

Proposed Safe Water Bill

The Pennsylvania Public Health Protection and Water Quality Assurance Act

The enclosed bill would prohibit the addition of any substance to the drinking water that is intended to treat humans, rather than the water, that has not been specifically approved by the U.S. EPA to fulfill the health claims of safety and effectiveness for which it is being added to the water, and prohibits any contaminants in the product that exceed levels established as scientific points of safety for lifetime consumption by the U.S. EPA.

This bill re-establishes the burden of proof of safety and effectiveness in place of the rhetoric that has often prevailed. The proposed bill does not single out any one substance, such as hydrofluosilicic acid, nor does it name fluoride generically. Thus, if the promoters and supporters of fluoridation have not misrepresented their claims of safety and effectiveness, this bill will have no effect on fluoridation; however, if there have been misrepresentations this bill will most probably halt fluoridation, at least with the chemicals currently used.

This approach in other state legislatures and municipalities has worked well for elected officials. It has allowed them to safeguard public health without being publicly seen as “anti-fluoride”. The proposed bill provides a vehicle to assert that we should not be adding any substance to our drinking water under the guise of better health that has not been specifically approved for safety and effectiveness, batch tested for content, and free of excessive concentrations of contaminants.

In other states and municipalities, the promoters of fluoridation and their supporters opposed any attempt to require:

- approval by the FDA, before addition to the water supply, of a substance intended to act as a medication, or
- batch testing or Good Manufacturing Practices for the substance, or
- limits on contaminants in the substance in accordance with the scientifically derived points of safety for lifetime consumption.

Since many proponents of fluoridation claimed that the proposed bill’s criteria would stop all fluoridation because the current practice could not comply, some legislators were pressed to understand why they should be promoting a mandatory bill, became more active in their due diligence, and eventually withdrew their original support of mandatory fluoridation legislation. Others expressed that they would suspend their own beliefs and biases and let the facts declare themselves.

We are in collaboration with others in support of this two-fold approach and invite more in-depth communication with your office at your earliest convenience. We have attached the proposed Pennsylvania Public Health Protection and Water Quality Assurance Act as it has been vetted and reviewed by legislative analysis in other states, and enacted in similar form in municipalities in other states. Your consideration of this important matter would be in the best interest of all Pennsylvania residents.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance in this process.