

Radiation Protection Incorporated.

Electrical Industry operatives embedded within our health agencies ensure that allowable exposure levels to Electromagnetic Radiation remain dangerously high. Consequently regulations are more for the protection of corporations from citizen actions than to actually protect citizens from harm. This situation has destroyed the credibility of our health officials.

-Walt McGinnis-

In Canada, the creation of rules and guidelines pertaining to the protection of public health fall under provincial jurisdiction. Provincial ministries of health rely on the recommendations of their respective chief medical health officers for setting regulations allegedly to protect the public from harm. For example, each province has different regulations to limit public exposure to the toxic substances in cigarette smoke. They could also limit the public's exposure to the toxic energy emitted from Electromagnetic (EM) Radiation-producing devices such as wireless internet, cordless and cellular telephone systems, baby monitors etc, if they chose to do so.

The setting more protective exposure limits could be based upon the thousands of scientific studies that show that everyday levels of exposure to EM Radiation is causing illness. But our health ministries refuse to do so. This article is about how our B.C. Chief Medical Health Officer has been able to dodge this responsibility, aided and abetted by individuals in Health Canada, in the World Health Organization, and in the international standard setting agencies, all to the benefit of the electrical industry.

(1) (2) Footnotes.

Failure of governments to do adequate research into independent scientific findings results in their relying largely on carefully-selected studies funded by the only entities paying for studies in North America – those corporate advisors that have stood to gain vast advantages from keeping allowable limits high, all at the expense of declining public health.

Below I have listed some of the individuals involved in keeping biologically based EM Radiation exposure regulations from being established in Canada.

(1) Dr. Michael Repacholi - manufacturing scientific consent.

On top of this pyramid of deception is Dr. Michael Repacholi. He headed the Committee for the Project into Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs), by the World Health Organization (WHO), from 1996 until July 2007. Part of this committee's job was to set exposure standards. These standards limit how much EM Radiation a product or broadcasting or other wireless transmission system is allowed to emit.

Repacholi is an Emeritus Chairman of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) since 1996. He is primarily responsible for the lax and unprotective EMR exposure guidelines that are still used today by the ICNIRP. He is a co author of Safety Code Six, Canada's existing safety standards.(3) No other person world- wide has had as much impact on keeping EM Radiation exposure standards so dangerously high.

In 2006 while working as the head of the WHO's EMF committee, it was discovered that Mike was accepting \$150,000 per year from industry sources. This revelation confirmed prevailing doubts in the independent, non-industry scientific community as to Repacholi's impartiality, therefore qualifications in the setting of exposure limits. Public policy was seen to be unduly influenced by those with a vested interest in maintaining the extremely high allowable radiation exposure levels in use today. Consequently Mike was obliged to resign, and to work directly for the electrical, wireless and Telecommunications sector.

As long as the WHO and ICNIRP remain associated with Mike Repacholi, all their proclamations regarding exposure to EM Radiation are not credible.

Early in his career Repacholi was an advocate for more precautionary non- thermal regulations. In his 1997 study, he reported that genetically-engineered mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation (RFR), exhibited a significant increase in lymphoma. Mike stopped talking about non-thermal health effects however at about the same time as research funding began rolling in from industry sources.

Repacholi is now an industry consultant using the biased reports he created while working for the WHO and the telecommunications industry, as evidence that the association between EMF's and disease is "very weak". It seems there is no limit in his ideology regarding stretching the truth.

For instance, there have been several large scale epidemiological studies on EMF's and childhood leukemia. These studies have shown that there is a doubling of the risk of leukemia in children as well as many other adverse effects in kids and adults who live near power lines, when exposed to magnetic fields as low as 2 to 4 Mg (milligauss)

over a long term. And what was Mike Repacholi's response to this research in official circles? Incredibly he claims that: "the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence suggests that exposure limits below 10,000 milligauss will result in no health benefit." (Microwave News, Nov 13, 2006).

If you have trouble with the arithmetic, Repacholi claims an exposure *5000 times* higher than what has been shown to double a child's chances of developing leukemia as safe.

