

## INQUIRY INTO DENTAL SERVICES IN NSW

**Organisation:** Citizens Against Flouridation  
**Name:** Ms Barbara Grant-Curtis  
**Telephone:**  
**Date Received:** 3/06/2005

---

**Theme:**

### Summary

Documents available from the secretariat.

Barbara Grant-Curtis

4

FOR AND ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS AGAINST FLUORIDATION (and Self)

N.S.W. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL ISSUES

INQUIRY INTO DENTAL SERVICES IN N.S.W.

24th MAY 2005.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to make a submission to the above Inquiry, regarding, in particular, the matter of WATER FLUORIDATION

1. Water fluoridation is promoted by the NSW Government on the basis that fluoride is safe for all people and helps reduce tooth decay.

However it is well documented by authorities such as the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council and the World Health Organisation that fluoride is not safe to consume in high doses.

Because of this the NHMRC and WHO both recommend that fluoridating governments measure the daily fluoride intake by individuals from all sources such as food and medication before commencing new fluoridation schemes. These recommendations have been ignored by the NSW Government on financial grounds and their failure to comply with health precautions and failure to warn people of the dangers of fluoride ingestion would appear to put people at risk from unregulated fluoride overdose.

2. One of the symptoms of fluoride poisoning is dental fluorosis which involves a weakening of the tooth structure and consequently leads to higher rates of tooth decay. Fluoridated places such as Sydney are experiencing rising rates of tooth decay (Sydney Morning Herald 15 February 2005). Some unfluoridated areas such as the Mid North Coast NSW actually have lower rates of tooth decay than many fluoridated areas.

The NSW Department of Health do not appear to be monitoring rates of dental fluorosis nor warning people of the potential for overdosing their children with fluoride from tapwater and nor do they appear to have investigated any dental care alternatives to fluoridation.

3. The chemical most used in fluoridation schemes is Silicofluoride which has never been tested for safe human consumption but has been shown to be associated with behavioural disorders in children and increased rates of social violence and crime. Silicofluoride is delivered to water supplies as an industrial grade product that contains contaminants such as Arsenic (a 'known carcinogen') and Lead (a 'probable carcinogen'). This is not healthy for human consumers and nor is it healthy for the wider biological environment.

4. Only about 1% of water is actually consumed while the balance goes to bathing washing and the garden. The installation of fluoridation equipment is estimated to cost about \$1million per water supply. That money is better spent on direct dental services rather than in the wasteful practice of fluoridation.

5. Officers of the NSW Department of Health and politicians of the NSW Government have declined to respond to community concerns about fluoridation and health safety. There appears to be a desire on the part of the Department of Health to gloss over community concerns and an unwillingness to admit that health and safety recommendations are not being followed. Despite this the Department of Health still advertise fluoridation as being 'safe' for the whole community. I believe that the Department should not be deceiving the community in this way and there should be a procedure through which government errors such as this can be properly exposed and aired.

Thank you for considering this submission as part of your inquiry.

Yours sincerely

signed *Barbara Grant Curtis* For and on behalf of self and CITIZENS AGAINST FLUORIDATION

We feel that fluoridation of drinking water supplies is not acceptable in any way. It has been proven to be ineffective. There are proven general health ill-effects, and more and more concerns are being expressed about possible (and expected) ill-health effects on general health.

*BAH* "Research" being relied upon by Health Departments, - all the promoters of fluoridation - is Old Research - mostly disproven and discredited. Might be helpful to have some good up-to-date clinical studies instead of only epidemiological studies *BAH*  
The two main "BIBLES" being constantly quoted by proponents of fluoridation, N.H.M.R.C. and W.H.O. are constantly quoted in in limited context of their advocacy with regard to the only reason for the use of fluoride - i.e. Possible limited reduction in the incidence of dental decay. Figures now are showing even this is false - or at least - overstated.

