Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



BULLETIN No. 52.

59

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS.



NUTRITION INVESTIGATIONS

PITTSBURG, PA., 1894-1896,

IN

ВY

ISABEL BEVIER,

Professor of Natural Science in the Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburg.



WASHINGTON: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE. 1898. 246

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS OF THE OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS ON THE FOOD AND NUTRITION OF MAN.

Charts. Food and Diet. By W. O. Atwater. (Four charts, 26 by 40 inches.)

- Bul. 21. Methods and Results of Investigations on the Chemistry and Economy of Food. By W. O. Atwater. Pp. 222.
- Bul. 28. The Chemical Composition of American Food Materials. By W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 47.
- Bul. 29. Dietary Studies at the University of Tennessee in 1895. By C. E. Wait, with comments by W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 45.
- Bul. 31. Dietary Studies at the University of Missouri in 1895, and Data Relating to Bread and Meat Consumption in Missouri. By H. B. Gibson, S. Calvert, and D. W. May, with comments by W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 24.
- Bul. 32. Dietary Studies at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., in 1895. By W. E. Stone, with comments by W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 28.
- Bul. 35. Food and Nutrition Investigations in New Jersey in 1895 and 1896. By E. B. Voorhees. Pp. 40.
- Bul. 37. Dietary Studies at the Maine State College in 1895. By W. H. Jordan. Pp. 57.
- Bul. 38, Dietary Studies with Reference to the Food of the Negro in Alabama in 1895 and 1896. Conducted with the Cooperation of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute and the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama. Reported by W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 69.
- Bul. 40. Dietary Studies in New Mexico in 1895. By A. Goss. Pp. 23.
- Bul. 43. Losses in Boiling Vegetables and the Composition and Digestibility of Potatoes and Eggs. By H. Snyder, A. J. Frisby, and A. P. Bryant. Pp. 31.
- Bul. 44. Report of Preliminary Investigations on the Metabolism of Nitrogen and Carbon in the Human Organism with a Respiration Calorimeter of Special Construction. By W. O. Atwater, C. D. Woods, and F. G. Benedict. Pp. 64.
- Bul. 45. A Digest of Metabolism Experiments in which the Balance of Income and Outgo was Determined. By W. O. Atwater and C. F. Langworthy, Pp. 434.
- Bul, 46. Dietary Studies in New York City in 1895 and 1896. By W. O. Atwater and C. D. Woods. Pp. 117.

FARMERS' BULLETINS.

Bul. 23. Foods: Nutritive Value and Cost. By W. O. Atwater. Pp. 32.

Bul. 34. Meats: Composition and Cooking. By C. D. Woods. Pp. 29.

Bul. 74. Milk as Food. Pp. 39.

BULLETIN No. 52.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, office of experiment stations.

NUTRITION INVESTIGATIONS

IN

PITTSBURG, PA., 1894-1896,

 $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Y}$

ISABEL BEVIER,

Professor of Natural Science in the Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburg.



WASHINGTON: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE. 1898. 246

.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS, Washington, D. C., March 24, 1898.

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.

These investigations were made under the immediate supervision of Prof. W. O. Atwater, special agent in charge of nutrition investigations, in accordance with instructions given by the Director of this Office.

In the prosecution of these investigations cordial cooperation and substantial aid were given by the authorities of the Pennsylvania College for Women. Special acknowledgments are also due the board of directors of Kingsley House, the college settlement of Pittsburg. The residents of Kingsley House rendered valuable assistance in the selection of the families whose dietaries were studied; while two of the residents, Miss L. P. Meloy and Miss E. R. Evans, gave much of their time to the practical details of the work.

The samples were prepared for analyses in the laboratory of the Pennsylvania 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.

Professor Bevier's report is respectfully submitted, with the recommendation that it be published as Bulletin No. 52 of this Office.

> A. C. TRUE, Director.

Hon. JAMES WILSON, Secretary of Agriculture.

3

.

· .

, ,

.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Dietary studies	7
Purpose and plan	7
Dietary standards.	8
Character and composition of food materials used	9
Details of the dietary studies	12
Dietary study of a lawyer's family (No. 43)	12
Dietary study of a mill workman's family (No. 128)	18
Dietary study of a mill workman's family (No. 129)	22
Dietary study of a boiler tender's family (No. 189)	27
Dietary study of a decorator's family (No. 190)	31
Dietary study of a glass blower's family (No. 191)	35
General remarks on the dietary studies	40
Food accessories	42
Variations in the cost and composition of bread	43
Discussion of results	45
Bakery experiment.	46
Discussion of results	47
	- 11

· · · ·



NUTRITION INVESTIGATIONS IN PITTSBURG, PA., 1894–1896.

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, mechanics, 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 beginning of the study and those received during the experiment the amounts remaining at the end were subtracted. This gave the

7

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 vegetable materials in the waste (bread crumbs, bits of meat, prepared food of different sorts, etc.) 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 nutrients in the waste subtracted from those of the food gave the amounts of nutrients 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 assign 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 2 to 5 years of age, inclusive, equivalent to 0.4 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 standards¹ 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

¹U.S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 21, p. 206 et seq.; Bul. 46, p. 6.

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.
Man without muscular work . Man with light muscular work . Man with moderate muscular work .	Grams. 100 112 125	Calories. 2, 700 3, 000 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. Seventeen specimens were analyzed in connection 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 every 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 bone. Used in dietary No. 128.
- 276. Beef, round steak .- No bone. 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.
- Beef, short steak.—Sample, 1.18 pounds. No bone. Price, 10 cents per pound. Used in dietary No. 43.

¹These 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.

²The reference numbers are those used in an unpublished compilation of analyses of American food materials.

- 415. Beef, lirer.-Used in dietary No. 129.
- 1029. Veal cutlets.-Weight of sample, 2.84 pounds; refuse, 0.06 pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
- 1122. Calf's liver.-Weight of sample, 2.09 pounds; refuse, 0.09 pound. Used in dietary No. 43.
- 1505. Lamb, leg.-Weight of sample, 7.12 pounds; refuse, 0.5 pound.
- 2025. Pork, loin roast.-Used in dietary No. 129.

2137. 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.	Refer- ence No.	Refuse.	Water.	Protein.	Fat.	Ash.	Fuel value per pound.
Beef: Rib roast Round steak Kidneys Veal: Cutlets Liver Lamb leg.	197 237 411 1029 1122 1505	Per cent. 19.4 11.6 19.9 2.1 4.3 7.0	Per cent. 38.2 64.3 63.1 73.8 69.3 48.2	Per cent. 13.2 18.6 14.1 19.6 18.9 16.0	Per cent. 28.7 4.6 1.9 3.3 6.3 28.0	Per cent. 0.5 .9 1.0 1.2 1.2 .8	Calories. 1, 455 540 340 505 620 1, 480

TABLE 2.-Composition of fresh, edible portion of food materials analyzed.1

Kind of food material.	Refer- ence No.	Water.	Protein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Ash.	Fuel value per pound.
ANIMAL FOOD. Beef: Boiling piece, neck, free from bone. Boiling piece, rump Rib roast Ronud steak	$145 \\ 304 \\ 197 \\ 237$	Per cent. 69.3 43.1 47.4 72.7	Per cent. 20. 9 22. 4 16. 5 21. 0	Per cent. 8.7 33.3 35.5 5.2	Per cent.	Per cent. 1.1 1.2 .6 1.1	Calories. 755 1, 820 1, 810 610
Round steak, free from bone Do	275 276	65.2 61.9	20. 9 21. 0	12.7 16.0		1.2 1.1	925 1,0 65
Average		66, 6	21.0	11.3		1.1	
Shoulder clod Short steak Kidneys Liver Veal:	$341 \\ 58 \\ 411 \\ 415$	69. 0 67. 7 78. 7 75. 0	18.8 19.8 17.6 18.8	$ \begin{array}{r} 11.2 \\ 11.5 \\ 2.4 \\ 3.9 \end{array} $	1.0	$ \begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ 1.0 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.3 \end{array} $	820 855 430 535
Veal: Cutlets Liver Lamb: Leg Pork:	$1029 \\ 1122 \\ 1505$	75.4 72.4 51.8	20.1 19.8 17.2	$3.3 \\ 6.6 \\ 30.1$		$\begin{array}{c} 1.2\\ 1.2\\ .9\end{array}$	$515 \\ 645 \\ 1, 590$
Loin roast Kidneys Lard Butter		41.1 76.1 7.0	15.8 17.2	42.3 5.5 100.0 89.5		.8 1.2 3.5	$\begin{array}{c}2,080\\550\\4,220\\3,775\end{array}$
Do Butterine Milk Do Do		$10.3 \\ 10.0 \\ 88.0 \\ 87.7 \\ 88.1$	$ \begin{array}{c} 1.0\\.5\\3.0\\3.2\\2.9\end{array} $	$\begin{array}{r} 86.9\\ 86.1\\ 3.7\\ 2.6\\ 3.0\end{array}$	4.6 5.8 5.3	1.8 3.4 .7 .7 .7	3, 685 3, 640 300 275 280
VEGETABLE FOOD.							
Buckwheat flour Corn meal Flour, wheat Rolled oats	$5014 \\ 5026 \\ 5311 \\ 5079$	12.3 10.2 9.5 1.8	5.2 9.2 14.4 16.9	1.2 1.5 1.3 7.8	$\begin{array}{c} 80.\ 7\\ 78.\ 4\\ 74.\ 4\\ 71.\ 8\end{array}$.6 .7 .4 1.7	$1,650 \\ 1,675 \\ 1,705 \\ 1,980$
White bread Do	5573 5574	34.6 35.8	9.2 9.7	.5 .7	54.3 52.6	1.4 1.2	1, 200 1, 185
Average		35.2	9.5	. 6	53.4	1.3	1,195
Sugar, granulated Sugar, coffee Beans, Lima, dried		$ 1.4 \\ 4.6 \\ 12.2 $	12.8	1.9	98, 6 95, 4 69, 5	3.6	$ \begin{array}{r} 1,835\\ 1,775\\ 1,645 \end{array} $

¹With the exception of Nos. 197, 237, 411, 1029, 112, and 1505, these analyses also represent the composition of the foods as purchased.

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

Kind of food material.	Refer- ence No.	Nitrogen.	Protein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Ash.
ANIMAL FOOD. Beef: Boiling piece, neck, free from bone Boiling piece, runp	$\frac{145}{304}$	Per cent. 11.13 6.38	Per cent. 68.2 39.4	$ 28.3 \\ 58.6 $	Per cent.	$3.5 \\ 2.0$
Rib roast Round steak	197 237	5.11 12.67	31.3 77.0	67.6 19.0		1.1 4.0
Round steak, free from boue Do		9.68 9.15	60. 0 55. 2	36.7 42.0		3.3 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: Cntlets Liver Lamb: Leg	$1029 \\ 1122 \\ 1505$	$13.10 \\ 10.65 \\ 5.86$	81.6 71.7 35.6	$ \begin{array}{c} 13.6 \\ 23.9 \\ 62.5 \end{array} $		$4.8 \\ 4.4 \\ 1.9$

Kind of food material.	Refer- ence No.	Nitrogen.	Protein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Ash.
ANIMAL FOOD-continued.						
Pork: Loin roast Kidneys Lard	2137	Per cent. 4.11 11.02	Per cent. 26.8 71.9	Per cent. 71.9 22.9 100.0	Per cent.	1.3 5.2
Butter Do Butterine Milk				96. 2 96. 9 95. 6 30. 9	38.3	3.8 2.0 3.8 5.8
Do. Do.			23.0 26.0 24.4	21.1 25.2	47.2 44.5	5.8 5.7 5.9
VEGETABLE FOOD.						
Buckwheat flour. Corn meal. Flour, wheat. Rolled oats.	$5026 \\ 5311$		5.9 10.3 15.9 17.3	$ \begin{array}{r} 1.4 \\ 1.7 \\ 1.4 \\ 7.9 \end{array} $	$92. 0 \\ 87. 3 \\ 82. 2 \\ 73. 1$.7 .7 .5 1.7
White bread			14.1 15.1	.8 1.1	83.0 82.0	2.1 1.8
Average			14.6	1.0	82.5	1.9
Sugar. granulated Sugar. coffee Beans, Lima, dried				2.1	100.0 100.0 77.8	4.5

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

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.

