|  | 22.1 | 6.5 |  | . 03 | 100 | 22 | 6 |  |
| Total animal |  | ........ |  | . 15 | 620 | 110 | 125 |  |
| Vegetables: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potatoe | 1. 2.2 | .1 | 18.8 8.1 | . 03 | 900 | 20 | 1 | 169 |
| Total vegetable waste. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ........ | $\cdots \cdot \cdots$ |  | . 03 | 1,170 | 24 | 2 | 191 |
| Total waste |  |  |  | . 18 | 1,790 | 134 | 127 | 191 |

Table 25.-Weights and percentages of food materials and mutritire ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 191.

| Kind of food material. | Weights. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  | Cost. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo-hydrates. |  | Food material. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo hydrates. |  |
| Per man per day. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Grams. | Cents. | Per ct. | Per ct. | Per ct. | Perct. | Perct. |
| Beef, veal, and mutton. | 193 | 33 | 36 |  |  | 14.4 | 34.3 | 29.6 |  | 26.9 |
| Pork, lard, ete. | 81 | 10 | 40 |  |  | 6.0 | 10.7 | 32.7 |  | 11.6 |
| Poultry.. | 16 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1.2 | 3. 2 | 2.0 |  | 3.4 |
| Fish, etc | 11 | 2 | 1 |  |  | . 8 | 1.6 | . 7 |  | 1. 9 |
| Fggs. | 21 | , | 2 |  |  | 1. 6 | 3.4 | 1.9 |  | 4.7 |
| Butter. | 36 |  | 30 |  |  | 2.7 |  | 24.3 |  | 10.7 |
| Cheese, smearcas | 13 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1. 0 | . 5 | .$^{4}$ | 0.2 | . 7 |
| Milk............. | 129 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 9.6 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 4.4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total animal } \\ & \text { food } . . . . . . . . . . . . ~ \end{aligned}$ | 500 | 55 | 117 | 7 | 10.2 | 37.3 | 58.1 | 95.8 | 1.9 | 64.3 |
| Cereals. | 288 | 32 | 4 | 199 |  | 21.5 | 33.2 | 3.2 | 51.6 | 11.8 |
| Sugars and starches .- | 99 |  |  | 99 |  | 7.4 |  |  | 25. 6 | 7.0 |
| Vegetables | 321 | 7 | 1 | 51 |  | 24.0 | 7.9 | . 6 | 13.1 | 11.1 |
| Fruits.... | 132 | 1 |  | 30 |  | 9.8 | . 8 | . 4 | 7.8 | 5.8 |
| Total vegetable food ............ | 840 | 40 | 5 | 379 | 5.7 | 62.7 | 41.9 | 4.2 | 98.1 | 35.7 |
| Total food ...... | 1,340 | 95 | 122 | 386 | 15.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 26.-Vutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 191.

| Kind of food. | Weights and fuel value. |  |  |  | Cost. | Percentages of total food. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo-hydrates | Fuel value. |  | Protein. | Fat. | Carbo hydrates | Fuel value. | Cost. |
| PER MAN PER DAy. <br> Food purchased: <br> Animal . <br> Vegetable | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grams. } \\ 55 \\ 40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grams. } \\ 117 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Grams. } \\ 779 \\ 379 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Calories } \\ 1,340 \\ 1,765 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Cents } \\ 10.2 \\ 5.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 58.1 \\ 41.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 95.8 \\ 4.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ter ct. } \\ 1.9 \\ 98.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Per ct. } \\ 43.2 \\ 56.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Tcret. } \\ 64.7 \\ 35.7 \end{array}$ |
| Total | 95 | 122 | 386 | 3, 105 | 15.9 . | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Beverages, condiments, etc .......... |  |  |  |  | . 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waste: Animal... Vegetable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 15 5 |  | . 6 | . 5 | . 3 | .3 .1 | .5 .1 |
| Total.. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 20 | $\ldots$ | . 7 | . 5 | . 3 | . 4 | . 6 |
| Food actually eaten : Animal Vegetable | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 40 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 116 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 378 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,325 \\ & 1,760 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.2 \\ 5.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.5 \\ & 41.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.3 \\ 4.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 97.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.9 \\ & 56.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}63.8 \\ 35.6 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Tutal | 94 | 121 | 385 | 3, 085 | 15.9 | 99.3 | 99.5 | 99.7 | 99.6 | 99.4 |