This is the man that our health authorities have so much confidence in. Is something very wrong here?

(2) Dr. Maria Stuchly - the Military/ Industrial/ Educational Complex

Dr. Stuchly was Health Canada's chief EM Radiation researcher at the time she authored Safety Code Six. She was also a Director of the industry-funded Board of the Wireless Information Resource Centre (WIRC) that claimed to be an independent, non-profit organization. She served as President of the Bioelectromagnetics Society, whose newsletter is funded by Motorola, in 1987, and as Vice-President of the International Union of Radio Science (URSI) in 1996. Maria's largely industry-funded papers on the biological effects of electromagnetic radiation are often cited by other professionals in the field.

Ironically, early in her career Stuchly had teamed up with Repacholi in calling for EMR guidelines based on biological effects, rather than focusing on the false metric of body tissue heating. But in the early 80's her opinion on this also changed; and it appears that she no longer saw the need for non-thermal regulations. In 1986, with the help of Dr. Repacholi, Maria co-authored Health Canada's revision of Safety Code Six. Not so coincidentally, this change of position occurred just before cellular telephones and their networks were rolled out and just as the wide-spread use of personal computers was getting underway. And these two technologies have now introduced an unprecedented burden of EM radiation exposure on a already beleaguered environment. As expected, the recommendations of such industry-funded scientists have ignored thousands of studies with inconvenient findings.

Dr. Stuchly was rewarded for all her hard work at Health Canada by receiving a chair at the University of Victoria Electrical Engineering Department where millions of industry and military research dollars rolled in. One of her major research projects was developing electromagnetic weapons for the military. I had a tour of the electrical lab and was given demonstrations by her eager students of their devices. Paradoxically, Maria was developing electromagnetic weapons for the military using the same frequencies that she claimed were safe for the public. An access to information request in the 1990's revealed that she had 56 different military and industrial funders for her research.

Strangely, when I contacted the University in 2010 they claimed to have no records of this research. One might think that perhaps they are trying to hide something. This casts a cloud on the credibility of all industry-funded research at the University of Victoria and elsewhere.

Maria Stuchly is another person in whom our Chief Medical Health Officer has complete trust.

(3) **“Dr” Mary McBride- Academic Fraud at the BC Cancer Agency,**

Mary McBride has a long history of public statements declaring that exposure to EM Radiation was not associated with illness. Our health authorities have relied heavily on her opinions, and the corporate media has quoted her numerous times over the years.

Recently it was found that Mary was not a doctor after all, although for 13 years she was listed as such on the BC Cancer Foundation’s website. So the Foundation has knocked the “Dr” off the front of her name and she is now just Ms. McBride. The Cancer Foundation seems to have no problem with Mary’s lapse in good judgment. She is still listed as a senior researcher. They certainly are not launching a full-scale review of all her work.

Here is part of a letter written by Colwood resident and writer/researcher Sharon Noble, to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Health, regarding Ms. McBride:

“I would like to provide some information about the potential significance of this for those of you who may never have heard of Mary McBride. She has worked on many important panels and studies: Interphone Study with Daniel Krewski, Health Canada's Royal Panel to review the adequacy of Safety Code 6; Industry Canada's Antenna Siting Policy, just to name a few. Many of the studies upon which she has worked have been funded to a significant degree, if not entirely, by the telecommunications industry.”

It seems that Mary is not about to bite the hand that feeds her.

Treating cancer is big business. There is certainly no shortage of industry and private funding for the BC Cancer Foundation. Twenty seven million dollars was donated last year, (2009), and Telus donated 1 million dollars alone.

The BC Cancer Agency has over 2500 employees on the provincial government payroll. It seems strange that most of their research is on genetic causes of cancer when in reality 80% of cancers are caused by environmental rather than genetic factors. It appears that not finding the causes of cancer is an even larger business. I can not imagine what they all do, but you can count on one thing for sure: that none of the employees of the Cancer

industry are going to find a link between EM Radiation exposure and cancer in the near future.(4). Our chief medical health officer seems to like this arrangement just fine.

