

not a part of my duty to teach dietetics excepting in so far as the subject is incidentally connected with many of the diseases of pregnancy and the puerperium. As a correct dietary is so vastly important in general toxemia of pregnancy I desire to make a few remarks on this subject in this connection.

There appears to be some charm for the laity in certain of the modern systems of diet; such, for instance, as the milk, the Salisbury, the koumiss, the whey, the proteid, and the vegetarian cures. I must admit that these, in certain cases, are to some extent successful. Many people are suffering simply because of eating more food than the digestive organs can assimilate. They may have used articles of food, which are simple enough in themselves, in combinations made indigestible by a certain mixing of physiological incompatibilities in the stomach. For these, a certain restriction of food, such as is necessitated by these so-called cures, may do good for a time. No one, however, can grow and continue vigorous and strong on a greatly restricted food régime.

Pritchard correctly observes that we should avoid such general observations as that meat is bad in kidney disease or that sugar is bad for rheumatism, as a moment's thought will demonstrate that such observations are nonsense. Meat we must have, and sugar we must have in some form or other. They are not bad for any condition, they are only injurious when taken in excess. Let us devote our energies to the limitation and definition of quantity. The further we limit the better, as everybody overeats and will overeat.

The same author, in referring to some fads connected with certain cures, speaks of diet in nephritis. Although I have already spoken on this subject in a former lecture I desire now to repeat, to a certain extent, and will quote from Pritchard. He asks us to take, for example, the case of a man suffering from some form of nephritis in which it is desirable and necessary to shield the kidneys from undue work. It is recognized, and rightly so, that nitrogenous elements of food should be cut down to a minimum, and, with this end in view, in nine cases out of ten, he is put upon a milk diet. Pritchard thinks, however, that in such a case this diet falls very far short of perfection, not only as regards the relative proportion of the essential constituents but also from the point of view of digestibility. "Nevertheless, from time immemorial, it has served, and served more or less effectively, as an exclusive food for such and similar complaints, and with all its shortcomings I have not a word to say against the use of milk. But why, I ask, should a man be condemned to a milk diet which contains a high percentage (4 per cent.) of nitrogenous elements and be refused the chop, or beef steak, in which his soul delights?"