

Supplementary  
Submission  
No 251a

## INQUIRY INTO DENTAL SERVICES IN NSW

**Organisation:**

**Name:** Cr Jillian Cranny

**Telephone:**

**Date Received:** 4/10/2005

---

**Theme:**

**Summary**

**Legislative Council Standing Committee on Social Issues**  
**Inquiry into the Dental Services in NSW**

4<sup>th</sup> October 2005

Re: Submission No 251 from Cr. Jillian Cranny,

Dear Ms Burnswoods, Committee Chair,

Thank you for your letter dated 20th September 2005, acknowledging my submission also sent to you on this day. I have only just received your letter so I apologise for this late response. I do not object to my submission being publicly available, although as my submission was done in haste I had overlooked an obvious error I made in one of the arguments and questions I was considering. Should my submission be made public, I require/request that my acknowledgement of the error made be added as an addendum to my submission.

*The error relates to my concern regarding what volume of tap water at 1ppm would be "safe" to use in making up infant milk formulae. I had suggested that if a "safe" level was 0.06mgF/kg then 150ml water at 1ppm would provide two and a half times over the "safe" dose or that if a "safe" level was taken to be 0.01mgF/kg then this amount of water would be fifteen times above that level. Both these statements are clearly wrong, as I have failed to relate the hypothetical example to an actual child of set bodyweight. The amount that would be "safe" depends clearly upon: the amount consumed; its F concentration; what level is set as "safe" and most importantly, the weight of the child, before any volume can be determined as a "safe" volume. Other sources of F ingestion should also be considered to determine likely expected daily consumption levels from non tap water sources.*

What F levels do the Department of Health consider to be "safe" for children and infants to consume daily? I am still awaiting a response to my letter of 4<sup>th</sup> August 2005, sent to the Acting Chief Dental Officer, whom I was told would answer my concerns or questions before a decision would be made. This did not happen. At today's Council meeting I endeavoured to move a motion arising out of this Notification of Gazettal, listed in our Correspondence section. My motion was ruled by the Mayor as unlawful and hence unable to be put. It was something like "Council undertake a Referendum at the next Local government election to determine, via Yes or No, if the residents agree to the decision to Fluoridate the town's water supplies, and that whatever the majority of those responding to the Referendum determine, this position be upheld by Council." I am very concerned that this was the determination made by the Mayor. Do you share his interpretation of the law, The relevant Acts, and if this is the case, does it really mean that once F is gazetted to be added it can never be removed, and is it illegal to even ask your Community about how it feels on the matter, or is it just illegal to respect and act on their wishes, when the majority, informed and consulted clearly do not want F in the water supplies? Gazettal has been determined, in defiance of the results of the postal ballot our Council paid for and requested the Director General consider.

This is outrageous! No respect has been given to a primary medical principle: informed consent prior to (mass) medication. The Department of Health has a moral obligation to answer my questions but it seems that legally, they can do and say as they please with immunity with no real obligation to adequately address the very real public concerns I have raised on behalf of the community I'm elected to represent. Democracy appears to have died today in the Bellingen Shire and what a sad and sorry day it is because of this. Please amend the relevant Acts if this is the case, to **give priority to the principle of informed (i.e. balanced information), consent, prior to any attempt to add F to water supplies: i.e. 1. A ballot/plebiscite must be conducted prior to considering adding F to a water supply; 2. All Councils currently adding F should have to undertake a poll of their residents and ratepayers on the subject; 3. All Councils having to change their position on F, when supported by some suitable plebiscite or postal ballot**, such as we have in our Shire. Both ballots this Council has conducted on F did not support its addition to the water supplies.

Thank you for these late considerations,

Yours sincerely  
Cr. Jillian Cranny.