

April 10, 1973

of questionable value. It says if the bankers told the Legislature to make it mandatory to deposit all your money, would this body pass such legislation? Well, it's possible. I think the situation has been rather thoroughly discussed. I drink fluoridated water everyday and some that isn't fluoridated, and somebody said, "Look what happened to me". But I don't necessarily drink it by choice. I reserve the right to close.

PRESIDENT: The motion before us is to indefinitely postpone. The first to speak is Senator Kelly, then DeCamp, Schmit, Stahmer, Cavanaugh, Chambers, in that order. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY: I will waive my place until after we have defeated this kill motion.

PRESIDENT: All right. Next is Senator DeCamp. I might add, more lights have gone on since then.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I am going to oppose the kill motion and I am going to support the fluoridation bill but I feel obligated to put forth one of the arguments that hasn't been developed very well or brought forth very completely and was barely touched upon by Senator Proud. The proponents of fluoridation have stated that the primary question is whether fluoride in the water is beneficial or helpful to your teeth and the rest of their argument, Senator Carpenter and several others, have said the dentist have told us it is, therefore, that settles the question. The opponents have said, well local control should, at least, be involved here to some degree. I think what is really involved and the thing we haven't touched on is the whole precedent setting apparatus we may be setting up here with the idea of putting fluoride in the water, and the precedence I am talking about is the precedence that the government of a state or of a country or anything when it determines and deems that some particular medication or thing is beneficial to the health of the people, then has the right and obligation to use a public necessity of life, the water system, to medicate people whether they like it or not. Now, as I say, it is precedent setting and there is no precedent in this country for this particular thing. Arguments might be made, as were suggested, that iodine in salt is an example. This is not true. The law specifically provides that non-iodized salt has to be produced too. Iodine was put into salt about 50 years ago when they determined that goiters were caused by a lack of iodine and you don't see goiter problems today, so, apparently, that solution worked, but it wasn't in the public water supply, something that everybody has to use. Mass inoculation is another example but the precedent and reason for this is that these were communicable diseases. I was being protected against you by the inoculation because you could communicate your disease to me. In the example of tooth decay, this is not true. This is strictly a one person's benefit and primarily for children. And so it is a completely new precedence that has not been set in the history of this country. Several states have adopted fluoride and have set the precedence themselves, but it is a new precedent and goes, as I feel, to the very outer walls or limits of the constitution. If this precedent is set, it may lay the ground work, next year or the next year or ten years down the road, to say, well, we deem...the government deems this other thing to be beneficial to your health. For instance, we might be having too many babies or too few babies born and some drug is discovered that can cause more or fewer babies, or maybe we have examples, next year or ten years down the road, where we decide children in school aren't learning fast enough but a new drug is discovered that can make them learn more quickly. Now the first reaction you have to examples like this is to say, Ya, this is ridiculous, DeCamp, you are talking in a whole different area but it isn't quite that ridiculous. Time