

1ST September, 2019

Ministers Greg Hunt & Brad Hazzard; NHMRC; Exec. Director Allan Singh,

Australian Government and NHMRC

Dear Sir's,

Ref. No. MC18-022286 Reply from Greg Hunt Via, Allan Singh: to my Fluoride enquiries, previously sent to all.

It is now 9 months since I received the email from you that supposedly, was to answer my queries and relay information that I could not find in the NHMRC's 2016 Draft or 2017 Statement on Fluoride.

I have to admit utter frustration at you and all health department employees and ministers is the reason I have not endeavoured to reply earlier. I

Initially, I was just going to re-phrased the same questions, that you mistakenly quoted that Dr. Ben Scalley had previously answered, which is NOT Correct. He merely referred me to a list of information that I had already read and found inadequate, as did you. He offered insight on ONE issue only and that was nothing more than the information that they had revised the acceptable safe level of fluoride to 1.5ppm based on the stats that the Teeth of the Australian children were not showing a "great deal of fluorosis". As a Mother of 4 children ranging in age from 31-16, that have Zero Cavities and were not raised in a fluoridated area, any level of tooth damage/fluorosis is horrendous, unnecessary and unacceptable, especially as it is obvious that Water fluoridation is 'Not' necessary for the growth of strong healthy teeth and many others of the population of Australia have the same experience and agree.

Regarding the increase to 1.5 for the safe level of fluoride NOTE: That the parameters set in the NHMRC 2017 Statement only allow for the inclusion of Science up to 1ppm **everything over 1 ppm was and is excluded**, which makes the **2017 Statement Redundant**. Please attach studies for safety & effects to the body of 1.5ppm.

Re- paragraph 5. Public Health Act 2010 "drinking water must be fit for human consumption", you of all people should know, fluoride is not added for water safety, its solely added to benefit the Teeth - (medicine for the teeth)!

In your closing statement you claim the NHMRC is unable to comment on the 2017 Canadian Study that found IQ damage at 0.7 and lower, which has been substantiated and backed up by yet another research/ report released on the 20/8/2019 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/fullarticle/2748634>

Please correct me if I'm wrong - the NHMRC is responsible for evaluating the science and creating the reports.

You go on to state that the NSW Health and Water Regulators are responsible for the Legislation and Regulation.

I am referred to the NSW Health's Q&A page: where I find (updated 24/1/2018); under heading: -

What standards are met? It clearly states: "The quality of water supplied to the communities *meets the REQUIREMENTS* of the NHMRC's Australian Drinking Water Guidelines!! NHMRC ARE THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY !!

Please answer this question this time: (I won't bother with the others) WHY IS THERE NO RESEARCH INCLUDED IN THE 2016 DRAFT OR THE 2017 STATEMENT ON FLUORIDE, TO THE EFFECTS OF FLUORIDE ON THE SKIN, THE LARGEST ORGAN OF THE BODY, WHICH IS WASHED, BATHED AND SOAKED IN THIS CONCOCTION DAILY? Especially, considering 75% of All Australians now suffer some form of skin allergy, be it, dermatitis, eczema, psoriasis (which in many cases is completely debilitating to many) and skin cancer increasing.

Yours Sincerely

Connie Crawford.



Ref No: MC19-015988

Connie Crawford
connielee@live.com.au

Dear Ms Crawford

Thank you for your correspondence of 30 September 2019 to the Minister for Health, the Hon Greg Hunt MP, and myself regarding safe levels of fluoride in water. The Minister has asked me to reply on his behalf.

As Australia's leading expert body promoting the development and maintenance of public health and clinical standards, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) is responsible for providing health advice based on the best available scientific evidence. You have expressed concerns that the evidence used to inform the [2017 NHMRC Public Statement: Water Fluoridation and Human Health in Australia](#) (the Statement) did not include the effects of fluoride on skin. I would like to assure you that as part of the evidence review, a separate literature search was conducted to identify studies on adverse health effects, excepting dental caries and dental fluorosis (which were the subject of separate literature searches) from exposure to fluoride in drinking water. This search did retrieve several studies reporting on dermal effects; however, these were excluded according to set criteria and were not included in the final evidence review.

The studies included in the review were those identified as meeting the key elements of the research question and the Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Study and Publication type (PICOS) criteria outlined on page 44 of the [Health Effects of Water Fluoridation – Evidence Evaluation Report](#). As well as the research gathered from searching various electronic databases, the Australian community was invited to submit published studies. The published studies submitted by the public that met the defined criteria were accepted by NHMRC for inclusion in the review.

For further information on the criteria for the research used in production of the Statement, please refer to the [Health Effects of Water Fluoridation – Evidence Evaluation Report](#) and [Technical Report](#). I trust this letter and the aforementioned documents will answer all outstanding questions you may have on the issue of community water fluoridation.

Yours sincerely

Alan Singh
Executive Director Research Translation Branch

/ November 2019