

Town Residents Vote On Fluoridation Saturday

LAND DEVELOPER FAVOURS RESIDENTIAL GROWTH
 Dear Mr. Editor:
 To answer your recent editorial entitled "A BAD OMEN," one needs only to look into North York to see how it has contained its taxes through land development.

People will demand services; services will create commercial enterprise; the two together will encourage industry to move into your area and that is when your taxes will be stabilized.

Markham and Vaughan Townships should consider themselves on the verge of a period of exploding development and such natural growth cannot be contained or prohibited by rules and regulations twenty years old.

Yours truly,
 C. D. MILANI,
 President, C. D. Milani Limited, Willowdale.

WOULD WELCOME FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

I am one of those people fortunate enough to have grown up in an area with natural fluoride in the water and had my first filling at age 33. Naturally I feel very strongly about inflicting unnecessary pain on my children, paying unnecessary dentist bills, and, in the future, having to answer to them for ugly fillings and possibly early loss of teeth.

My two children (ages 1 1/2 and 2 1/2 years) have had fluoride drops since birth, but I would welcome the less costly and more reliable method of the fluoridation of this community's water supply.

Yours truly,
 MRS. JOHN GRIFFITHS
 213 Loch Street.

DENTAL MEDICAL AUTHORITIES SUPPORT FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

To fluoridate or not to fluoridate: that is the question. Whether it is nobler in the mind to suffer the spasms and twinges of outrageous pain.

Or to take precautions against a sea of cavities. And by fluoridating end them? To drill—to fill. No more, and by fluoridating to say we end. The toothache and the unnatural misery that our children are heir to: It is a consumption. Devoutly to be wished. Fluoride—yes. Fluoridate—yes.

Having read numerous letters in the columns of "The Liberal" denouncing the inclusion of fluoride in our water supply, I as a layman felt compelled to find out for myself just what the pros and cons were.

The first thing that I noticed was that most of the opposition seemed to come from non-professional people, like myself, and that most of the statements made against fluoridation appeared to be somewhat suspect in nature.

I, therefore, made it my business to discuss this issue with my own dentist and also my children's dentist. Both of these professional men, who deal with the disease of tooth decay every day of their lives, advocated the inclusion of fluoride in our water supply. Not content with their advice, I discussed the matter with my own doctor and again the medical advice of these professional people was overwhelmingly in favour.

I was still not completely convinced, so I contacted the Canadian Dental Association, the Canadian Medical Association and Health League of Canada, and again I found overwhelming endorsement of the fluoridation programme.

In addition, I have found that the following lay and professional groups have also spoken out in favour of this method of prevention for the disease of tooth decay.

- World Health Organization—Faculty of Dentistry—U. of T. American Dental Assoc.—British Government. American Medical Assoc.—Dept. of Health of the U.S. Gov't.
- Canadian Cancer Society—American Cancer Society.

In view of the overwhelming approval given by these professional and lay organizations, I as a layman on this matter, must be guided by their opinions and will vote in favour on December 5.

I urge all citizens of Richmond Hill to check with their own dental and medical advisors and any of the professional organizations I have listed, then make up their own minds based on the facts and cast their ballots accordingly.

Yours very truly,
 A. J. SMYTH,
 381 Allgood Street.

SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Many arguments for and against fluoridation have been presented to the public in recent weeks.

Whether or not these can be "proved" to everyone's satisfaction, there is one point that merits the serious consideration of those who are proponents of fluoridation before casting their ballots on December 5. Many people in our community believe that the even, sodium fluoride, ingested, even in small quantities, over a long period

of time, is not proven safe through adequate research, and in fact may be harmful to a number of individuals, particularly those subject to chronic conditions or other bodily weaknesses.

The placing of fluoride in the public water supply is a form of compulsory medication, depriving these people of a freedom of choice in the matter.

There is an alternative available for those who wish to use fluorides for reducing tooth decay in children. Tablets can be easily obtained from drug stores and dissolved in milk, etc., in prescribed amounts. It may be a little less convenient and involve more personal responsibility, but it certainly costs little and by so doing, safeguards and respects the rights of others.

A. W. LEMAN,
 102 Ruggles Ave.

FLUORIDATION AND GUINEA PIGS
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The average reader must find it almost impossible to decide what he should do about his vote on fluoridation.

