Fluoridation Products
Unregulated, Unapproved, Unsafe, Uncontrolled, Illegal

The Supreme Court of Canada in 1957\(^1\) ruled that fluoridation was a "compulsory preventive medication", which is "not to promote the ordinary use of water as a physical requisite for the body" but has a "special health purpose". This ruling has never been contested by the Canadian Government.

**Supreme Court Justice Cartwright stated:** "In pith and substance the by-law relates not to the provision of a water supply but to the compulsory preventative medication of the inhabitants of the area. In my opinion, the words of the statutory provisions on which the appellant relies do not confer upon the council the power to make by-laws in relation to matters of this sort."

**Supreme Court Justice Rand stated:** "But it is not to promote the ordinary use of water as a physical requisite for the body that fluoridation is proposed. That process has a distinct and different purpose; it is not a means to an end of wholesome water for water’s function but to an end of a special health purpose for which water supply is made use of as a means."

**USA Food and Drug Administration**

- “The Food and Drug Administration Office of Prescription Drug Compliance has confirmed, to my surprise, that there are no studies to demonstrate either the safety or effectiveness of these drugs which FDA classifies as unapproved new drugs.” To Dr. David Kessler, M.D., Commissioner, US Food & Drug Administration, June 3, 1993 from Congressman Kenneth Calvert,

- “A search of the Drugs@FDA database . . . of approved drug products and the Electronic Orange Book . . . does not indicate that sodium fluoride, silicofluoride, or hydrofluosilicic acid has been approved under a New Drug Application (NDA) or Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) for ingestion for the prevention or mitigation of dental decay.” Email from FDA on 7-22-09

---

\(^1\) Metropolitan Toronto v. Forest Hill (Village), [1957] S.C.R. 569