DIETARY STUDY OF A LAWYER'S FAMILY (No. 43).

The first of the dietary studies here reported was made in the winter of 1895 in the family of a lawyer 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 taken was as follows:

	Meals.
Two men	155
Six women (529 meals \times 0.8 meal of man), equivalent to	423
Girl 12 years old (90 meals \times 0.6 meal of man), equivalent to	54
Visitors, men	16
Visitors, women (41 meals \times 0.8 meal of man), equivalent to	33
Visitor, child, equivalent to	1
Total number of meals taken equivalent to	682

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

		(Composit	ion.			Weig	ht used.	
Beef: trian bone 1 16.5 trians, tris, tris, trians, trians, trians, trians, trians, trians, trians,	Kind of food material.		Fat.			food ma-		Fat.	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Beef: Rib, no bone ¹ Rump, no bone ¹ Shoulder clod ¹ . Short steak ¹ . Tenderloin steak Dried and smoked Kidneys, edible portion ¹ .	16.5 21.0 16.8 18.8 19.8 14.8 31.8 17.6	$\begin{array}{c} 35.5 \\ 5.2 \\ 25.6 \\ 11.2 \\ 11.5 \\ 27.3 \\ 6.8 \\ 2.4 \end{array}$	0.6	$2.40 \\ .58 \\ .95 \\ .40 \\ .44 \\ .25 \\ .30$	5, 300 6, 945 2, 265 3, 760 1, 840 1, 100 455 1, 845	$875 \\ 1, 458 \\ 380 \\ 707 \\ 364 \\ 163 \\ 144 \\ 325 \\ 144$	$ \begin{array}{c} 1, 881 \\ 361 \\ 580 \\ 421 \\ 212 \\ 300 \\ 31 \\ 44 \\ \end{array} $	3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Total				7.68	23. 510	4,416	3, 830	3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Chops, no bone Cutlets, no bone ¹	20.1	3.3		. 95	2.200	442	73	
	Total				2.55	6, 3 90	1,263	429	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Chops, no bone Leg, no bone ¹ Roast, no bone	17.6 17.2 17.6	28.3 30.1 28.3		1.00 1.11	3,005 3,200	517 563	904 906	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Total				3.25	9,605	1,653	2,662	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ribs Bacon Ham, no bone Ham	9.2 15.5 13.3	61.8 39.1 33.4		.06 .19 .12 .24	170 625 470 875	16 97 63	105 244 157 397	7
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total				1.30	10, 630	568	7,917	7
Total animal food. 37. 43 150, 290 11, 962 33, 831 3, 411 VEGETABLE FOOD. Cereals: Barley 9.3 1.0 77. 6 .03 365 34 4 283 Barley 9.3 1.0 77. 6 .03 365 34 4 283 Barley 9.3 1.0 77. 6 .01 11, 110 578 133 8, 966 Corn meal ¹ 9.3 1.5 78. 4 117 3, 940 366 59 3, 0.541 Rice 78. 4 74. 4 2.17 41, 050 5, 911 534 30, 541 Rice 7.8 74. 79. 2.2 1.520 1.8 6 1, 201 Rolled oats ¹ 16.9 7.8 71. 7 42 3, 090 522 241 2, 216 Bread, baker's 9.5 1.2 52.8 .55 5, 105 485 61 2.095 Macaroni 11.7 1.6 72.9 .09 340 40	Eggs (15.9 per cent shell) Butter ¹ Cheese Milk ¹	$ \begin{array}{r} 14.9 \\ 26.0 \\ 3.0 \\ 2.5 \\ \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{r} 10.6 \\ 89.5 \\ 34.2 \\ 3.7 \\ 18.5 \\ \end{array} $	2.3 4.6 4.5	3.75 8.54 .20 4.76	$13,510 \\ 625 \\ 55,725$	1, 605 163 1, 672	$1, 142 \\ 12, 091 \\ 214 \\ 2, 062$	2.563
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Total animal food				37.43	150, 290	11, 962	33, 831	3, 411
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	VEGETABLE FOOD.			•					
Sugars: 98.6 2.07 18,825 18,561 Sugar, granulated 1 95.0 49 4,425 4,204 Molasses (New Orleans). 2.7 68.0 .07 3,175 86 2.159	Barley Bnckwheat flour ¹ Corn meal ¹ Flour, wheat Rice Rolled oats ¹ Bread, baker's	5.2 9.3 14.4 7.8 16.9 9.5	1.2 1.5 1.3 .4 7.8 1.2	80. 7 78. 4 74. 4 79. 0 71. 7 52. 8	.61 .17 2.17 .25 .42 .55	$11, 110 \\ 3, 940 \\ 41, 050 \\ 1, 520 \\ 3, 090 \\ 5, 105$	578 366 5,911 118 522 485	$ \begin{array}{r} 133 \\ 59 \\ 534 \\ 6 \\ 241 \\ 61 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} 8, 966 \\ 3, 089 \\ 30, 541 \\ 1, 201 \\ 2, 216 \\ 2, 695 \end{array}$
Sugar, granulated ¹ 98.6 2.07 18,825 18,561 Sugar, brown 95.0 49 4,425 4,204 Molasses (New Orleans) 2.7 68.0 .07 3,175 86	Total				4.29	66, 520	8,054	1,043	49, 239
Total 2. 63 26, 425 86 24, 924	Sugars: Sugar, granulated ¹ Sugar, brown Molasses (New Orleans)	2.7		98.6 95.0 68.0	. 49	4,425			4,204
	Total				2.63	26, 425	86		24, 924

TABLE 4.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dictary study No. 43.

¹ Analyzed in connection with this dietary.

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigl	nt used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
VEGETABLE FOOD-continued.								
Vegetables: Beans, dried Beans, Lima, dried Cabbage, edible portion Lettuce Onions, edible portion Peas, canned Potatoes (29.9 per cent refuse) Sweet potatoes (24.9 per cent refuse)	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct. \\ 22. \ 3 \\ 14. \ 0 \\ 2. \ 1 \\ 2. \ 8 \\ 1. \ 1 \\ 1. \ 7 \\ 3. \ 6 \\ 2. \ 1 \\ 1. \ 8 \end{array}$	Per ct. 1.8 1.9 .4 1.3 .3 .4 .2 .1 .7	$\begin{array}{c} Pcr \ cent. \\ 59.1 \\ 70.1 \\ 5.8 \\ 19.3 \\ 2.7 \\ 9.9 \\ 9.8 \\ 18.0 \\ 27.1 \end{array}$	\$0. 26 .14 .18 .52 .04 .10 .70 1.66 .37	Grams. 3, 035 1, 275 1, 930 1, 825 285 535 5, 175 35, 855 3, 795	Grams. 677 178 40 51 3 9 186 753 68	Grams. 55 24 8 24 1 2 11 36 27	Grams. 1, 793 894 112 352 8 53 507 6, 454 1, 028
Tomatoes, canned	1.0	. 2	4.0	. 47	6, 045	72	12	242
Total			<u></u>	4.44	59,755	2,037	200	11, 443
Fruits, etc.: Cranberries Oranges, pulp Prunellas	.5 .8 2.0	. 7 . 6 . 7	$10.\ 1 \\ 9.\ 7 \\ 58.\ 6$	$.35 \\ 1.20 \\ .30$	$1,475 \\ 2,440 \\ 905$	7 19 18	$\begin{array}{c}10\\15\\6\end{array}$	$150 \\ 237 \\ 530$
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, 934
Waste	10.2	15.8	24.6		14, 795	1, 509	2, 338	3, 639

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

¹ Analyzed in connection with this dietary.

 TABLE 5.—Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 43.

		Weig	ghts.			Total food.				
Kind of food material.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton Pork, lard, etc Fish, etc Butter Cheese Milk. Cream	Grams. 174 47 5 47 60 3 245 81	Grams. 32 3 1 7 2	Grams. 31 35 5 53 1 9 15	Grams.		$\begin{array}{c} Per \ et. \\ 12. \ 8 \\ 3. \ 5 \\ .4 \\ 3. \ 5 \\ 4. \ 4 \\ .2 \\ 18. \ 1 \\ 5. \ 9 \end{array}$	Per ct. 33.1 2.6 .7 7.2 .7 7.5 2.1	Per ct. 19. 7 22. 6 . 3 3.3 34. 4 . 6 5. 9 9. 6	Per ct.	$\begin{array}{c} Perct. \\ 26.5 \\ 2.6 \\ .8 \\ 7.4 \\ 16.9 \\ .4 \\ 9.4 \\ 9.9 \end{array}$
Total animal food.	662	53	149	15	16.5	48.8	53.9	96.4	3.8	73. 9
Cereals . Sugars and starches Vegetables	$ \begin{array}{r} 293 \\ 117 \\ 263 \\ 21 \end{array} $	36 9	5	$217 \\ 110 \\ 50 \\ 4$		21. 68. 619. 41. 6	36.3 .4 9.2 .2	2.9 .6 .1	$54.8 \\ 27.7 \\ 12.7 \\ 1.0$	
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

	We	ights an	d fuel va	lue.	Cost.	Percentages of total food.				
Kind of food.	Pro- teiu.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.		Pro- teiu.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY.										
Food purchased: Animal . Vegetable	Grams. 53 45	Grams. 149 6	Grams. 15 381	Calories 1,665 1,800	Cents. 16. 5 5. 8	Per ct. 53.9 46.1	Per ct. 96, 4 3. 6	Per ct. 3.8 96.2	Per ct. 48.0 52.0	Per ct. 73. 9 26. 1
Total Waste	98 7	$\begin{array}{c}155\\10\end{array}$	396 16	$3,465 \\ 185$	$22.3 \\ {}^{1}1.5$	100.0 6.8	100.0 6.7	100.0 4.0	100.0 5.5	100.0 6.8
Food actually eaten	91	145	380	3, 280	20.8	93. 2	93.3	96.0	94.5	93.2

 TABLE 6.—Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 43.

¹Estimated.

Discussion of results.—The amount of nutrients per man per day actually consumed by this family agree very closely with averages of the food consumption 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 Connecticut¹ shows rather more protein (107 grams) and about the same fuel value (3,430 calories). The dietary of a teacher's family in Indiana² showed a daily consumption of 106 grams protein and a fuel value of 2,780 calories, while two dietaries of professional men in Chicago³ 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. 129 (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 among 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.

¹Connecticut Storrs Sta. Rpt. 1896, p. 155.

² U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 32, p. 14.

³Not yet published.

In other words, 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 flour. The cost of the flour was \$1.54 (2.4 cents a pound). In bakery experiments carried on in New Jersey¹ 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_1 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 1043 pounds of bread would thus be about \$2.60, or 21 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 24 cents a pound, 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

¹U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.

²Such 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 definite statements can be made on this subject, since the number of experiments bearing upon it is comparatively limited.

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 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. 43.

