

NEW CASES OF ASBESTOSIS DIAGNOSED IN 1955 - 1962 ANALYSED BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION. (4 P.M.F.'s in U.K.)			
PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION	No. OF CASES 1955 - 1963	No. OF CASES 1963 - 1969	TOTAL
OPENING, DISINTEGRATING	41 (17%)	45 (10%)	86 (12%)
INSULATING : LAGGERS	72 (29%)	134 (28%)	206 (29%)
SPRATERS	13 (6%)	15 (4%)	28 (4%)
MATTRESS MAKERS	5 (2%)	21 (4%)	26 (4%)
OTHERS	12 (5%)	71 (15%)	83 (12%)
WEAVING	16 (7%)	14 (3%)	30 (4%)
CARDING, SPINNING ETC.	37 (13%)	51 (11%)	88 (12%)
SLAB AND PIPE MAKING	20 (8%)	19 (4%)	39 (5%)
SHAKE LINING	4 (2%)	10 (3%)	14 (2%)
MISCELLANEOUS	27 (11%)	91 (19%)	118 (16%)
	<u>247 (100%)</u>	<u>474 (100%)</u>	<u>721 (100%)</u>



CASES OF THE LUNG

1. INCIDENCE RELATED TO SEVERITY OF ASBESTOSIS, DUE TO INTENSITY OF DUST EXPOSURE.
2. OTHER AETIOLOGICAL FACTORS :

Cigarette smoking (an overwhelming effect)

Type of asbestos

Age population (small effect)

3. SPECIFIC ASBESTOS EFFECT PROBABLY PREVENTABLE BY PRACTICABLE DUST CONTROL.

But at all, 1960 lung shows that people employed prior to 1911 Regulations had the greater chance of dying from lung cancer after 20 years exposure. In people employed at the same factory since 1911 (from Regulations took effect) the incidence of lung cancer after 20 years exposure was no greater than for the general population.

ASBESTOS EXPOSURE 1969 took effect 14 MAY 1970.

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

1. Have tumours directly associated with exposure to asbestos (as)?
2. A small percentage of those exposed develop tumours.
3. Long latent period (over 20 years).
4. Dust exposure short and possibly small in some cases.
5. In mice and all the lung disease is apparently related to the type of asbestos and the effects of chrysotile are very much less than those of amphibole. Asbestos and amphibole do not have any demonstrable effect to date.
6. In manufacturing industry, sharp exposure has often been noted, no type of asbestos has been proved innocent.
7. Other factors : not related to cigarette smoking have not identified.
8. PREVENTION?