



Dear Electoral Candidate and Staff,

We understand that many of you have not had the opportunity to follow this important issue over the last three years as Health Canada conducted their review of Canada's wireless safety guidelines, Safety Code 6. We also understand the complexity of the issue at hand and the fact that you and your team have many issues to consider as the election date moves closer.

In a recent Nanos survey, 72% of Canadians are aware of possible health effects from electromagnetic radio frequency radiation from wireless devices. 54% are concerned or somewhat concerned about the possible health effects.

In an attempt to provide you with the key points and information to give you an understanding of this public health issue, we have put this information package together.

Included in this package is the C4ST Fact Sheet, our recent letter to Health Minister Ambrose outlining course of events to date, as well as our letter to you requesting your support.

Should you require further information, supporting documentation, or have questions, please email us at [info@c4st.org](mailto:info@c4st.org). We sincerely thank you for your consideration and look forward to adding you as leader in improving Canadian's health regarding wireless awareness and safety.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank Clegg', is positioned above the printed name.

Frank Clegg  
CEO – C4ST

**1.1 WHAT IS SAFETY CODE 6?**

Safety Code 6 is Health Canada's guideline for recommended human exposure limits to radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic energy, the kind of energy given off by various electronic devices such as cell phones and Wi-Fi, as well as broadcasting and cell phone towers.

Safety Code 6 was originally created in the 1970's for the protection of federal employees and visitors to federal buildings

- It has been expanded to include Wi-Fi, smart phones, smart meters and cell phone towers
- It has not had any major revisions in the last 30 years

**1.2 HEALTH CANADA ADMITS STUDIES SHOW HARM AT LEVELS BELOW SAFETY CODE 6**

**Mr. Andrew Adams, Health Canada:** In testimony before the Parliamentary Health Committee admitted there are studies that show harm below Safety Code 6. (1)

**Health Canada document** "determined that 36 studies were of "sufficient quality for inclusion in the Risk Assessment" in the following categories:"

- Cancer is linked in 6 studies,
- Brain/nervous system impacts in 13,
- Biochemical disruption in 16 and
- Development and/or learning behaviour impacts in 7. (2)

**1.3 CANADA'S SAFETY CODE 6 IS AMONG THE COUNTRIES WITH THE WORST GUIDELINES IN THE WORLD.**

China, Russia, Italy and Switzerland have wireless radiation safety limits 100 times safer than Canada. (3)

40% of the world's population lives in countries with codes safer than Canada.

Industry Canada does not measure for the multi-hour, multi-day exposure of today's environment; nor the cumulative effects from multiple devices

Manufacturers have safety warnings that are buried in cell phones and tablets (4)

Over 50 Canadian MD's and international scientists signed declarations stating that the current levels of Safety Code 6 do not protect Canadians (5), (6)

**1.4 CANADA HAS FALLEN BEHIND COUNTRIES SUCH AS FRANCE, TAIWAN AND BELGIUM IN PROTECTING CANADIANS FROM THE UNSAFE USE OF WIRELESS DEVICES.**

January 29, 2015 France passed the following articles into law: (7)

- A ban on the use of Wi-Fi in day care centres and nurseries for children under three years of age

- Wi-Fi must be deactivated when not in active use for digital educational activities in primary schools with Wi-Fi already in place,
- For primary schools without Wi-Fi, a consultation process must be followed. (Primary schools include pre-school, (ages 2 to 6) and elementary school, (ages 6 to 11))
- All advertisements promoting cell phones must demonstrate a device to limit the exposure of the head to radiofrequencies emitted by the cellular phones. ( eg. ear buds or speaker mode)
- A campaign of "awareness and information on the responsible and rational use of mobile devices" will be conducted.

