

2 February 2017

Chair

Health Select Committee

Parliament Buildings

WELLINGTON

Dear Sir

**HEALTH (WATER FLUORIDATION OF DRINKING WATER) AMMENDMENT
BILL**

Introduction

I am an extremely 'concerned' parent of a child that has been diagnosed with "severe autism". I am currently sitting as Chairman of my local Kohanga. I am also the Vice President and Junior co-ordinator of our town's soccer club. I am writing this submission to the water 'Bill' advocating specifically for all of our children - as they are not only unable to vote but are also the most vulnerable sub population to harmful effects of water fluoridation and overexposure to fluoride in general from all sources.

I am submitting my 'opposition' to this 'Bill' on three main sections. I am opposed to the 'Transfer of Power' for the decision making of our water from our Local District Council's to the District Health Boards. This is nothing short of a 'Power Grab' from local hands to the hands of Government/Corporations with a clear 'intention' of destroying any future public debate, especially in terms of the 'safety' of the Ministry of Health's 'Fraudulent' Water Fluoridation Policy.

I have attached all relevant documents to this submission to back everything I claim within this submission as evidence.

1. LACK OF TOXICOLOGICAL SAFETY DATA PROVING THAT ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION BREACHES THEIR REFERRED 'WATER STANDARDS'

The 'actual' substance, fluoride, being used in our waters is the cheapest, industrial grade (unrefined) fluoride on the market - 'Hydrofluorosilicic Acid'. A composite sample from New Plymouth District Council to its supplier, Orica Chemical Ltd back in 2013 showed that their hydrofluorosilicic acid contained 'trace amounts' of Arsenic, Barium, Cadmium, Chromium, Lead, Mercury and other heavy metals. You don't need to be a 'scientist' to understand that adding 'any' amount of mercury is going to be of any 'health benefit' to a child with a 'neurological disorder' such as autism or ADHD or any person for that matter.

According to Roholm's Toxicology research into Fluorine Toxicity: "Hydrofluorosilicic Acid is 25 TIMES MORE LETHALLY TOXIC than naturally forming Calcium Fluoride."

It is, at this point, I would like to refer to the definition of 'Fraud' in the Blacks Law Dictionary (9th Ed.) and urge you to take this into consideration throughout this and the many other submissions you have on this 'Bill'.

"fraud, n. (14c) 1. A knowing misrepresentation of the truth or concealment of a material fact to induce another to act to his or her detriment. *Fraud is usu. a tort, but in some cases (esp. when the conduct is willful) it may be a crime. - Also termed 'intentional fraud.' 2. A misrepresentation made recklessly without belief in its truth to induce another person to act. 3. A tort arising from a knowing misrepresentation, concealment of material fact, or reckless misrepresentation made to induce another to act to his or her detriment. 4. Unconscionable dealing; esp., in contract law, the unfair use of the power arising out of the parties' relative positions and resulting in an unconscionable bargain. - fraudulent, adj."

I entered the 'fluoride scene' shortly after my son's autism diagnosis around 2012/13. I was researching what I could do, as a parent, to make his life more beneficial. It was at this time that I came across the Lancet Medical Journals article that listed 'Fluoride' as a "developmental neurotoxin". Immediately this raised concerns and I contacted my local

council representative, community board and local district council for the toxicological data they had to give me the confidence that this was safe for my son and my whole community at large. The 'general' response was the usual Center for Disease and Control (CDC), World Health Organisation (WHO), Government & Non Government Organisations (NGO's) 'endorsements' (which are only opinion!), that water fluoridation is "Safe and Effective" and referral to our local District Health Board (DHB) or the Ministry of Health for the data.

The District Health Board (Toi Te Ora DHB) failed to reply to my Official Information Act request to them and with the five Official Information Act requests sent to the Ministry of Health, they provided links to water standards but no 'Toxicological' data. They eventually referred me to WaterNZ who stated that they: "did not have any specific toxicological data." When I showed the Ministry of Health the response from WaterNZ, the Ministry of Health closed my Official Information Act request down. This resulted in a complaint to the Ombudsman's Office who then, after 3 months, confirmed that the Ministry of Health: "doesn't hold any toxicological safety data for hydrofluorosilicic acid."

