

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 ♦ www.vws.org

October 1, 2007

Greg Gajda
Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau
Health Canada

Dear Mr. Gajda,

Thank you for your prompt reply. I note you make no comment about Germany's recent position to which I referred in my letter, and you similarly ignore the position of the investigative arm of the European Union, as well as the concerns voiced by the Fire Fighters Union not to mention other adverse reports. Your comments on the BioInitiative Report are peculiarly irresponsible.

You and your confreres seem to be willing to not only take a position that cell phone transmission and usage is not hazardous to human health but you base your findings upon excessively narrow testing parameters, which disinclude the very premises on which the hazards have been demonstrated. And to compound this, you ignore the basis for the exercise of the Precautionary Principle.

The Precautionary Principle presently adopted in law and by the World Court in 2002 (in the Pfizer case) applies — as I pointed out — when action or policy *might* cause severe or irreversible harm, even “in the absence of a scientific consensus.” The key word is MIGHT. Never did any situation present the circumstances which demand the adoption of a precautionary approach more than those concerning cellular usage. Yet — in the see-and-hear-no-evil position adopted by Health Canada — the waves of adverse scientific reports by outstanding scientists and medical doctors worldwide crash against your unyielding position to no effect and with evidently little concern on your part for the evident applicability of their findings.

My letter pointed out that the Telus transmitter, which your continued position makes possible, is immediately adjacent (within 30 meters) to a children's playground and 50 meters from residences. Yet massive evidence from scientific studies around the world, that there may be particularly grave dangers from cell transmitters to children and teenagers whose brains are in development and whose immune systems are not yet mature. gives you no pause to reconsider this position. Surely there is more to the huge batch of reports adverse to cell phones and transmitters that should lead you to begin to question the tape-loop approval that Health Canada continues to offer. Recall the concern about exposure guidelines expressed by Norbert Hankin, Chief EMF Scientist for the US Environmental Agency: he stated, “The U.S. Federal Communications Commission, (FCC's) exposure guidelines are considered protective of effects arising from a thermal mechanism but not from all possible mechanisms. The generalization by many that the guidelines protect human beings from harm by any and all mechanisms is not justified.”

It seems extremely unscientific to most members of the public, aware of the adverse reports, that Health Canada, through its spokesmen, hunkers down around its old findings.

You do admit in writing that on-the-ground studies have *not* been conducted, and that actual affects on human, (apart from your Petri-dish's demonstration and other tests *in vacuum*) have not been undertaken, yet Health Canada's position presents a portrait of obstinately closed minds, repeating their mantra that the studies are "old news", ignoring the ever-enlarging new reports and responses indicative of serious health hazards.

This is gravely reminiscent of the fact that Health Canada approves, for use in Canadian agriculture, 60 pesticides which over 20 countries in Europe have banned. There are many other cases in which Health Canada has set Minimum Residue Levels for pesticides in food substantially higher than other countries. There are innumerable scientific studies linking these chemicals to cancers, neuro-system damage and other serious illnesses.

I point this out in order to cite many instances, as with asbestos, smoking and its second hand effects, lead in gasoline, and other dangers, that Health Canada has lagged behind substantial adverse science. This, by using narrow testing parameters, lets years pass while the hazards have accumulated injury to the public health. There is much good Health Canada has achieved but there is a dark history which counterbalances it, derived from a conservative mind-set and concern for the economics, a history resonated by its present shutdown to world-wide reports of cell phone hazard.

The full scope of the material presented to you should be sufficiently alarming for Health Canada to reconsider its position and adopt the precautionary principle. After all, hazard to human health, especially to children, are involved. Please let me hear from you in connection with this call for reconsideration, given this accumulating evidence.

Sincerely,

Richard Caniell
Chairperson

250-358-2586 (home)
250-358-2298 (fax)

c.

Robert Bradley, Director, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau, Health Canada
Darren Entwistle, President and CEO, Telus
Steve Jenkins, Manager, Interior South, B.C. Region, Telus
Robert Rabinovitch, President and CEO, CBC
Raymond Carnovale, CBC Chief Technology Officer
Stephen Hume, Vancouver Sun
Gary Symons, CBC reporter
Administrator, Mayor and Council of New Denver
Alex Atamanenko, MP
Don Munro, RDCK director
Healthy Housing Society
New Denver Chamber of Commerce
Valley Voice newspaper
BioInitiative Council
Penny Bonnett, researcher
TMTV-BCTV News