

29th January 2017

Chair
Health Select Committee
Parliament Buildings
Wellington

Dear Sir,

Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill

Introduction

1. I (Daniel Lacey) appreciate the opportunity to provide a submission on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill.
2. My experience includes working for the past 3 years in charge of marketing at one of the largest natural health companies in New Zealand, and over a year volunteering my own time working for clean water advocacy group Fluoride Free NZ. Both these roles have allowed me access to the opinions of hundreds of medical professionals across New Zealand, as well as information to read and decipher myself. I am well educated and have a University degree.

Objection to DHB decision making

3. I object to the proposed shift of decision making powers on whether or not to fluoridate drinking water supplies from local councils to district health boards.

Freedom of choice

4. The choice of what goes in peoples drinking water should be made at as much of a local level as possible, ideally it should be completely up to the individual to decide – but the next best thing is for local councils to make the decision that affects those living in their local area.
5. By centralising decision making it is easier for those decision makers to detach from the local area and the people in it, those making the decisions are less likely to see the negative impacts of their decisions. Much like a general sitting in an office commanding hundreds of troops to death on the battlefield, but never seeing the frontline.
6. New Zealand is a democracy, not a dictatorship. It goes against every democratic principle to decide for everyone in the country what should be added to their drinking water.
7. The Government only has the power which is given to it by the people, therefore if I cannot decide what medicines go into my neighbours water supply, the Government cannot decide what goes into mine.
8. It is a human rights violation to mass medicate a population without informed consent.
9. The controversy around fluoridation of drinking water is so great, that it makes much more sense to allow those who want to add fluoride to their water to add it themselves, than to force it upon everyone.
10. The 1947 Nurembourg Code states that “In no case should a collective community agreement or the consent of a community leader or other authority substitute for an individual’s informed consent.”
11. Many councils are more well informed than DHB’s as they have already trawled through all the presentations and evidence and rejected fluoridation. Whereas many DHB members just follow the govt. company line and support fluoridation with no personal investigation.

Flaws in the bill

12. The legislation strongly recommends fluoridation and doesn't allow the DHB's to consider any ill health effects when making their decision.
13. The 2009 oral health survey only uses a small sample size (60 children) when claiming a 40% reduction in tooth decay and it doesn't take into account any socio-economic factors. This is not enough information to make a decision to medicate an entire country on.
14. No other survey or study shows a 40% reduction in tooth decay in fluoridated areas vs unfluoridated, in fact lots of studies show unfluoridated areas have better teeth and one recent study from the NZ MoH even shows that Counties Manakau (fluoridated) has 40% more tooth decay than Christchurch (unfluoridated) – (graph and study attached as evidence).
15. It is a waste of money that would be much better spent elsewhere.

Those who propose and support the Bill are not open to evidence which doesn't support fluoridation

16. Peter Dunne said anyone opposed to fluoridation were “tin foil hat wearing, UFO abducted campaigners, peddling pseudo-science myths”. Does this sound like someone who would even consider a study which proved fluoride had negative effects on health?
17. Annette King said that anyone who was opposed to fluoridation used “misinformation” and “voodoo science”. Does this sound like someone who is open to new evidence that fluoridation is harmful, or someone who is dead-set in their ways and won't change no matter what the evidence?
18. Peter Gluckman made a huge mistake in his review “Health effects of water fluoridation”, where in his original report he claimed a shift of less than 1 IQ point as a result of being exposed to high fluoride levels was of “no functional significance”. He later realised that actually the loss of IQ points was much higher and changed his report to say “less than one standard deviation”, which he still claimed was of “no functional significance”. He clearly used this measurement to hide the fact that it is actually of huge significance, as one standard deviation is equal to 15 IQ points. Peter Gluckman apparently believes this is not significant.
19. The WaterNZ CEO John Pfahlert recommends mandatory fluoridation for all by dictatorship. This man was previously NZ spokesman for big oil, the frontman for fracking, offshore oil drilling and seismic blasting. He was even named “asshole of the week” in a popular internet blog for his involvement in a controversial oil spill. Ask yourself, does this man have our teeth at heart or the industrial waste industry? (fluoride is industrial waste)
20. If these people were in charge at the height of smoking, they would still be recommending it (as many doctors used to) and denying it caused cancer.

Natural health vs “big pharma” wealth

21. Through my job roles and own interests I have had the pleasure to work alongside hundreds of natural health practitioners. I have never met one who supported fluoridation or thought it was a good idea. The vast majority are against it and a small percentage have said they need to research it further.
22. Hypothyroidism is prevalent in New Zealand, some estimates have 10% of the population with this condition. The most common cause is a deficiency of iodine. Fluoride displaces iodine in the body because it has a similar structure and causes this deficiency. Iodine is an actual essential nutrient (fluoride is not) which the body needs, but is losing because it is being displaced by fluoride, causing hypothyroidism.