Kind of food ma-	Actual	Nutrie	ents and	energy in	1 pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.				
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	
Beef: Ribs Round Shoulder clod. Veal, chops. Lamb, roast. Eg:s. Butter Milk Wheat flour Rolled oats.	$ \begin{array}{r} 15.0 \\ 13.3 \\ 28.0 \\ 3.9 \end{array} $	Pound. 0.120 .196 .184 .159 .164 .122 .029 .122 .144	Pound. 0.255 .047 .109 .084 .261 .086 .868 .036 .012 .070	Pound.	$\begin{matrix} Calories. \\ 1, 300 \\ 565 \\ 800 \\ 650 \\ 1, 405 \\ 590 \\ 3, 665 \\ 290 \\ 1, 635 \\ 1, 870 \end{matrix}$	Pound. 0.08 .13 .16 .09 .11 .09 .07 .51 .23	0.17	Pounds.	Calories. 865 375 700 360 935 445 1, 310 750 6, 805 3. 015	
Bread, baker's Sugar, granulated . Beans, dried Potatoes Oranges	$\begin{array}{r} 4.9 \\ 5.0 \\ 4.2 \\ 1.5 \\ 10.0 \end{array}$. 081 . 161 . 013 . 008	. 011	.517 .966 .593 .120 .043	$1,160 \\ 1,795 \\ 1,470 \\ 245 \\ 80$. 16 . 38 . 09	. 02	$1.06 \\ 1.93 \\ 1.41 \\ .80 \\ .04$	2.365 3,595 3.500 1,645 80	

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 foods. Cereals and starches Sugars Vegetables and fruits	98 85	Per cent. 97 90	Per cent. 100 98 100
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

17089—No. 52—2

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 and 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 derived from a varied dietary may more than offset the difference in cost, within limits, if absolute economy need not be practiced.

DIETARY STUDY 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 sewing 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.

The study began January 24, 1896, and continued 29 days. The number of meals taken was as follows:

Meals	
Two men 174	ł
Woman (87 meals \times 0.8 meal of man), equivalent to	0
Girl, 16 years old (87 meals \times 0.7 meal of man), equivalent to 61	1
Two boys, 10 and 13 years old (173 meals \times 0.6 meal of man), equiva-	
lent to 104	1
Two children, 6 and 8 years old (174 meals \times 0.5 meal of man),	
equivalent to	ī
Visitors	1
	_

Total number of meals taken, equivalent to 500 Equivalent to 1 man 167 days. 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.

					Weight used.				
	C	omposit	10h.			w eigi	it used.		
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	
ANIMAL FOOD Beef: Stew meat, mostly neck, no bone ' Ronnd, no bone ' Bologna sausage Suet	Per ct. 20, 9 20, 9 18, 0 4, 8	Per ct. 8.7 12.7 19.7 79.9	Per ct.	\$1.00 1.65 .30	Grams. 7, 810 8, 305 1, 445 140	Grams. 1, 632 1, 7:26 260 7	Grams. 680 1,054 285 112	Grams.	
Total				2.95	17,700	3, 635	2, 131		
10111									
Pork: Steak	15.5 18.2 9.2	36.0 14.8 39.1 37.0 61.8 24.0 100.0		$ \begin{array}{r} .53 \\ .20 \\ .45 \\ .46 \\ .15 \\ .90 \\ \end{array} $	2,4803,0351,4403,9701,9608103,440	290 489 217 723 180 151	$893 \\ 449 \\ 547 \\ 1.469 \\ 1.211 \\ 194 \\ 3.440$		
Total				4.34	17,095	2,050	8,203		
Fish : Herring, smoked, no bone, Salmon, canned	36.4 20.7	15.8 10.8	1.2	. 20	1,460 855	531 177	231 92		
Total				. 50	2, 315	708	323		
Eggs, without shell Butter ¹ Cheese, whole milk Cheese, Limburger. Milk ¹	14.9 1.0 26.0 23.0 3.2	$ \begin{array}{r} 10.6 \\ 86.9 \\ 34.2 \\ 29.4 \\ 2.6 \end{array} $	2.3 .4 5.8	$ \begin{array}{r} .99 \\ 3.08 \\ .16 \\ .12 \\ 1.20 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{r} 2,735\\ 5,480\\ 470\\ 270\\ 19,305\end{array}$	407 55 122 62 618	$\begin{array}{r} 290\\ 4,762\\ 161\\ 80\\ 502 \end{array}$	11 1 1, 119	
Total animal food				13. 34	65, 370	7,657	16, 452	, 1, 131	
VEGETABLE FOOD.									
Barley Flour Oatmeal Rice Bread Cake Pie	15.6 7.8 9.2 7.0	$1.0 \\ 1.1 \\ 7.3 \\ .4 \\ .5 \\ 8.1 \\ 9.5$	$\begin{array}{c} 77.6\\74.6\\68.0\\79.0\\54.3\\63.4\\39.5\end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{r} .03 \\ .20 \\ .05 \\ .05 \\ 3.30 \\ .49 \\ .45 \\ \end{array} $	$255 \\ 2,555 \\ 455 \\ 455 \\ 445 \\ 2,565 \\ 2,565 \\ 2,585 $	$24 \\ 289 \\ 71 \\ 36 \\ 4,084 \\ 180 \\ 121$	2 28 33 2 222 208 246	$198 \\ 1,906 \\ 310 \\ 359 \\ 24,107 \\ 1,626 \\ 1,021 \\ 1,021 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 190 \\ 100 \\$	
Total				4.57	53, 265	4,805	741	29, 527	
Sugars: Sugar, coffee ¹ Molasses	2.7		95. 4 68. 0	L. 07 . 15	8, 210 1, 755	48		7, 833 1, 193	
Total	·			1.22	9, 965	48		9,026	
Vegetables: Beans Catsup Peas Onions Potatoes (23.4 per cent	$ \begin{array}{r} 22.3 \\ 1.5 \\ 24.1 \\ 1.5 \end{array} $	1.8 .2 1.1 .4	59.1 12.3 61.5 8.9	. 30 . 10 . 01 . 04	2,350 215 115 1,205	524 3 28 18	42 1 5	1, 389 26 71 107	
refuse)	2.1 1.2	$^{\cdot 1}_{\cdot 2}$	$18.0 \\ 4.0$	$1.55 \\ .20$	$\frac{48,335}{1,620}$	$\begin{array}{c}1.\ 015\\19\end{array}$	48 3	8, 700 65	
Total				2.20	53, 840	1.607	99	10, 358	
								1	

¹Analyzed in connection with this dietary.

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigl	nt used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
VEGETABLE FOOD-continued.								
Fruit, etc.: Apples Jani Prunes	Per ct. 1.4 1.1 2.0	Per ct. 3.0	Per ct. 57.6 77.1 58.6	\$0.05 .19 .10	Grams. 1,020 570 400	Grams. 14 6 8	Grams. 31 3	Grams. 587 440 234
Total				. 34	1,990	28	34	1, 261
Total vegetable food				8.33	119,060	6, 488	874	50, 172
Total food				21.67	184, 430	14, 145	17, 326	51,303
Accessories: Coffee Tea Salt Yeast. Pepper Mustard Vinegar Total				.51 .42 .04 .02 .05 .10 .08 1.22	1, 080 365 740 15 25 280 855			
Total cost of food and accessories		·		22. 89				
Waste: Animal ¹ . Vegetable (bread crumbs) ¹		47.3	40.0			128 133	447 69	720
Total waste					2, 745	261	516	720

TABLE 8.-Food materials and table and kitchen wastes in dietary study No. 128-Cont'd.

¹ Analyzed in connection with this dietary.

 TABLE 9.— Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man

 per day in dietary study No. 128.

		Weig	ghts.			Perc	entages	of total	fo o d.	Cost.
Kind of food material.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy: drates.	
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton Pork, lard, etc Fish, etc Butter Butter Cheese Milk	Grams. 106 102 14 16 33 4 116	Grams. 22 12 4 3 1 4	Grams. 13 49 2 2 29 1 3	Grams.		Per ct. 9.6 9.2 1.2 1.5 3.0 .4 10.5	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct. \\ 25.7 \\ 14.5 \\ 5.0 \\ 2.9 \\ .4 \\ 1.3 \\ 4.3 \end{array}$	Per ct. 12.3 47.3 1.9 1.7 27.5 1.4 2.9	Per ct.	13.6 20.0 2.3
Total animal food	391	46	99	7	8.0	35.4	54.1	95.0	2.2	61.5
Cereals. Sugars and starches Vegetables. Fruits.	$319 \\ 60 \\ 322 \\ 12$	29 10	4	$ \begin{array}{r} 177 \\ 54 \\ 62 \\ 7 \end{array} $		$ \begin{array}{r} 28.9 \\ 5.4 \\ 29.2 \\ 1.1 \end{array} $	34.0 .3 11.4 .2	4.3 .5 .2	57.6 17.6 20.2 2.4	$ \begin{array}{c} 21.1 \\ 5.6 \\ 10.2 \\ 1.6 \end{array} $
Totalvegetable food	713	39	5	300	5.0	64.6	45.9	5.0	97.8	38.5
Total food	1,104	85	104	307	13.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	We	ights an	d fuel va	alue.		Perc	entages	of total	food.	
Kind of food.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY.										
Food purchased : Animal Vegetable	Grams. 46 39	Grams. 99 5	Grams. 7 300	Calories 1, 140 1, 435		Per ct. 54.1 45.9	Per ct. 95.0 5.0	Per ct. 2.2 97.8	Per ct. 44. 0 56. 0	Perct. 61. 5 38. 5
Total	85	104	307	2, 575	13.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Beverages, condi- ments, etc					. 8					
Waste: Animal Vegetable	1	3	4			.9 .9	2.5 .4	1.4		
Total	2	3	4	50		1.8	2.9	1.4	2.0	
Food actually eaten: Animal Vegetable	45 38	96 5	7 296			53.2 45.0	92.5 4.6	2. 2 96. 4		
Total	83	101	303	2, 525		98.2	97.1	98.6	98.0	

 TABLE 10.—Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 128.

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 would have obtained more nutrients for the same outlay of money. Round steak was purchased in considerable quantities 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 nutritious as sirloin steak at 18 or 20 cents a pound. Beef stew meat and beef round, pigs' feet, smoked herring, herring, bread, beans, and potatoes were all very economical foods. These eight materials furnished 73 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 jani 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 canned salmon used by this family was not economical, the smoked herring was very

economical. The herring is one of the few 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 lunch, and was purchased daily at a cost of 19 cents per pound. Butter, also, formed a heavy 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 diges	teoro nati nento in 1
pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials us	ed in dietary study
No. 128.	

Kind of food ma-	Actual cost	Nutri	ents and	en e rgy in	1 pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.				
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	
Beef:	Cents.	Pound.	Pound.	Pound.	Calories.	Pound.	Pounds.	Pound.	Calories.	
Stew meat	5.0	0.176	0.073		635				1,270	
Round		, 202	. 121		885	.14		. 23	995	
Bologna sau-										
sage	9.4	. 176	. 191		1,130	. 20		. 19	1,205	
Pork:										
Ham, boiled	18.8	.178	. 359		1,845				982	
Head-cheese	8.5	. 183	. 233		1,325	. 27		. 21	1,555	
Fish, herring,		(
smoked		. 339	. 145		1,245			. 57	2, 105	
Eggs	14.2	. 126	. 089		610	.06		. 09	4:30	
Butter		.010	. 843		3.575	.33			1,400	
Milk		. 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		. 133	. 064	. 669	1,760	. 13	1.33	. 27	3, 520	
Bread	3.4	. 078		. 532	1,135		1.56	. 23	3, 340	
Sugar, coffee				. 954	1,775		1.61		3,010	
Beans		. 178	. 016	. 561	1,442	. 03	. 97	. 31	2,495	
Potatoes	1.1	.013		. 130	265		1.18	. 12	2, 420	

DIETARY STUDY OF A MILL WORKMAN'S FAMILY (No. 129).

