

VALHALLA COMMITTEE  
For Environmental Health

---

Box 329, New Denver, British Columbia, Canada V0G 1S0  
250-358-2333 (office) 250-358-7950 (fax)  
[vws@vws.org](mailto:vws@vws.org) ♦ [www.vws.org](http://www.vws.org)

January 30, 2008

To: William King  
Chief of Staff  
Minister of Health  
Ottawa, K1A 0K9

Dear Mr. King,

In my letter of 4 December 2007, replying to yours of 7 November 2007, I enclosed a copy of our position as set forth in a letter to Health Canada dated 17 October 2007. In it I listed the names and credentials of the scientists, researchers and medical doctors who authored the 611-page BioInitiative Report published by the University of Albany.

In your letter you stated that the health hazards connected with non-thermal levels:

“are not scientifically established.”

and that adverse health effects are *speculative* as to any claim of occurring at levels below the exposure limits specified in the code. Do you mean your language to apply to the authors of the BioInitiative Report? Or, for that matter, does your characterization extend to the 1200 doctors endorsing the Freiberg Appeal in Germany (which had, overall, 40,000 signatories)? I enclose a copy of its text and the initials of the medical doctors who signed, since superadded to by a huge number of physicians.

In an endeavor to acquaint yourself with what Health Canada is *not* telling you, have you consulted the material on our website? Is it possible that the public is actually being misled by safety assurances when a huge body of research has been describing substantial health hazards? If, some time in the future, when cancer clusters break out of their development boundaries and class actions commence, won't the central question be “what did the government know and when did they know it?” Is not the entire correspondence we have with Health Canada since August a part of that record?

You say as to health hazards that “their implications are not sufficiently understood.” Is that not, in itself, a substantial basis to invoke precautionary principles? At least the German government is warning its citizens; Canada is assuring its electorate there is no basis for concern even while a tidal wave of reports reflecting serious, deadly health hazards is crashing upon the shores of our government's indifference.

And while the Canadian cell-phone position duplicates the American, which was dictated by the telecommunications industry in setting standards, the accruing weight of evidence concerning health hazards is beginning to break through the governments pro-industry imperviousness. The Vancouver Sun, January 18, 2008, reports that the US Food and Drug Administration asked the National Research Council to open new lines of study into adverse health effects from cell phones. After the NRC held a meeting with experts, including engineers and biologists, a full report thereafter released took the position that "Most studies looked only at short-term effects on healthy adults. More study needs to be done on multiple, long-term, *low-intensity* radiofrequency [RF] exposure." It also stated, "Although it is unknown whether children are susceptible to RF exposure, they may be at increased risk because of their developing organ and tissue systems."

When the report states the effect on children is unknown, it is unknown to those concerned in Washington, it is unknown to Health Canada, but it has been repeatedly documented in Europe and Scandinavian countries. But leaving the statement as it stands, WHY IS IT UNKNOWN? The safety assurances promulgated by Health Canada, which fuels the intrusionary wheels of Industry Canada in cell tower placement makes no acknowledgment of what it doesn't know, though it can only do so by protractedly ignoring evidence and competent reports which are contrary to its preset, pro-industry position.

This is a scandal in the making and the persons addressed in government by concerned persons are part of an eradicable record of flat-out incompetence, bad faith or bias. If you ask yourself the inevitable question all this material to which I refer repeatedly begs, what now will be your reply?

In the light of all this, may I have a response to my 4 December 2007 letter and this present one at your earliest possible opportunity?

Sincerely,

Richard Caniell  
Chairperson

c.  
Dr. David Carpenter, MD  
Institute for Health  
University of Albany

Cindy Sage  
BioInitiative Report

Alex Atamanenko, MP

Jim Prentice, MP

Radiation Protection Bureau, Health Canada,