The BC Cancer Foundation has collected millions of dollars of donations as a result of Mary McBride's industry-friendly activities. She will continue to attract millions of dollars in donations from the telecommunications industry to the Foundation. This situation calls into question the independence of this organization from those who provide its funding. There would seem to be priorities involved that are over and above protecting public health and therefore their opinions are not credible.

(4) Randy Ross- Head, Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection Services, BC CDC. A career devoted to misleading the public about Safety Code Six

About 15 years ago, I called the BC Radiation Protection Branch - the people who are supposed to be working to protect public health – to air my concerns regarding EM Radiation exposure. Randy assured me that power lines and household wiring emitted radiation hundreds of times below what was safe. I looked at the Safety Code Six table and there it was, 1000 milligauss was the maximum allowable 24 hour exposure level. (Since then, Health Canada has eliminated standards for power frequency electromagnetic radiation (EMR), relying instead for this frequency range upon the limit values used by ICNIRP levels). Then I looked at the studies that showed a doubling of childhood leukemia for long-term exposures starting at 4 milligauss. I called Randy several times pondering how could there be such a wide discrepancy between the numbers in the studies and the allowable limits in the regulations. He offered no explanation.

Finally one night while contemplating this dilemma I sat bolt upright in bed. I got it; we had to be talking about two totally different effects. Safety Code Six had to be covering something totally unrelated to adverse health effects. I got up in the morning and instead of calling Mr. Ross I called the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) who followed guidelines similar to Safety Code Six. They explained to me in no uncertain terms that I was right, and that the existing regulations had nothing to do with limiting risk of disease from so called long term, low-level exposures. The truth was that these guidelines dealt exclusively with the heating of tissue.

The person from the EPA explained that guidelines like Safety Code Six are what are known as thermal exposure standards that protect people from being heated up or burned by exposure to extremely high levels of EM Radiation. This is what happens to tissue in a microwave oven for example. It has nothing to do with diseases processes that occur at exposures thousands of times less than what it takes to heat tissue.

When the public expresses their concerns regarding getting sick from EM Radiation exposure and Mr. Ross quotes Canada's very lax "Safety Code Six" guidelines to assure them they are safe, he is deliberately deceiving them. For the past 15 years Ross has artfully avoided making the distinction between thermal and non thermal health effects. The Radiation Protection Services of BC has allowed this deception to go on for years and therefore are not credible.

CONCLUSION

In my opinion the only way to create protective exposure guidelines is to insist that our provincial medical health officer and other health protection officials do their job to protect citizens from all threats to human and environmental health – as described in the Health Act. This includes taking the same kind of precautionary action as the great, Canadian-born pharmacologist Dr. Frances Kelsey did when, in 1960, in her first assignment as a reviewer for the U.S. Food and Drug administration (FDA), she refused to approve the infamous drug thalidomide for the US market.

She was pressured heavily by the drug industry, but held her ground, and in 1962, was awarded by President John Kennedy, the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, for having prevented by her diligence, thousands of birth deformities in that country. Meanwhile in Europe and Canada no such diligence or courage among those charged with public health protection was evident, and many thousands of children were born severely deformed as a direct result. It is time to insist that our health protection officials take their role seriously. It is inappropriate for them to rely on advisors loyal to corporate interests, or biased science.

Our health officials have both the authority as well as the duty to make recommendations to the Ministry of Health – based upon a full and unprejudiced review of all studies, not simply those which – in the case of EMR – appear to show no harmful effects. Nor should these officials have the right to ignore the preponderance of studies showing adverse bio-effects at fractions of the official allowable levels.

What most Canadians do not understand is that all our Provincial Health officers already have the authority to set public EM Radiation exposure guidelines that are stricter than Health Canada's guidelines.

That is what they are doing now in B.C. with the tightening of bylaws for tanning salons in order to protect young people from over exposure to UV electromagnetic radiation.

