

Vote NO on Bellingham Proposition No. 1

1. The health risks of fluoride are significant. The most common ailment is dental and skeletal fluorosis.

- "Well nourished children drinking fluoridated water experienced a dental fluorosis rate of 25%, poorly nourished children experienced a fluorosis rate of 60%." — JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION 44:156165 (1952)

Is this what we want for the Bellingham resident's teeth and bones?

- Fluorosis goes deeper than the teeth, causing brittle bones. The risk of hip fractures in the elderly and bone cancer in young males increased substantially in fluoridated U.S. cities — as documented in a recent Harvard University study. Because fluoride has been linked to cancer, skeletal fluorosis and other health problems, the following European countries have recently banned the practice of adding fluoride to public water supplies: Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.
- The fluoride used for water fluoridation does not have FDA approval and is considered by the FDA as an "unapproved drug." On August 5, 2005, 11 separate unions of scientists and engineers of the Environmental Protection Agency called for a national moratorium on fluoridation of public water supplies. The EPA scientist statements alone should make anyone pause before fluoridating a water supply.

2. Bellingham residents should reject paying for the \$750,000 initial cost and \$140,000 per year "Fluoride Tax."

These figures are derived from the city of Lakewood, WA (pop. 60,000), a city slightly smaller than Bellingham, who recently rejected fluoridating their water supply. Of course, factors such as increased population, inflation, or engineering issues, may make the costs different in Bellingham.

- Thus "if the fluoridation measure passes," Bellingham City Council member John Watts said, "the council will have to approve increases to water rates."

— BELLINGHAM HERALD (8/17/2005)

Water rates are already high enough in Bellingham. Even this cost, however, pales in comparison to the expense of buying hundreds (thousands?) of water purifiers and/or the expense of hiring a water service.

Should Bellingham now become like many major cities in the United State where the tap water is avoided and ridiculed and bottled water use becomes the norm?

3. Choice of Medication: The right to decide the medication one ingests is fundamental.

Bellingham City residents have already spoken clearly on the inappropriateness of using the city water supply to mass medicate the populace via the Bellingham City Council on September 15, 1997. On this date, the bipartisan city council overwhelmingly (6-1) to protect clean water and reject fluoridation enacting:

Res. No. 42-97 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM RECOGNIZING THE IMPROPRIETY OF THE USE OF ITS PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM TO DISPENSE FLUORIDE TREATMENT TO THE GENERAL POPULATION.

As of today, this resolution remains valid.

Undeterred, the fluoridationists, operating a campaign based in Seattle and El Segundo, California, now seek to spend over \$100,000 with paid signature gatherers to try to impose their will on what has been a settled issue in Bellingham for the last 8 years.

Forcing medication on an entire populace is morally and medically unethical. Who should decide what medications and supplements you and your family take?

4. Bellingham residents have already extensively considered and rejected the proposal to fluoridate the water supply in 1992 and 1997 after numerous public hearings.

Addressing the issue of forced fluoridation of the water supply every 5 to 7 years is divisive to the community and unnecessary. If anything, Bellingham residents have made it clear that having a clean drinking water supply is more of a priority now than ever.

What sense does it make to now add a chemical with documented health risks to the water supply at the city utility?

5. Any benefits of Fluoride occur when Fluoride is applied topically, not ingested:

- When water fluoridation began 50 years ago, it was believed that fluoride needed to be ingested in order to be effective. This, however, is no longer the view of the dental establishment, which now generally concedes that *fluoride's benefits are derived primarily from topical application.*
- According to the US Centers for Disease Control: "*Laboratory and epidemiologic research suggests that fluoride prevents dental caries predominately after eruption of the tooth into the mouth, and its actions primarily are topical for both adults and children.*"

PAID FOR BY

BELLINGHAM CITIZENS
AGAINST FLUORIDE TAX

For more information, visit:
www.noforcedfluoride.org