Category D:

Exposures that may induce irreversible disease or death.

There is also some discussion of both the levels of toxic substances in biological specimens, and the use of other biological indicators of environmental exposure. Not surprisingly, the conclusion is reached that further study is desirable. Consideration is given to the use of human volunteers in experimental studies, and the comments of H. E. Stokinger on this emotive subject are particularly relevant, both in respect of the need for such studies, their methodology, and ethical considerations. Indeed, although the quality of the working papers prepared by individual members of the Committee is very variable, Stokinger's several thoughtful contributions are especially noteworthy.

The survey of national legislation and practice concerning maximum permissible concentrations lists 655 substances, with an index giving the names of the countries in whose lists the individual compounds appear. This would have been rather more helpful had it been found possible to quote all the values both in parts per million as well as in milligrammes per cubic metre, but it is still valuable to have all the facts recorded together in one volume. It is of interest to note the remarkable extent to which the recommended values differ in various countries, sometimes by a factor of 90. The values most widely accepted in other countries are the Threshold Limit Values of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, and the Maximum Allowable Concentrations laid down by the health legislation of the U.S.S.R. In only 24 instances do these values approximate sufficiently to differ by less than a factor of 2. The Committee adopted a list of safe concentration zones for these 24 substances, and recommends these for international use. A plea for increased international co-operation is put forward.

It is unlikely that most industrial medical officers will find this a particularly useful work of reference. There can be no doubt, however, that careful perusal will help the student of toxicology to achieve a better understanding of the significance of published figures for maximum permissible concentrations, and of why such concentrations may vary substantially in different countries with differing philosophic concepts.

ALEXANDER MUNN

Baillière's Handbook of First Aid, 6th ed., edited by Stanley Miles. (Pp. 336; illustrated; £1.00.) London: Baillière, Tindall, and Cassell. 1970.

This book first appeared in 1941 and its stated objective is to be 'a complete and authoritative work'. This new edition has been rewritten in parts but the layout and illustrations now have a somewhat dated air. At over 300 pages it would be too much for the novice first-aid, and I imagine that it would have most appeal to the enthusiastic first-aid who wants to know rather more than the minimum necessary to pass his re-examination. I would particularly recommend the chapters on the illness of injury and the management of cardiac and respiratory arrest; there is also a useful index. The book would be a great help to doctors who are planning to give lectures on first aid. A number of minor inaccuracies persist from

earlier editions, but these are inevitable until the publishers are prepared to indulge in a complete re-setting of type.

P. J. TAYLOR

Proceedings of the Symposium on the Psychological Effects of Noise (1967). Edited by Dr. W. Taylor. (In 10 sections; no price stated.) London: Research Panel, Society of Occupational Medicine. 1970.

This is the report of a symposium (the second of its kind) arranged by the Research Panel of the Society of Occupational Health and held at University College, Cardiff, in September 1967. There is a foreword, by Dr. D. Malcolm, followed by a brief résumé of the nine papers presented.

As with most symposia, the material presented varies appreciably in quality and substance. Dr. Broadbent's opening paper is an attempt to make sense of the puzzling literature dealing with the effect of noise on work performance. He suggests that the effect is more likely to be adverse when subsequent effort cannot make up for earlier inefficiency, and if the essential nature of the work is perceptual rather than motor. Whether, as he believes, noise may be harmful only when the worker is in an aroused state, is an idea which will need critical examination. One concluding remark, namely, 'that the average of a group of men may include some who are consistently worse in noise and some who are consistently better' is somewhat hard to interpret.

The second paper is a sharp critique, by Dr. Buzzard, of the value of current procedures and measures in the study of work performance. What he has to say should be taken to heart by all those engaged in industrial psychology. He does not content himself with fault-finding but adds a number of useful recommendations, particularly for the recording of data.

Dr. Hawel, whose paper seems to have been prepared more for a listener than for a reader, shares Dr. Buzzard's doubts with respect to the application of laboratory results to 'real life' situations. This conclusion does not, however, seem to follow from the evidence which he presents and which suggests that ill-humoured people dislike traffic noise more than good-humoured people.

Dr. Atherley's useful analysis deals with the idea of stress in relation to noise. He raises the question whether stress might not sometimes be due to information overload rather than to sheer acoustical effects, a suggestion which could lead to interesting investigations.

The implication from Dr. Atherley's paper that meaningful and meaningless noise have differential effects is challenged by Dr. D. R. Davies who, after sketching the evidence on physiological effects of noise, concludes that nothing has yet been established.

A fresh look at the topic is introduced by Drs. Hopkinson and Rowlands in their comparison of discomfort from noise with discomfort from glare. Their conclusions are supported by an account of an investigation, based on this comparison, into the assessment of noise in hospitals.

The reader of Dr. H. J. Eysenck's paper, which makes the largest claims, may have a feeling of *déjà vu*. It does little more than reiterate his dogma that the two major