The activities of these people are only some of the players in the EM Radiation deception game. There are many others. Model citizens Denis and Sharon Noble from

Colwood, British Columbia have done a massive amount of work exposing conflicts of interest amongst scientists and regulators involved in Radiation Protection in Health Canada. I urge everyone to read their letter to the Auditor General as well as their petition. It is attached to the end of this paper. (5)

The next time you hear the line from your Chief Medical Health Officer saying there is no credible evidence that shows that EM radiation is harmful at non thermal levels of exposure remember it is these health authorities themselves that have no credibility. Regarding the consensus amongst scientists that EM Radiation is posing no harm to humans, remember that this is merely a consensus amongst corporate-funded, corporate-controlled scientists and their compliant collaborators in our health regulatory agencies.

-Walt McGinnis Electrician/EM radiation Tester Co chairman EM Radiation Health Alliance of BC. emf@islandnet.com 250 652 2554

Many thanks to my good friend and fellow EM Radiation Tester Christopher Anderson for editing this article.

Footnotes

(1)

This is a story where the major players are shrouded in secrecy, and where hidden agendas abound. How can there be so much evidence that EM Radiation is harmful and still there is are so few regulations? How is it possible that so few people could control a world wide effort to keep regulations from being formed? As Winston Churchill once said about Stalin's Russia, "It is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma; but perhaps there is a key."

In this case the key is the interests of the people who control global corporations.

The electrical / telecommunications industry does not want biologically based, public exposure regulations. The people who own General Electric, Nortel, Bell, Cisco Systems, Microsoft, Boeing , Raytheon , Mattel, and so on, do not want stricter standards because that would mean they would have to improve all their products and systems to reduce exposure. This would not only be very costly but it would mean having to eliminate some of their technologies all together. This is a chance they are not willing to take and so they will do almost anything to avoid it. They have their operatives in Health Canada, in our cancer research agencies, in our universities, and in the committees that review evidence of harm. These elites pretty well set the agenda as to what is reported in the corporate owned press and they control what research gets done.

I recommend you read the paper by Don Maish , "*Conflict of Interest and Bias in Health Advisory Committees: A case study of the WHO's EMF Task Group.*" He outlines the issues around corporate medaling in government operations. (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/12447399/Conflict-of-Interest-and-Bias-in-Health-Advisory-Committees-a-case->

[study-of-the-WHOs-EMF-Task-Group](#)).

No one can dispute that those controlling the electrical and telecom industry are some of the richest and most powerful people in the world. In my opinion they have created a sort of technocratic tyranny in which little gets said or done without their approval. These are the people who not only profit from technological advancements like cordless and cellular telephones, wireless internet systems, wireless electric meters etc. They make even more profits from creating the machinery of warfare including nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. They are the nameless and faceless global elites that pretty well have an iron grip on the global economy right now. These elites have to have a public face to speak and act for them to manipulate and control the research, the universities, the media, and our health authorities. That is where the folks listed in the article come in. They get paid to do the dirty work.

Corporations have used our own laws against us. The *Radiocommunication Act* of Canada for example, is the legal battering ram that corporations have used to smash through municipal and provincial development and zoning laws and erect microwave transmitters for cell phone systems. This act was written by the industry for the industry. Basically no community can stop a Telecommunications Corporation from putting a transmitter in their neighborhood if the company has leased or purchased the property legally.

“8. Are licensees required to comply with zoning bylaws?

[Updated on April 1, 2008] <http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf08788.html>

There are many provincial and local requirements such as municipal zoning bylaws that relate only incidentally to radiocommunication and are outside the purview of federal law. That being said, radiocommunication is a field exclusively within the legislative competence of the federal government. Therefore, matters that affect the establishment of federally authorized radio stations are clearly governed by the Radiocommunication Act and the policies there under.