With nobody left in 'authority' to request this information from I went through WaterNZ's 'Supply of Fluoride for Use in Water Treatment' document. In this document Section 5.3.1 states "For standard tests for the properties of fluoride compounds, refer to the following ANSI/AWWA Standards - Hydrofluosilicic Acid ANSI/AWWA B703-11.

In the ANSI/AWWA B703-11 document, Section 4.3.3 - Product Certification it states: "This material should be certified in accordance with the requirements of NSF/ANSI 60."

In the NSF/ANSI 60 Standards document, Section 3.2.1 to 'paraphrase', it requires that: "the manufacturer shall submit, at a minimum.....when required by Annex A a list of published and unpublished toxicological studies relevant to the treatment chemical and the chemicals and impurities present in the treatment chemical"

In the NSF/ANSI 60 Standards document, in their Disclaimer, they state: "NSF shall not incur any obligations or liability for damages, including consequential damages, arising out of or in connection with the use, interpretation of, or reliance upon this Standard."

The ANSI/AWWA B703-11 has an almost identical disclaimer too.

This is the 'Fraud'!

Either our Council's are using 'uncertified' NSF 60 hydrofluorosilicic acid to fluoridate our water, or the 'Manufacturers' have been 'Fraudulently' certified by the NFS, or Toxicological data is being withheld from the public. Either way, this is a 'major' breach of the water 'Standards' and this requires an immediate investigation and Artificial Fluoridation must STOP immediately! Any Minister of Parliament who 'support' this 'Bill' to 'Transfer the Power of water decision making from the Local District Councils to the Local District Health Boards' should now be on notice that they are also supporting the 'ownership of liability of any harm caused' from the continued use of hydrofluorosilicic acid in our waters.

2. UNTESTED, UNSAFE & DANGEROUS POLICY OF ARTIFICIAL FLUORIDATION

This section I would like to briefly show examples of why the Ministry of Health's Water Fluoridation Policy is not only 'Fraud' but 'Dangerous' and detrimental to the livelihoods of the people of New Zealand, particularly our young children.

To date, I have not been able to find much, if any scientific literature, that actually uses the highly more toxic fluoride, Hydrofluorosilicic Acid, as the substance tested/studied - they seem to have always used the lesser toxic Sodium Fluoride (pharmaceutical grade) and Calcium Fluoride (natural). This seems amazing that there is so little in terms of studies specifically using hydrofluorosilicic acid, considering that we have been using it for over half a century. Despite using the lesser toxic fluorides, there were still 98 studies regarding 'concerns' of fluorides effects on multiple body parts/functions in 2016 alone - to state that the "science is settled" on fluoridation (Chief Scientific Advisor to the PM's Office - Peter Gluckman) is totally fictional and untrue - there has been opposition to Artificial Fluoridation since its very beginning but there has also been a strong, proactive and aggressive movement to suppress, discredit and ignore the 'real' experts and 'Truth'.

I'm sure other submissions are putting in many different health risks/harms - I will just

point out a couple that I think prove, that our children are being put at risk, unnecessarily, with the Ministry of Health's water fluoridation policy and the 'promotion' and 'support' of it from our 'officials' is borderline 'malpractice'. The following example is made from using World Health Organisation (WHO) & Center for Disease and Control(CDC) data and results from Table 2 of the Institute of Medicine's 1997 Report "Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium, Phosphorus, Magnesium, Vitamin D and Fluoride." I am using the data for children aged 1-3 years old as my example of how dangerous this policy is for our infants.

According to the WHO a 1-3 yr old is recommended to consume 1.3L of water per day. CDC's upper tolerable limit for fluoride for a 1-3 year old is 1.3mg per day. A 2 year old will swallow, on a conservative average, 0.6 mg from 2 brushings per day. New Zealand's water, on average is 0.85 ppm. This alone, puts our kids at approximately 1.7mg of fluoride per day. That's already 0.4mg 'over' the 'upper tolerable limit' before taking into consideration that there are other sources of fluoride in our environment (i.e. anything from the cafe, baby foods, pesticides, anything processed in a fluoridated area). This would explain the current rate of 41% of our young children who have some form of dental fluorosis - where is the logic in adding stuff to the water to treat 'teeth' if it's only going to create another problem with 'teeth'? Fluorosis further is an indication of fluoride poisoning and this affects the whole body.