Discussion of results.-The members of this family were accustomed to rather more than the average amount of labor when all were at work. During the period of the study the average daily food consumed furnished 94 grams of protein and 3,085 calories of energy. While this was perhaps a rather scant ration if all had been at manual labor, it may be regarded as ample under the circumstances. Two of the family were idle, and the aged mother of course performed very little work. It is therefore not improbable that the average amounts of nutrients and energy in the food came very near to the actual bodily demands of the different members of the family.

The cost of the food per man per day ( 16 cents) was very moderate for the kind and variety of the foods purchased, while the beverages, condiments, etc., cost but one-half cent per man per day. All the foods were purchased in quantity, thus effecting a considerable saving.

The most expensive meat used was flank steak at $15 \frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. Beef chuck at 9.6 cents and beef rump at 8.4 cents were cheap. As usual, flour was the cheapest source of both protein and energy, and bread the next cheapest, although the latter furnished but two-thirds the amount of protein and one-half the energy for the same expenditure. Eggs, as is quite frequently the case, furnished a comparatively small amount of protein and a very small amount of energy for the money expended.

The cost per pomid and the amounts and fuel value of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of fifteen of the more important of the foods used are shown in the following table:

Table 27.-Cost per pound and amounts and fuel ralue of the digestible nutrients in 1 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dictary sludy No. 191.


## GENERAL REMARKS ON THE DIETARY STUDIES.

The families studied represent a great diversity of occupation and financial condition. Care was taken to select as representative families as possible and it is believed the food consumption in dietary No. 43 is fairly representative of a professional man's family, that in dietary No. 190 of a skilied artisan, and that in dietary No. 191 of a skilled laborer. The average day laborer's family is represented in dietary No. 189, and that of the unskilled mill workman in Nos. 128 and 129. It is, of course, impossible from so few studies to make definite deductions regarding the actual living habits, and the character and amounts of food consumed by families under somewhat different conditions of labor and of environment.

It will be of interest to compare the amounts and proportions of nutrients in these dietaries with those found in similar stndies in other places. This is done in the table below. The 14 families of professional men were those of college professors, teachers, chemists, and lawyers residing in Midlletown and Storrs, Comn., Lafayette, Ind., Chicago, Ill., and vicinity, and Pittsburg, Pa. The mechanics' families resided in Middletown, Comn., New Brunswick, N. J., Knoxville, Temn., and Lafayette, Ind.

TABLE 28. -Summary of dietary studies here reported with averages of studies made elsewhere.
[Quantities per man per day.]

|  | Cost. | Protein. | Fat. | Carbohy: drates. | Fuel <br> valne. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents. | Grams. | Grams. | Cirams. | Calories. |
| Dietary of a professional man's family (No.43) | 21 | 91 | 145 | 380 | 3,280 |
| Dietary of a mill workman's family (No.128) | 13 | 85 | 104 | 307 | 2, 575 |
| Iietary of a mill workman's fimily (No.129) | 9 | 77 | 90 | :314 | 2,440 |
| Dictary of a boiler tender*s family (No. 189). | 22 | 147 | 173 | 683 | 5, 010 |
| Dietary of a honse decorators family (No. 190) | 20 | 112 | 144 | 368 | 3,305 |
| Dictary of a glass blower's family (No.191) .......... | 16 | 94 | 121 | 385 | 3. 085 |
| A verage 14 dietaries of professional men's families ${ }^{1}$. | 225 | 104 | 125 | 423 | 3325 |
| Average 14 dietaries of mechanics' families ${ }^{3}$. ${ }^{\text {a }}$. . . . | 420 | 103 | 150 | 402 | 3,465 |

[^11]It will be seen from the above table that the food consumption of the family in dietary No. 43 was quite near the average for professional men's families. The other dietary studies made at Pittsburg, while representing the food consumption of people with moderate muscular labor, show $n o$ uniformity of results. Some contain a larger and some a smaller amount of nutrients than the average of $1 t$ dietary studies of mechanics' families. All but one are below the tentative standard for a man at moderate labor.