The provisos included in those two reports, N.H.M.R.C. and W.H.O. regarding much needed studies of background ingestion and ill-health effects and the need to conduct proper extensive studies, and the willingness of the population to accept water fluoridation, are IGNORED. In fact, the enclosed letter (copy) Australian Government National Health & Medical Research Council to Mr. John Irving, Project Manager, Oral Health, North Coast Area Health Service, P.O.Box 649, Taree 2430, shows this - in that it referred to HAC HAD INTENDED to do review, but considered it could not because of insufficient resources and has discontinued, and has no plans to recommence at this stage.

So, once again, reliance is being placed on OLD STUDIES, OLD RESEARCH - relied upon over the decades since the 1930's and 1940's and onwards into the 80's - nothing of CURRENT VALUE AND RESPECT.

The 1996 Australian Drinking Water Guidelines, itself based on OLD INFOORMATION, is now nearly 10 years old in itself!

HOW QUAIN'T - HOW DANGEROUS - HOW INSULTING - that the people are to "HAVE FLUORIDATION WHETHER YOU LIKE IT OR NOT" considering this - forcibly, without DUE CARE, DUE DISCLOSURE of possible or proven ill-effects to general health, AND WITHOUT OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT!

The riposte to this from the blind advocates of fluoridation is that it is NOT A MEDICATION so no disclosure is required, and that you can avoid fluoride in your drinking water (for which you have had to pay enforced LEVIES TO YOUR WATER SUPPLY AUTHORITIES) - that you be put to the expense of either buying bottled water, putting in a rainwater tank, or investing in expensive water filtration/purification methods (i.e. reverse Osmosis systems etc). Reputable literature questions whether ANY normal method available to ordinary citizens (incl reverse osomosis) are in any way effective in removing fluoride from drinking water. And then we have a leading Medical Doctor in the area rubbishing people's concerns about fluoridation by advising them to "get a rainwater tank" - To top this off, on the recent ABC segment on fluoridation concerns of a w western area we had a Health Department spokesperson also advocating that y ou could always resort to a rainwater tank. BOTH these people should know that we should not resort to drinking rainwater, as the Department of Health itself, and the relevant water supply bodies (Councils) issue edicts to the people not to use rainwater tanks for drinking - in fact it is a requirement, when inspections are made in the Councils which do afford rainwater tank subsidies that, one condition, is that there must be a notice on the tank - NOT FOR DRINKING PURPOSES, before the subsidy will be granted!

Let those who feel they need fluoride, either their own judgement, or on the advice of their medical or dental advisor, take fluoride as and when they so desire. LET THE REST OF US FREE - to drink the water we have paid for, without risk of damage. Most of us belong to those "SUBSETS" who are being constantly referred to as being AT RISK in the long-term ingestion of fluoride, from the cradle to the grave!.

MONEY WOULD BE BETTER SPENT ON SEEING TO IT THAT THERE IS A PROPER UNIVERSAL DENTAL CARE SYSTEM UNDER NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME -get dental health care back where it rightly belongs - UNDER MEDICARE.

To end this, I would ask that you consider all the enclosed

papers, scientific papers, and literature, as per the list 1 to ~~74~~, and the copies of correspondence list 1 to 23, as well as the packet of newspaper clippings and articles from April 2004 to May 2005, with the notes I have made on the various papers.

I would appreciate that, when you have finished your perusal, you either forward them to the OMBUDSMAN or return them to me at the above address.

I thank you for this opportunity to convey our very real and extensive concerns about dental health and water fluouridation.

I would welcome any comments from you in the intervening period as you consider this matter, prior to your REPORT due by 31st March 2006.

I do not consider that I need to have any confidentiality on this submission.

Yours sincerely,

*Barbara Grant-Curtis*

Barbara Grant-Curtis

on BEHALF OF CITIZENS AGAINST FLUORIDATION.

24th May 2005.

P.S. I enclose Personal Statement / Notice of NON CONSENT.

*B. Grant-Curtis*  
24/05/05

TO ALL PERSONALLY AND COLLECTIVELY TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

TAKE NOTICE herein contained that I, Barbara Grant-Curtis, having made myself informed (and being of sound mind) DO NOT CONSENT to having fluoride or any other substance, medication or non-medication, administered to me through Hastings Council town water supply (or whatever the designated name and supplier may be from time to time), SAVING ONLY the necessary accredited and accepted and permitted historic methods of purification and filtration methods common to public drinking water supply schemes.

FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that I DO NOT CONSENT to any ALTERATION AND/OR VARIATION in the implied terms of the long-established implied CONTRACT I have had between Hastings Council (or other named body constituted in my dealings in a 30-year water supply and consumption agreement) on the one part for the supply of drinking water, clean pure and uncontaminated, in return for me, on the other part, by payment of a compulsory levy for the provision of such clean pure uncontaminated drinking water to my premises.

SIGNED AND DATED at PORT MACQUARIE in the State of New South Wales,

this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2005..

Barbara Grant-Curtis  
.....

25th May 2005

Barbara Grant-Curtis

W 2444

The Director,  
Standing Committee on Social Issues  
Legislative Council  
Parliament House  
Macquarie St.  
SYDNEY 2000

Sir/Madam,

INQUIRY INTO DENTAL SERVICES IN NSW

I confirm package and submission despatched to you yesterday. I enclose copy of my submission and refer you to the papers I forwarded yesterday.

I would like now to make an addendum to my submission, which was also made on behalf of the Citizens Against Fluoridation, based in the Hastings, North Coast Area.

Once again, our group is very much against the fluoridation of drinking water. If there is any benefit, and that is debatable as to any real benefit, we are convinced that putting extra fluoride into our bodies with each glass of water that we may ingest is dangerous. Most people with any sense are trying to keep themselves as healthy as they can by avoiding chemicals, and a lot are going out of their way to achieve this by using organic foods and avoiding heavily processed foods. Those of us who may believe that there is ANY benefit use fluoridated toothpaste, though for the ADMITTED 1% or more of the population said to be allergic to fluoride they need to search high and low to find a brand which is not fluoridated. They find it in the health food shops which they frequent for the vitamin supplements etc. they use to maintain optimal health in these days of depleted and contaminated foodstuffs.

It is interesting to note that, at the same time as toxic and highly corrosive SILICOFLUORIDE is intended to be forcibly administered to us by way of our drinking water, the Authorities are hellbent on trying to limit the use of other vitamin/mineral supplements by "regulating them out of existence". The efficacy and safety of these products, which are NUTRIENTS in any sense of the word are being questioned and attacked while at the same time poisonous FLUORIDE (SILICOFLUORIDE) - which is not essential for health and wellbeing, and cannot in any way be termed A NUTRIENT - but is actually classified as a Schedule 6 POISON and has NEVER BEEN APPROVED for human use - is somehow to be forced upon us by the very Authorities who have not done any recent peer-reviewed class I Studies concerning the safety of ingesting such a substance over a lifetime use, in uncontrolled dose, and regardless of race, age, health and economic status etc. No matter how these

"Authorities" twist and turn in rubbishing anyone who has either expressed their real concerns, or even those who have conducted good research showing proven (AND suspected) ill-effects to general health, especially to the very young, the elderly and the health-compromised etc. they can only come up with their argument that there MAY be SOME benefit in reducing the incidence of dental decay, in SOME people. They insist in carrying on with their arbitrary plan to DOSE ALL OF US, no matter what.

The Health Department's own recent figures show that there is LITTLE OR NO DIFFERENCE in the incidence of dental decay between children in areas which have NEVER been fluoridated, to those which HAVE BEEN since as long ago as 1968. Compare the figures for 12 year-olds between NAMBUCCA (fluoridated since 1968, and the HASTINGS (NEVER fluoridated). But, of course, when this is pointed out to our Political<sup>4</sup> Health Masters they resort to some convoluted argument about "possible other factors". Well, DO THE WORK, DO THE STUDIES, PROVE YOUR POINT - instead of rubbishing those who do not agree with them. They come up with such ignorant and derogatory remarks as "Oh, WE don't have to prove ANYTHING (about safety or otherwise) - YOU have to prove YOUR argument" (i.e. that fluoride is harmful. They have not done the studies - they rely on OLD information, and we have it in writing that they do not intend to do the very much needed studies, "due to the difficulty and lack of resources".