February 15, 2015. Taiwanese lawmakers passed new legislation in which: (8)

- Parents face fines if they allow children under the age of two to use tablets and smartphones
- Youth under 18 years of age are allowed devices for a 'reasonable length of time'

March, 2014. It is illegal to market cell phones to children less than seven years of age in Belgium. (9)

## 1.5 TESTIMONY FROM WORLD RENOWNED EXPERTS TO THE PARLIAMENTARY HEALTH COMMITTEE

Dr. Devra Davis, team member Nobel Prize with Al Gore re climate change (10)

- Damaged and reduced sperm (11), (12)
- ADHD-like symptoms in offspring when pregnant mice exposed to cell phones (13)
- Co-author "The underestimation of cell phone radiation, especially in children" (14)

Dr. Anthony Miller, visiting senior scientist World Health Org., U. of Toronto (15)

- Links to brain cancer referencing Swedish and French studies (16),(17), (18)
- Overview of recent information re breast cancer (19)

Dr. Riina Bray, Women's College Hospital, Dr. Magda Havas, Trent Univ. (20), (21)

- Electrosensitivity can affect 3% of the population in the short term and up to 30% in the long term (22)

Dr. Martin Blank Columbia University (23)

- Proof of DNA damage (24), (25)

Dr. Martha Herbert Ph.D., M.D. Harvard Medical School (26)

- Links to autism (27), (28)

Dr. Meg Sears, Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute (29)

- Health Canada's recent review of Safety Code 6 fails all major criteria for the evaluation of scientific evidence based on international best practices (30)

## **1.6 SAFETY CODE 6 DOES NOT PROVIDE THE NECESSARY PROTECTION FOR CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN.**

Children are not “little adults”; their skulls are thinner

The tissues of a child’s head, including the bone marrow and brain absorb significantly more energy than those in an adult head. (31)

Radiation from a cell phone which penetrated 10% of an adult head, would affect 70% of the brain of a five year old. (32)

The Canadian Teachers’ Federation states: “Teachers and school communities have not been informed regarding the implementation of Wi-Fi and any inherent potential hazards. In the absence of a definitive statement regarding the safety of Wi- Fi that addresses concerns raised through social and regular media, teachers are rightly concerned for their personal safety and the safety of the children in their care.” (33)

Safety Code 6 guidelines are based on computer models for heating, not specific human measurements of biochemical changes. (34)

## **1.7 HEALTH CANADA WASTED OVER \$100,000 OF TAXPAYERS’ MONEY. THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF CANADA (RSC) REPORT IS NOT AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW.**

The RSC Expert Panel was conflicted; half of the panel members have strong financial ties to industry. (35)

The original panel chair resigned only after the CMAJ reported an undisclosed conflict of interest. (36)

The RSC invited Dr. Anthony Miller and Dr. Martin Blank as peer reviewers of the report. Their input challenging the report results was ignored. (37)

(1) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7892702&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1540

(2) [http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hesa/Health\\_Canada\\_Response\\_to\\_C4ST\\_References\\_of\\_140\\_Missing\\_Studies.pdf](http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hesa/Health_Canada_Response_to_C4ST_References_of_140_Missing_Studies.pdf)

(3) [http://buildingbiology.ca/media/pdf/rf\\_exposure\\_limits\\_cell\\_antennas.pdf](http://buildingbiology.ca/media/pdf/rf_exposure_limits_cell_antennas.pdf)

(4) <http://www.c4st.org/PMB>

(5) <http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hc-resolutions/medical-doctors-submission-to-health-canada-english.pdf>

(6) <http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hc-resolutions/scientific-declaration-to-health-canada-english.pdf>

(7) <http://www.complianceandrisk.com/france-publishes-law-on-electromagnetic-waves/>

(8) <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2929530/Does-toddler-play-iPad-Taiwan-makes-ILLEGAL-parents-let-children-two-use-electronic-gadgets-18s-limit-use-reasonable-lengths.html>

(9) [expatica.com/be/news/belgian-news/TMag-Mobile-phones-to-be-banned-for-children\\_259994.html](http://expatica.com/be/news/belgian-news/TMag-Mobile-phones-to-be-banned-for-children_259994.html)

(10) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7945128&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1640