The cost of the food "per man per day" varied considerably in the different studies, ranging from 22 cents in dietary No. 43 to 9 cents in dietary No. 129.

An examination of the data of the different studies will show that the less the income the more economical the expenditures for food (as shown by the amount of nutrients obtained) and vice versa. This is more noticeable in the case of the animal food than of the vegetable food and as regards the fuel value or energy of the food than its content of protein.

The variation in the average cost of nutrients is smaller in case of vegetable foods than in case of animal foods. This is doubtless due to the fact that the cereal foods, which furnished so large a part of the total nutrients, do not vary greatly in price. Thus flour and bread together furnished from one fifth to one-third of the total mutrients in these studies, and the variation in the cost per pound was comparatively slight. The food materials containing the largest proportion of nutrients are the cheapest source of these nutrients. It is in the increased purchase of the higher priced meats, of vegetables, and of fruits that the increased cost of the food lies.

In brief, when the cost of living must be diminished, the cheaper cuts of beef, beans, peas, oatmeal, flour, or bread can be profitably used as a source of protein. So far as is known, such food materials are as wholesome and, when properly prepared and served so that
sufficient variety is secured, as acceptable as the more expensive foods. White flour or bread, sugar, rice, corn meal, oatmeal, potatoes, and the cheaper cuts of pork are economical sources of energy (fuel). If food variety rather than food economy is desired, this variety may be obtained by the use of expensive cuts of meat and considerable quantities of eggs, butter, green vegetables, and fruits.

## FOOD ACCESSORIES.

In the previous discussions of the dietaries no mention has been made of the beverages, condiments, and other food accessories which give flavor to the food or increase its palatability, but have little or no food value in themselves.

Under the head of food accessories are classed tea and coffee, condiments, flavorings, etc. Pickles might very properly be classed under the same head since they are used more as a condiment than as a food. They have, however, some food value, and have been designated as food in the previous tables. Although the food accessories here used neither build tissue nor yield energy, they serve to make the food more palatable and may be of some aid to digestion by causing a more profuse secretion of the digestive juices and in other ways. They are an element of expense entering, to a greater or less extent, into the dietaries of all families. In the first dietary studied (No.43) no account was made of these items, but in the subsequent studies the amount of food accessories consumed was determined.

For the sake of comparison the amounts of the various food accessories used in the different dietary studies are given in the following table. These quantities have been calculated for one man for one month ( 30 days) rather than for the family for one month, since the points to which it is desired to call attention are thus more clearly shown.

Table 29.-Cost of food accessories per man per month (30 days) in the different dietaries.


It will be seen from the table that aside from coffee and tea there was a comparatively small expenditure for accessories. The actual cost of salt, flavoring extracts, pepper, etc., was very small. Tea and coffee
were the chief beverages, and the cost of these two materials made up the largest proportion of the money paid for food accessories. The largest amount expended for tea and coffee as compared with the sum paid for actual food materials was found in dietary No. 189, in which $\$ 6.91$ was paid for food materials and 93 cents, or about one-seventh, for the food accessories. In dietary No. 128, $\$ 24.52$ was expended for food materials and $\$ 1.20$ for food accessories. While this sum was not large, it should be remembered that as compared with the standards this family had insufficient nourishment. The conclusion seems warranted that they could have advantageously expended this sum for flour, bread, potatoes, beans, or the cheaper cuts of meat. This sum expended for flour at the price actually paid per pound for that purchased would have added 8 grams of protein and 260 calories of energy per man per day to the diet. In the same way in dietary No. 129 the protein might have been increased 12 grams per man per day and the fuel value over 400 calories.

While tea and coffee are stimulating and refreshing as beverages, they are comparatively expensive and furnsh little if any nutriment. Either cocoa, whole milk, or skim milk would furnish considerable nutriment besides being useful as a beverage. Of these materials the skim milk would furnish the largest food return for the sum expended.

