

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Anon 5

This paper refers to the York Review and claims the benefits from fluoridation are substantial. The risks are dismissed as (of dental fluorosis) insignificant and "mainly a cosmetic problem". For bone fractures and cancer there is "no clear association" or "insufficient evidence to establish whether there could be an association".

As fluoride accumulates in the body, surely we should err on the side of caution and not add it to drinking water. However, if required, fluoride can be provided in tablet form and also using tooth paste containing it, in fact it is virtually impossible to find a tooth paste without it. Young children could end up having too much as many swallow tooth paste while brushing.

My husband and I are both very much opposed to fluoride being added to our drinking water as there is so much uncertainty over its long term affects. Also being given medication without our consent contravenes our human rights. Worse still fluoride is an unlicensed medical product and a registered poison.

As water is one of the most vital elements of life surely our water supply should only be treated with chemicals that are necessary to make it safe to drink.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.