(11) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15910543>

(12) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22348902>

- (13) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22428084>
- (14) <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>
- (15) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7936469&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1535
- (16) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23261330>
- (17) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4211006/>
- (18) <http://oem.bmj.com/content/early/2014/05/09/oemed-2013-101754>
- (19) <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/crim/2013/354682/>
- (20) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7945128&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1530
- (21) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7936469&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1555
- (22) [http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/cell-tower-situations/Peel-DSB/American Academy of Environmental Medicine Letter to PDSB.pdf](http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/cell-tower-situations/Peel-DSB/American%20Academy%20of%20Environmental%20Medicine%20Letter%20to%20PDSB.pdf)
- (23) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7892702&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1656
- (24) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2999986/>
- (25) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19268550>
- (26) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7945128&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1629
- (27) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24095003>
- (28) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24113318>
- (29) <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=7892702&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=41&Ses=2> at time 1540
- (30) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4080517/>
- (31) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18562780>
- (32) <http://www.ece.ncsu.edu/erl/html2/papers/lazzi/1996/NCSU-ERL-LAZZI-96-03.pdf>
- (33) <http://www.ctf-fce.ca/Research-Library/BriefToExpertpanel.pdf>
- (34) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21999884>
- (35) <http://www.cmaj.ca/content/185/11/E515.full?sid=1c87d088-0133-4029-8fdd-101ad78008c6>
- (36) <http://www.cmaj.ca/content/185/12/E573.full?sid=1c87d088-0133-4029-8fdd-101ad78008c6>
- (37) <http://news.nationalpost.com/health/canadian-scientists-urge-more-research-into-safety-of-wireless-technology-saying-recent-report-downgrades-cancer-risk>

March 23, 2015

The Honourable Rona Ambrose, P.C., M.P.  
Health Canada  
Brooke Claxton Building, Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9

Via email: [Minister\\_Ministre@hc-sc.gc.ca](mailto:Minister_Ministre@hc-sc.gc.ca)



PO Box 33  
Maple Grove Village Postal Outlet  
Oakville, ON  
L6J 7P5

Dear Minister Ambrose,

As a business leader for more than thirty years and loyal Canadian citizen, I am writing to you out of some frustration. I represent a growing number of Canadians that are disappointed in the government for failing to take into account the most recent science in providing advice on exposures to microwave radiation emitted by common wireless devices as represented in Health Canada's Safety Code 6. Please note this is the fourth letter sent to you on this matter over the past two years.

We have had several meetings with Ministry of Health representatives who hold responsibility for the radiation safety file and are deeply disappointed with the response to date. Dr. Graham Howell who has moved to the Prime Minister's office, Mr. Jess Weiser who has returned to the office of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Andrew Adams who was on leave for some time and finally a phone conversation with Mr. Clark Olsen. In all the meetings, the feedback we received was that the issues we raise are reasonable. Each attendee took several pages of notes, commented on the complexity of the file and agreed to get back to me. There have been no follow up meetings. Most recently, our request to meet with Ms. Trina Morissette, your recently announced director of policy and stakeholder relations, was declined.

Despite our considerable and respectful effort to engage on the issues, Health Canada's recent announcement of its update to Safety Code 6 fails to note new evidence that we have brought to your attention. Our evidence regarding the poor scientific practices in updating Safety Code 6, and lack of scientific process that was riddled with conflict of interest, has only increased our concern since our July, 2014 letter. As we declared in previous correspondence with your office, it has become evident that the outcome of the current revision to Safety Code 6 was pre-determined.

Without any explanation whatsoever, the revised "safety" code rejects the World Health Organization's determination that exposure to wireless radiation is a Class 2B Carcinogen (May 2011). Since protecting the health of Canadians is Health Canada's mandate, in this case it has failed. In fact, given the evidence its scientists and Directors have received, there is a strong argument that Health Canada is turning a blind eye to an extremely serious and rapidly growing health hazard affecting our country.

