

We now take a step forward. We know by experience that the means which we have hitherto been discussing suitable to obviate unemployment are insufficient to completely prevent innocent, involuntary unemployment and that the number of the unemployed is very large. Unemployment would still remain to be reckoned with, and means must be taken to provide for its occurrence. Insurance against unemployment is the most effective institution. Let us consider the significance of this suggestion from a hygienic standpoint without criticizing the several schemes of insurance which have been attempted or proposed. From the standpoint of trade hygienics the chief place must decidedly be given to insurance against unemployment whether it be fraternal insurance in the meaning of the system in vogue at Ghent or compulsory or involuntary insurance, such as compulsory savings, etc., and for the following reasons: A very important consideration in the matter of protection of the workmen and one frequently very effective in dangerous occupations and especially in such as involve danger of poisoning is the promptest possible separation of the endangered workmen from the dangerous work, the change of work, the change from dangerous to uninjurious occupation, that is to say, a temporary separation from the dangerous work.*

As will be anticipated, it will rarely be possible to carry out this suggestion within the limits of any one business that is without requiring the workman to seek a new situation. It may be to some extent possible in the case of industries carried on on a large scale where several processes are involved.

It must be remembered that in this case sickness insurance is no complete protection as it must be emphasized that a workman must quit the occupation before he takes sick, that is before he is sick within the meaning of the laws relating to sickness insurance, when he shows the tendency to sickness or the premonitory symptoms (first indications). Hygiene must prevent the actual taking sick; this in many cases is possible only when the dangerous occupation is dropped at once and when, after a proper time for recuperation a new employment is sought. For such cases I emphatically recommend insurance against inno-

cent unemployment, due to a consideration of health, and, therefore, involuntary. We are now dealing especially with cases of chronic poisoning, due to the nature of certain trades, where poison is stored in the system, and which in the case of lead poisoning can be recognized from symptoms in the early stages. By quitting the employment time and opportunity may be given the system to throw off the poison. There are, moreover, other sicknesses such as tuberculosis in its early stages, but not sicknesses as defined by the laws relating to sickness insurance, which demand the prompt relinquishment of an occupation, which promotes tuberculosis such as a trade process creating quantities of dust. This is the special reason why I as an expert in trade hygienics feel it my duty to support insurance against unemployment or some substitute (compulsory savings, etc.), quite apart from the general social hygienic considerations already touched upon.

Not to become diffuse and so obliterate the impression I have sought to make as to this, which seems to me to be the most important point of view of our subject, I shall not close without pointing out again the general significance of providing for the welfare of laborers with the object of contending with unemployment. Such provisions for the welfare of laborers in the narrower sense—as I style them—those arrangements for the well being of labor which go beyond the behests of the laws protecting labor are intended to elevate the general condition and well being of the laborer to confirm his domestic and social existence in brief, to create a contented, healthy, independent labor class which will not suffer from unemployment. I know that by such an expression I may appear to come into conflict with some of the designs of organized labor, but that would be a misunderstanding. We are not dealing with a conflict of social classes nor with a political problem; these considerations should be laid aside when we desire to accomplish social hygienic aims. In this case emulation should take the place of discord and assuredly the labor organizations are not prohibited; it will, indeed, be their duty, to emulate the employers in providing for the welfare of laborers.

*In considering this point, complete tabulation of the dangerous occupations, especially of those in which there is danger of poisoning, would from one standpoint be very desirable. (Krejel)