## VARIATIONS IN THE COST AND COMPOSITION OF BREAD.

It is, of course, to be expected that in any locality there will be more or less range in the composition of food materials. This variation is due in part to fluctuations in the water content of different specimens of the same kind of food and in part to varying proportions of the different nutrients. Changes in the amount of water affect directly the nutritive value of the food material. Changes in the proportion of the different nutrients do not always affect the nutritive value materially. Generally speaking, however, if the amount of protein is diminished the value of the food is also lessened, for it has been found that it is the nitrogenous constituents of the food materials which are the most expensive. Fluctuations in the relative amounts of fat and carbohydrates affect the fuel value, since the fuel value of the fats is $2 \frac{1}{4}$ times that of the carbohydrates. In most vegetable foods the amount of fat is so small as to be of little importance, and the real question of value must lie in the proportion of protein to carbohydrates and in the amount of water.

From the data available it would appear that there is considerably greater variation in the composition of bread than of flour. In 169 analyses of flour ${ }^{1}$ the water ranges from 9.3 to 14.3 per cent, averaging 12.3 per cent, while in 108 analyses of bread ${ }^{1}$ the water ranges from 26 to 49.1 per cent, averaging 35.4 per cent.

Since baker's bread forms so important an article of food with many families, especially in the large towns and cities, it is desirable to have abundant data concerning the extent of variation in its composition and cost. For instance, it is desirable to learn whether bread costing 6 or 7 cents a pound contains more actual nutrients than bread costing $2 \frac{1}{2}$ or 3 cents a pound; whether there is any marked variation in the amount of nutrients contained in the different varieties of bread made by the same or by different bakers, and whether the variations in composition are due to the relative proportion of nutrients and water or to a variation in the nutrients themselves.

The work here reported is very similar to that carried on by Professor Voorhees, of New Jersey.* Ten samples of bread purchased in the open market were analyzed, and the results are given in the following tables. In Table 30 the weight of the different loaves as purchased is given, together with the cost and composition on the fresh basis, while Table 31 gives the composition on the water-free basis and the actual heat of combustion per gram, as determined by the bomb calorimeter and as calculated.

Table 30.-Weight and cost per loaf, cost per pound, and composition of fresh bread.

|  | Laboratory No. | Weight of loaf. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { loaf. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { per } \\ \text { pound. } \end{gathered}$ | Composition of fresh bread. |  |  |  |  | Fuel value. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Water. |  | Protein. | Fat. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carbo- } \\ \text { lry- } \\ \text { drates. } \end{gathered}$ | Ash. |  |
|  |  | Grams. | Lbs. |  | Cents. | Cents. | Perct. | Perct. | P.ct. | Perct. | P.ct. | Calories. |
| Bread | 594 | 1, 115 | 2. 45 |  |  | 26.0 | 11.3 |  | 60.7 |  | 1,360 |
| Do | 595 |  | 1.17 |  | 4.3 | 34.8 | 9.8 | . 9 | 53.3 | 1. 2 | 1,210 |
| Do | 596 | 896 | 1. 98 | 6 | 3.0 | 34.4 | 10.8 | . 4 | 53.0 | 1.4 | 1, 205 |
| Do | 597 | 1,145 | 252 | 9 | 3.6 | 33.3 | 9.8 | . 4 | 55.3 | 1.2 | 1, 230 |
| Do | 598 | 795 | 1.75 | 5 | 2.9 | 29.8 | 11.0 | . 6 | 57.2 | 1.4 | 1,295 |
| Do | 599 | 565 | 1. 25 | 9 | 7.2 | 29.3 | 15.4 | . 7 | 53.0 | 1. 6 | 1,300 |
| Do | 600 | 663 | 1.46 | 6 | 4.1 | 32.1 | 10.6 | . 4 | 55.6 | 1.3 | 1, 250 |
| Do | 2559 | $\left\{\begin{array}{r}594 \\ 1,061\end{array}\right.$ | 1.31 2.34 | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | 3.8 4.3 | 35.6 | 10.3 | . 3 | 52.6 | 1.2 | 1,185 |
| Do | 2743 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 34.6 | 9.2 | . 5 | 54.3 | 1.4 | 1,200 |
| Do | 2749 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 35.8 | 9.7 | . 7 | 52.6 | 1.2 | 1,190 |
| Average of 10 analyses..... |  |  |  |  | 3.9 | 32.6 | 10.8 | . 5 | 54.8 | 1.3 | 1,240 |
| Average of 140 analyses ${ }^{1}$...... |  |  |  |  |  | 35.1 | 9.4 | 1.2 | 53.2 | 1.1 | 1,215 |
| Flour ${ }^{1}$... |  |  |  |  |  | 12. 1 | 11.2 | 1.2 | 75.2 | . 4 | 1,655 |

${ }^{1}$ From an unpublished compilation of analyses.