By now it must be clear to him that there is bitter disagreement among scientific and medical men about the safety of fluorides in water. This one indisputable fact is enough to make me decide against fluoridation. I prefer to be cautious, when experts disagree.

If, with a minor ailment, I went to a clinic, and the doctors suggested an injection but, in my presence, argued, violently, whether the treatment would cure me or kill me, I would get out of there in a hurry.

Especially, if I were told that I could receive the same benefits by taking tablets, which could be discontinued at the first sign of unfavourable reactions.

Anyone who agrees to fluoridation is willingly accepting the roll of guinea pig.

Yours truly,
 (MRS. D.H.)
 DOROTHY MORRIS
 8 Longbridge Road,
 Thornhill.

BIOLOGIST WILL VOTE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

I shall be voting against the fluoridation of Richmond Hill's water supply on Saturday.

I am a natural scientist, a biologist by profession. As a result of my work I realize very clearly that biological questions can rarely be answered by "yes" or "no," "do" or "don't".

The processes of life are intricately linked, the tolerance of individuals to any substance varies greatly. The use of fluorides has not been adequately studied to permit balanced judgments to be made. This is reflected by the wide difference in approach to fluoridation in countries throughout the world.

Yours very truly,
 DOUGLAS H. PIMLOTT,
 65 Centre Street West.

FLUORIDATION AND PUBLIC SPIRITED CITIZENS
 Dear Mr. Editor:

I sincerely wish that I, as a layman, were not called upon to decide on the merits of a scientific matter such as fluoridation. Such a decision, for which no one but an expert is equipped, is being forced upon me and so I have tried to become as informed as possible.

First of all, I find that the scientific community gives fluoridation its overwhelming support. It is endorsed by every major scientific group on this continent (some of which were listed in a letter last week) and organizations whose integrity and professional credentials are beyond question.

It is true that a minute percentage of scientific people, for various reasons, disagree. There will always be dissenters to any public health measure. These people are entitled to their opinions and should be given a hearing. Personally, considering their arguments against the evidence of the proponents of fluoridation, I find no difficulty deciding whom to trust.

No public health measure has ever been tested so exhaustively (almost 35 years) nor had such widespread scientific approval.

Getting closer to home, my doctor, my children's pediatrician, and my dentist publicly approve fluoridation. I consider very seriously the opinions of those whom I trust to protect the health of my family.

Let us leave aside for a moment the scientific aspects of our problem and examine the issue of civil rights. Many people seem to be convinced of the value of fluoridation but feel that a fluoridated water supply is invasion. This is quite true in exactly the same way that chlorination is an invasion.

To me this is a small sacrifice in the interests of those children who, through no fault of their own, receive inadequate diet and dental care. To many people in this town whose families are grown or half grown fluoridation will be of little advantage but if we consider only those near and dear to us the walls of our concern are narrow indeed.

Finally, I have gone one step further in my search for information. Last night I talked by long distance to Dr. Aeneas Dunton, Medical Officer of Health

for Brant County, who is an inside expert and observer of the fluoridation of municipal water supplies because of doubts about long term effects. He asked that I would not quote him and use his name. A sad sidelight to the issue—but who can blame him?

(2) A nurse in an oral surgeon's clinic—she stated that "we don't talk about it around here."

(3) Our family doctor in Richmond Hill—twelve days before the election he said that I was the first patient to ask him about it. He hadn't given it much thought—considered it to be probably not harmful, but admitted that I had given more consideration to many aspects of the problem than he had. He is a very busy man—worked off his feet—caring for patients with varied problems of the moment.

Most doctors and dentists haven't the time or inclination—or even the inclination—to examine for themselves the many reports of studies on all phases of this question. Most of those who have, and consequently doubt the total benefit, refrain from discussing it openly and ask not to be quoted.

It might be wise for politicians and local public health officials to look into the reasons for the discontinuing of fluoride additives to the municipal water supply of some communities in England and the United States.

I certainly hope that fluoride, carefully administered to children, does prevent dental caries—although even this is questioned by some experts. ALL however agree that proper diet and good oral hygiene are by far the most positive steps to good healthy teeth.

Once again remember—"No proof of harm is not the same as proof of no harm."

