

Left councils in nuke row

LEFT-WING councils which continue to refuse to make satisfactory Civil Defence preparations for nuclear war face financial penalties, the government warned yesterday.

Announcing a new get-tough Civil Defence programme, Home Office Minister Giles Shaw said there was "a widespread lack" of committed planning by local authorities.

The "vast majority" of the 54 authorities in England and Wales had not done sufficient to fulfil their obligations under the 1983 Civil Defence regulations, he declared.

Three county councils — Avon, Mid-Glamorgan and

South Glamorgan — had submitted no civil defence plans. The government is now considering withholding Civil Defence grants from them.

The new three-year programme for the full implementation of civil defence measures should be recognised as "a constructive and necessary focus for this vital work."

He added: "I anticipate that if local authorities do not comply, there will be some hold-back of civil defence grant." The government's 1985-86 civil defence budget was £13.7 million, compared with £3 million in 1979.

CIVIL DEFENCE
23 7 86 MS

Atom war update delayed

By George Jones
Political Correspondent

UPDATED official advice on domestic protection against a nuclear attack is to be held back from the public until a time of crisis, the Government has decided.

The decision not to publish at this stage a new version of the official document, Protect and Survive, reflects a desire not to heighten public anxieties about nuclear war.

Protect and Survive was first published in May 1980. It gave advice on how families could make shelters to protect themselves against blast and radioactive fall-out and store supplies of food and drink.

But the document was criticised for being out of date, and Ministers gave an assurance that it would be revised in the light of more up to date information about the effects of nuclear blast and radiation.

Overall plan

The Government has also decided that civil defence against a nuclear attack should be incorporated within overall Government and local authority proposals for dealing with civil emergencies, ranging from floods to explosions at a chemical or nuclear plant.

The Home Office has prepared a new film about civil protection, and there will also be an explanatory booklet available to the public.

Both will deal with civil defence against nuclear attack, although they will emphasise that this forms only part of official planning to deal with a much wider range of emergencies and natural disasters.

Doctors to say who will survive nuclear war

From Andrew Veitch
in Madrid

The British Medical Association is to spell out who will be allowed to live, and who should be left to die after a nuclear war.

An expert group, similar to that which embarrassed the Government with its assessment of the medical effects of a nuclear attack, is now being set up and is due to complete its report next year.

Those picked to survive would include market gardeners, mechanics, and nurses. Dr John Dawson, head of the BMA's science division, told a weekend conference.

Anyone unable to contribute to the survival and regeneration of the community would be denied treatment. That, he said, would probably include doctors because they tended to know little about first aid and were helpless without their equipment.

Britain's one million diabetics, and all those needing constant supplies of drugs to survive, would be left to die.

The report would not be for or against civil defence, it would be a careful examination of the facts, Dr Dawson told the European symposium of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, meeting in Madrid.

"To duck the issue is to con-

the public," he said. "There is a cosy assumption put out by the Government that treatment will be all right, we'll muddle through somehow, and Vera Lynn will be singing again."

The Government had no plans for selecting which of the millions of casualties of an attack should be treated, Dr Dawson said later, so the BMA would do it for them.

"We say there should be an open public discussion on the selection of casualties for treatment so we are setting up a working party to study it," he added.

With no health service, desperate shortages of blood, dressings, and drugs all resources would have to be concentrated on those who could contribute to the survival and possible regeneration of the community.

He said that the rest "should not be treated if they are injured, because to do so would be to waste resources."

The BMA's first report forced the Home Office to rethink its calculations of the numbers who would be killed in an attack. Civil defence plans are being revised to take account of data which suggests that a full scale attack would kill 26 million people — half the population of the UK — and not 16 million as the Home Office had previously assumed.

Civil Defence