Other countries such as France, Israel, Belgium, Taiwan and India have responded to recent scientific evidence and the WHO Class 2B determination by passing laws and regulations that limit wireless exposure to children and pregnant women, and attempting to educate their population about safer use of wireless technology.

In its unexpected announcement of March 13<sup>th</sup>, Health Canada posted on its website that, "Safety Code 6 has always established human exposure limits that are far below the established scientific threshold for

potentially harmful effects.” This is untrue. Safety Code 6 only limits microwave exposure from wireless devices at the “thermal threshold”; when it’s strong enough to heat human skin. The selection of the thermal threshold as a danger point is arbitrary and not scientific. Science has now established, in a large number of legitimate studies, that there is serious and potentially irreparable biological damage from wireless radiation exposure well below the thermal threshold.

It is endangering of public health and safety to see this misleading information published on a government website when the truth is well known among Health Canada senior scientists. When “selling” their Safety Code they have published a misleading statement, but when pressed under oath, Health Canada’s staff has provided the complete story.

In a Quebec Superior Court on 13 Feb 2013, Health Canada Scientist James McNamee stated that Safety Code 6 accounts only for “thermal effects”. However the Royal Society in its evaluation of Safety Code 6 agreed that biological effects including increased permeability of the blood-brain barrier can occur from microwave radiation from a simple Wi-Fi router well below the thermal effect. Therefore either Health Canada’s website is currently misleading Canadians as to the guarantees claimed in Safety Code 6, or Mr. McNamee lied under oath on behalf of Health Canada.

During the same testimony, Dr. McNamee informed the Quebec Superior Court that, “There are a large number that show an adverse effect here, an adverse effect there. So, I’m not denying that there are studies showing effects, no question.”

However the Health Canada website currently denies this. There is a clear message currently published on Health Canada’s website stating: “The limits in Safety Code 6 are based on established, scientific evidence, and provide protection against all known harmful health effects for all individuals.”

Again, either the Health Canada website is deliberately omitting the large number of studies that show wireless radiation causes adverse effects, or Mr. McNamee has lied under oath.

Due to the seriousness of this error, C4ST would like clarification as to which of the above is true. We expect a response this time within 14 days. If Health Canada is aware of a “large number” of scientific papers that show adverse affects of wireless radiation, and Mr. McNamee was not lying under oath, then this information must not be withheld from Health Canada’s website.

Health Canada’s unpublished “weight of evidence” model does not follow standard scientific practices. It is being used to dismiss the strength of evidence of hundreds of studies that show Canadians are harming themselves by not using their cell phones and Wi-Fi systems safely. It appears that if there is only one more study showing no harm over the army of studies showing harm, then Health Canada will state there is no harm. This methodology results in Health Canada misleading Canadians when it suggests there is zero chance of harm even with 24/7 exposure to any number of wireless devices used in close proximity to the body. In our previous letters to you we have requested that Health Canada make public its methodology. This is standard operating procedure in the scientific process. Health Canada is keeping its methods secret. Canadians have a right to know that Health Canada is aware that scientists have proven wireless devices cause harm, but has chosen not to value it.

I can assure you that Dr. McNamee is not alone in his understanding of the many studies showing adverse effects from common wireless devices such as cell phones, tablets and Wi-Fi routers.

On Sept. 19, 2014 two experts in the review of scientific evidence met with Health Canada officials in Ottawa. In summarizing their meeting, they commented that they would give Health Canada an "F" in the review process used to evaluate Safety Code 6.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Moher and Dr. Sears presented several tools, (including software) and processes Health Canada can and should be using. None of these recommendations have been acknowledged or implemented in the recent update of Safety Code 6. In fact, in the meeting, Dr. McNamee commented that the provinces and school boards can always implement their own safety standards. However this is not how Safety Code 6 is presented. It is held up by school Board administrations as an authoritative document that overrules the requests of parents who want Wi-Fi use reduced in their schools to protect their children from this possible carcinogen.