(MRS. T.)
 BARBARA BEATTIE,
 248 Demaine Crescent.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO HAROLD SANDERSON
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Elected by acclamation to serve Ward 2 as public school trustee, and being limited as to speaking time at the meeting, I omitted to say that if I can be as useful and capable a member to that body as Harold Sanderson (who did not wish to stand this term) I shall be more than satisfied with my service. Mr. Sanderson has made a strong and capable member of that body and I think we owe him our thanks for the years he has served the community in this capacity.

PHYLLIS HAWKES,
 Public School Trustee-Elect.

THE CASE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The last two editions of your paper—November 19 and 26, give prominent and full coverage of a fluoridation meeting with Dr. R. C. Burgess as guest speaker. Dr. Burgess was quoted as saying "that since it is impossible for the average voter to study all reports and information on the subject they must rely on the integrity of scientists who have done so and without exception these men recommend addition of fluoride to the drinking water."

This is an extraordinary statement! One is hard put to find an issue relating to the scientific, medical and dental fields that has aroused more controversy and conflicting views among specialists. They disagree on many points including the cumulative effects, as well as the advisability of use by every member of the community over a long period of time.

In front of me are copies of reports, letters and booklets on the subject—some of them not easily come by, but available. These are written by scientists, doctors, etc.—some dating back to 1956, others as recent as January and March 1964. Lines of research vary as do statistics. They state many diverse opinions. ALL agree, however, that fluoride CAN be dangerous. Even very small concentrations of it will destroy enzymes which control most vital functions in the body.

Lack of fluoride is NOT the CAUSE of dental caries—nor is it in fact a treatment. At best it is a preventive step.

Fluoride is admittedly a drug, a medicine—administered for a specific purpose—to prevent dental caries in children—its intake is restricted only during a specific period in their lives.

No doctor, to my knowledge, would prescribe a drug for longer than was necessary to adequately treat a given condition—and only then in prescribed and controlled doses, to be stopped when the condition no longer could benefit from that medication.

My husband and I intend to continue the fluoride treatment our dentist has been providing for our three children over the past years. We do NOT want a waterworks engineer administering this treatment to ALL of us indefinitely. Many children (we have one) have varying degrees of allergic tendencies and are suffering from numerous known and unknown toxic substances. Surely none of us should FORCE members of our community whether they are "senior citizens" or anyone suffering from kidney disease and other ailments to consume a substance that could be of no possible benefit to them and which might prove too late to be harmful.

During the past week I have tried to discuss this with many people including the following: (1) Our family dentist—pro-

minent in Metro. He is against fluoridation of municipal water because of doubts about long term effects. He asked that I would not quote him and use his name. A sad sidelight to the issue—but who can blame him?

(2) A nurse in an oral surgeon's clinic—she stated that "we don't talk about it around here."

(3) Our family doctor in Richmond Hill—twelve days before the election he said that I was the first patient to ask him about it. He hadn't given it much thought—considered it to be probably not harmful, but admitted that I had given more consideration to many aspects of the problem than he had. He is a very busy man—worked off his feet—caring for patients with varied problems of the moment.

Most doctors and dentists haven't the time or inclination—or even the inclination—to examine for themselves the many reports of studies on all phases of this question. Most of those who have, and consequently doubt the total benefit, refrain from discussing it openly and ask not to be quoted.

It might be wise for politicians and local public health officials to look into the reasons for the discontinuing of fluoride additives to the municipal water supply of some communities in England and the United States.

I certainly hope that fluoride, carefully administered to children, does prevent dental caries—although even this is questioned by some experts. ALL however agree that proper diet and good oral hygiene are by far the most positive steps to good healthy teeth.

Once again remember—"No proof of harm is not the same as proof of no harm."

(MRS. T.)
 BARBARA BEATTIE,
 248 Demaine Crescent.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO HAROLD SANDERSON
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Elected by acclamation to serve Ward 2 as public school trustee, and being limited as to speaking time at the meeting, I omitted to say that if I can be as useful and capable a member to that body as Harold Sanderson (who did not wish to stand this term) I shall be more than satisfied with my service. Mr. Sanderson has made a strong and capable member of that body and I think we owe him our thanks for the years he has served the community in this capacity.

PHYLLIS HAWKES,
 Public School Trustee-Elect.