This dietary study was made with an English family in very poor 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 consumption. Severe colds frequently prevented him from working, and during the study he lost eight days on this account. He was a blacksmith by trade; his usual wages were \$1.25 per day. The mother and the married daughter. 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 daughters, 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 7 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	139
Two children, 10 and 13 years old (174 meals \times 0.6 meal of man	ı) ,
equivalent to	101
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.

	С	omposit	ion.			Weigh	nt used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost,	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
ANIMAL FOOD. Beef: Chuck Round, no bone ¹ Rump ¹ . Fore shank Liver ¹ . Leberwurst ²	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct. \\ 15.7 \\ 21.0 \\ 22.4 \\ 12.3 \\ 18.8 \\ 12.2 \end{array}$	Per ct. 10.2 16.0 33.3 7.3 3.9 20.2	Per et.	\$0.40 .75 .28 .20 .15 .14	Grams. 3, 160 3, 820 2, 300 1, 765 1, 800 1, 035	<i>Grams.</i> 496 802 515 217 339 126	<i>Grams.</i> 322 611 766 129 70 209	Grams.
Total Pork: Loin, no bone ¹ Ham. smoked, no bone Ham, boiled. Bacon Pigs' feet Kidney ¹ Sausage Lard, unrendered	15.8 15.5 18.2 9.2 10.0 17.2 12.8 1.1	42. 3 39. 1 37. 0 61. 8 9. 3 5. 5 45. 4 94. 0		1.92 1.95 1.15 $.10$ $.05$ $.15$ $.11$ $.05$ $.26$	$\begin{array}{c} 13,880\\ \hline \\ 9,235\\ 5,670\\ 325\\ 215\\ 1,715\\ 1,200\\ 340\\ 1,530\\ \end{array}$	2,495 1,459 879 59 20 172 206 44 17	$\begin{array}{c} 2,107\\ \hline \\ 3,906\\ 2,217\\ 120\\ 133\\ 159\\ 66\\ 154\\ 1,438\\ \hline \end{array}$	178
Total Oysters Butterine Cheese Milk ¹ Total animal food	$ \begin{array}{r} 6.1 \\ .5 \\ 26.0 \\ 2.9 \\ \hline \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{c} 1.4\\ 86.1\\ 342\\ 3.0\\ \hline \hline \end{array} $	3.3 2.3 5.3	3.82.101.45.50.808.59	$20, 230 \\ 525 \\ 3, 910 \\ 1, 860 \\ 14, 745 \\ \hline 55, 150$	2,8563220483428 $6,314$	8, 193 8 3, 366 636 442 14, 752	43 781 1,022

¹ Analyzed in connection with this dietary.

² From foreign analyses.

	C	Composit	ion.			Weig	ht used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
VEGETABLE FOOD.						e		
Cereals: Flour. Rolled oats Bread ¹ Cake.	Per ct. 11.3 16.9 9.7 7.0	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct. \\ 1.1 \\ 7.2 \\ .7 \\ 8.1 \end{array}$	Per ct. 74.6 66.8 52.6 63.4		Grams. 9,810 235 46,755 2,660	Grams. 1, 108 48 4, 535 186	Grams. 108 21 327 215	Grams. 7,318 190 24,593 1,687
Pie Rolls Sugar	4.7 9.6	9.5 5.2	$39.5 \\ 57.3 \\ 100.0$.38 .20 1.30	$3,720 \\ 2,660 \\ 10,455$	175 256	353 138	$ \begin{array}{r} 1, 469 \\ 1, 524 \\ 10, 455 \end{array} $
Total				4.99	76, 345	6, 308	1, 162	47,236
Vegetables:								
Beans Jeans, Lima. Cabbage (16 per cent ref-	22.3 15.9	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8 \\ 1.8 \end{array}$	59.1 67.1	$.06 \\ .15$	$\begin{smallmatrix}&580\\1,330\end{smallmatrix}$	129 212	$11 \\ 24$	343 892
Carrots (21.8 per cent ref-	2.1	.4	5.8	. 15	4.590	97	18	266
Use) Celery	$1.1 \\ 1.4$.4	9.2 3.0	.05 .05	670 200	7 3	3	62 6
Onious Parsnips (25 per cent ref-	1.5	.4	8.9	. 12	3, 445	52	14	306
use) Potatoes (34.6 per cent ref-	1.7 2.1	.6	16.1 18.0	. 05 . 66	655 21, 215	11	- 01	105
use) Water cress ² Ruta bagas (23 per cent	2.1 3.8 1.3	.1	8.9	.05	21, 213 115 2, 180	446 5 28	21 1 5	3,818 10 185
refuse) • Total	1.0		0.0	1.39	34,980	990	101	5, 993
Fruit, etc.:								
A pples Apple jelly ²	.4 1.1	.4	$\begin{array}{c} 12.4\\ 77.1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .10\\ .05\end{array}$	$1,715 \\ 365$	7 4	7	212 281
Total				. 15	2,080	11	7	493
Total vegetable food				6. 53	113, 405	7, 309	1,270	53, 722
Total food				15.12	168, 555	13, 623	16,022	54.744
A ccessories : Tea. Coffee. Salt. Mustard Yeast.				.71 .15 .08 .18 .02	$\begin{array}{r} 865 \\ 270 \\ 1,540 \\ 440 \\ 25 \end{array}$			
Total				1.14	3, 140			
Total cost of food and accessories				16. 26				
Waste: Animal ¹ Vegetable (bread crumbs) ¹	6. 9 6. 4	41.3 4.2	31.3		565 715	39 46	233 30	224
Total waste					1,280	85	263	224

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

¹ Analyzed in connection with this dietary. ² Composition assumed, as there are no analyses of such materials.

		Weig	ghts.			Perc	entages	of total	food.	
Kind of food material.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton. Pork, lard, etc Fish, etc. Butter. Cheese. Milk.	Grams. 80 116 3 22 11 85	Grams. 14 16	Grams. 12 47 20 4 2	1	Cents.	Per ct. 8.2 12.0 .3 2.3 1.1 8.8	Per ct. 18.3 21.0 .2 .1 3.6 3.1	Per ct. 13.2 51.1 21.0 4.0 2.8	Per ct. 0.3 .1 .1 1.4	Perct. 12.7 25.3 .6 9.6 3.3 5.3
Total animal food	317	36	85	6	4.9	32.7	46.3	92.1	1.9	56, 8
Cereals Sugars and starches Vegetables Fruits	$379 \\ 60 \\ 201 \\ 12$	36 6	7	$212 \\ 60 \\ 34 \\ 3$		$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{39.1} \\ \textbf{6.2} \\ \textbf{20.8} \\ \textbf{1.2} \end{array}$	46.3 7.3 .1	7.3	$\begin{array}{r} 67.2 \\ 19.1 \\ 10.9 \\ .9 \end{array}$	24.48.69.21.0
Total vegetable food	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 13.—Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man per day in dictary study No. 129.

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

	W	eights ar	nd fnel v	alue.	•	Percentages of total food.						
Kind of food.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fnel value.	Cost		
PER MAN PER DAY.												
Food purchased: · Animal Vegetable	Grams. 36 42	Grams. 85 7	Grams. 6 309	Calories. 965 1, 505	Cents. 4.9 3.8	Per ct. 46.3 53.7	Per ct. 92.1 7.9	Per ct. 1, 9 98, 1	Per ct. 39.0 61.0	Per ct. 56 8 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: Animal Vegetable		2	1	20 10		. 3 . 3	1.5 .1	. 5	. 6 . 3			
Total	1	2	1	30		. 6	1.6	. 5	, 9			
Food actually eaten: Animal Vegetable	36 41	83 7	6 308	945 1, 495		46. 0 53. 4	90.6 7.8	1.9 97.6	38.4 60.7			
Total	77	90	314	2, 440		99.4	98.4	99.5	99.1			

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 nourished. 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 (9 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 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. 129.

Kind of food ma-	Actual cost	Nutrie	ents and	energy in	l pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.				
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy. drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	
Beef: Chuck Round Rump Pork: Loin Hau, smoked . Butterine Cheese Milk Flour Bread Pastry Sugar Beans Cabbage Potatce s	5.7 8.9 5.5 8.7 8.8 16.8 12.25 2.0 2.5 4.0 5.6 5.0 1.2	$\begin{array}{c} 0.154\\ .205\\ .220\\ .141\\ .146\\ .006\\ .255\\ .028\\ .096\\ .082\\ .051\\ \end{array}$	$0.099 \\ .154$	Pounds. 0.023 .533 .731 .516 .459 1.000 .613 .047 .112	Calories. 705 1,030 1,770 1,835 1,810 3,535 1,920 275 1,580 1,140 1,220 1,860 1,480 1,480 115 230	$\begin{array}{c} 0.27 \\ .23 \\ .40 \\ .16 \\ .17 \\ .21 \\ .11 \\ .48 \\ .33 \\ .13 \\ .28 \\ .12 \end{array}$	0.17 .17	Pounds. 		

As will be seen by reference to the above table, the family used good judgment in their selection and purchase of food, and the smallness of the diet could be remedied with difficulty, unless, as was pointed out for similar cases in the report of dietary studies in New York City,¹ the amount of vegetable foods, such as flour, meal, beans, peas, and potatoes purchased, should be increased and the amount of animal foods correspondingly diminished. At the prevailing market prices, generally speaking, certain of the vegetable 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 animal 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 oysters, 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 3,120 calories per man per day, instead of 78 grams protein and 2,465 calories which were furnished by the daily diet actually eaten.

¹ U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 46, p. 65.

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 eaten 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.

DIETARY STUDY 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 8 years of age. The father, a healthy man 32 years of age, was boiler tender in an office building and earned about \$42 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 very 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 began January 12, 1897, and continued 8 days.

