

## 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)

October 17, 2007

Robert Bradley  
Greg Gajda  
Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau  
Health Canada

Dear Messrs. Bradley and Gajda,

I enclose herewith a copy of a flyer we have distributed in the Slokan Valley in connection with cell phone usage and our news release.

We note you did not reply to our letter urging Health Canada to suspend their approval of the cell phone transmission and usage based on the precautionary principle, this despite an abundance of opposing scientific and medical reports on health hazards generated from cell phone usage on a non-thermal basis.

Strangely, Health Canada ordered that the arthritic pain relieving drug Prexige have its usage suspended and made an order to remove the drug from shelves based on a report of *two individuals in Canada* coming down with hepatitis, this on a precautionary basis.

Is it any wonder that many observers, recognizing the contradictions, believe that Health Canada's intransigence to recognizing a huge body of scientific reports adverse to cell phone transmission and usage, and its refusal to take a precautionary approach, is shaped by the influence of the billion dollar tele-communication industry? Why should the integrity of Health Canada be thus called into question?

To further develop this subject, Mr. Norbert Duerichen delivered to me a copy of your extensive reply to his questions. The answers you made show a laudable endeavor to be informative, but your text contains in it a number of factors that greatly contribute to the growing resistance and disbelief in Health Canada's assurance of safety in cell phone usage.

For instance, you state research has been carried out on rodents (not humans) in terms of long duration exposure; and in response to the query as to how present research deals with the effects of increased cell phone usage (in number of calls per day or duration), as contrasted to the highly unrealistic "average" used in the past of two calls per week, you reply that since the Bureau,

“of which I am a part, does not carry out epidemiological studies, I would not be in a position to answer . . .”

If Health Canada has not conducted epidemiological studies, why has it not? And if it relies on studies by other scientists, is not Health Canada the very forum created to siphon through reports from various years and authors in order to present them to the public?

How can you, or any other spokesmen for Health Canada, not be in a position to cite reports dealing with increased cell-phone usage and its effects on humans, especially young people? And on the face of world-wide reports on non-thermal effects hazardous to health, how can you ignore earthquake fractures in your science?

These replies defy the logic of your safety assurance. And for that matter, why should the writer (Mr. Duerichen) be told to contact the authors of the research papers on extended usage when the Radiation Bureau surely exists to vet, correlate, assess just such studies, and all others, in order to arrive at determinable, reliable, inclusive answers in support of the Bureau's assurances of cell phone safety?

Is it not a fact that there are a considerable number of reports by legitimate scientists and medical doctors who do report on the effects of increased cell phone usage and duration of calls, plus duration of overall usage, and their studies report health hazards? Why are you not concerned and involved in this?

In response to Mr. Duerichen's query as to your position in connection with the German government and their Radiation Bureau warning its citizens to not use wireless devices but to use conventional cable connections, you stated:

“The question and answer were primarily concerned with wireless internet and not cellular phone base stations.”

hence you needn't take Germany's position into account. The distinction you make is a sophisticated evasion of the fact that in both instances the subject is electromagnetic radiation from wireless devices which clearly encompasses cell phone radiation frequencies.

For instance, in Germany where wireless communication is at issue, the electromagnetic field covers frequencies applicable to WiFi / WLAN and mobile phones. In fact the German government states “ a large study is in progress to give a numerical determination of the specific whole body absorption rate of children and mobile phone technology.” Why has Health Canada not conducted such research?

When the German government states that electromagnetic radiation must be kept as low as possible and that cable connections are to be preferred, where do any similar caveats appear in Health Canada's assurances of safety in cell phone usage? What research has been conducted representing the alteration and magnification of effects when magnetic or wireless signals intercept or intermix? And doesn't the German Government also state that it distributes leaflets or information sheets, brochures and educational material for schools on the subject of mobile phone systems, *in connection with minimizing personal exposure*? Where are such caveats in Health Canada's official position?

What research does Health Canada rely upon reflecting high cell-phone usage on a daily/nightly basis, particularly by teens who can be said to veritably live on their phone communications? And what Health Canada studies take up effects for a ten-year and longer duration, which is generally considered a minimum for the manifestation of brain tumours?

The most alarming contradiction which your replies introduce is your repeated failure to answer our questions on the reason why Health Canada has limited its research to thermal effects when the health hazards reported around the world demonstrate dangers on non-thermal grounds. On this subject both you and your chief Mr. Bradley are obstinately silent. Why is this so?

Lastly, you make the statement

“Health Canada recognizes that there are studies reporting possible risks associated with cellular phone use; however, a majority of well-conducted research shows no such risk.”

This reply lamely relies on the research which evidently corroborates Health Canada’s position, while airily dismissing a deluge of well-based research as *not* well-conducted. Would you consign the BioInitiative report as not well-researched or conducted? Consider its authors:

### **List of BioInitiative Participants**

#### *Organizing Committee Members*

**Carl F. Blackman\*, Ph.D.**

Founder, Former President and Full Member of the Bioelectromagnetics Society  
Raleigh, NC USA

**Martin Blank, PhD Associate Professor**

Former President and Full Member of Bioelectromagnetics Society  
Dept. of Physiology. College of Physicians and Surgeons  
Columbia University  
New York, NY USA

**Prof. Michael Kundi, PhD**

Full Member of the Bioelectromagnetics Society  
Institute of Environmental Health,  
Medical University of Vienna  
Vienna, Austria