However, Industry Canada's policy is to seek meaningful local input with respect to antenna siting. As outlined in the Department's Client Procedures Circular [CPC-2-0-03](#), Industry Canada requires proponents to work with local land-use authorities and to accommodate reasonable local requirements. On occasion, local requirements may unduly impede the deployment of radiocommunication facilities or land-use authorities and proponents may not be able to reach concurrence with respect to local requirements. In those cases, proponents can petition Industry Canada for a decision in accordance with [CPC-2-0-03](#)”

Fifteen years of personal experience on this issue tells me that this is all bureaucratic mumbo jumbo. No one can stop a transmitter from being installed including our own federal Minister of Industry. This is what I mean by a technocratic tyranny. The rationale behind the safety of wireless technologies was also created by the industry for the

industry in the form of a document called Safety Code Six.

(2)

If a member of the public has a concern and has evidence that EM radiation is hurting people, first the documents are submitted to your provincial chief medical health officer, who may or may not, pass it on to the Center for Disease Control, and they may or may not, pass it on to the FPTRPC, EMF Working Group* all depending upon how good they think the research is. If the evidence has made it through this gauntlet the EMF Working Group will evaluate the research and submit their conclusions back to the medical health officer who sees no need to challenge their opinions.

***FPTRPC / EMF Working Group –imbedding military and industrial interests into the Canadas health regulatory system.**

A key strategy of the electrical industry and their collaborators in government to keep Canadians confused about the hazards associated with EM Radiation is by controlling the regulatory system. They do this by keeping the process as complicated as possible.

Deep within this bureaucratic maze, lays a virtually unknown organization called “Federal Provincial Territorial Radiation Protection Committee / Electromagnetic Field Working Group”. (FPTRPC/EMF Working Group). This convoluted name helps to hide their convoluted schemes. The EMF Working Group allegedly examines the research and advises our health officers what research is acceptable. They play a key role in deciding how much EM Radiation to which Canadians can be exposed.

A member of the military sits on the EMF Working Group as did, and until very recently, an employee of BC Hydro: the two parties that stand to gain the most from lax EM radiation standards. Astonishingly, there are no EM Radiation research scientists in this group.

One does not need to have a medical background or be a scientist to be a member. The chairman of the EMF Group, by his own admission, has no professional background in the biological effects of EM Radiation exposure. Shockingly, he admits he has learned how to evaluate the validity of scientific research from being in the group.

Any government regulatory body that makes radiation-related legislation in Canada, either federally or provincially can send a delegate to this committee, although few exercise this right. The FPTRPC is not regulated by *any* government ministry however. This committee exists in a kind of legislative limbo. Various ministries appoint a delegate but no one is overseeing their work. If you were an industry or military operative what better set up could you have?

The EMF Working Group is unaccountable. It appears that the main purpose of the EMF Working group is to discredit and sequester the evidence. They do not search out evidence on their own but they do have to handle information sent to them from the public. When they reject this research however there is no process for Canadians to challenge them.

The problem for the public is that the EMF Working Group can accept or reject research and not answer to anyone. There is no ministerial oversight, no accountability to the public and no recourse if mistakes are made or if there is corruption.

When I made some inquiries to members of the group regarding their lack of credentials and their secret conflicts of interest, the chairman Lothar Doehler replied:

“I've asked that EMF working group members not respond to your queries. It's up to the FPTRPC to judge whether a person has the competence and neutrality to be a knowledgeable and unbiased member of a working group. I ask you not to e-mail members of the working group unless you have discovered new research that changes the position statements of internationally recognized scientific authorities on the subject of non-ionizing radiation protection. If you wish, we can continue to communicate through my home address.”

What he is saying here is, when Dr. Repacholi and the WHO change their mind, give us a call. As you might expect, I was not comforted by this response. Here are the email addresses of the people who are secretly deciding how much EM Radiation Canadians can safely be exposed to. These people's activities have to be placed under public scrutiny. I urge everyone reading this article to contact them and ask them why they are rejecting world class research on the harmful effects of EM Radiation.