The whole 'concept' of Artificial Fluoridation is redundant and has no basis of logic whatsoever. In 1999, the Center for Disease and Control (CDC) stated: "Fluoride prevents dental caries predominately after eruption of the tooth into the mouth, and its actions primarily are topical." In 2006, the National Review Council (NRC) review stated: "The major anticaries benefit of fluoride is topical and not systemic". In 2011, Dr Robin Whyman, in a report prepared for the National Fluoridation Information Services (NFIS) stated: "Professor Connett's highlighting of the conclusion from Warren et al, 2009, that there was no relationship between fluoride ingested and tooth decay levels is unsurprising. It is generally accepted that the principal caries protective effect from fluoride is topical". The living proof of this is Europe, where 97% of countries do not fluoridate their water, who have had the same declines in tooth decay as the fluoridated countries - yet their teeth, if anything are better than ours. To credit water fluoridation for this is ludicrous and extremely misleading.

The other propaganda I want to shed light on is this Government/Pro fluoride claim of a 'national average' of a 40% decrease in tooth decay for kids in fluoridated communities

compared to unfluoridated. Again this is just simply, not the reality - as shown in the recent unfluoridated Christchurch data showing that their kids have better teeth than the fluoridated Auckland and Hamilton kids. Also in the recent statistics for the unfluoridated Wairarapa compared to its neighbouring fluoridated areas. The 'real' and 'current' data does not support this fictional claim. This is the kind of 'Public Opinion/Input' that this water 'Bill' seems intent on removing from the decision making process of our waters, which looks very clear, from its contents, that the main focus is about 'cost benefit', money - well ahead of our children's health and general well being of the entire population subjected to this 'Fraudulent' policy of adding a toxic waste in the guise of 'public health'.

The 'only' cause of Dental Fluorosis is 'over exposure to fluoride'. Everything in the scientific literature states that we should be eliminating fluoride exposure from our children's environment. The fact that our Ministry of Health and other 'entities' are actively 'promoting' the 'expansion' of Artificial Fluoridation clearly shows that they are not treating our children's health as a priority.

3. INTENTIONAL FRAUD AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF NEW ZEALAND

In the 1970's there were two 'major' studies that showed serious flaws and health impacts on Artificial Fluoridation.

- Grimbergen - 1974 - A Double Blind Test for Determination of Intolerance to Fluoridated Water (Preliminary Report) Fluoride 7 146-152
- Yiamouyiannis and Dean Burk 1977 "Fluoridation and cancer age-dependence of cancer mortality related to artificial fluoridation published in the International Society for Fluoride Research journal - shortly afterwards the Netherlands 'banned' Artificial Fluoridation in that same year.

At this point in time, there seemed to be a bit of concern in New Zealand around the issue of Artificial Fluoridation's safety. It was enough to prompt the US Wellington Embassy in 1978, to ask the then Sec. State "Please advise whether house subcommittee on intergovernmental relations and human resources has issued recent report on fluoridation of public water supplies and, specifically, on alleged linkage between fluoride and cancer." To which the US Sec. State advises a month later: "that no report has been or will be issued on fluoridation of public water supplies or alleged linkage between fluoride

and cancer." There clearly was no intention, as is the case still today, to properly investigate any 'alleged' risks of fluoride's harms on the body and any linkage to cancer. Meanwhile throughout the late 1970's and into the 1980's more and more of the European countries were stopping or banning their fluoridation "experiments".

To look a bit deeper into the Fraud of Artificial Fluoridation you only need to look as far as Dr John Colqhoun's (former Dental Officer for Auckland) Affidavit in the US Court case "Safe Water Associations Inc (Plaintiff) vs Fond du Lac County (Defendant) along with multiple other expert's Affidavits.