In our July 2014 letter, we referenced 140 studies that Health Canada had omitted in its review of Safety Code 6. While we have not received an official response to our analysis, it is our understanding that a large number of these studies were considered to be in scope and of sufficient quality to be considered in the recent revision of Safety Code 6. How were they reviewed? What impact do these studies have on Safety Code 6? Why are they not mentioned on Health Canada's website today? Proper scientific analysis would include a discussion on how these studies were considered. As a point of reference, these studies show harm at levels significantly below the Safety Code 6 thermal threshold. Cancer is linked in 11 studies, brain/nervous system impacts in 44, biochemical disruption in 65 and 31 show development and/or learning behaviour impacts.

By rejecting or ignoring the "large number" of scientific articles showing adverse affects from wireless devices, Health Canada has placed our country behind others who are protecting their citizens under the strength of this evidence.

In January, 2015 France passed the following articles into law:

- All advertisements promoting cell phones must demonstrate a device to limit the exposure of the head to radiofrequencies emitted by the cellular phones. ( eg. ear buds or speaker mode)
- A campaign "of awareness and information on the responsible and rational use of mobile devices" will be conducted.
- A ban on the use of Wi-Fi in day care centres and nurseries for children less than three years of age.
- Wi-Fi must be deactivated when not in active use for digital educational activities in primary schools with Wi-Fi already in place,
- For primary schools without Wi-Fi, a consultation process is required before installing it.

(Primary schools include pre-school, (ages 2 to 6) and elementary school, (ages 6 to 11))

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Moher, PhD, Senior Scientist, Clinical Epidemiology, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute; Associate Professor, Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa; Dr. Moher is a world leader in systematic review of medical research.

Dr. Meg Sears, PhD., Adjunct Investigator, Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Research Institute and Senior Clinical Research Associate, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

In January, 2015 Taiwanese lawmakers passed new legislation in which:

- Parents face fines who allow children under the age of two to use tablets and smartphones
- Youth under 18 years of age are only allowed devices for a 'reasonable length of time'

As of March 1, 2014, it is illegal to market cell phones to children less than seven years of age in Belgium.

Also in our previous letters to you, we predicted that the Royal Society report was not an independent review of Safety Code 6 and was in fact, a waste of over \$100,000 of tax payer's money since the results were pre-determined. Our predictions turned out to be true as two of the internationally acclaimed scientists who were peer-reviewers, publicly criticized the process and the final report.<sup>2</sup>

Medical professionals and international scientists have publicly submitted that Safety Code 6 is outdated and does not protect Canadians. None of their formal submissions or statements has been acknowledged. There is no evidence that any of this expert opinion was considered in Safety Code 6's recent update.

- In July 2014 over forty Canadian physicians signed a submission calling for Health Canada to assist Canadian physicians in becoming apprised of wireless radiation exposure and related health problems that may be associated with over-exposure or sensitivity.
- Over 50 international scientists who currently research in the field of wireless radiation also signed a declaration stating that Canada's Safety Code 6 Guideline is fundamentally flawed by limiting its danger point at the thermal threshold.
- The MD's and scientists all state that the current levels of Safety Code 6 do not protect Canadians and called for Health Canada to do a more complete review. They also called for Health Canada to minimize exposure to wireless radiation, especially among children. Instead, Health Canada is now encouraging 24/7 exposure to children, even infants.
- Twenty-three experts from Canada and other countries world-wide, submitted formal documents outlining specific areas of concern, backed by science and/or clinical observations.

Minister, for over two years now, C4ST has expressed concerns over the process that Health Canada is using to update Safety Code 6. We have now been joined by dozens of medical doctors and scientific experts in Canada and around the world. It is clear, that Health Canada's "weight of evidence" approach in analyzing the science is completely outdated and under resourced. It has resulted in a message that is completely untrue: That any amount of exposure to wireless devices is safe "for all age groups, including infants and children, on a continuous (24 hours a day/seven days a week) basis." In fact "a large number of studies" by Health Canada provide evidence to the opposite, according to their own senior scientist when questioned under oath.

