Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Hamilton’s motion to remove fluoride from drinking water is an extremely progressive step to improve the health of the constituents.

Surely it is common sense, in that, we should not medicate anyone unless the dose is appropriate to the patient. Hence mass fluoride medication cannot be the same for a thirsty diabetic with comprised kidneys, 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.

You may what to question how our health authorities claim such differing dosage safe for all?

Also their pro fluoridation deputations never address the real concerns of the community namely: the collateral damage such as "impairments to the liver, kidney, brain, bones, pineal gland, thyroid, and even teeth*. These too are clearly dependent of dosage and have severe effects on those with compromised health and/or immune systems.

You may want to question why these major health impairments continue to trump the paltry, if not outright questionable, benefits to teeth?

How can the Dental Societies and the Health Units call so many Health damages as health benefits?

* They tell us that molten 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 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 expertise do they have with regard to Fluoride’s toxicity let alone on the untested waste substance hydrofluosilicic 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. Ask them to show why such adulteration of water can be an exception?

Most health units are panicking about lead, are they not aware that Fluoride is more toxic
then lead?

If yes than why do they want to put such a toxic substance in our water?

**Given the above we simply don't want this toxin in our water so why are we being subjected to it against our will?**

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/annapolis.htm
http://www.fluoridealert.org/U-of-C.htm

Just because something is low concentration, it does not follow it is safe.

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.?

Why have the costs form so many health impairments, not considered? These costs are passed on to the constituents and other health bodies.

Then ask them again why the damage from fluoride so harshly and recklessly ignored and covered up over the real threat to the people, they are supposed to protect, let alone call it a health benefit?

Fluoride is now everywhere. It is in the air we breathe 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. or go to www.waterlooowatch.com to get the full reports):

**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
Fluorosilicate Toxicity - also known as Hydrofluorosilicic acid
Fluorosilicates Increase Blood Lead Levels

The above is bad enough, adding insult to injury, an untested industry waste product Hydrofluorosilicic acid which 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!

Regarding tooth protection here is what Bill Osmunson DDS, MPH, Aesthetic Dentistry of Bellevue, Bellevue, Wash. has to say...

"As a dentist with a master's degree in public health for more than 25 years, I promoted water fluoridation and fluoride supplements. Current research has shifted, finding fluoridation in developed communities is unnecessary. Most European dental associations no longer recommend it.

Dentists are puzzled and can't explain why fluoridation no longer appears to reduce dental decay. One theory is the total fluoride intake from all sources, such as pesticides, dental and medical products and post-harvest fumigants, has reached high enough levels to provide the so-called "optimal" dose. [halo effect]

Significant increase in dental fluorosis in children, from 22 percent to 32 percent, supports this theory. Another theory is fluoridation never did reduce tooth decay, and flawed historical studies are at fault. The evidence is strong - fluoridation no longer reduces tooth decay. Evidence for fluoridation intervention is lacking.

Dental expenses are a good example. After 60 years of fluoridation, people fluoridated should show a reduction in dental expenses if fluoridation were effective. Several studies have shown either no reduction in dental expenses or slight increases.

Non-fluoridated Portland, Ore. (19 percent of Oregon is fluoridated) had $210 average, annual dental expenses per person. Across the river, fluoridated Vancouver, Wash. (46 percent of Washington was fluoridated at the time) had $215. Add the cost of bottled water for infants and those who choose not to have fluoridated water, medical risks and cosmetic treatments for dental fluorosis damage, fluoridation equipment, chemicals and maintenance, and fluoridation makes no cents or sense, unless you own the company profiting.

Public health agencies are marching soldiers and do not question their orders. They
have been told to "promote fluoridation," and they do so, regardless of the evidence."

Even one 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!

So Why do we need to continue to **ADD** fluoride to our drinking water?

This action is essential to prevent the damage to the health of constituents. These are serious health effects compared to the paltry and/or perceived if not moot dental benefits. Clearly more will get hurt the longer it is in the water. Your stance to remove this toxin from the water is a clear win for the community and is a laudable and essential move!

Chris Gupta P. Eng