Chair: Lothar Doehler (Ontario Labour)

Members: Randy Ross (Head Non Ionizing Radiation BC CDC)

Art Thansandote (Health Canada)

James McNamee (Health Canada)

Hughes Nappert (Industry Canada)

Vera Pachner (National Defense)

Wayne Tiefenbach (Director Radiation Safety Unit Sask)

Lothar.doehler@ontario.ca

Randy.Ross@bccdc.ca

art_thansandote@hc-sc.gc.ca

janes_mcnamee@hc-sc.gc.ca

nappert.hughes@ic.gc.ca

Pachner.v@forces.gc.ca

waynetiefenbach@gov.sk.ca

The more you look, the more secret associations between the people in the EMF Working Group, and the electrical industry and the military are exposed. It would be foolhardy for the public to trust them. It appears the only reason FPTRPC exists is to imbed military and industrial interests into the regulatory system. There is no way to revamp this group to make it functional. They should just be disbanded and replaced with an organization that is accountable to the public.

Immediately after I began my inquiries into the activities of the EMF Working Group, things began to change within the group. I was contacted by Wayne Tiefenbach informing me that chairman Major Mark Kuisma, a member of the Canadian Armed Forces had “retired”. Major Vera Pachner has replaced Major Kuisma but still has the same conflicts of interest given the military's history of exposing their members and the

general public not only to ionizing radiation (as in “depleted uranium), but also to non ionizing radiation from extensive use of radar, sonar, and the emissions from electromagnetic weapons.

Mr. Quan, from BC Hydro was abruptly taken off the committee but not for any conflict of interest reasons. He apparently did not “belong to any regulatory body that made radiation related legislation”. I guess they had not noticed that for the last 15 years.

Mr. Lothar Doehler, the person whose résumé probably read- inexperienced but very eager and a fast learner, is now the chairman

(3)

The misuse of Safety Code Six

Few people know that these guidelines are not based upon limiting EM Radiation exposure to below the level that causes disruption of normal cellular function. In fact Code Six is based solely upon how much radiation is needed to heat tissue. The disruption of normal cellular activity and your body warming up as a result of microwave exposure are two totally different responses that health authorities rarely mentioned until scientists and EM Radiation activists pressed the issue.

According to Health Canada any exposure below that which heats your body up one degree Celsius in a 6 minute time period is deemed to be safe. While the public’s definition of safety is protecting their body from disease, the Health authority’s definition of safety is limiting tissue heating. Our health officials however, artfully avoid making this distinction when informing the public.

What they do not want us to know is electromagnetic radiation triggers cells to go into diseased states at exposure levels thousands of times less than what it takes to heat your body. As long as there are no standards based upon the association with disease and exposure to EM Radiation, Canadians will continue to suffer. Witness for example the adverse health effects students and teachers are experiencing due to WI FI networks in their schools. These effects are occurring at levels of exposure well below that which heats tissue.

Health Canada claims that Code Six takes into account so called non thermal effects in the frequency range of 3 kilohertz and 100 kilohertz. This is pure sophistry. This clause affects the regulation of very few devices. It ignores non thermal effects where it really counts: in the gigahertz range where cell phones, baby monitors, cordless phones and wireless internet systems operate for example. What is ironic is even if you are only concerned about tissue heating this guideline is not adequate.

This sophistry, this subtle, tricky, superficially plausible, but generally fallacious method

of reasoning that Health Canada uses around Safety Code Six is just one example of their efforts to do the bidding for industry and exposes the corruption within this organization. The corporatist ideology behind the motivation to deceive the public is clearly defined in John Ralston Saul's seminal book "The Unconscious Civilization". http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Ralston_Saul. I recommend everyone to read it.

(4)

Scientists Report 80% of Cancer Cases Caused by Environmental & Food Carcinogens
Subject: Nat'l Cancer Institute: 80% of Cancer Cases Due to Environmental

The Environment News Service June 28, 2004

<http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/jun2004/2004-06-28-02.asp>

Environmental Factors the Major Cause of Cancer

BETHESDA, Maryland, June 28, 2004 (ENS) - Most cases of cancer are linked to environmental causes, U.S. government scientists report, and simultaneously, a second group of government researchers says the number of cancer survivors is growing in the United States. Cancer is the second leading cause of death for Americans after heart disease.