* U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.

Table 31.-Composition of bread calculated to water-free basis, with the heats of rombustion "s detirmined by the bomb calorimeter and as culculuted.

${ }^{1}$ By the bomb calorimeter.
${ }^{2}$ On the supposition that 1 gram of protein, fat, and carbohydrates will yield 5.5, 9.3, and 4. calories. respectively. In the estimation of fuel values as distinguished from heats of combustion the factor 4.1 per gram is commonly used for protein compounds, thus allowing for their incomplete oxidation in the body.
${ }^{3}$ U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28.

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.

It will be seen from the above tables that there is a much greater variation in the price per pound of bread than in its chemical composition, and, moreover, that the variations in the latter bear little or no relation to those in the former. The lowest price per pound was 23 cents; the highest, $7 \frac{1}{1}$; the average, $3 \frac{3}{4}$ cents. The protein raried more than either the water or the carbohydrates, the lowest proportion being 9.2 per cent; the highest, 15.4 per cent; the average, 10.8 per cent.

Variations in the amounts of fat and of mineral matter are unimportant, as the quantities in any case are relatively small. The mineral matter probably varies little, aside from additions of salt and baking powders.

The variations in protein and carbohydrates are probably due, in a large degree, to differences in the kinds of flour and other material used. Since all samples were taken on the day the bread was said to have been baked, and were equally fresh, the rariations in the water content may, perhaps, be attributed to the methods employed in the making, which render some breads more absorptive than others.

The variations in cost are dependent almost entirely upon the baker. Different makes of bread sell at different prices per pound. while the nutritive value may be essentially the same in all cases. As a rule, in the Nem Jersey samples, the larger the loaf the greater the cost per pound. The study in Pittsburg was too limited in extent to allow many definite deductions. The size of the loaf, apparently, had no direct bearing upon the price of the breal per pound. This depended rather upon the brand or trade name given by the maker.

It is interesting to note that while the average price of bread at the time these investigations were carried on was 33 cents a pound in Pittsburg, it averaged from 3.8 to 4.9 cents a pound in different cities in New Jersey, and was from 5 to 6 cents a pound in Middletown, Conn.

## BAKERY EXPERIMENT.

The usual process of bread making is essentially as follows: Flour is intimately mixed with a certain a mount of water (or milk), salt, and yeast, and usually with more or less sugar and butter or lard. The whole is then placed in a warm place, where the yeast plant grows and eauses the carbohydrates, sugars, etc., to ferment, yielding alcohol and carbonic acid gas, which make the dough porous. During the process of baking, the alcohol and carbonic acid are mostly or entirely driven off, water escaping at the same time.

For sometime past apparent discrepancies in the results obtained from analyses of flour and of bread made from similar flour have led to the belief that there may be a loss of mutrients during the process of baking. The information on this point is limited.*
The experiment here reported was made in a small bakery in Pittsburg, and was conducted under the personal supervisiou of the writer. All the ingredients used in the process of bread making were weighed and the flour was analyzed. The other ingredients were so small in amount that they were not sampled. Their chemical composition was assumed from average analyses of similar articles. After baking, the bread was weighed and a sample at once prepared for analysis.

