November 26, 2009

Dear CDW Secretariat

For over 60 years we have been forced and subjected to water fluoridation without supportable scientific evidence on the efficacy of this substance. Now here again is - the total regurgitation of the same <u>junk science</u>*. It is abundantly clear that the panel for this <u>Health Canada review</u> was chosen specifically to continue this disgraceful tradition by deliberately cherry picking data to support a predetermined outcome!

*See also:

http://fluoridealert.org/re/canada.report.response.clinch.pdf

http://fluoridealert.org/re/canada.report.omissions.clinch.pdf

http://fluoridealert.org/re/connett.canada.11-11.09.pdf

Given the dearth of excellent science on Fluoride toxicity, it boggles the mind that this, supposed learned, panel could over look the following:

It is common sense, in that, we should not <u>medicate</u> anyone unless the dose is appropriate to the patient. Hence mass fluoride medication cannot be the same for a thirsty diabetic with <u>comprised kidneys</u>, a 3-year-old toddler and a 35-year-old construction worker. All should require different amounts of medication and not be subject to the same tolerances of this (or any) medication.

Clearly this dosage responsibility lies with each individual and her/his practitioner to determine for themselves.

How could this panel, of so called experts claim, such differing dosages are safe for all?

The real concerns of the community namely: the collateral damage such as, "impairments to the liver, kidney, brain, bones, pineal gland, thyroid, and yes - even teeth** (these too are clearly dependent on dosage and have severe effects on those with compromised nutrition, health and/or immune systems) are summarily ignored.

These major health impairments continue to trump the paltry, <u>if not outright questionable</u>, <u>benefits to teeth</u> so why are these not properly addressed in the review?

** They tell us that molted teeth from fluoridation of water is just a cosmetic effect. When in fact this is a proof positive sign of bone damage. In the British Medical Journal (B.M.J.), October 7, 2000 it is reported that 48% of children who live in fluoridated communities have developed dental fluorosis (damaged bone) due to fluoride overdose. Now then, if the bone is damaged how are you going to get fewer cavities? This demonstrates that ingesting of fluoridated water to reduce tooth decay is clearly a myth.

What expertize did this panel have on Fluoride's toxicity let alone on the untested waste substance hydrofluorosilcic acid (used to fluoridate) that contains variable quantities of arsenic, lead among other toxic residues?

We are not allowed to adulterate our foods with any amount of lead, arsenic etc. The panel failed to show, why such adulteration of water can be an exception?

While <u>Health Canada continues to panic about lead</u>, is this panel not aware that Fluoride is more toxic than lead?

If yes, than why does it, or anyone, want to continue to put such toxic substances in our water?

If fluoride is so safe why do kidney dialysis patients have to remove fluoride from city water in their machines***?

***If this is not done, it could kill some of them obviously this is a good demonstration of short term adverse reaction to the low level of fluoride in water. Hence it follows, that long term potential health hazards must be far worse and effect a much larger population... Our bodies work on trace amounts of minerals so how can "such low levels of fluoride" be an exception?

Examples of Fluoride poisoning linked to kidney dialysis patients can be viewed @

http://www.fluoridealert.org/health/accidents/chicago-1993.html http://www.fluoridealert.org/health/accidents/annapolis.html

Just because something is low in concentration, it does not follow that it is safe! As usual the panel conveniently over looked these well understood issues. Why?

If fluoridation is so safe then why is it banned in so many enlightened European countries, such as Norway, Sweden, Austria, Germany, Belgium, Italy, France etc.?

What do they know that Health Canada's, so called, panel of experts don't?

Fluoride is now everywhere. <u>It is in the air we breathe</u> and in the food and beverages we consume. It is impossible to eliminate our body's systemic ingestion of fluoride so why do we need to add more to our bodies?

"In 1997, the EPA estimated that Americans were ingesting nearly five times more fluoride than in 1971 - from food and drinks alone."

Smith G. 2001, Why Fluoride Is An Environmental Issue, Earth Island Institute, 22nd meeting of the ISFR, August 24-27

Here is a list, not complete by any means, on the adverse health effects (click each title for ref.):

Fluoride And The Brain

Fluoride And Cancer

Fluoride And Children

Fluoride And Dental Fluorosis

Fluoride And Hypersensitivity

Fluoride And Kidneys

Fluoride And Skeletal Fluorosis

Fluoride And Thyroid Function

<u>Fluorosilicate Toxicity</u> - also known as Hydrofluorosilicic acid <u>Fluorosilicates Increase Blood Lead Levels</u>

The above is bad enough, adding insult to injury, an untested industry waste product Hydrofluorosilicic acid which, again I repeat, includes traces of arsenic and lead is being used to fluoridate the water - Fluoride also increases the up take of Aluminum and possibly other toxic metals!

These are serious negative health effects compared to the paltry and/or perceived, if not moot, dental benefits.

Why are the costs form so many health impairments, not considered?

These costs are passed on to the constituents and other health bodies.

Even one negative health effect in the incomplete list above, is reason enough to remove this toxin from the water given that anyone can get fluoride if they wish but, no one can avoid it!

How could this panel so harshly and recklessly ignore the damage from fluoride and cover up the real threat to the people, they are supposed to protect, let alone call it a health benefit?

<u>Deliberately polluting the environment is unconscionable</u> - when only less than 1% of water is actually used for drinking. Why was this not considered?

Given the above why do we need to continue to ADD fluoride to our drinking water?

In summary, water Fluoridation violates:

- 1) Medical ethics as one dose does not fit all ie mass medicating without a prescription
- 2) Ontario Safe Drinking Water Act, section 20(1,3) also the food adulteration act
- 3) Breaks the fisheries act by polluting our lakes streams and rivers etc.

How could this panel ignore such significant and important issues?

From the questions posed it does not take rocket science to conclude that adding fluoride to our water **is** detrimental not only to our health but also the environment!

How can this panel, of so called experts, continue to recommend water fluoridation at any level is beyond pail of understanding?

From the lack of rigor, in this review, one can only conclude that the panel members are not experts and do not qualify to do such a review. It is clear that, due to overwhelming good science accessible to the public on the negative health effects - a panel of industry puppets as opposed to real experts was chosen to mitigate public sentiment against water fluoridation. One can only conclude that this review was nothing but a blatant public relations tactic (and a poor one at that) to maintain the status quo. This makes this sham review totally null and void!

I am appalled at the shoddy quality of work and management on this serious health issue by Health Canada. This is negligence of the highest order all at the expense of public health and funds.

Health Canada's motto "Your health and safety... our priority" is nothing but a cruel joke. What a pretence!

Who exactly does Health Canada work for - the public or the industry?

As a tax payer I should like all of the above questions answered satisfactorily with good supporting data. Until such time all water fluoridation must be stopped. To do so otherwise is unethical and failure of due diligence as it will continue to <u>hurt us all</u>.

Chris Gupta P. Eng 919 Plantation Rd London, Ont. Canada N6H 2Y1

Blind copied to the public at large.