

LANSING\*BAGNALL\*LTD



Kingsclere Road  
Basingstoke  
Hampshire  
RG21 2XJ

Telephone: Basingstoke (0256) 3131  
Telex: 858120 Bagnallie Botke

Sir Emmanuel Kaye, C.B.E.  
Chairman & Governing Director

Ref: EK/CM

19th October, 1979

The Rt. Hon. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, M.P.,  
Prime Minister,  
10 Downing Street,  
LONDON S.W.1.

My dear Prime Minister,

If I may take a few minutes of your time on the fluoridation question, you will see from the enclosed cutting from last Sunday's "Observer" that there are officials in the D.H.S.S. who are preparing legislation to force water authorities to add fluoride to drinking water.

Nothing could be more unjustified or unpopular, or more contrary to the Conservative philosophy of freedom of choice! In support of the unpopularity of such coercion I enclose also a copy of Peter Simple's article in the "Daily Telegraph" of 16th October: So I do hope there will be a denial from Dr. Gerard Vaughan that he has any such intention.

Reverting to my remarks at Monday's dinner party, I do very much hope that the Committee to be appointed by Dr. Vaughan will be fairly constituted on a 50/50 basis; i.e. 50 per cent of the members should represent the anti-fluoridation point of view. In the past all committees specifically set up to look into fluoridation have consisted of fluoridationists, which is why their reports have carried no conviction and have not been generally accepted. Hence the widespread opposition.

A Department of Health spokesman admitted last week that there has been an increase in cancer mortality, particularly from leukaemia, in Birmingham since fluoridation. In his B.B.C. Radio 4 interview, on 12th October, Dr. Dean Burk stated that for ten years prior to fluoridation in 1964 Birmingham had a very steady cancer death rate - 210 deaths per one hundred thousand population per year. Within five years it had gone up to about 235, and it is much above that now.

Congratulations on your splendid & statesmanlike speech at Luxembourg!

With every good wish,

Yours very sincerely,  
Emmanuel.





## Add fluoride—by order

THE Government is preparing legislation to force water authorities to add fluoride to drinking water, writes Geoffrey Lean.

Its action, which is sure to meet vigorous protest, comes at a particularly sensitive time—amid allegations that cancer deaths in Birmingham rose after fluoridation.

Eighty-four of Britain's 90 Area Health Authorities, which are responsible for making the decision on medical grounds, have said that they want fluoride added.

But only 23 have seen fluoridation wholly or partially implemented because water authorities, who actually add the chemical, have been slow to obey. About 4½ million people, mainly in Birmingham, the West Midlands and Newcastle, drink the treated water.

Health authorities can only request water authorities to add fluoride and the Government believes there must be a way to enforce decisions.

Fluoridation provokes stronger reactions than almost any other environ-

mental issue. Its supporters are convinced that it is safe and essential to fight tooth decay. Opponents, however, passionately argue that mass medication is wrong in principle and that fluoride can cause a host of diseases including cancer.

The opponents point to research by an American scientist, Dr Dean Burke, who concluded that cancer deaths have risen in Birmingham and 10 American cities since fluoride was added to the water there. Department of Health scientists disagree.



**Urgent**

**F**LUORIDATION is a notoriously boring subject; I accordingly write about it only once a year. The time has now come to write about it again, and much more urgently than ever before. For once again the Government is threatening to make water authorities add fluoride to public water supplies; and this time it looks as if it may actually try to force them to do so by law.

This is far from boring. It is a scandal and a menace.

There are two arguments against this measure. In the first place it amounts to compulsory mass medication, which is wrong in principle; in the second place, there is a great deal of evidence that although the addition of fluoride to public water supplies may temporarily benefit children's teeth, it may also have long-term adverse effects on the human body—notably cancer.

Because the medical "establishment" in this country has taken up an entrenched position on this subject—the reason why it should have done so is mysterious and even sinister—it has been able to dismiss objectors to fluoridation as a lot of cranks and reactionary fanatics, and to convince the public by incessant propaganda that there is only one side to the question.

This is not so. There are 40 MPs of all political parties who believe it is the *duty* of MPs to oppose fluoridation. They have formed an All-Party Committee, with Mr Ivan Lawrence, Conservative MP for Burton, as chairman. In a speech in the Commons last year he said that "the sheer irresponsibility in the dental and medical profession about this problem" was positively "frightening."

He also pointed out that most of the nations of Western Europe either had not allowed fluoridation in the first place or had rejected it after trial.

Yet 84 of the 90 Area Health Authorities in this country have now pronounced in favour of it. At present they can only *recommend* that water authorities follow their advice. So far only a few have done so: only about four and a half million people, mainly in the West Midlands and Tyneside, have been subjected to this more than dubious experiment.

Will the Government now try compulsion by law? If so, it must be resisted all the way. If ever there was a thin end

of an enormous wedge, it is here.

Peter Simple -  
article -