Today, most school boards across Canada are implementing Wi-Fi systems, subjecting students of all ages to continuous exposure to radiation based on this misleading declaration by Health Canada. The

---

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Anthony Miller, Professor Emeritus, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto and Visiting Senior Scientist in the Monographs programme in IARC September 2011-January 2012 and Dr. Martin Blank, Special Lecturer, Columbia University both state that the Report failed in its obligation to the public.

American Academy of Environmental Medicine states that 3% of students and teachers will be affected in the short term and up to 30% longer term. The Canadian Teacher's Federation has requested, "That Safety Code 6 include a recommendation for prudent use of Wi-Fi whenever possible including the recommendation to limit consistent exposure in schools by turning off wireless access points when not in use." School board trustees naturally rely on Health Canada's Safety Code 6 as the determinant of safety in their decision to install Wi-Fi in all their classrooms and recreation areas. Many have used Safety Code 6 and Health Canada's misleading statements to treat radiation from Wi-Fi and cell phones differently than other substances and agents (lead and DDT) on the WHO Class 2b Carcinogen list, which is a standard reference for prudent avoidance in schools. Similarly, Safety Code 6 is used as the basis for installing smart meters on every home, school and workplace and for installing cell towers near playgrounds, schools, and on apartment buildings.

Minister, we applaud the approach for transparency that you have clearly demonstrated within some of the scope of Health Canada. On behalf of this and future generations, we hope that the Environmental and Radiation Health Sciences Directorate makes your priority list for improvement.

We will appreciate your response as noted, within 14 days.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank Clegg', with a horizontal line underneath.

Frank Clegg  
CEO, Canadians for Safe Technology  
[frank@c4st.org](mailto:frank@c4st.org)

cc: Mr. Terence Young, MP Oakville



PO Box 33  
Maple Grove Village Postal Outlet  
Oakville, ON  
L6J 7P5

Dear Canadian Electoral Candidate,

My name is Frank Clegg and I am the CEO of C4ST, Canadians for Safe Technology a not-for-profit, totally volunteer-based, national coalition of parents, citizens and experts. On behalf of your future constituents I am requesting you support a simple but critical science-based health and safety matter currently before Parliament.

I have been a national leader in technology and child safety for decades. Throughout my career as President of Microsoft Canada I championed parental controls over the emerging internet so that parents and teachers could censor materials deemed inappropriate for young children.

My team also built a software system designed to help law enforcement track and catch child predators online, before they lured vulnerable children out of their homes. This program is now running in ten countries and is responsible for many of the arrests we read about when predators are caught with evidence on their home computers.

Today as CEO of C4ST I am heading Canada's leading edge public health education team on the potential risk of wireless devices and how to use them more safely.

I am appealing to all candidates for Canada's 42<sup>nd</sup> Parliament to protect not only our children, but all Canadians from the well published hazards of wireless radiation from everyday devices used by almost every citizen.

The process of educating Canadians via government initiatives has just passed through our Parliamentary process. During the spring of 2015 the Canadian Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health invested several sessions to investigate Health Canada's Safety Code 6, the federal guidelines for the safe use of wireless technology. The motion was presented by Liberal MP Dr. Hedy Fry, seconded by the NDP Health Critic at the time, MP Libby Davies, and was unanimously supported by all Conservative committee members. This is demonstrated to be a non-partisan issue. All parties involved are behind Canadian health and safety.

The Health Committee heard from an overwhelming number of national and international scientific and medical experts, that millions of Canadians are at risk of long term health effects including infertility and cancer. [The Fact Sheet](#) that we have included provides a brief summary of the evidence. In order to reduce the chance of ubiquitous wireless radiation from altering the lives of a generation of Canadians, the Chair of the Standing Committee on Health reported to the Government on June 17, 2015. The final report included 12 recommendations. The recommendations are listed in the attachment, organized into four categories: Education and Awareness, Electrosensitivity, improving Health Canada's process and Research.