THE CASE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The last two editions of your paper—November 19 and 26, give prominent and full coverage of a fluoridation meeting with Dr. R. C. Burgess as guest speaker. Dr. Burgess was quoted as saying "that since it is impossible for the average voter to study all reports and information on the subject they must rely on the integrity of scientists who have done so and without exception these men recommend addition of fluoride to the drinking water."

This is an extraordinary statement! One is hard put to find an issue relating to the scientific, medical and dental fields that has aroused more controversy and conflicting views among specialists. They disagree on many points including the cumulative effects, as well as the advisability of use by every member of the community over a long period of time.

In front of me are copies of reports, letters and booklets on the subject—some of them not easily come by, but available. These are written by scientists, doctors, etc.—some dating back to 1956, others as recent as January and March 1964. Lines of research vary as do statistics. They state many diverse opinions. ALL agree, however, that fluoride CAN be dangerous. Even very small concentrations of it will destroy enzymes which control most vital functions in the body.

Lack of fluoride is NOT the CAUSE of dental caries—nor is it in fact a treatment. At best it is a preventive step.

Fluoride is admittedly a drug, a medicine—administered for a specific purpose—to prevent dental caries in children—its intake is restricted only during a specific period in their lives.

No doctor, to my knowledge, would prescribe a drug for longer than was necessary to adequately treat a given condition—and only then in prescribed and controlled doses, to be stopped when the condition no longer could benefit from that medication.

My husband and I intend to continue the fluoride treatment our dentist has been providing for our three children over the past years. We do NOT want a waterworks engineer administering this treatment to ALL of us indefinitely. Many children (we have one) have varying degrees of allergic tendencies and are suffering from numerous known and unknown toxic substances. Surely none of us should FORCE members of our community whether they are "senior citizens" or anyone suffering from kidney disease and other ailments to consume a substance that could be of no possible benefit to them and which might prove too late to be harmful.

During the past week I have tried to discuss this with many people including the following: (1) Our family dentist—pro-

minent in Metro. He is against fluoridation of municipal water because of doubts about long term effects. He asked that I would not quote him and use his name. A sad sidelight to the issue—but who can blame him?

(2) A nurse in an oral surgeon's clinic—she stated that "we don't talk about it around here."

(3) Our family doctor in Richmond Hill—twelve days before the election he said that I was the first patient to ask him about it. He hadn't given it much thought—considered it to be probably not harmful, but admitted that I had given more consideration to many aspects of the problem than he had. He is a very busy man—worked off his feet—caring for patients with varied problems of the moment.

Most doctors and dentists haven't the time or inclination—or even the inclination—to examine for themselves the many reports of studies on all phases of this question. Most of those who have, and consequently doubt the total benefit, refrain from discussing it openly and ask not to be quoted.

It might be wise for politicians and local public health officials to look into the reasons for the discontinuing of fluoride additives to the municipal water supply of some communities in England and the United States.

I certainly hope that fluoride, carefully administered to children, does prevent dental caries—although even this is questioned by some experts. ALL however agree that proper diet and good oral hygiene are by far the most positive steps to good healthy teeth.

Once again remember—"No proof of harm is not the same as proof of no harm."

(MRS. T.)
 BARBARA BEATTIE,
 248 Demaine Crescent.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO HAROLD SANDERSON
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Elected by acclamation to serve Ward 2 as public school trustee, and being limited as to speaking time at the meeting, I omitted to say that if I can be as useful and capable a member to that body as Harold Sanderson (who did not wish to stand this term) I shall be more than satisfied with my service. Mr. Sanderson has made a strong and capable member of that body and I think we owe him our thanks for the years he has served the community in this capacity.

PHYLLIS HAWKES,
 Public School Trustee-Elect.

THE CASE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The last two editions of your paper—November 19 and 26, give prominent and full coverage of a fluoridation meeting with Dr. R. C. Burgess as guest speaker. Dr. Burgess was quoted as saying "that since it is impossible for the average voter to study all reports and information on the subject they must rely on the integrity of scientists who have done so and without exception these men recommend addition of fluoride to the drinking water."

This is an extraordinary statement! One is hard put to find an issue relating to the scientific, medical and dental fields that has aroused more controversy and conflicting views among specialists. They disagree on many points including the cumulative effects, as well as the advisability of use by every member of the community over a long period of time.

