has often been stated that bronchial cancer should be regarded as a complication of asbestosis, in contradiction to pleural mesothelioma. However, although much evidence points to asbestos related lung carcinoma as an occupational disease (particularly in smokers), there is not yet enough evidence to exclude the risk of environmentally induced lung carcinoma as a public health risk. This is still an area for concern, and for proper study. So, the previous statement that bronchial carcinoma is only associated with asbestosis in the occupationally exposed population, needs reassessment.

A recent unpublished study by Skinner and Castle in Rhodesia (Gilson, personal communication) suggested that there was no detectable excess of bronchial cancer in the asbestos mining area, whereas this was detected in the gold mining regions within that country, probably due to arsenic. So, one should take into account the complete occupational and environmental history, before suggesting too easily a relationship between e.g. asbestos and malignancy. In some studies one may have not been careful enough in this respect.

Recently some doubt arose with regard to the "innocence" of ambient asbestos air pollution in ind: ing bronchial cancers. Warnock et al (1975) performed quantitative counts of asbestos bodies in lungs of 100 control and 30 cancer patients: the last group had significantly higher levels, according to the authors, probably in general not due to occupational asbestos exposure. However their technique for counting bodies only gave minimal recovery; the occupational history was not very detailed. Doniach et al (1975) recently also performed a similar study in autopsy cases from London (UK); the history with regard to occupation and area of residence was more detailed. The authors could not find any correlation between presence of asbestos bodies and bronchial carcinoma, confirming findings of Elmes et al (1965); they concluded that - smoking apart - the increased incidence of bronchial carcinoma in urban as compared to rural populations is likely to be due to atmospheric pollutants other than asbestos dust. So, the suggestion brought forward by Warnock et al (1975) was not confirmed. This question remains however an area for future studies, emphasizing the application of adequate counting techniques and detailed environmental history.

IX-3 REF

In
tween a
al (197
cavity,
bestos,
past e:
more d
portan
period
compar
differ
to a
sent
worke
asbes
time
with
indic

betw
36 c
area
sugg
sue
conf

sis
two
mac

8001 0789

PRODUCED BY FORD