The number of meals taken was as follows:	Meals.
Man	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), equi	iva-
lent to	24
Two children, 2 and 4 years old (48 meals \times 0.4 meal of man), equi	iva-
lent 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. 189.
--------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

	C	omposit	ion.	Total cost.	Weight used.				
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.		Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	
ANIMAL FOOD. Beef: Fore shank (1.5 per cent refuse)	19.6	11.6	Per ct.	\$0.45 .40	Grams. 2, 655 1, 535	<i>Grams.</i> 520 296	Grams. 308 173	Grams.	
Total				. 85	4, 190	816	481		
Veal chops (16.3 per cent ref- use)	19.4	10.4		. 25	580	113	60		

·	0	Composit	ion.	1		Weig	ht used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein	Fat.	Carboby- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
ANIMAL FOOD—continued.								
Pork: Ham (31.6 per cent refuse). Steak (7.9 per cent refuse). Lard.	Per ct. 15.5 13.4	Per ct. 39.1 41.8 100.0	Per ct.	\$0.71 .23 .16	Grams. 3, 105 1, 005 720	Grams. 481 135	Grams. 1, 214 420 720	Grams.
Total				1.10	4,830	616	2, 354	
Sunfish ¹ Eggs (31.9 per cent refuse) ² Butter Milk	6.8 15.0 3.3	$7.5 \\ 11.0 \\ 82.4 \\ 4.0$	5.0	.15 .10 .74 .90	$795 \\ 215 \\ 1,675 \\ 13,090$	54 32 432	$ \begin{array}{r} 60 \\ 24 \\ 1,380 \\ 524 \end{array} $	654
Total animal food				4.09	25, 375	2,063	4.883	654
VEGETABLE FOCD.								
Cereals: Flour Rolled oats Rice Bread Cakes Crackers, soda Pies	11.4 16.6 7.8 9.4 6.9 9.8 4.2	1.1 7.2 .4 1.2 8.7 95 10.5	$\begin{array}{c} 75.1\\ 66.9\\ 79.2\\ 53.0\\ 62.0\\ 73.3\\ 40.8 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{r} .67 \\ .23 \\ .20 \\ .27 \\ .10 \\ .04 \\ .10 $	$ \begin{vmatrix} 11, 200 \\ 2, 070 \\ 960 \\ 3, 985 \\ 425 \\ 240 \\ 495 \end{vmatrix} $	$1,277 \\ 343 \\ 75 \\ 375 \\ 29 \\ 23 \\ 21$	$123 \\ 149 \\ 4 \\ 48 \\ 37 \\ 23 \\ 52$	$\begin{array}{c} 8,411\\ 1,385\\ 760\\ 2,112\\ 264\\ 176\\ 202\end{array}$
Total Sugar			100.0	$1.61 \\ .47$	19, 375 3, 885	2, 143	436	13, 310 3, 885
Vegetables: Beans, baked Onfons (5 per cent refuse). Potatoes (20.6 per cent refuse).	6.9 1.7 2.2	3.1 .4 .1	19.6 10.2 18.8	.10 .02 .32	920 270 12, 835	63 5 282	29 1 13	180 27 2, 413
Total				. 44	14,025	350	43	2, 620
Fruit, etc.: Lemons (58.3 per cent refuse) Apple butter	1.0 1.2	.9	8.3 58.5	. 05 . 25	170 1, 190	2 14	1	14 696
Total				. 30	1,360	16	2	710
Total vegetable food				2.82	38, 645	2,509	481	20, 525
Total food				6.91	64, 020	4, 572	5, 364	21, 179
Accessories : Baking powder Ginger Pepper Salt. Coffee. Tea.				.09 .04 .01 .02 .14 .63	85 85 15 845 225 565			
Total				.93	1, 820			
Total cost of food and accessories				7.84				
Waste : Shoulder steak Ve a l chops	19.3 20.2	11. 3 6. 2			15 25	3 5	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Total animal waste					.40	8	4	
Bread	9.4	1.2	53.0		15	1	1	8
Total waste					55	9	5	8

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

¹Composition assumed. ² This large percentage of refuse must have included more or less waste as well. Inasmuch, how-ever, as the total weight of eggs used is very small, the figures for the amount of refuse are given as reported.

	1	Wei	ghts.			Percentages of total food.					
Kind of food material.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton Pork, lard, etc Eggs. Butter Milk.	Grams. 154 156 26 7 54 422	Grams. 30 20 2 1 	Grams. 17 76 2 1 45 17	Grams.		Per ct. 7.5 7.5 1.2 .3 2.6 20.5	Per ct. 20.3 13.5 1.2 .7 9.4	Per ct. 10. 1 43. 9 1. 1 .4 25. 8 9. 8	Per ct.	Per ct. 15.9 15.9 2.2 1.5 10.7 13.0	
Total animal food	819	67	158	21	13.2	39.6	45.1	91.1	3.1	59.2	
Cereals Sugars and starches Vegetables Fruits	$625 \\ 125 \\ 452 \\ 44$	69 11	14	429 125 85 23		$ \begin{array}{r} 30.3 \\ 6.0 \\ 22.0 \\ 2.1 \end{array} $	46.9 7.7 .3	8.1	62.8 18.4 12.4 3.3	23.3 6.8 6.4 4 3	
Total vegetable food		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 17.— Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man

 per day in dictary study No. 189.

 TABLE 18.—Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man per day in dietary study No. 189.

	We	ights an	d fuel va	lue.		Percentages of total food.					
Kind of food.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	
PER MAN PER DAY.											
Food purchased : Animal Vegetable	Grams. 67 80	Gram s . 158 15	Grams. 21 662	Calories 1, 830 3, 180	Cts. 13. 2 9. 1	Per ct. 45. 1 54. 9	Per ct. 91, 1 8, 9	Per ct. 3, 1 96, 9	Per ct. 36.4 63.6	Per ct. 59. 2 40. 8	
'Total	147	173	683	5,010	22.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Beverages, condi- ments, etc					3.0						
Waste (animal) ¹						. 2	.1		.1	. 3	
Food actually eaten : Animal Vegetable	67 80	158 15	$\begin{array}{c} 21 \\ 662 \end{array}$	1,830 3,180	·····	44. 9 54. 9	91.0 8.9	3.1 96.9	36. 3 63. 6	58.9 40.8	
Total	147	173	683	5,010	•••••	99.8	95.9	100.0	99.9	99.7	

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) was 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, would have amply supplied their wants and needs. 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 (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 were 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 value 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 ma-	Actual cost	Nutrie	ents and	energy in 1	1 pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.					
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.		
Beef: Fore shank	Cents.	Pound. 0, 189	Pound. 0.110	Pound.	Calories. 815	Pound. 0, 25	Pound. 0.14	Pounds.	Calories. 1,075		
Steak, shoulder		. 189	.109		810	. 16	. 09		690		
Veal, chops		. 160	. 083		650	.10			395		
Pork:	10.0	. 100	. 005		0.00	. 10	. 00		•555		
Ham	10.1	. 147	. 367		1,825	.14	. 37		1.810		
Steak	9.5	.120	. 372		1.790	.13	. 39		1, 885		
Butter	20.0		.800		3, 315	.*	. 40		1,690		
Milk		. 032	. 039	0.050	320	. 10	.13	0.16	1.025		
Flour		. 097	. 010	. 736	1,590	. 36	.04	2.73	5,890		
Rolled oats	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	3.740		
Pastry	9.4	.053	. 087	.542	1,475	.06	.09	. 58	1.570		
Beans, baked	4.9	. 055	. 028	.186	565	.11	.06	. 38	1.155		
Potatoes		.013		. 141	285	.14			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 high. If less butter had been eaten, the cost of the food would have 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 \$4 per month 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 advantageously and showed good management in the kitchen, otherwise the amount of nutrients could never have been purchased for the price paid.

DIETARY STUDY OF A DECORATOR'S FAMILY (No. 190).

This dietary study was made in a Swiss family in quite comfortable circumstances. The family consisted of the father, mother, and three children. The father, a healthy man 44 years of age, was a house decorator and in business for himself. His income was estimated to be \$84 a month. They paid \$13 a month rent for a four-room house with garret, cellar, and laundry. Everything about the place was very neatly kept.

The mother, a rather frail woman 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 out 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.

The study began January 14, 1897, and continued 30 days. The number of meals taken was as follows:

he number of meals taken was as follows:	Meals.
Man	···· ¹ 58
Woman (90 meals \times 0.8 meal of man), equivalent to	72
Girl, 15 years old (89 meals \times 0.7 meal of man), equivalent to	62
Boy, 12 years old (90 meals \times 0.6 meal of man), equivalent to	54
Child, 2 years old (90 meals \times 0.4 meal of man), equivalent to.	36
Visitors, women (5 meals \times 0.8 meal of man), equivalent to	4
Visitor, man	1
	-

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

¹ Dinners were taken at a restaurant.

32

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigl	nt used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tei n .	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
ANIMAL FOOD.								
Beef: Chuck (4.8 percent refuse)	Per ct. 19.0	Per ct. 12.6	Per ct.	\$0.63	Grams.	Grams. 546	Grams. 362	Gram s .
Neck	13.9	11.9		.12	2,875 655	91	78	
Rib (44.9 per cent refuse) . Steak, shoulder (8.3 per	17.0	26.6		. 50	1.760	299	468	
cent refuse) Steak.porterhouse Shank (10.3 per cent ref-	$\begin{array}{c} 16.1\\ 18.2 \end{array}$	9.8 20.3		$.10 \\ 1.05$	425 2, 990	$\begin{array}{c} 68\\544\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 42 \\ 607 \end{array}$	
nse) Liver pudding ¹	19.8 20.9	$\begin{array}{c} 11.5\\ 5.0\end{array}$	1.6	.86 .07	$4.705 \\ 465$	932 96	541 24	7
Total				3.33	13.875	2,576	2,122	7
Veal:								
Veal: Chops (13.7 per cent refuse) Cutlet (2.8 per cent refuse) Rib roast (9.2 per cent ref-	$\begin{array}{c} 19.4\\ 20.8 \end{array}$	10, 4 9, 9	·····	$^{.20}_{.15}$	$\begin{array}{c} 540\\ 465\end{array}$	105 97	$\begin{array}{c} 56 \\ 46 \end{array}$	
use) Shank (1.2 per cent refuse) Shoulder (4.8 per cent ref-	$\begin{array}{c} 20.2\\19.9\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.2\\ 4.6\end{array}$.50 .30	$1,520 \\ 1,095$	$\frac{307}{218}$	$\begin{array}{c} 94 \\ 50 \end{array}$	
Shoulder (4.8 per cent ref- use)	20.1	8.2		. 23	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 (14.6 per cent refuse)	17.6	28.3		.10	270	48	76	
Total				. 30	1,060	186	311	
Pork: Bacon. Chung fot (118 yor cont	8.9	62.5		.10	365	33	228	
Chops, fat (11.8 per cent refuse).	12.2	45.0		. 18	635	77	286	
Chops (11.6 per cent refuse) Ham (12.4 per cent refuse)	15.5	31.3 39.1		$.35 \\ 1.05$	$1,320 \\ 3,775$	220 585	$\begin{array}{r} 413\\ 1,476\end{array}$	
Shank (23.1 per cent refuse) Shoulder, smoked (5.5 per	15.5	29.4		. 42	2,600	403	764	
cent refuse)	15.8	32.5		.15	1,250	198	406	
Steak	$11.7 \\ 12.7$	36.0 44.2	1.1	. 10 . 52	$365 \\ 2, 245$	43 285	131 992	25
Lard.	••••••	100.0		. 44	2,060		2,060	
Total				3.31	14, 615	1,844	6, 756	25
Oysters. Eggs (11.5 per cent refuse)	6.0	1.3	3.3	.10	595	36	8 206	19
Butter		$ \begin{array}{c} 11.0 \\ 82.4 \end{array} $.67 1.60	1,875 2,995	281	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
VEGETABLE FOOD.								
Cereals:					0.05	0.0		001
Barley Corn meal	9.3 9.3	$ \begin{array}{c} 1.0 \\ 2.4 \end{array} $	77.6 74.9	.03 .05	285 940	26 87	3 23	$\frac{221}{704}$
Flour. wheat	11.4	1.1	75.1	1.14	19,480	2,221	214	14,630
Rice Bread	7.8 9.4	1.2	79.2 53.0	. 05 . 28	$255 \\ 3,955$	$\frac{20}{372}$	1 48	$\begin{array}{c} 202\\ 2.097\end{array}$
Bread, rye	9.9	6	54.5	.04	710	70	+	387
Cake Crackers, oyster	$6.9 \\ 10.1$	8.7 10.6	$\begin{array}{c} 62.\ 0\\ 71.\ 6\end{array}$.10	580 200	$ 40 \\ 20 $	50 21	360 143
Total			100.0	1.72	26,405	2,856	364	18, 744 1, 245
Sugar			100.0	. 15	1, 245			1, 240
Sugar								
Sugar	22.4	1.8	59.1 9.8	. 08	1,375 3,090	308 46	$25 \\ 3$	812 303
Sugar Vegetables:		1.8 .1 .3	59.1 9.8 5.7	. 08 . 10 . 21	1, 375 3, 090 5, 895	$308 \\ 46 \\ 112$	25 3 18	812 303 336

¹ Composition assumed.