In front of me are copies of reports, letters and booklets on the subject—some of them not easily come by, but available. These are written by scientists, doctors, etc.—some dating back to 1956, others as recent as January and March 1964. Lines of research vary as do statistics. They state many diverse opinions. ALL agree, however, that fluoride CAN be dangerous. Even very small concentrations of it will destroy enzymes which control most vital functions in the body.

Lack of fluoride is NOT the CAUSE of dental caries—nor is it in fact a treatment. At best it is a preventive step.

Fluoride is admittedly a drug, a medicine—administered for a specific purpose—to prevent dental caries in children—its intake is restricted only during a specific period in their lives.

No doctor, to my knowledge, would prescribe a drug for longer than was necessary to adequately treat a given condition—and only then in prescribed and controlled doses, to be stopped when the condition no longer could benefit from that medication.

My husband and I intend to continue the fluoride treatment our dentist has been providing for our three children over the past years. We do NOT want a waterworks engineer administering this treatment to ALL of us indefinitely. Many children (we have one) have varying degrees of allergic tendencies and are suffering from numerous known and unknown toxic substances. Surely none of us should FORCE members of our community whether they are "senior citizens" or anyone suffering from kidney disease and other ailments to consume a substance that could be of no possible benefit to them and which might prove too late to be harmful.

During the past week I have tried to discuss this with many people including the following: (1) Our family dentist—pro-

minent in Metro. He is against fluoridation of municipal water because of doubts about long term effects. He asked that I would not quote him and use his name. A sad sidelight to the issue—but who can blame him?

(2) A nurse in an oral surgeon's clinic—she stated that "we don't talk about it around here."

(3) Our family doctor in Richmond Hill—twelve days before the election he said that I was the first patient to ask him about it. He hadn't given it much thought—considered it to be probably not harmful, but admitted that I had given more consideration to many aspects of the problem than he had. He is a very busy man—worked off his feet—caring for patients with varied problems of the moment.

Most doctors and dentists haven't the time or inclination—or even the inclination—to examine for themselves the many reports of studies on all phases of this question. Most of those who have, and consequently doubt the total benefit, refrain from discussing it openly and ask not to be quoted.

It might be wise for politicians and local public health officials to look into the reasons for the discontinuing of fluoride additives to the municipal water supply of some communities in England and the United States.

I certainly hope that fluoride, carefully administered to children, does prevent dental caries—although even this is questioned by some experts. ALL however agree that proper diet and good oral hygiene are by far the most positive steps to good healthy teeth.

Once again remember—"No proof of harm is not the same as proof of no harm."

(MRS. T.)
 BARBARA BEATTIE,
 248 Demaine Crescent.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO HAROLD SANDERSON
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Elected by acclamation to serve Ward 2 as public school trustee, and being limited as to speaking time at the meeting, I omitted to say that if I can be as useful and capable a member to that body as Harold Sanderson (who did not wish to stand this term) I shall be more than satisfied with my service. Mr. Sanderson has made a strong and capable member of that body and I think we owe him our thanks for the years he has served the community in this capacity.

PHYLLIS HAWKES,
 Public School Trustee-Elect.

THE CASE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The last two editions of your paper—November 19 and 26, give prominent and full coverage of a fluoridation meeting with Dr. R. C. Burgess as guest speaker. Dr. Burgess was quoted as saying "that since it is impossible for the average voter to study all reports and information on the subject they must rely on the integrity of scientists who have done so and without exception these men recommend addition of fluoride to the drinking water."

This is an extraordinary statement! One is hard put to find an issue relating to the scientific, medical and dental fields that has aroused more controversy and conflicting views among specialists. They disagree on many points including the cumulative effects, as well as the advisability of use by every member of the community over a long period of time.

In front of me are copies of reports, letters and booklets on the subject—some of them not easily come by, but available. These are written by scientists, doctors, etc.—some dating back to 1956, others as recent as January and March 1964. Lines of research vary as do statistics. They state many diverse opinions. ALL agree, however, that fluoride CAN be dangerous. Even very small concentrations of it will destroy enzymes which control most vital functions in the body.

Lack of fluoride is NOT the CAUSE of dental caries—nor is it in fact a treatment. At best it is a preventive step.

Fluoride is admittedly a drug, a medicine—administered for a specific purpose—to prevent dental caries in children—its intake is restricted only during a specific period in their lives.

