The Chairperson,

Health Committee,

Parliament Buildings,

WELLINGTON.

Submission on the Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment

Bill.

Fluoridation is unethical.

Fluoridation is used to treat people, not to make water safe to drink.

It is not even an essential nutrient. It is a medication. All

medications are prescribed with one intention, to create bodily changes.

No responsible physician in his or her right mind would prescribe any

medication for a person he or she has never met, with a medical history

he or she knows absolutely nothing about and then throw in some

unprofessional advice such as, "Do it for life mate and don't even

worry about your dosage."

All medications are individually formulated, the daily dose

accommodating the patient's age, the gender, the exposure to other

sources, the sensitivity to the medication, the current medication

load, the physical condition, the freedom to discuss the medication with

a clear indication of how the individual response will be tracked not to

mention the freedom to the absolute right of refusal to take the

medication on grounds of belief or personal choice for one's own

body.

This unethical intrusion into our bodies, every time of every day we

turn on a domestic tap is an outright violation and denial of medical

ethics. It is in fact mass medication with an uncontrolled dosage.

Has Adolph Hitler been reincarnated?

Fluoridation is ineffective.

Major dental researchers concede that fluoride's benefits are topical

not systemic (Fejerskou 1981, Carlos 1983, CDC 1999,2001: Limeback

1999: Locker 1999: Featherstone 2000).

The largest survey conducted in the United States showed only a minute

difference in tooth decay between children who had lived all their

lives in fluoridated compared to non-fluoridated communities. The

difference was not clinically significant nor shown to be statistically

significant (Brunelle & Carlos, 1990).

South Canterbury's Ministry of Health records (attached) alone are

conclusive evidence that fluoridation is not required to improve teeth.

When fluoridation was halted in Finland, former East Germany, Cuba and

Canada, tooth decay did not increase but continued to decline! (Maupome

et al, 2001: Kunzel and Fischer, 1997, Kunzel et al, 2000. and Seppa et

al, 2000).

According to the NZ Herald, "Crisis of Rotting Teeth in Children" (5

October 1998), toddlers with painful baby teeth are turning up at

hospitals in increasing numbers. Why? Auckland has been fluoridated

since the 1960s!

Bob McKegg, president of the Public Health Association said, "The

teeth of some children living in South Auckland, where the water is

fluoridated, were as bad as the teeth of some children in Northland,

where the water was not fluoridated"! Dr John Birbeck, the then medical

director of the Nutrition Foundation stated the following day that

decay could not be blamed on whether water was fluoridated and neither

could it be blamed entirely on the health service. He blamed the reason

for rotten teeth on poor diet, too much reliance on quick and easily

manufactured meals and the loss of skills as simple as brushing teeth.

Dr Birbeck advised that sticky, sugary foods such as sugared doughnuts

and sticky buns - especially as snacks between meals - should be

avoided.

Eight years later the NZ Herald featured a headline, "Alarm at the

Rotten State of Children's Teeth", reporting the deteriorating state of

children's teeth and how increasing numbers are having them extracted

under general anaesthetic.

Dr Robin Whyman, the ministry's chief adviser on Oral Health, said,

"one of the primary drivers of dental decay is diet and consumption of

sugars, frequency of consumption being one of the determinants of how

much decay occurs".

Dr Callumm Durward, Auckland District Health Board children's dentist

said that some children aged 5 or younger were having all their 20

primary teeth removed under general anaesthetic at the Green Lane

Clinical Centre because they had so much decay. This happens a few

times a year and the numbers are growing. Hello! Where is the supposed

'benefit' of fluoridation?

The sugar issue was being talked about all those years ago and is still

being talked about but no substantial action has been led. Why is the

Ministry of Health pushing fluoridation when unfluoridated Denmark has

the least decay in the entire world?

Fluoridation is unsafe.

Fluoride, a very toxic substance, is the active ingredient in a number

of pesticides. Poor nutrition exacerbates the toxic effects of fluoride

exposure, a further reason not to target low income communities where

poor nutrition can so easily prevail. Existing data indicate that

subsets of the population may be unusually susceptible to the toxic

effects of fluoride and its compounds. These populations include the

elderly, people with deficiencies of calcium, magnesium and/or vitamin

C and people with cardiovascular and kidney problems (Agency for Toxic

Substances and Disease Registry).

All the chemical reactions necessary to the life and function of the

body depend on enzymes but fluoride is an enzyme inhibitor. Fluoride

poisons enzymes. For certain patients, it is vital that they do not

have fluoride in the water. (Dr Harold Loe, National Institute of

Dental Research, 1989).

Continuous depression of enzyme activity by fluorides produces

alterations of function and symptoms of disease. Professor Hugo

Theorell, Nobel Prize winner, (Medical Nobel Inst, Biochemist, Dept of

Communication to Royal Medical Board. Sweden, March 1, 1958) based his

opposition to fluoridation on the fact that fluoride is an established

enzyme poison and potent inhibitor of many enzyme systems. His

research, together with that of others in unanimous ruling of Sweden's

Supreme Administrative Court, December 1961, that fluoridation of water

supplies was not permissible under the "Swedish Health Act". ("Fluoride

Poisons Enzymes," Harvey Petraborg, M.D., 9/6/64).

"It is now known that such vital organs, such as the kidneys, thyroid,

aorta, (main heart artery), liver, lungs, and others can be the sites

of an unusually high fluoride build-up. No matter how small the amount

of fluoride in the diet, a part of it tends to accumulate in the body.

When the water supply is fluoridated the intake of the individual is

considerably increased and the accumulation in the body increases

accordingly. There is no clear-cut pattern as to the degree of

retention among individuals. Further, it accumulates in certain organs

in an unpredictable way. Some individuals may store up to 100 times

more fluoride in certain tissue than others. This has given rise to

concern over fluoride's possible role in chronic disease. Fluoride is

an enzyme poison and medical authorities recognize that disturbances of

the enzyme system are a cause of disease."(Dr Jonathan Forman, M.D.,

world-renowned specialist in allergy, Professor-Emeritus of Ohio State

University, former editor editor of the Ohio State University, former

editor of the Ohio State Medical Journal, editor of Clinical

Physiology, in statement in behalf of Medical-Dental Committee on

Evaluation of Fluoridation.)

Instead of pushing everyone to ingest a substance (fluoride) that

poison enzymes that are vital agents in the body why are you not

investigating why New Zealand, a very heavily fluoridated country, has

so many people needing organ transplants and why there is a very

high rate of particular diseases.

I am 90 suffering from heart failure, chronic kidney disease (attached)

and other problems. If this bill is passed I will need and expect to

have delivered to me, unfluoridated water. Will instead, I be

unethically bullied into drinking unsafe and ineffective fluoridated

water. Please reply to this question.

Imelda Hitchcock