

In a study of 2,622 accidents, an accurate determination was made of the length of service of those injured. It was found that those who had been employed one month or less were being injured at the rate of 160 per month per 100 employees. (This does not mean that 160 accidents were caused per month, but that they occurred at the rate of 160 per month). Those who had been employed for three months had accidents at the rate of 70 per month per 100 employees. Those who had been employed from three to eight months had a rate of 16 accidents per month per 100 employees; and those whose experience ranged from eight months to one year had 12 accidents per month per 100 employees.

After the first year, the rate dropped rapidly. For those employed from one to five years, it was 15 accidents per year per 100 employees. For those employed from five to ten years it was 11 accidents per year per 100 employees. Those who had served from ten to twenty years suffered 5 accidents per year per 100 employees, and those who had been employed from twenty to thirty years made the best showing of all, with a rate of only 3 accidents per 100 employees. After thirty years of service, the rate took a slightly upward trend.

Another study showed the relation of what might be called the labor recruiting rate to the accident frequency rate. (Do not confuse the term "labor recruiting" with the term "labor turnover.") In the study referred to, the total number of employees increased gradually from 340 at the beginning to 590 at the end of the period. One would naturally think that the number of accidents would follow fairly closely the total number of employees exposed to the hazards of the plant. Such was not the case. Instead, accidents happened with the greatest frequency during the months when conditions required the hiring of the largest number of new employees, and a drop in those months during which there was also a drop in the number of new employees hired.

"Right now, the very commendable efforts of the industries to keep as many as possible of their people employed may result in the assignment of men to work which is new to them and for which they are not fitted and lead to accidents. When business picks up, and it most certainly will, there will be a great deal of shuffling around until things become stabilized. All of those classes of employees that have been termed new will be entering our plants in large numbers. If it is possible to devise ways and means of preventing injuries among them we should get busy and formulate our programs now and be ready to tackle the problem as soon as it arises."

The careful selection of employees is all important. Employee selection should be exercised in the plant having but a handful of workers no less thoroughly than in one having thousands. The principles involved are precisely the same. Every selected employee should measure up to the physical, mental and moral requirements of the job for which he is hired. It follows that all of those who have the responsibility of hiring men should examine themselves carefully to determine if they are fully familiar with the job requirements.

Physical examinations prior to employment are desirable. They should not be undertaken with the idea of excluding subnormal applicants from employment altogether, but to ascertain what particular work each one can do with the maximum of safety for himself and the minimum of risks for the employing company. There may be some who object to physical examinations, but these objections are based usually on the belief that industry will take an unfair advantage of the workmen through information obtained from the examinations. Just as soon, however, as it is demonstrated that the examinations are not being made for an ulterior purpose but to fit the men to jobs at which they will be safest and at the same time most likely to succeed in a financial way, the objections will cease.

Closely allied with the determination of physical fitness is the question of mental qualifications. Modern employment technique includes many different kinds of tests. Such tests should be as brief as possible and actually suitable for the purpose for

which they are intended, namely, the detection of certain specific characteristics and qualifications. Any tests that are unduly long and fail to give information that cannot be obtained otherwise will defeat their own purpose. There is room for a lot of common sense as well as technical skill in employee selection which, if it means anything, should be fitting employees to their jobs.

Of no less importance are moral qualifications. It is not suggested that industry should perform the functions of a Sunday School, or that employment managers should try to give a moral rating to each applicant for employment. It is obvious, however, that one who makes untruthful statements, or is evasive rather than straightforward in answering questions, or is known to disregard accepted standards of conduct, cannot be given a task that requires individual initiative and the acceptance of a measure of personal responsibility. Moreover, such a person will not team up well with his fellows. He cannot be counted on for much help in bettering your accident records.

"When an applicant is accepted for employment a contract of hire either expressed or implied has been made. It is assumed, on the one hand, that the employer has examined the qualifications of the applicant and has found them satisfactory, and on the other, that the applicant has familiarized himself with the conditions under which he will work and has considered them acceptable. What an opportunity to start a man off right so far as accident prevention is concerned! The applicant is in a receptive frame of mind. Now is the time to explain the safety objectives of the company, and the part he will be expected to play in this effort if he becomes a member of the organization. This is a dignified and important part of the employment program. Time spent on it will be justified by the results."

Discussion: Mr. Prouty emphasized that it is well to have a re-examination of a man's physical fitness when he returns to work after an absence, even though he is an old employee. Also the foreman should realize his responsibility in the matter and not assume that the man can do the work as he formerly did. The discussion developed also that in a certain plant a man who was found to have a communicable disease sued the plant doctor on the basis of "privilege communication." The plant in question now has all applicants for positions sign waivers before physical examination takes place.

Report of the Nominating Committee

Will Cooper, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, then presented the committee's report and officers were elected for the ensuing year as follows:

General Chairman—HENRY J. MINEUR, The Borden Company, New York City.
Vice-Chairman—FRANK A. HASSE, Corn Products Refining Company, Chicago.
Secretary and News-Letter Editor—J. J. ZEITNER, Continental Baking Company, New York City.
Engineering Committee Chairman—J. J. LYONS, John F. Jelke Company, Chicago.
Membership Committee Chairman—ROBERT FLEMING, Kellogg Company, Battle Creek, Mich.
Poster Committee Chairman—THOMAS STEUBER, Wagner-Taylor Company, Philadelphia.
Program Committee Chairman—W. C. WASHINGTON, Sheffield Farms Company, Inc., New York City.
Publicity Committee Chairman—RUTH E. CALE, A. E. Staley Manufacturing Company, Decatur, Ill.
Statistics Committee Chairman—T. A. SCHENDEL, Premier Malt Products Company, Peoria, Ill.
Members at Large—
 WILLIAM F. BARRETT, Horn and Hardart Baking Company, Philadelphia.
 W. P. BELL, California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., Crockett, Calif.