No doctor, to my knowledge, would prescribe a drug for longer than was necessary to adequately treat a given condition—and only then in prescribed and controlled doses, to be stopped when the condition no longer could benefit from that medication.

My husband and I intend to continue the fluoride treatment our dentist has been providing for our three children over the past years. We do NOT want a waterworks engineer administering this treatment to ALL of us indefinitely. Many children (we have one) have varying degrees of allergic tendencies and are suffering from numerous known and unknown toxic substances. Surely none of us should FORCE members of our community whether they are "senior citizens" or anyone suffering from kidney disease and other ailments to consume a substance that could be of no possible benefit to them and which might prove too late to be harmful.

During the past week I have tried to discuss this with many people including the following: (1) Our family dentist—pro-

minent in Metro. He is against fluoridation of municipal water because of doubts about long term effects. He asked that I would not quote him and use his name. A sad sidelight to the issue—but who can blame him?

(2) A nurse in an oral surgeon's clinic—she stated that "we don't talk about it around here."

(3) Our family doctor in Richmond Hill—twelve days before the election he said that I was the first patient to ask him about it. He hadn't given it much thought—considered it to be probably not harmful, but admitted that I had given more consideration to many aspects of the problem than he had. He is a very busy man—worked off his feet—caring for patients with varied problems of the moment.

Most doctors and dentists haven't the time or inclination—or even the inclination—to examine for themselves the many reports of studies on all phases of this question. Most of those who have, and consequently doubt the total benefit, refrain from discussing it openly and ask not to be quoted.

It might be wise for politicians and local public health officials to look into the reasons for the discontinuing of fluoride additives to the municipal water supply of some communities in England and the United States.

I certainly hope that fluoride, carefully administered to children, does prevent dental caries—although even this is questioned by some experts. ALL however agree that proper diet and good oral hygiene are by far the most positive steps to good healthy teeth.

Once again remember—"No proof of harm is not the same as proof of no harm."

(MRS. T.)
 BARBARA BEATTIE,
 248 Demaine Crescent.

EXPRESSES THANKS TO HAROLD SANDERSON
 Dear Mr. Editor:

Elected by acclamation to serve Ward 2 as public school trustee, and being limited as to speaking time at the meeting, I omitted to say that if I can be as useful and capable a member to that body as Harold Sanderson (who did not wish to stand this term) I shall be more than satisfied with my service. Mr. Sanderson has made a strong and capable member of that body and I think we owe him our thanks for the years he has served the community in this capacity.

PHYLLIS HAWKES,
 Public School Trustee-Elect.

THE CASE AGAINST FLUORIDATION
 Dear Mr. Editor:

The last two editions of your paper—November 19 and 26, give prominent and full coverage of a fluoridation meeting with Dr. R. C. Burgess as guest speaker. Dr. Burgess was quoted as saying "that since it is impossible for the average voter to study all reports and information on the subject they must rely on the integrity of scientists who have done so and without exception these men recommend addition of fluoride to the drinking water."

This is an extraordinary statement! One is hard put to find an issue relating to the scientific, medical and dental fields that has aroused more controversy and conflicting views among specialists. They disagree on many points including the cumulative effects, as well as the advisability of use by every member of the community over a long period of time.

In front of me are copies of reports, letters and booklets on the subject—some of them not easily come by, but available. These are written by scientists, doctors, etc.—some dating back to 1956, others as recent as January and March 1964. Lines of research vary as do statistics. They state many diverse opinions. ALL agree, however, that fluoride CAN be dangerous. Even very small concentrations of it will destroy enzymes which control most vital functions in the body.

Lack of fluoride is NOT the CAUSE of dental caries—nor is it in fact a treatment. At best it is a preventive step.

Fluoride is admittedly a drug, a medicine—administered for a specific purpose—to prevent dental caries in children—its intake is restricted only during a specific period in their lives.

No doctor, to my knowledge, would prescribe a drug for longer than was necessary to adequately treat a given condition—and only then in prescribed and controlled doses, to be stopped when the condition no longer could benefit from that medication.

My husband and I intend to continue the fluoride treatment our dentist has been providing for our three children over the past years. We do NOT want a waterworks engineer administering this treatment to ALL of us indefinitely. Many