

Sir

I wish to voice my opposition to fluoride in drinking water

1) There has never been a scientific study carried out to prove the benefits and safety of fluoride

2) All those involved in the decision making process and are pro fluoride should make available all their information which led them to their pro fluoride views

3) I am not going to go into detail except to say I support the findings of Paul Connett PhD - who has a degree in human toxicology

James Beck MD PhD

H. S. Micklem DPhil

Authors of: The Case Against Fluoride

I refer the committee to the above book

4) Fluoride in the water acts as diluted rat poison. It is there to kill bacteria, good and bad. Once swallowed fluoride is of no further benefit. In fact it has an adverse effect.

5) Fluoride is the second most toxic substance after mercury to be introduced into the human body

6) Sodium fluoride does not belong in the human body

7) Sodium fluoride does not belong in drinking water

8) The likes of Peter Dunn do not know more or better than Dr Paul Connett

9) Peter Dunn in particular along with all elected representatives should table all their pro fluoride information

10) For example

Julie Anne Genter of the Greens is "thoroughly convinced that fluoridation is a good thing and opponents are 'fearful'"

A) Genter should table her convincing evidence. And, table it at the submissions hearings.

B) Being convinced however thoroughly does not make Genter right. It could even suggest she is totally ill informed and/or has a flawed decision making process

C) I do not like being accused of being fearful when my views are informed and fact based

I would like to speak at the hearing

Regards

Brian Johnston

Mob. 0210 283 1510