**Cindy Sage, MA, Owner**

Full Member. Bioelectromagnetics Society  
Sage Associates  
Santa Barbara, CA USA

#### *Participants*

**David O. Carpenter, MD**

Director, Institute for Health and the Environment  
University at Albany East Campus  
Rensselaer, NY USA

**Zoreh Davanipour. DVM, PhD**

Friends Research Institute  
Los Angeles, CA USA

**David Gee, Program Chair**

Coordinator Emerging Issues and Scientific Liaison  
Strategic Knowledge and Innovation  
European Environmental Agency  
Copenhagen, Denmark

**Lennart Hardell, MD, PhD, Prof.**

Department of Oncology  
University Hospital  
Orebro, Sweden

**Olle Johansson, PhD, Associate Professor**

The Experimental Dermatology Unit.  
Department of Neuroscience  
Karolinska Institute  
Stockholm, Sweden

**Henry Lai, PhD**

Department of Bioengineering  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington USA

**Kjell Hansson Mild, PhD, Prof.**

Former President and Full Member of  
Bioelectromagnetics Society  
Board Member, European Bioelectromagnetics  
Society (EBEA)  
Umea University, Department of Radiation  
Physics  
Umeå, Sweden

**Eugene L. Sobel, PhD**

Friends Research Institute  
Los Angeles, CA USA

**Zhengping Xu, PhD****Guangdi Chen, PhD**

Bioelectromagnetics Laboratory,  
Zhejiang University School of Medicine  
Hangzhou . People's Republic of China

*Reviewers (partial)***James B. Burch, PhD**

Arnold School of Public Health

University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC USA

**Nancy Evans, BS**

Health Science Consultant  
San Francisco, CA USA

**Stanton Glanz, PhD**

University of California, San Francisco  
Center for Tobacco Control Research and  
Education  
Cardiovascular Research Institute, Institute for  
Health Policy Studies  
San Francisco, CA USA

**Denis Henshaw, PhD**

Professor of Physics  
Human Radiation Effects Group  
Wills Physics Laboratory  
Bristol University, Bristol, UK

**Samuel Milham, MD**

Washington State Department of Health (retired)  
Olympia, Washington

**Louis Slesin, PhD**

Microwave News  
New York, NY USA

Are these scientific and medical mavericks unworthy of an in-depth review of their findings? Does your airy dismissal to me in a recent letter of its 610 pages as “old literature” represent an objective, inquiring scientific attitude about a subject of much public and scientific contention?

The enclosures reached in the BioInitiative omnibus report states, among other observations and directives:

“Good public health policy requires preventative action proportionate to the potential risk of harm and the public health consequences of not taking action . . . no assertion of safety at any level of wireless exposure (chronic exposure) can be made at this time”

Prudent Public Health Planning  
Page 18 and page 21

One has to consider Health Canada’s seemingly blithe positive assurances of complete safety in cell phone usage against the massive compendium of reports the BioInitiative Report presents.

Consider, against this, the Pfizer appeal to the European Court of Justice in 2002, when it sought to have an adverse judgment overturned connected to the sale of antibiotics as

growth promoters in animals on the basis of insufficient scientific evidence. The Court ruled against Pfizer setting forth the grounds for the adoption of precautionary principles in circumstances of scientific uncertainty, connected to wide-spread, if low, public exposure to a potentially serious threat. Is the Health Canada position as to cell phones so different from that of Pfizer?

The response of Health Canada has been stubbornly and alarmingly indifferent to all the facts cited to you and Mr. Bradley. This stone-wall attitude hardly inspires confidence particularly when the nature of the scientific uncertainty has enough corroborating evidence in studies for non-thermal effects as to warrant a responsive, concerned and enlarged outlook, something which Health Canada has conspicuously not demonstrated.

If Health Canada's standing (as in its reliability for safety assurances) is being assaulted and denigrated, is it not through the factors which I have repeatedly pointed out? This is to say that the Radiation Bureau's see-no-evil stance has been assiduously injuring both its reputation and sense of reliability, given the reports of health hazards it ignores.

In the last letters written to you the hard questions have been repeatedly ignored. As I wrote to Mr. Bradley, this irresponsiveness has given rise to enormous frustration, contributing to the irate tone which characterize some of my communications. Ever since the BioInitiative Report, and your Bureau's complete disinterest in it, you have, by this attitude, gravely injured your standing in the eyes of many concerned citizens. Don't you think the public's health concerns deserve better than this?

Frankly, Health Canada seems surprisingly stubborn in ignoring the requirement to broaden its testing standards to include non-thermal effects hazardous to health, as have been reported world-wide. This resistance impeaches Health Canada's scientific standing, so much does it resemble the Tele-Communication industry's position. We continue to urge Health Canada to adopt a precautionary approach, temporarily rescinding your present edict that cell phone usage is safe, at least for the term of a new and extensive inquiry into non-thermal hazards, using duration, increased hourly usage of cell phones by the public and on-the-ground studies of the effects for an enlarged and enlightened approach. This is essentially the solution put forth in the flyer.

The adoption of the precautionary principle is the most basic requirement demanded by these circumstances. And, I might say, it should be a corollary to the action taken by Health Canada as to Prexige. In the juxtaposition of these instances, as our news release points out, you are left in a contradiction. We earnestly solicit a comprehensive reply from you or Mr. Bradley, taking up these issues and all those posed in our earlier letters which have been long ignored.

Sincerely,

*Richard Caniell*  
Chairperson