"4. Until 1980, I was a keen advocate of water fluoridation. In that year, 1980, I was sent on a world study tour by the NZ Department of Health, for the purpose of investigating recent research into fluoridation. On my return I was appointed to the post of Chairman of the Fluoridation Promotion Committee of the NZ Dental Health Foundation.

5. After returning from the study tour, I reported the then new discovery that dental decay was declining in "western" counties, with or without fluoridation, and that the differences between decay rates in fluoridated and nonfluoridated places were much less than we had claimed would occur.

6. Nonetheless, like many of my professional colleagues today, I was most reluctant to admit that fluoridation was a failure. I advocated, and my superiors agreed to a new approach based on the belief that fluoridation still provided a marginal benefit. I was reinforced in that belief by my superiors' claim that new statistics, collected for all New Zealand School Dental Service patients (98% of our child population) revealed such a benefit.

7. I was shocked to discover, when the statistics were sent to me, they revealed no such benefit. In fact, in most Health Districts the percentage of children who were "caries-free" was higher in the non-fluoridated areas than in the fluoridated areas. I disagreed sharply with my superiors' action in circulating a document, "overview of fluoridation statistics," which omitted the above information, disgracefully "doctored" the remaining statistics, and claimed that a marginal benefit existed.

*8. When, in addition, I discovered that **dental fluorosis** prevalences (**a sign of fluoride toxicity**) were much higher than expected in fluoridated areas, I publicly chanced my stance on fluoridation in 1983."*

An ADA white paper written in 1979 states: "Dentists' nonparticipation [in fluoridation promotion] is overt neglect of professional responsibility." An ADA spokesperson says

this is still the association's official policy. In recent years, several dentists who have testified on the antifuoridation side have been reprimanded by their state dental officers.

According to Robert J. Carton, former President of EPA Headquarters Union and an environmental scientist at EPA said "the scientific assessment of fluoride's health risks written by the agency in 1985 omits 90% of the literature on mutagenicity, most of which suggests fluoride is a mutagen." Dr Carton also has stated: "**Fluoridation is the greatest case of scientific fraud of this century, if not of all time**"

These are just a couple of literally 'hundreds' of examples of how this Fraud has played out over the decades that this 'failed experiment' has been operating. Just last week we had the NZ Green Party facebook page removing comments, blocking accounts and censoring the 'Truth' around this Fraud. The comments removed were actually links to 'real' studies and scientific literature while at the same time leaving unsubstantiated claims and name calling unmoderated.

Mainstream media is also in on this 'suppression' of 'Truth'. Stuff.co.nz were caught out last week also 'moderating' certain content containing comments on their website. While letting some through, the common factor for the comments that were not approved were those comments stating the 'toxicity' and the difference between calcium fluoride and hydrofluorosilicic acid.

WaterNZ and Sir Peter Gluckman despite openly supporting and promoting the 'policy' have consistently ignored tweets, facebook comments and emails requesting what specific toxicological data they reviewed in order to make the claim that it is in fact, "Safe and Effective". This is 'all' Fraud! It fits the Black's Law definition like a glove!

In fact Gluckman's "safety" review deliberately misrepresents the data from NZ showing half a standard deviation difference in fluoridated to non fluoridated IQ's, he calls this 'half an IQ point' which is not statistically significant. Half a standard deviation is actually just over 7 IQ points and would be catastrophic to the mental ability of a nation. This is probably the reason China does "not allow any fluoirdes into their water supplies."? When informed of his error he just changed the IQ point to standard deviation and left his conclusions that it was not significant. This again, is 'Fraud' at its most heinous and certainly willingly and knowingly inflicting grievous bodily harm on a

population and its life potentials.

In conclusion, whenever I have travelled to an unfluoridated area I have physically observed significant positive changes in my autistic son's behaviour, social interaction and attention span which disappear as soon as we return home to our fluoridated town - just how many New Zealanders are currently being affected and how many more will be affected by legislating 'Mandatory Fluoridation' nationwide?

This water 'Bill' needs to be suspended until a 'real', 'independent' and full investigation into the NSF 60 Standards certification of Hydrofluorosilicic Acid has been conducted and completed.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission in OPPOSITION to this 'Bill'.