23. Fluoride calcifies the pineal gland, this gland is responsible for production of serotonin which produces hormones that make people happy, and melatonin which helps people sleep. If your pineal gland becomes calcified your body struggles to do either of these well and you have real problems.
24. Calcification of the pineal gland also has an extremely negative affect on people spiritually and on meditation. More people in NZ need less stress and more meditation.
25. The precautionary principle MUST apply here. There are so many reasons not to fluoridate and so many people against it so why do we continue to do it?
26. 338 health professionals added their names to a list started by Fluoride Free NZ to say they are against fluoridation. I personally know a lot more than this who are also against it. Why are you not listening to these experts? Why is Peter Gluckman the only “expert” you will listen to, but you won’t listen to over 300 experts who tell you how bad fluoride is for us?
27. There is 250 times the amount of fluoride in a baby’s milk bottle made with powder and fluoridated water than there is in breast milk. This is because it is not needed and this is a huge over-exposure to fluoride for babies. Do you honestly think Peter Gluckman got it right where nature got it wrong?
28. There is not one single biochemical process in the body that has been shown to require fluoride for normal function.
29. Fluoride does not work by swallowing, any debatable benefit is by topical application only.
30. A recent study shows that fluoride causes excess suffering and death by initiating and exacerbating kidney disease, which in turn causes a cascade of secondary, often fatal, diseases (study attached as evidence).
31. There is no toxicity data to show that fluoride is safe.
32. 96% of the world do not fluoridate, because it doesn’t work – in a large number of these countries it has been completely banned (see supporting documentation attached as evidence).
33. Fluoride is a waste product from the phosphate fertiliser industry.
34. This country has some of the purest and most beautiful water in the world, why on earth would you want to ruin it by dumping industrial waste into it?
35. An analysis of water fluoridation chemicals added to Hamilton water in 2015 showed that included in the chemicals was: aluminium, arsenic, barium, copper, lead, iron, mercury, nickel, silver, tin and uranium (image attached as evidence). We should not be drinking any of these.
36. Fluoride is an endocrine disrupter, which means it can cause cancerous tumors, birth defects, and other developmental disorders.
37. The worlds most prestigious medical journal “The Lancet” lists fluoride as a neurotoxin.
38. Most conventional dentists who support fluoridation also have no idea that mercury fillings are toxic, they are filling people’s teeth with them and causing health problems to patients while holistic dentists are removing them and improving their patients health.

Difficult to avoid fluoride

39. In a fluoridated area it is difficult, if not impossible to avoid fluoride.
40. Fluoride promoters say those who oppose it can use filters, yet no ordinary filter can remove fluoride, and the expensive filters which can also take out all of the beneficial minerals too.
41. We are also forced to bathe and shower in fluoridated water, your skin is the largest organ in your body and absorbs a significant amount of fluoride this way.
42. Our food gets grown using it and absorbs it, if we eat at a restaurant or drink a coffee or a beer while out it will contain fluoride. There is no escaping it.
43. Perhaps it would be easier for those who want fluoride to buy tablets? Except the Ministry of Health no longer recommends them because they do not work.
44. People who are poor and sensitive to fluoride cannot afford to avoid it.

Alternative options

45. When CHILDSMILE started in Scotland in 2000 their kids teeth were about the same as NZ kids teeth, now year 8 children free of decay is at 73% in Scotland compared with 54% in NZ. The difference being that Scotland do not fluoridate and focus on educating children around brushing teeth and the bad effects of sugar (comparison between Scotland CHILDSMILE and NZ Fluoridation attached as evidence).
46. Meanwhile NZ focuses on adding chemicals to drinking water and no education, perhaps those in charge do not want to offend the sugar lobby.
47. Education around sugar, especially on giving sugary food and drink to children is key.
48. Referendums do not work. They only need 20-25% of a populations approval to go through. About 50% of the population generally do not vote, they often do not consent to be goverened and have no faith in the government or the entire process (with good reason). This does not mean they wave their right to clean water. This 50% of non-voters do not consent. This means as long as 26% of the remaining voters believe the govt. propaganda then 26% of a population can vote for 74% to have toxic chemicals in their water. This is not democratic.

An important study

49. In 1974 G.W. Grimbergen conducted a double blind test for the determination of intolerance to fluoridated water. Preliminary results with 60 patients out of a group of 300 showed that certain individuals are intolerant to fluoride and reproducibly develop gastrointestinal symptoms, stomatitis, joint pains, polydipsia, headaches and visual disturbances (study attached as evidence).

Safe Water Assciation vs Fond du Lac County

50. 23 doctors provide evidence of the harmful effects of fluoridation, the judge agrees that it is harmful but does not have the power to end it (affidavits attached as evidence).

Summary

It's about time people in positions of "power" started looking at real evidence and put people's health and wellbeing ahead of profit and dirty politics. We need to stop letting corrupt corporate sell-outs make decisions for us and put the health of this country first.

Let's be honest that's why we're here, the people and councils in so many areas have rejected fluoridation, and so the repsonse from the government and corporate suits has been to try and strip our decision making away and force it upon us. It's time to take a stand and end water fluoridation for good.. This has to stop.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Best wishes
Daniel Lacey

Web references:

- <http://drsircus.com/iodine/iodine-protects-fluoride-toxicity/>
- <http://fluoridefree.org.nz/nz-health-professionals-opposed-to-fluoridation/>
- <http://fluoridefree.org.nz/childsmile-2/>

Additional evidence attached to submission:

- affidavits-safe-water-assn_plaintiff-vs-fond-du-lac_defendant.pdf
- Fluoride-is-a-developmental-Nephrotoxin-coming-to-a-Kidney-near-you.pdf
- Grimbergen-1974-A-Double-Blind-Test-for-Determination-of-Intolerance-to-Fluoridated-Water-Preliminary-Report-Fluoride-7-146-152.pdf
- Hamilton-Chemicals.jpg
- fluoridation-banned-in-holland.jpg
- fluoridation-not-in-europe.jpg
- christchurch-has-better-teeth.jpg
- 2014-age-5-oral-health-data-from-community-oral-health-service-jun16.pdf
- Comparison-NZ-to-Scotland-Dental-Health-2000-2015.pdf