We have had blatant misinformation (if not outright lies) from the Health Department (in particular from the Oral Health Project Manager) and others, in this latest "Teeth for Life Program". Public consultation processes have been almost non-existent, and one of the core recommendations of World Health Organization and National Health & Medical Research Council as to the necessity of gaining strong acceptance from the community prior to instigating fluoridation has been totally ignored, even to the extent that the 1991 POLL figures showing 20,553 AGAINST fluoridation, to only 8,198 IN FAVOUR) had no import to these people dictating to us that "WE KNOW WHAT IS BEST FOR YOU ALL - AND YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE IT WHETHER YOU LIKE IT OR NOT". We were even denied ANY opportunity of either showing that our views remained the same as the 1991 poll, or had changed - our demands for a fresh poll were denied.

What is going on here? Is it that, since the signing of the FREE TRADE AGREEMENT our Governments have lost any authority and autonomy and sovereignty and have to bow to others (the U.S.A.)?, having an eye on ALL our SERVICES, and that our Governments are now preparing our WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS to be STANDARDIZED to their requirements to enable the Halliburtons of the world to have a neat little package prepared for their onslaught - at the expense of the Taxpayers of N.S.W. and the ratepayers of the various Councils which are being affected? Is that why we are paying increased rates and charges in the "restructuring" as to Service provision and user-pay charges?



Or is it that now our Governments have bowed themselves down before the vested interests of the chemical manufacturers and fertilizer-manufacturer POLLUTERS totally, and are prepared to even risk our health and well-being, as well as our environment at their behest? Is it that the pharmaceutical industry (largely the huge U.S. interests) have yet another vested interest, in filling us with more and more of their REMEDIES for the harm that is being done to us? Did you know, for instance that, if there is PROVEN neurotoxic effects from fluoride ingestion, then that being so, the pharmaceuticals such as PROZAC and other antidepressant type drugs are largely based on fluoride in their formulae?

Wonderful isn't it, that we, the people, seem to lose out on ALL FRONTS!

And not only with regard to OUR HEALTH, but with regard to the health of our environment also. No problem seen by these PUSHERS of fluoride in getting rid of the toxic waste from the phosphate fertilizer and other manufacturers into our waterways via our town drinking water systems. This despite the fact that fluoride (silicofluoride) is a heavy pollutant which is legislated against being released into the environment! For instance, here in Port Macquarie, there is only a short journey from our sewerage retention ponds (where practically ALL of this serious pollutant (silicofluoride) ends up, only a couple of kilometres at the most down through our Kooloonbung wetlands, down into the Hastings River, and only another Km on into the ocean. No wonder our Oyster Growers expressed some concern only the other day about "adding yet ANOTHER pollutant into the "chemical cocktail" that is being released into our streams and rivers.

I have read the tonnages of fluoride material which are used in fluoridating water supplies - in the U.S.A. the figures are staggering. On a comparison basis they would be no less here in Australia. (Somewhat out-dated figures show, for instance, that there were (are) more than 1030 tonnes of fluoride going through the City of Melbourne's water supply system EACH YEAR! No wonder the YARRA and PORT PHILLIP BAY are DEAD or DYING, as also is our Hawkesbury and St. George's Basin systems so far as oyster growing etc. Just ask Bob Carr what he saw and learned on his recent visit to the Hawkesbury to talk with the oyster growers about the death of their industry.

We have poisoned the earth, our waterways, our bodies, <sup>more than</sup> enough, without knowingly adding to the assault. COME ON, SHOW CONCERN, SENSE AND LEADERSHIP in these matters. Dental health is a small segment of all this, and is rightfully in the area of proper care, readily accessible and available to all, and proper nutrition (diet) and hygiene. If this IS ANY level of dental decay, then it is best managed in this way, NOT by blindly relying on a supposed "MAGIC BULLET" of fluoridation to try to counteract the damage done by the heavily subsidised SUGAR INDUSTRY and their users, such as COCA COLA and others. (yet ANOTHER lot of vested interests controlling our economy and Governments!)

*Yours Sincerely*  
*Barbara Grant-Curtis*  
and CITIZENS AGAINST  
FLUORIDATION.