
Absurd and risky

Re: **Dentists did plenty — Nov. 26: and Fluoride fighters should be saving us from so many other things — Nov. 30**

Dr. Ira Kirshen has again trotted out the old mantra that fluoridation "in the right amount" is a safe and effective public-health measure.

Not everyone drinks the same amount of water. Standard fluoridation amounts assume that the average person drinks roughly one litre of tap water a day. Curiously, an accounting of the fluoride from water used in food preparation, and especially in store-bought foods, is missing.

Some people drink more. A roofer or athlete could easily drink 10 litres a day, thus having a total fluoride intake much greater than "the right amount." Anyone being treated for kidney stones is typically advised to drink extra fluids, again bringing a higher fluoride dose.

People with a lifelong need to drink extra fluids, for example those who depend on catheters for urination, would be especially at risk for fluoridation-related side effects. These are often the most vulnerable members of society.

Furthermore, because different people have different sensitivities, fluoridation brings more side effects in some people.

Meanwhile, Heidi Engelhardt seems to have forgotten that fluoride is not required by the body and thus is a drug. This is in contrast to essential nutrients such as iodine and the vitamins, which are legitimate food supplements.

There are many other reasons why fluoridating one's whole body is an inherently absurd and risky practice. There have been many excellent letters in the Record to this effect.

Also, I am really tired of the profluoridationists arguing that the fluoride vote should be disregarded because less than half the population voted. Since the mayors and councillors were also voted on by less than half the population, does this mean that the wrong people were elected?

Michael Frind

Waterloo.