The following table gives the cost, weights, and percentage composition of the ingredients used in making the bread, and the amount and percentage composition of the bread made from them:

Table 32.-Weights, cost, and composition of ingredients used in making bread, with the weight and composition of the baked bread.

|  | Laboratory No. | Weights. |  | Cost. |  | Composition. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Per pound. | Total. | Water. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { tein. } \end{aligned}$ | Fat. | Carbohydrates. | Ash. |
| Flour | 2558 | Grams. $21,670$ | $L b s$. <br> 47.75 | Cents. $2 \frac{1}{4}$ | \$1.08 | I'erct. $10.9 t$ | Perct. $\text { i4. } 19$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per ct. } \\ 1.24 \end{gathered}$ | Perct. 73.17 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Perct. } \\ 0.46 \end{array}$ |
| Potatoes ${ }^{1}$. |  | 1,050 | 2.32 | 2 | . 05 | 79. 20 | 2.10 | . 10 | 17. 80 | . 80 |
| Sugar ${ }^{1}$. |  | 127 | . 28 | 5 | . 01 |  |  |  | 100. 00 |  |
| Teast ${ }^{2}$. |  | 2, 350 | 5. 19 |  | . 09 | 95.03 | 1. 21 | . 04 | 2.17 | 1.55 |
| Salt.. |  | 298 | . 66 |  | . 01 |  |  |  |  | 100.00 |
| Total |  | 25. 495 | 56.30 |  | 1. 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bread from the above. $\qquad$ | 2559 | ${ }^{3} 29,840$ | 65.75 | 4 | 2. 60 | 35.56 | 10.32 | . 26 | 52.64 | 1. 22 |

[^12][^13]In the following table the amounts, composition, and fuel value of the nutrients of the different ingredients and of the bread made from them are given:

Table 33.- Weights and fnel ralue of mutrients in ingredients nsed in makin! bread and in the baked bread.

|  | Total weight of nutrients. |  |  | Heats of combustion as calculated. ${ }^{1}$ | Heats of combustion as determined. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein. | Fat. | Carboliy. drates. |  |  |
| Flour | $\underset{3,075}{\operatorname{Grams} .}$ | Grams. 269 | $\underset{15,856}{G r a m s .}$ | Calories. 84, 425 | Calories. <br> ²85, 595 |
| Potatoes | 22 | 1 | 187 | 895 | ${ }^{3} 895$ |
| Sugar .. |  |  | 127 | 520 | ${ }^{3} 520$ |
| Yeast. | 28 | 1 | 51 | 375 | ${ }^{3} 375$ |
| Total. | 3,125 | 271 | 16, 221 | 86, 215 | 87,385 |
| Bread | 3, 083 | 78 | 15, 708 | 82, 085 | ${ }^{2} 82.655$ |
| Apparent loss. | 42 | 193 | 513 | 4,230 | 4, 730 |
| Per cent of loss | 1.3 | 71.2 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 5.4 |

[^14]
## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.

From Table 33 it will be seen that there was no material loss during baking except in the case of the ether extract. This accords with the experiments of Professor Voorhees ${ }^{1}$ at New Brunswick, N. J., as will be seen by the comparison of the loss of fat during the process of baking shown in the following table:

Table 34.-Loss of fat in baking bread, as shown in experiments in Pittsburg and New Jersey.

|  | Weight of fat in raw materials. | Weight of fat in baked bread. | Loss. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In the Pittsburg experiment | Grams. 721 | Grams. 78 | I'er cent. 71 |
| In the first Now Brunswick experime | 2, 638 | 1,133 | 57 |
| In the second New Brunswick experiment. | 2,337 | 1,037 | 59 |

It would seem from the above results that either the fat is rendered partially insoluble in ether during the process of baking or that it has been volatilized. The fact that there is a very considerable loss in the fuel value of the materials in the bread as compared with that of the raw ingredients before baking indicates that the latter is the true explanation, for if the fats had simply been rendered nonextractable their heat of combustion would probably have remained unchanged and there would be no such pronounced loss of heat values as is actually the case.

The relative cost of the raw materials and of the baked bread.-It was shown in Table 32 that raw materials worth $\$ 1.24$ when made into

[^15]bread sold for $\$ 2.60$, or an increase of 110 per cent over the original cost. In the experiment carried on in New Jersey the increase was 116 per cent. In other words, the consumer pays from $\$ 210$ to $\$ 216$ for bread made from raw materials costing $\$ 100$. The labor of making the bread, rent of building, etc., are not taken into account, but would not in all probability account for the discrepancy, allowing a fair profit.

