

Oct 9, 2009

Dear CDW secretariat

Regarding the Review Process on Fluoride

I believe Canadians desire accurate, balanced and up-to-date presentations of the research literature when it comes to government policy and the use of taxpayers' money. It is very clear that the review process and review paper on Fluoride is unacceptable for a number of reasons:

1. Health Canada external panel lacks necessary expertise for proper risk assessment of fluoridation chemicals. How was the "expert" panel chosen? By what criteria?
2. False assumptions are used in this risk assessment
3. Basic scientific procedures are not followed
4. Omissions of many areas of research without justification, including evidence from members of the Health Canada review panel - published (Kumar, Levy, Clark) and unpublished papers (Tardiff 2006/7)
5. Lack of objectivity is demonstrated
 - Double standards for research demonstrating efficacy & research demonstrating health harm.
 - Health Canada admits to Auditor General of Canada Petitions office that incorrect answers were provided to petitioners
 - Misrepresentation of National Research Council 2006 Review
 - Misrepresentation of World Health Organization official position on artificial water fluoridation
 - Misrepresentation of dose and concentration

Available evidence clearly demonstrates health harm to humans, plants and animals from fluoride over-exposure. Risk analysis by the NRC 2006 committee [Table 2-4](#), demonstrates that a number of susceptible populations in Canada consume fluoride doses which are known to cause health harm.

Available evidence clearly does not control confounding variables influencing cavity rates when attempting to demonstrate efficacy.'

There is little evidence to show how fluoride reacts to other chemicals within municipal water systems. Currently water treatment measures do not remove nor identify all possible contaminants and fluoride is a known activator.

On a personal note, my daughters both have fluorosis. See attachments for the photos of their teeth. The discolouration is under the enamel. My sister is a dental hygienist who warned me to avoid exposing my children to fluoridated toothpaste when I was pregnant. In spite of avoiding fluoride products, they manifested the condition and I strongly believe drinking water was the main source of exposure for them.

If Health Canada is so confident that fluoride in drinking water is beneficial, perhaps they should cover the cost of veneers for those who are adversely affected by its use. In my view it's only a matter of time before this matter is addressed with a class action law suit. My advice is to cut the potential liability risk, promote toothpaste if you wish but stop forcing citizens to drink and bathe in it.

Have there even been toxicology studies linked to the use of it as bath and shower water?

Thank you kindly for your time.

Louissette Lanteigne
700 Star Flower Ave.
Waterloo Ontario
N2V 2L2