

Current Status Of Water Fluoridation Practices In...

Waterloo

Elmira

St. Jacobs

part of Kitchener

part of Wilmot Twp.

other parts of Woolwich Twp.

and possibly Elsewhere?

When Considering Regional Fluoridation Options...

- Understand interconnectivity of the various water distribution systems.
- Water systems are interconnected for supply, security of supply and maintaining system pressures.
- Interconnection mitigates the possibility of water outages from systems failures or shortages, as areas may be back-fed from other areas.
- Interconnections are used to mitigate areas with poor water pressure, or problem water.
- Line breakages, fire fighting, pump failures and water shortages can cause changes in the direction of water flow within the interconnected system.
- Problems of cross-fluoridation, and continuance of fluoridation, are something water treatment and distribution staff are well aware of.
- The Regional MOH had no idea communities outside Waterloo were being fluoridated, according to remarks made to Waterloo Council.

Waterloo has only four existing cross-border water agreements, according to the Clerk's office.

- Waterloo-Woolwich (Factory Outlet Mall) 1991
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Kitchener (Woolwich MacVille Kiwanis Grand River) 2000
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Woolwich (Stockyards Industrial-Commercial) 2006
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Woolwich (up-coming Walmart) 2008
MENTIONS FLUORIDE

Waterloo has only four existing cross-border water agreements, according to the Clerk's office.

- Waterloo-Woolwich (Factory Outlet Mall) 1991
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Kitchener (Woolwich MacVille Kiwanis Grand River) 2000
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Woolwich (Stockyards Industrial-Commercial) 2006
NO MENTION OF FLUORIDE / FLUORIDATION
- Waterloo-Woolwich (up-coming Walmart) 2008
MENTIONS FLUORIDE

Elmira and St. Jacobs started receiving fluoridated water from Waterloo in 1992

Other parts of the interconnected network may also receive fluoridated water periodically due to changes in system pressure and direction of flow.

Under the Fluoridation Act, Regional Council may continue to fluoridate those still receiving regional fluoridated water as at June 29, 1987 without passing a by-law.

- But all these other communities, beyond Waterloo, received water fluoridation after 1987.
- Did the Region pass the necessary by-laws to legally fluoridate these communities?
- If not, shouldn't this fluoridation stop immediately, before someone takes legal action?
- Kitchener always rejected artificial fluoridation.
- Where was the plebiscite for these communities?
- Is it only important to have a plebiscite when things become transparent?
- When were these communities ever notified?
- The Regional MOH had a professional obligation & duty of health care to notify people receiving fluoridated water.

Where in the Municipal Act does it indicate the Region has authority to hold a municipal plebiscite on water fluoridation?

- Regional sphere of jurisdiction claimed here is “water production, treatment and storage” under Section 11 of the Municipal Act.
- We cannot merely pre-suppose water fluoridation satisfies a “water treatment” definition.
- Fluoridation is a chemical process which does not improve the quality of treated water.
- Fluoridation does not reduce contaminant levels in treated water.
- Fluoridation does not make treated water safer to drink.
- Fluoridation degrades water quality and water safety by adding traces of lead, arsenic, mercury, cadmium, radionuclides, etc. all found in Hydrofluorosilicic Acid.
- Only by statutory authority of the Fluoridation Act has the fluoridation question ever been allowed to be put to the electorate.
- The Region admits it does not have Fluoridation Act stand-alone authority to hold a plebiscite.
- The Fluoridation Act is quite clear on what powers the Region has, and must adhere to.
- The region has no authority to re-write laws concerning fluoridation in Ontario.
- People cry foul when a plebiscite question is not put ‘*just so*’ – they will certainly cry foul here!

Where in the Municipal Elections Act does it indicate the Region can implement a simple majority result based on the cumulative votes cast; and not subscribe to the required double 50% majority formula for a binding fluoridation plebiscite?

- Municipal Elections Act states at least 50% of eligible electors must vote on the question, and over 50% of those votes must decide the question.
- Why create a mockery through an election process highly unlikely to achieve the minimum 50% turnout required?
- Why waste taxpayer's money, time and effort on a non-binding election?
- The Fluoridation Act gives the Region full authority to establish, maintain and operate, or discontinue, fluoridation by by-law without holding a "plebiscite" or other public process.
- Does the Region simply want to wait and see which way the wind is blowing, before deciding what it must do?

How will the Region define and enumerate electors for this plebiscite?

- What water fluoridation concentration must one receive to be an elector (0.5 - 0.8 mg/L) ...or varying concentrations due to periodic changes in system pressures and direction of flow?
- How will the Region enumerate water fluoridation concentrations door-to-door, house-to-house, to uniformly and accurately generate a list of electors?
- Will those who periodically receive fluoridated water due to changes in system pressures and direction of flow also be counted as electors?
- Will the citizens see this due diligence going forward?

What question will the Region ask during this plebiscite?

- How do we determine the nature of the question?
- Do we ask those unaware their water is fluoridated if they wish to continue or discontinue fluoridation?
- Is there one question we can universally ask all affected electors?
- Kitchener has always said no to fluoridation, so *what do we ask those electors?*
- How do you say to some electors that water fluoridation has been forced upon you without your knowledge or consent, then ask are you in favour of water fluoridation?
- Is there any authority within a mutually (binding) plebiscite to ask a different question of different electors?
- Perhaps not adhering to the Fluoridation Act will at least allow us to ask a much more telling question. “Are you in favour of fluoridating with hydrofluorosilicic acid containing traces of arsenic lead, mercury, cadmium, radionuclides...”
- It’s all about an informed plebiscite... right?

If Waterloo Council were to change its resolution, and ask the Region to turn off fluoridation, or ask for a different method of fluoridation, would the Region comply?

- It was said in these chambers that had Waterloo Council passed a motion to discontinue water fluoridation, Regional Council would have likely done so.
- It was said we are having this plebiscite because Waterloo Council asked for it.
- Waterloo Council assured its citizens this would be a made in Waterloo solution, decided by Waterloo's people.
- Must Waterloo's Mayor and Council now sit by as our City's fate is to be decided by communities outside Waterloo.
- Can anyone accept holding a binding plebiscite on fluoridation, where disparate communities and parts of disparate communities decide each other's fates?
- Waterloo has no Fluoridation Act authority to hold its own plebiscite, but it could come back to the Region with an amended fluoridation resolution.
- Waterloo has the authority to reject the chemical currently being used to fluoridate its water, pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act.
- Would the Region permit Waterloo Council an opportunity to re-think these things?

Time For Questions...