33

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigh	nt used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
VEGETABLE FOOD-continued.								
Vegetables_Continued.	D (~	
Onions (17 per cent ref- use)	Per ct. 1.7	<i>Per ct.</i> 0.4	Per ct. 10.2	\$0.03	Grams. 200	3	Grams. 1	20
Peas, canned. Pickles	3.6 .6	$^{2}_{.3}$	9.8 3.4	.09 .04	595 765	$^{22}_{5}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	58 26
Potatoes (15.5 per ceut								
refuse) Potatoes, sweet (25.6 per	2.2	.1	18.8	. 52	21, 625	476	22	4,065
cent refuse) Soup greens	$1.8 \\ 4.2$.7 .6	$27.4 \\ 6.3$. 18	$4.155 \\ 15$	75 1	29	1, 138
Turnips (27.8 per cent						-		-
refuse) Turnips, Swedish (31.4	1.3	. 2	8.1	. 05	920	12	2	74
per cent refuse) Catsup	$1.3 \\ 1.5$	$\frac{2}{2}$	8.1 12.3	.05 .04	1,985 300	26 4	4	161 37
Chili sance 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
Fruits. etc.:								
Apples (6.3 per cent ref- use)	.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 ref-							1	
use) Lemons (37.4 per cent ref	.8	. 6	9.7	.10	1,010	8	6	98
nse) Peaches, canned	1.0 .5	.9 .2	8.3 7.5	.05 .34	260 1.940	3 10	24	22 145
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 vegetable 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	2.300			
Tea Pepper				. 13 . 10	25 25			
Salt				. 01	3, 120			
Vinegar				. 03	465			
Total				. 52	5, 935			
WASTE.								
Beef: Chuck	19.0	12.6		. 10	470	89	59	
Rib (trimmings)	11.8	25.0		. 15	540	64	135	
Shank Liver pudding ¹	$19.8 \\ 20.9$	11.5 5.0	1.6	$.13 \\ .19$	$710 \\ 125$	141 26	82 6	2
Veal: Shank	19.9	4.6		. 02	75	15	3	
Pork: Chops	16.7	31.3		.01	25	4	8	
Ham	15.5	39.1		. 02	60	9	24	
Total animal waste Potatoes	2.2	.1	18.8	.62 .01	$2,005 \\ 625$	348 13	317 1	2 118
Total waste				. 63	2,630	361	318	120

¹Composition assumed.

•• ••

17089—No. 52—-3

		Weig	ghts.		e.	Perc	entages	of total	food.	
Kind of food material.	Food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton Pork, lard, etc Fish, etc Eggs Butter Milk	$\begin{array}{c} 202\\ 152\\ 6\end{array}$	Grams. 38 19 1 3 	Grams. 29 70 2 26 13	Grams.		Per ct. 10.9 8.3 .3 1.1 1.7 18.4	Per ct. 32.9 16.6 .3 2.5 9.7	Per ct. 19.4 47.8 1.5 17.5 9.2	Per ct. 0.1	Perct. 26.7 17.6 .5 3.6 8.5 10.9
Total animal food	750	72	140	17	13.3	40.7	62.0	95.4	4.7	67.8
Cereals Sugars and starches Vegetables Fruits	$ \begin{array}{r} 275 \\ 13 \\ 469 \\ 336 \end{array} $	30 12 2	4 2 1	195 13 78 66	6.3	$ \begin{array}{r} 14.9 \\ .7 \\ 25.5 \\ 18.2 \end{array} $	25.7 10.6 1.7	2.6 1.0 1.0	52.9 3.5 21.1 17.8	9.5 .4 11.7 10.6
Tøtal vegetable food Total food	1,093	44	7	352	6.3	59.3	38.0	4.6	95.3	32.2
20141100411111	2,010	110		000		20010	20010	20010	20010	

TABLE 21.—Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 190.

 TABLE 22.—Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man

 per day in dietary study No. 190.

	We	ights and	l fuel va	lue.		1	Percenta	ges of to	tal food.	
Kind of food.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY.										
Food purchased: Animal Vegetable	Grams. 72 44	Grams. 146 7	Grams. 17 352	Calories 1, 665 1, 690	Cents. 13. 3 6. 3	Per ct. 62.0 38.0	Per ct. 95.4 4.6	Per ct. 4.7 95.3	Per ct. 49.8 50.2	Per ct. 67. 8 32. 2
Total:	116	147	369	3, 355	19.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Beverages, condi- ments, etc					.5					
Waste: Animal Vegetable	4	3	1	45 5		3.1 .1	2.3	.3	$1.3 \\ .2$	3. 3
Total	4	3	1	50		3.2	2.3	. 3	1.5	3.3
Food actually eaten : Animal Vegetable	68 44	137 7	17 351	1, 620 1, 685		58. 9 37. 9	93.1 4.6	4.7 95.0	48 .5 50.0	64.5 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

¹Connecticut Storrs Sta. Rpt. 1896, p. 154.

was very reasonable. Skill was shown in the choice 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 value of the digestible nutrients in 1

 pound and in 10 cents' worth of the more important food materials used in dietary study

 No. 190.

Kind of food ma-	Actual	Nutrie	ents and	energy in i	l pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.				
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fue l value.	
Beef:	Cents.	Pound.	Pound.	Pound.	Calories.	Pound.	Pound.	Pounds.	Calories.	
Chuck	9.5	0.177	0.116		820	0.19	0.12		860	
Ribs	10.2	. 132	. 205		1,110	.13	. 20		1, 110	
Shank	8.1	.190	. 110		815	. 23	.14		1,010	
Veal, rib roast		. 179	. 054		560	. 13	. 04		410	
Pork, ham	11.0	.133	. 328		1,630	.12	.30		1, 485	
Eggs		. 126	.091		620	. 09	. 07		445	
Butter			. 799		3,370		. 33		1, 395	
Milk		. 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, 555	
Corn, canned	7.7	. 022	. 012	. 183	430	. 03	. 16	. 24	560	
Potatoes	. 9	.014		. 149	305	. 16		1.66	3, 378	
Chili sauce				.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.

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigh	t used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total. cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
ANIMAL FOOD.								
Beef: Chuck (11.3 per cent ref-	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.		Grams.	Cuamo	Grams.	Grams.
use)	19.0	12.6		\$0.88	3,960	753	499	Grums.
Chuck, fat (11.2 per cent refuse)	10.0	10.0		1.00	0.715	1 100	1 150	
Flank steak	18.0 16.1	18.8 19.0		$1.26 \\ .73$		$1,106 \\ 335$	$1,156 \\ 395$	
Flank steak, fat	15.6	27.2		.23	725	113	197	
Plate, medium fat (26.2 per cent refuse)	15.7	29.1		. 32	1,730	272	503	
Plate, lean (26.3 per cent								
refuse) Round steak, medium fat	14.6	18.8		. 04	340	50	64	· · · · · · · · · · · ·
(1.8 per cent refuse)	19.8	13.6		. 75	2,660	528	362	
Round steak, fat (1.7 per	10.0	00.0		10			107	
cent refuse) Rump, medium fat (8.7	18.9	22.3		. 48	1,800	340	401	
per cent refuse)	16.8	26.1		. 56	2,705	454	706	
Rump, fat (8.6 per cent ref-	16.4	35.7		. 28	1,440	236	514	
use) Shoulder	16.1	9.8		. 50	3, 135	230 505	307	
Sirioin 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		10.1				204	105	
cent refuse)	13.3	41. 9		. 09	395	52	165	
Rump, corned (9.9 per cent refuse)	15.3	23.3		. 23	1,250	191	291	
Tripe Liver pudding ¹	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
Total				7.63	34, 745	5, 857	6, 486	29
Veal: Shoulder (14.2 per cent								
refuse)	20.1	8.2		. 20	765	154	63	
Lamb: Shoulder (11.9 per cent				10				
	17 5	90 7				m.e.	190	
refuse)	17.5	29.7		. 10	435	76	129	
	17.5	29.7		. 10	435		129	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse).	16.7	31.3		. 97	4,030	<u> </u>	1, 261	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse).								
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse)	16.7	31.3		. 97	4,030	673	1, 261	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref-	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5		. 97 . 18 . 20	4,030 410 1,070	673 64 169	1, 261 160 348	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse)	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8 13. 4	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8		.97 .18 .20 .53	4,030 410 1,070 2,820	673 64 169 378	1, 261 160 348 1, 179	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2	······	.97 .18 .20 .53 .76 .52	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335	673 64 169	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032	26
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse)	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0	······	.97 .18 .20 .53 .76	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120	673 64 169 378 306	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2		.97 .18 .20 .53 .76 .52	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335	673 64 169 378 306	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse). Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use). Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Lard. Total.	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2	······································	$ \begin{array}{c} .97\\.18\\.20\\.53\\.76\\.52\\.26\end{array} $	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887	$1, 261 \\ 160 \\ 348 \\ 1, 179 \\ 2, 122 \\ 1, 032 \\ 1, 275 $	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse). Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use). Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Lard.	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2		$ \begin{array}{c} .97\\.18\\.20\\.53\\.76\\.52\\.26\end{array} $	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275	673 64 169 378 306 297	$1, 261 \\ 160 \\ 348 \\ 1, 179 \\ 2, 122 \\ 1, 032 \\ 1, 275 $	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse)	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2 100. 0		.97 .18 .20 .53 .76 .52 .26 3.42	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032 1, 275 7, 377	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per cent refuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) Fish:	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2 100. 0 15. 3		.97 .18 .20 .53 .76 .52 .26 3.42	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 102 1, 032 1, 275 7, 377 449	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Baccon (2.1 per cent refuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) Fish: Codfish, shredded Mackerel, salt	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7 19.2 22.2 13.9	31.3 39.1 32.5 41.8 68.0 44.2 100.0 15.3		$ \begin{array}{c} .97\\.18\\.20\\.53\\.76\\.52\\.26\\\hline\hline 3.42\\\hline\hline 1.00\\.09\\.19\end{array} $	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 440 555	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032 1, 275 7, 377 449 118	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sansage Total	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7 19.2 22.2	31, 3 39, 1 32, 5 41, 8 68, 0 44, 2 100, 0 15, 3 .3		.97 .18 .20 .53 .76 .52 .26 3.42 1.00	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 440	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032 1, 275 7, 377 449	26
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per cent refuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) Fish: Codfish, shredded Mackerel, salt	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7 19.2 22.2 13.9	31.3 39.1 32.5 41.8 68.0 44.2 100.0 15.3		$ \begin{array}{c} .97\\.18\\.20\\.53\\.76\\.52\\.26\\\hline\hline 3.42\\\hline\hline 1.00\\.09\\.19\end{array} $	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 440 555	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 032 1, 275 7, 377 449 118	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) Fish: Codfish, shredded Mackerel, salt	16.7 15.5 15.8 13.4 9.8 12.7 19.2 22.2 13.9	31.3 39.1 32.5 41.8 68.0 44.2 100.0 15.3		$\begin{array}{c} .97\\ .18\\ .20\\ .53\\ .76\\ .52\\ .26\\ \hline 3.42\\ \hline 1.00\\ .09\\ .19\\ .30\\ \end{array}$	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 440 555 1,095	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77 112	$1, 261 \\ 160 \\ 348 \\ 1, 179 \\ 2, 122 \\ 1, 032 \\ 1, 275 \\ 7, 377 \\ \hline 449 \\ 1 \\ 118 \\ 33 \\ 33 \\ 160 \\ 100 \\ $	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per cent refuse) Sausage Total	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8 13. 4 9. 8 12. 7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2 100. 0 15. 3 21. 2 3. 0 11. 0		$\begin{array}{c} .97\\ .18\\ .20\\ .53\\ .76\\ .26\\ .26\\ \hline 3.42\\ \hline 1.00\\ .09\\ .19\\ .30\\ \hline .58\\ \hline 1.38\\ \end{array}$	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 1,	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77 112	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 275 7, 377 449 1 18 33 152 439	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Lard Total Poultry: Chicken (21 per cent refuse) Fish: Codfish, shredded Mackerel, salt Whitefish Total Eggs (13.7 per cent refuse) Butter	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8 13. 4 9. 8 12. 7	31.3 39.1 32.5 41.8 68.0 44.2 100.0 15.3 15.3 21.2 3.0 11.0 82.4		$\begin{array}{c} .97\\ .18\\ .20\\ .53\\ .76\\ .52\\ .26\\ \hline 3.42\\ \hline 1.00\\ .09\\ .19\\ .30\\ .58\\ \hline 1.38\\ 3.16\\ \hline \end{array}$	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 440 555 1,095 2,090 3,995 6,675	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77 112 287 599	$1, 261 \\ 160 \\ 348 \\ 1, 179 \\ 2, 122 \\ 1, 032 \\ 1, 275 \\ 7, 377 \\ 449 \\ 118 \\ 33 \\ 152 \\ 439 \\ 5, 501 \\ 1$	
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Shank (10.8 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per centrefuse) Sausage Total	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8 13. 4 9. 8 12. 7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2 100. 0 15. 3 21. 2 3. 0 11. 0		$\begin{array}{c} .97\\ .18\\ .20\\ .53\\ .76\\ .26\\ .26\\ \hline 3.42\\ \hline 1.00\\ .09\\ .19\\ .30\\ \hline .58\\ \hline 1.38\\ \end{array}$	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 1,	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77 112 287	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 275 7, 377 449 1 18 33 152 439	26
Pork: Loin (11.7 per cent refuse). Ham (14.6 per cent refuse). Shoulder, smoked (14.1 per cent refuse) Bacon (2.1 per cent ref- use) Bacon (2.1 per cent refuse) Sausage Lard	16. 7 15. 5 15. 8 13. 4 9. 8 12. 7	31. 3 39. 1 32. 5 41. 8 68. 0 44. 2 100. 0 15. 3 21. 2 3. 0 11. 0 82. 4 4. 0		$\begin{array}{c} .97\\ .18\\ .20\\ .53\\ .76\\ .26\\ .26\\ \hline 3.42\\ \hline 1.00\\ .09\\ .19\\ .30\\ .58\\ \hline 1.38\\ 3.16\\ 1.30\\ \end{array}$	4,030 410 1,070 2,820 3,120 2,335 1,275 15,060 2,935 2,935 440 555 1,095 2,090 3,905 6,675 23,865	673 64 169 378 306 297 1,887 63 5 98 77 112 287 599 788	1, 261 160 348 1, 179 2, 122 1, 275 7, 377 449 11 18 3 152 5, 501 955	