(5)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN HEALTH CANADA:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE AUDITOR GENERAL

by: Sharon Noble

Ms. Sheila Fraser
Auditor General of Canada
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G6
Re: Conflict of Interest -- Health Canada

Dear Ms. Fraser,

It was with great interest I learned that your Office has alleged conflict of interest in several departments of Government. One concerns a consultant who worked on a strategy for greenhouse emissions and later worked for organizations that received grants

from the program.

In June, 2008, I and my husband submitted a petition (#255) to your Office alleging conflict of interest in Health Canada. It included many examples of scientists either having received funding from or being affiliated with telecommunications industries. Some of these scientists are responsible for determining the safety of devices sold by these industries or the electromagnetic radiation (EMR) emitted by these devices. Others are "experts" whose research is used by Health Canada's scientists as bases for decisions. I provided many examples of Health Canada scientists refusing to consider independent studies by credible scientists which demonstrate that EMR can and does contribute to major health problems.

One, Dr. James McNamee, research scientist, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau, Health Canada, is the new EMR specialist on the editorial board of Radiation Research. He has published three negative papers on microwave genotoxicity in Radiation Research. McNamee also has written a review paper with Moulder on cell phones and cancer. Vijayalaxmi, McNamee and Maria Scarfi, an Italian researcher, are authors on 14 of the 42 negative genotox papers. Ten of their 14 negative papers were published in Radiation Research. (Microwave News, July 31, 2006)

Dr. McNamee is on the Board of Directors for the Bioelectromagnetics Society, with his term ending 2008. (www.bioelectromagnetics.org) This Society's newsletter is funded by Motorola, and its editor is Dr. Mays Swicord, director of EMR research for Motorola. (Microwave News, July 2004)

In reply to my request for examples of what Health Canada considers credible studies showing that there are no adverse health effects from non-thermal RF radiation, on March 17, 2008, Dr. McNamee sent me the following list:

- a) Krewski D, Glickman BW, Habas RW, Habbick B, Lotz WG, Mandeville R, Prato FS, Salem T, Weaver DF. Recent advances in research on radiofrequency fields and health: 2001-2003. *J Toxicol Environ Health B Crit Rev.* 10:287-318 (2007)
- b) Valberg PA, van Deventer TE, Repacholi MH. Workgroup report: base stations and wireless networks-radiofrequency (RF) exposures and health consequences. *EnvironHealth Perspect.* 115:416-424 (2007)
- c) Moulder JE, Foster KR, Erdreich LS, McNamee JP. Mobile phones, mobile phone base stations and cancer: a review. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 81:189-203 (2005)
- d) Vijayalaxmi, Obe G. Controversial cytogenic observations in mammalian somatic cells exposed to radiofrequency exposure. *Radiat Res.* 162:481-496 (2004)
- e) Ahlbom A, Green A, Kheifets L., Savitz D, Swerdlow A; ICNIRP. Epidemiology of health effects of radiofrequency exposure. *Enviro Health Perspect.* 112:1741-1754

(2004)

I decided to apply Dr. McNamee's "vigilant surveillance" to the quality and integrity of some of his sources:

a) D. Krewski is Director of the R. Samuel McLaughlin Centre for Population Risk Assessment, University of Ottawa.. According to CBC's Marketplace, Nov. 25, 2003, the Canadian Wireless and Telecommunication Association (CWTA), a cell phone industry lobby group along with its members invested \$1 million to help establish the R. Samuel McLaughlin Centre for Population Health Risk Assessment at the University of Ottawa, where Dr. Krewski is doing his cellphone research. The head of the CWTA, Peter Barnes, told CBC that the million dollars his lobby group gave to Krewski's centre has no strings attached.

Dr. Krewski also holds the position of Chair of the scientific advisory group of the Wireless Information Research Centre (WIRC). According to CBC News, Nov. 25, 2003, the WIRC is funded by the Canadian Wireless and Telecommunication Association.