From the above it would seem that in the case of very poor families, like those reported in dietary studies Nos. 128 and 129 above, an important pecuniary saving would result if bread was baked at home. To the man in ordinary circumstances it must be always more a question of convenience and taste than of cost. In short, each family can best determine whether it is desirable to pay the baker for the trouble of making the bread and delivering it or whether the labor of making and the extra fuel for baking can best be provided at home.

As mentioned above, the actual cost per pound of bread is apparently less in Pittsburg than in the other cities where similar investigations have been carried on.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ U.S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 21, p. 206 et seq.; Bul. 46, p. 6.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ These averages were taken from U.S. Dept. Agr.. Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28, in the case of studies Nos. 43,128 , and 129. In studies Nos. 189, 190, and 191 figures from a revision of the above bulletin not yet in print were used.
    ${ }^{2}$ The reference numbers are those used in an unpublished compilation of analyses of American food materials.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Connecticut Storrs Sta. Rpt. 1896, p. 155.
    ${ }^{2}$ U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 32, 1. 14.
    ${ }^{3}$ Not yet published.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.
    ${ }^{2}$ Such foods are undoubtedly of value for the acids and mineral salts which they contain. There are many theories which rest on such an assumption, and references to the value of fruit acids and salts are numerous, particularly in popular articles. The consensus of opinion of leading physiologists seems to be that few definitestatements can be made on this subject, since the number of experiments bearing upon it is comparatively limited.

[^4]:    The study began January 24, 1896, and continued 29 days.
    The number of meals taken was as follows:
    Meals.
    Two men ............................................................................... . . . 174
    Woman ( 87 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equivalent to ..................... 70
    Girl, 16 years old ( 87 meals $\times 0.7$ meal of man), equivalent to..... . 61
    Two boys, 10 and 13 jears old ( 173 meals $\times 0.6$ meal of man), equiva-
    lent to .................................................................................. 104
    
    Visitors................................................................................... . 4
    Total number of meals taken, equivalent to .... ................. . . . . 500
    Equivalent to 1 man 167 days.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Analyzed in connection $w i t h$ this dietary.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Analyzed in connection with this clietary.
    ${ }^{2}$ Composition assumed, as there are no analises of such materials.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ U. S. Dept. Agr., Oftice of Experiment Stations Bul. 46, p. 65.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Composition assumed.
    ${ }^{2}$ This large percentage of refuse must have included more or less waste as well. Inasmuch, however, as the total weight of eggs used is very small, the figures for the amount of refuse are given as reported.

[^9]:    The study began January 14, 1897, and continued 30 days.
    The number of meals taken was as follows:
    Meais.
    Man ........................................................................................... $1 .$.
    Woman ( 90 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equiralent to $\ldots \ldots$............ 72
    Girl, 15 years old ( 89 meals $\times 0.7$ meal of man), equiralent to...... 62
    Boy, 12 years old ( 90 meals $\times 0.6$ meal of man), equiralent to....... 54
    Child, 2 years old ( 90 meals $\times 0.4$ meal of man), equiralent to $\ldots .$.
    Visitors, women (5 meals $\times 0.8$ meal of man), equivalent to........ 4
    Visitor, man............................................................................. 1
    Total number of meals taken, equivalent to..................... 287
    Equivalent to 1 mau 96 dares.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Dinners were taken at a restaurant.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Connecticut Storrs Sta. Rpt. 1896, and U.S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations, Bul. 32. Dictary No. 43 of this bulletin is also inchuded and three dietaries of professional men in Illinois not yet published.
    ${ }_{2}^{2}$ Average of nine studies.
    ${ }^{3}$ Connecticut Storrs Sta. Rpt. 1896, and U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Buls. 29, 32, and 35 .
    ${ }^{4}$ A verage of five studies.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Percentage composition taken from arerage composition of such foods as given in U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28.
    ${ }_{2}$ Water and ash determined. Nutrients assumed to be in same relative proportions as in average given in U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28.
    ${ }^{3}$ Including water used in preparing the bread.

[^13]:    * U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ On the supposition that 1 gram of protein, fat, and carbohydrates will yield $5.5,9.3$, and 4.1 calories, respectively. See foot note to Table 31.
    ${ }_{3}^{2}$ Determined by bomb calorimeter.
    ${ }^{3}$ Calculated.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.