¹ Composition assumed.

Kind of food material. Pro- trin. Fat. Carbohy- drates. Total rest. Total rest. Total rest. Total rest. Total rest. Total rest. Fat. Carbohy- drates. VEGETABLE FOOD. 0.3 2.4 Pret. Pret. 80.8 7.373 12 30.3 10.3 Corn meal. 0.3 2.4 80.8 1.373 12 30.3 10.3		(omposit	ion.			Weigl	at used.	
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Creases:} & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Kind of food material.		Fat.			food ma		Fat.	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						~			
Rice $i. 3$ $i. 4$ $i. 2$ $i. 3$ $i. 12$ $i. 33$ $i. 33$ $i. 34$ <	Corn meal Flour	9.3 11.4	$2.4 \\ 1.1 \\ 1.0$	$74.9 \\ 75.1 \\ 74.0$	$2.23 \\ .05$	1,375 39,300 1,220	$\begin{array}{c} 128 \\ 4,480 \\ 123 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{r} 33 \\ 432 \\ 12 \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{r} 103 \\ 29, 512 \\ 903 \end{array} $
Total	Rice Bread Cakes, drop	9.4 7.6	.4 1.2 14.7	$\begin{array}{c} 79.2 \\ 53.0 \\ 60.3 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} -11 \\ .78 \\ .07 \end{array} $	$555 \\ 9,525 \\ 240$	43 896 18	$2 \\ 114 \\ 35$	$ \begin{array}{r} 440 \\ 5,049 \\ 145 \end{array} $
					3.49	53, 535	5, 877	733	37, 064
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Sugar			. 100.0					
Beaus, Lima, dried. 18, 1 1, 5 65, 9 10 1, 300 225 20 887 Corn, canned. 2, 8 1, 3 10, 38 10 225 4 12 Onions (0.1 per cent refuse) 1, 3 1, 3 8 10 225 4 12 use) 1, 7 4 10, 2 20 2, 255 38 9 230 Potatoes (20 per cent refuse) 1, 8 7 27, 4 21 2, 995 54 21 821 Tomatoes, canned 1, 1 1, 2 3, 8 3, 85 42 8 146 Turnips, Swedish (18 per cent refuse) 1, 3 2 8, 1 10 4, 335 56 9 331 Catsup 1, 5 2 12, 3 57 2, 710 41 5 333 Suerkraut 1, 7 5 3, 8 20 2, 780 47 14 106 Tomatoses - - - - 5 75 2, 141 Suerkraut - -	Total				.2.06	18, 385			18, 382
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Beaus, Lima, dried Corn, canned	2.8	1.3	19.3	.10	625	18		121
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Onions (10.1 per cent ref- use)						1. T	9	1
cent refuse) 1.8 .7 27.4 .21 2.995 54 21 821 Turnips, Swedish (18 per cent refuse) 1.3 .2 8.1 1.0 4.335 56 9 351 Catsup 1.5 .2 12.3 .57 2.710 41 5 333 Pickles .6 .3 .4 10 4235 3 1 14 Samerkraut 1.7 .5 .20 3,855 112 19 Total	use)	2.2	.1	18.8	1.02	34, 350	756	34	6, 458
cent refuse) 1.3 .2 8.1 10 4,335 56 9 331 Pickles .6 .3 3.4 10 425 3 1 14 Samerkrant .7 .5 .8 .90 2.780 47 14 106 Vegetable sonp .7 .5 .8 .20 2.780 47 14 106 Total .5 .20 3.855 112 19 Total 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 10 7.0 1.0 7.0 1.0 7.0 1.0 7.0 1.0 7.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0	cent refuse) Tomatoes, canned		. 2	3.8	. 38				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	cent refuse) Catsup Pickles Sauerkraut	$ \begin{array}{c} 1.5 \\ .6 \\ 1.7 \end{array} $.2 .3 .5	12.3 3.4 3.8	.57 .10 .20	2,710 425 2,780	$\begin{array}{c} 41\\ 3\\ 47\end{array}$	5 1	333 14 106
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $								129	
Bananas 7 .4 13. 2 10 780 5 3 103 Figs 7 .4 13. 2 .10 780 5 3 103 Lemon 7 .6 5.8 .01 60 33 Peaches, dried ¹ 2.9 63.3 .09 225 6 142 Jelly and jam ¹ 1.1 77. 2 1 785 20 1,378 Apple and tomato butter 1.2 15.8.5 .46 2,355 28 2 1,378 Total 10.54 156,305 7,424 944 70,512 Total food 29.51 249,390 17,718 22,596 71,886 Accessories:	Fruit:								
Peaches, dried'	Bananas Figs	.7 4.3 .7	.4.3	$ \begin{array}{r} 13.2 \\ 74.2 \end{array} $. 10 . 15	$780 \\ 610 \\ 60$	5	$^{3}_{2}$	$ \begin{array}{r} 103 \\ 453 \\ 3 \end{array} $
Total vegetable food	Peaches, dried ¹ Jelly and jam ¹	1.1		77.2	$.09 \\ .17$	1,785	20		1,378
Total food 29.51 249.390 17,718 22.596 71,886 Accessories: Baking powder 05 100	Total				1.71	24, 595	141	82	5, 598
Accessories:									
Baking powder 05 100 Cotiee 69 555 Natmeg 01 15 Pepper 04 45 Salt 06 2,665 Total 85 3,280 Total cost of food and accessories 30.36					29.51	249, 390	17,718	22, 596	71,886
Salt	Baking powder Cotïe o Nutmeg			·····	.69 .01	$555 \\ 15$			
Total cost of food and accessories 30.36 WASTE. 30.36 Beef: Chuck, fat 18.0 18.8 .07 325 57 61 Round, fat 18.9 22.3 15 3 3 Shonlder. 19.3 11.3 15 2 5 Corned 15.3 23.3 01 25 4 6	Salt								
accessories 30.36 WASTE. 30.36 Beef: Chuck, fat 18.0 18.8 Round, fat 18.9 22.3					. 85	3,380			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	accessories				30.36				
Round, fat. 18.9 22.3 15 3 3 Shoulder. 19.3 11.3 01 40 8 5 Rump, fat. 14.9 36.3 01 15 2 5 Orned 15.3 23.3 01 25 4 6	Beef: Chuck, fat		18.8		. 07				
	Round, fat Shonlder Rump, fat	$\begin{array}{c}19.3\\14.9\end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} 11.3 \\ 36.3 \end{array} $			$\frac{40}{15}$	8 2	5 5	

¹Composition assumed.

	C	omposit	ion.			Weigh	t used.	
Kind of food material.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Total cost.	Total food ma- terial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.
WASTE-continued.								
Pork: Loin	Per ct. 16.7	<i>Per ct.</i> 31.3	Per ct.	\$0.01	Grams. 25	Grams.	Grams. 8	Grams.
Shank	13.4	41.8		ф0. 01	25	$\frac{4}{3}$	10	
Bacon	9.8	68.0		.01	25	2	17	
Total				. 02	75	9	35	
Poultry: Chicken		15.3		. 01	25	5	4	
Fish: Whitefish	22.1	6.5		. 03	100	22	. 6	• • • • • • • • • • •
Total animal waste				. 15	620	110	125	
Vegetables:								
Potatoes	2.2	.1	18.8	. 03	900	20	1	169
Turnips, Swedish	1.3	. 2	8.1	••••••	270	4	1	22
Total vegetable waste				. 03	1,170	24	2	191
Total waste				. 18	1,790	134	127	191

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

38

 TABLE 25.—Weights and percentages of food materials and nutritive ingredients per man per day in dietary study No. 191.