Another of his positions is that of Director of IARC, the Canadian Interphone Study. Canada is the only country of the 13 participants that accepts funding from the telecommunications industry. "Krewski has about \$1million to fund his part of the IARC research, most of it came from the Canadian Wireless and Telecommunications Association, the cellphone industry lobby group." (CBC News, Nov. 25, 2003)

According to the University of Ottawa Gazette, May 10, 2001, "The Canadian project has received a grant from the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association (CWTA), which is being administered through the university-industry partnership program of the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR). CIHR is expected to fund half, with the CWTA funding the remainder. "Industry has a responsibility to contribute to health research on their products, to address questions about potential health risks associated with wireless telecommunications," he says. "The university-industry partnership program that CIHR has set up is exactly designed for this purpose."

In addition, "Roger Poirier, the man who negotiated the million dollar deal, is a consultant on the big cellphone study for IARC," as reported by CBC News, Nov. 25, 2003.

The World Health Organization (WHO), according to many observers, is closely associated with the industries they are supposed to be researching. According the WHO 2005 Annual Report, Krewski acted as the Principal Investigator in the epidemiological study of cellular telephones and head and neck cancer which was funded by CIHR and CWTA, with the databases created and coordinated by the McLaughlin Centre.

In the same WHO Report is documentation that Dr. Krewski, along with R. Habash and M. Repacholi, was the principal investigator for the study on Electromagnetic Fields and

Health which was funded by the CWTA and CIHR (\$850,000).

b) John Moulder is an industry consultant, and, according to Microwave News, July 31, 2006, "has a lucrative consulting practice on EMFs and health. Over the years, Moulder has earned hundreds of thousands of dollars disputing the existence of adverse EMF health effects, even those accepted by most other members of the EMF community."

He has worked for Radiation Research since the early 1990s and is now senior editor of it. "Over the last 16 years, only one positive paper on microwave genotoxicity has appeared in Radiation Research.... 80% of the negative papers (17 out of 21) published in Radiation Research were paid for by either industry or the U.S. Air Force."

Microwave News is "meticulously researched and thoroughly documented." Time Magazine, July 30, 1990

"the most authoritative journal on ELF fields and health." Fortune Magazine, Dec. 31, 1990

"the world's most authoritative source on EMF health risks." Washington Journalism Review, Jan/Feb 1991

c) Obe G. Vijayalaxmi, together with Moulder and some colleagues from Washington University and the U.S. Air Force had published a review paper that dismissed any possible connection between cell phones and cancer. This was published in Radiation Research. After Moulder had moved up to senior editor in 2001, he recruited Vijayalaxmi of the University of Texas in San Antonio to join the Radiation Research editorial board. Vijayalaxmi is the lead author on seven of the negative microwave-genotox papers. All were funded by the U.S. Air Force, Motorola or a combination of the two. (Microwave News, July 31, 2006)

Dr. Vijayalaxmi is treasurer for the Bioelectromagnetics Society, and will be until 2010.

Many surveys confirm that money-source influences results of research. One done by Harvard University Medical School was reported in the New York Times, June 10, 2008. In another one, Dr. Henry Lai in 2006, reported on 326 studies on EMR, finding that where the results were of no biological harm, 72% were industry funded. Of those showing biological harm, only 33% received industry funding. Yet Health Canada replied to my charges with, "The fact that some studies are either directly or indirectly funded, in whole or in part, from the wireless industry or any other sources does not constitute a valid reason to dismiss these research findings outright."

Dr. James McNamee of Health Canada supports the use of industry-funded research, arguing that the number of studies which show no biological harm outnumber those showing harm. Therefore, using the "weight of evidence" argument, he supports the current stance.

Ms. Fraser, please explain to me how this evidence, and more which I could provide, does not warrant an investigation into conflict of interest. Is our health not as important as natural resources? For years, experts have questioned Health Canada's competence and independence, yet it continues to fail to fulfill its mandate of protecting Canadians. It is well past the time for you and your office to investigate why Health Canada appears to be working for the corporations rather than the citizens of Canada.

Yours truly,
Sharon Noble

[READ PETITION #255](#)

www.emrabc.ca