		Wei	ghts.			Perc	eentages	of total	food.	
Kind of food material.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.	Food mate- rial.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY. Beef, veal, and mutton. Pork, lard, etc Poultry	Grams. 193 81 16	Grams. 33 10 3	Grams. 36 40 2	Grams.		$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct. \\ 14. \ 4 \\ 6. \ 0 \\ 1. \ 2 \end{array}$	Per ct. 34.3 10.7 3.2	Per ct. 29.6 32.7 2.0	<i>Per ct.</i>	26, 9
Fish, etc Fggs Butter. Cheese, smearcase Milk.	$ \begin{array}{c} 11 \\ 21 \\ 36 \\ 13 \\ 129 \end{array} $	2 3 4	$1 \\ 2 \\ 30 \\ 1 \\ 5$	$\frac{1}{6}$.8 1.6 2.7 1.0 9.6	1.6 3.4 $.5$ 4.4	.7 1.9 24.3 .4 4.2	0. 2 1. 7	$ \begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 4.7 \\ 10.7 \\ .7 \\ 4.4 \end{array} $
Total animal food	500	55	117	7	10.2	37.3	58.1	95. 8	1.9	64.3
Cereals Sugars and starches Vegetables Fruits	288 99 321 132	32 7 1	4	$ \begin{array}{r} 199 \\ 99 \\ 51 \\ 30 \end{array} $		$ \begin{array}{r} 21.5 \\ 7.4 \\ 24.0 \\ 9.8 \end{array} $	33.2 7.9 .8	3.2 .6 .4	$51. \ 6 \\ 25. \ 6 \\ 13. \ 1 \\ 7. \ 8$	$ \begin{array}{r} 11.8 \\ 7.0 \\ 11.1 \\ 5.8 \end{array} $
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

	Wei	ights and	l fuel va	lue.		1	Percentag	ges of to	tal food.	
Kind of food.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Fuel value.	Cost.
PER MAN PER DAY.										
Food purchased : Animal Vegetable	Grams. 55 40	Grams. 117 5	Grams. 7 379	Calories 1, 340 1, 765	Cents 10. 2 5. 7	Per ct. 58.1 41.9	Per ct. 95.8 4.2	Per ct. 1. 9 98. 1	Per ct. 43, 2 56, 8	Per et. 64. 7 35. 7
Total	95	122	386	3, 105	15.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Beverages, condi- ments, etc					.5					
Waste: Animal Vegetable	1	1	1	15 5		.6 .1	. 5	. 3	.3	.5
Total	1	1	1	20		.7	. 5	. 3	.4	. 6
Food actually eaten : Animal Vegetable	54 40	116 5	7 378	1, 325 1, 760	10.2 5.7	57.5 41.8	95. 3 4. 2	1.9 97.8	42. 9 56. 7	63, 8 35, 6
Total	94	121	385	3, 085	15.9	99. 3	99. 5	99.7	99.6	99.4

 TABLE 26.—Nutrients and potential energy in food purchased, rejected, and eaten per man

 per day in dietary study No. 191.

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 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 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 study No. 191.

Kind of food ma-	Actual cost	Nutrie	ents and	energy in	l pound.	Nutrients and energy in 10 cents' worth.					
terial.	per pound.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Fuel value.		
Beef:	Cents.	Pound.	Pound.	Pound.	Calories.	Pound.	Pound.	Pounds.	Calories.		
Chuck	9,6	0.180	0.159		1,005	0.19	0.17		1,045		
Flank steak	15.5	. 157	. 205		1,155	.10	. 13		745		
Round	12.3	. 187	. 163		1,035	. 11	.10		825		
Rump		.149	. 261		1,380	.18	. 31		1,640		
Pork:					-,						
Loin	10.0	. 149	. 276		1, 440	.15	. 28		1,440		
Shank	7.6	. 118	. 364		1,755	. 15	. 48		2,305		
Chicken		. 149	. 117		770	.12	. 10		635		
Eggs		. 126	. 092		620	. 09	.07		460		
Butter	21.5	1	. 799		3, 370		. 37		1,570		
Milk		. 032	. 039	0,050	320	. 13	. 16	0.20	1,270		
Flour		. 098	. 010	. 740	1,600	.38	. 04	2.85	6, 150		
Bread	3.7	. 080	. 011	. 518	1, 160	. 22	. 03	1.40	3, 125		
Sugar				. 980	1,825			1.92	3, 575		
Potatoes		.014		. 144	295	. 13		1	2,675		
Catsup		. 012		. 117	240	.01		.12	250		
string the string strin						1			200		

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 skilled 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 studies 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 Middletown and Storrs, Conn., Lafayette, Ind., Chicago, Ill., and vicinity, and Pittsburg, Pa. The mechanics' families resided in Middletown, Conn., New Brunswick, N. J., Knoxville, Tenn., 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 value.
	Cents.	Grams.	Grams.	Grams.	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
Dietary of a mill workman's family (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 decorator's family (No. 190)	20	112	144	368	3, 305
Dietary of a glass blower's family (No. 191)	16	94	121	385	3, 085
Average 14 dictaries of professional men's families 1.	² 25	104	125	423	3 325
Average 14 dictaries of mechanics' families 3	420	103	150	402	3, 465

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 included and three dictaries of professional men in Illinois not yet published.

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 Average of five studies.

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 no uniformity of results. Some contain a larger and some a smaller amount of nutrients than the average of 14 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 nutrients 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.

	Dietary No. 128.	Dietary No. 129.	Dietary No. 189.	Dietary No. 190.	Dieta r y No. 191.
Coffee	\$0.51 .42 .04	\$0.15 .71 .08		\$0.25 .13 .01	\$0.69 .06
Baking powder Mustard Vinegar Pepper Ginger	.10 .08 .05	. 18	. 09	.03 .10	. 05 . 04
Nutmeg			. 93 6, 91	.52 18.89	. 01 . 85 29. 51
Cost of food and condiments	25.72	17.38	7.84	19.41	30.36

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 furnish 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 21 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 flour¹ the water ranges from 9.3 to 14.3 per cent, averaging 12.3 per cent, while in 108 analyses of bread¹ the water ranges from 26 to 49.1 per cent, averaging 35.4 per cent.

¹U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28.

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.

				a .		Composition of fresh bread.					
	Labo- ratory No.	Weight	of loaf.		Cost per pound.	Wa- ter.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbo- hy- drates.	Ash.	Fuel value.
Bread Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Average of 10 analyses ¹ Flour ¹	595 596 597 598 599 600 2559 2743 2749	Grams. 1, 115 529 806 1, 145 705 565 6663 { 594 1, 061 	Lbs. 2.45 1.17 1.98 2.52 1.75 1.25 1.46 1.31 2.34	Cents. 8 5 9 9 6 5 10 	3.3 4.3 3.0 3.6 2.9 7.2 4.1 3.8 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ ct.\\ 26.0\\ 34.8\\ 34.4\\ 33.3\\ 29.8\\ 29.3\\ 32.1\\ 35.6\\ 34.6\\ 35.8\\ 32.6\\ 35.8\\ 32.6\\ 35.1\\ 12.1\\ \end{array}$	Per ct. 11.3 9.8 10.8 9.8 11.0 15.4 10.6 10.3 9.2 9.7 10.8 9.4 11.2	$\begin{array}{c} P. \ ct. \\ 0.5 \\ .9 \\ .4 \\ .4 \\ .6 \\ .7 \\ .4 \\ .3 \\ .5 \\ .7 \\ \hline .5 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.2 \end{array}$	Per et. 60, 7 53, 3 53, 0 55, 3 57, 2 53, 0 55, 6 52, 6 54, 3 52, 6 54, 8 53, 2 75, 2	$\begin{array}{c} P. ct. \\ 1.5 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.4 \\ 1.4 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.4 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.4 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.2 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.1 \\ .4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} Calories.\\ 1,360\\ 1,210\\ 1,205\\ 1,205\\ 1,205\\ 1,300\\ 1,295\\ 1,300\\ 1,250\\ 1,185\\ 1,200\\ 1,190\\ \hline 1,240\\ 1,215\\ 1,655\\ \end{array}$

¹ From an unpublished compilation of analyses.

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

	Labo- ratory No.		Heats of combustion per gram.				
		Protein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Ash.	As deter- mined. ¹	As calcu- lated, ²
Bread Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do Do	$594 \\ 595 \\ 596 \\ 597 \\ 598 \\ 599 \\ 600 \\ 2559 \\ 2743 \\ 2749 $	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ cent. \\ 15.3 \\ 15.0 \\ 16.4 \\ 14.7 \\ 15.7 \\ 21.7 \\ 15.6 \\ 16.0 \\ 14.1 \\ 15.1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ cent. \\ 0, 6 \\ 1, 4 \\ .6 \\ .9 \\ 1, 0 \\ .6 \\ .9 \\ 1, 0 \\ .6 \\ .1 \\ .8 \\ 1, 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} Per \ cent. \\ 82.1 \\ 81.8 \\ 80.9 \\ 82.9 \\ 81.4 \\ 75.0 \\ 81.9 \\ 81.7 \\ 83.0 \\ 82.0 \end{array}$	Per cent. 2.0 1.8 2.1 1.8 2.0 2.3 1.9 2.1 1.8	$\begin{array}{c} Calories. \\ 4.475 \\ 4,460 \\ 4,405 \\ 4,390 \\ 4,415 \\ 4,425 \\ 4.425 \\ 4.400 \\ 4.300 \\ 4.385 \\ 4,375 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} Calories, \\ 4, 265 \\ 4, 310 \\ 4, 275 \\ 4, 265 \\ 4, 265 \\ 4, 265 \\ 4, 265 \\ 4, 255 \\ 4, 255 \\ 4, 205 \\ 4, 205 \end{array}$
Average of 10 analyses Average of 135 analyses ³ Flour		16.0 14.5 12.7	.8 1.8 1.2	81, 3 82, 0 85, 6	1.9 1.7 .5	4,400	$\begin{array}{c} 4.285 \\ 4.325 \\ 4.320 \end{array}$

TABLE 31.-Composition of bread calculated to water-free basis, with the heats of combustion as determined by the bomb calorimeter and as calculated.

¹By the bomb calorimeter.

²On the supposition that 1 gram of protein, fat, and carbohydrates will yield 5.5, 9.3, and 4.1 calories, respectively. In the estimation of fuel values as distinguished from heats of combastion the factor 4.1 per gram is commonly used for protein compounds, thus allowing for their incomplete oxidation in the body.

³U. 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 $2\frac{3}{1}$ cents; the highest, 71; the average, 33 cents. The protein varied 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 variations 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 New 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 bread 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 amount 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 causes 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 nutrients during the process The information on this point is limited.* of baking.

The experiment here reported was made in a small bakery in Pittsburg, and was conducted under the personal supervision 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:

	Labo-	bo-		Cost.		Composition.				
	ratory No.	Weig	Weights.		Total.	Water.	Pro- tein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	Ash.
Flour Potatoes ¹ Sugar ¹ . Yeast ² Salt		127	$\begin{array}{c} Lbs. \\ 47.\ 75 \\ 2.\ 32 \\ .\ 28 \\ 5.\ 19 \\ .\ 66 \end{array}$	Cents. 24 2 5	\$1.08 .05 .01 .09 .01	Per ct. 10.94 79.20 95.03	Per ct. 14.19 2.10 1.21	1.24 .10 .04	Per ct. 73.17 17.80 100.00 2.17	Per ct. 0.46 .80 1.55 100.00
Total Bread from the above	2559	25. 495 ³ 29, 840	56.30 65.75		1.24 2.60	35, 56	10.32	. 26	52. 64	1. 22

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

¹Percentage composition taken from average composition of such foods as given in U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 28. ²Water 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. ³Including water used in preparing the bread.

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

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 fuel value of nutrients in ingredients used in making bread and in the baked bread.

	Total v	Heats of combustion	Heats of		
	Protein.	Fat.	Carbohy- drates.	as calcu- lated.1	
Flour	22	Grams. 269 1	Grams. 15, 856 187 127	Calories. 84, 425 895 520	Calories. 285, 595 3895 3520
Yeast		1	51	375	3375
Total Bread Apparent loss Per cent of loss	42	271 78 193 71. 2	16, 221 15, 708 513 3, 2	$\begin{array}{r} 86,215\\82,085\\4,230\\4.9\end{array}$	87, 385 2 82, 655 4, 730 5, 4

¹On 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. ²Determined by bomb calorimeter.

³Calculated.

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 Voorhees¹ 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 In the first New Brunswick experiment In the second New Brunswick experiment	Grams. 721 2, 638 2, 537	Grams. 78 1, 133 1, 037	Per cent. 71 57 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

¹U. S. Dept. Agr., Office of Experiment Stations Bul. 35.

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