As Canadians, we appreciate and respect your commitment to serve and improve our country by offering your time, knowledge and energy as a Member of Parliament. We are asking, if elected, for you to agree to support efforts to work with Health Canada and other appropriate agencies and organizations for the following four initiatives:

1. Develop an awareness campaign relating to the safe use of wireless technologies, such as cell phones and Wi-Fi, in key environments such as the school and home
2. Investigate, and potentially adopt, measures taken in other countries to limit the exposure of vulnerable populations, including infants, and young children in the school environment to radiofrequencies
3. Improve the testing, diagnosis, treatment and data collection regarding electromagnetic hypersensitivity and its possible impact on health in the workplace
4. Establish a database to collect adverse reaction reports to radiofrequency wireless devices.

As a technology leader and advocate for child safety in the technology sector in Canada, I invite you to commit to supporting the above initiatives along with all candidates in your riding. We realize, if you were not part of the Standing committee on Health hearings, you have not seen the evidence to support all twelve recommendations to Parliament. This process has been a non-partisan partnership achieving unanimous support among the major parties in the interest of public health and we give you this opportunity to help shepherd it through to a full part of our national health education and disease prevention strategy.

I remain committed to Canada's leadership in technology and its innovation for the benefit of our lives and our economy. Only through a national public safety education campaign will our country maintain its international advantage, by using this potentially harmful technology more safely in our daily lives.

If you agree, we would like to identify your name on our webpage, [www.c4st.org/CandidatesWhoCare](http://www.c4st.org/CandidatesWhoCare) . To demonstrate your agreement;

[CLICK HERE](#) and state your name, riding, and that you agree to be listed on our webpage as supportive of the 4 key initiatives.

I can also be reached directly at the email below. I am looking forward to your response that we will post on our website [www.c4st.org](http://www.c4st.org).

Sincerely,



Frank Clegg  
CEO, Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST)  
[frank@c4st.org](mailto:frank@c4st.org)

# Appendix

## HESA Recommendations: Education and Awareness

**Recommendation 4:** That the Canadian Medical Association, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, the College of Family Physicians of Canada and the World Health Organization consider updating their guidelines and continuing education materials regarding the diagnosis and treatment of electromagnetic hypersensitivity to ensure they are based on the latest scientific evidence and reflect the symptoms of affected Canadians.

**Recommendation 9:** That the Government of Canada develop an awareness campaign relating to the safe use of wireless technologies, such as cell phones and Wi-Fi, in key environments such as the school and home to ensure that Canadian families and children are reducing risks related to radiofrequency exposure.

**Recommendation 12:** That the Government of Canada and manufacturers consider policy measures regarding the marketing of radiation emitting devices to children under the age of 14, in order to ensure they are aware of the health risks and how they can be avoided.

## HESA Recommendations: Electrosensitivity

**Recommendation 2:** That Statistics Canada consider including questions related to electromagnetic hypersensitivity in the Canadian Community Health Survey.

**Recommendation 4:** That the Canadian Medical Association, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, the College of Family Physicians of Canada and the World Health Organization consider updating their guidelines and continuing education materials regarding the diagnosis and treatment of electromagnetic hypersensitivity to ensure they are based on the latest scientific evidence and reflect the symptoms of affected Canadians.

**Recommendation 5:** That the Government of Canada continue to provide reasonable accommodations for environmental sensitivities, including electromagnetic hypersensitivity, as required under the *Canadian Human Rights Act*.

**Recommendation 7:** That the Government of Canada establish a system for Canadians to report potential adverse reactions to radiofrequency fields

## **HESA Recommendations: Improving Health Canada's process**

**Recommendation 6:** That Health Canada ensure the openness and transparency of its processes for the review of Safety Code 6, so that all Canadians have an opportunity to be informed about the evidence considered or excluded in such reviews, that outside experts are provided full information when doing independent reviews, and that the scientific rationale for any change is clearly communicated

**Recommendation 8:** That an independent scientific body recognized by Health Canada examine whether measures taken and guidelines provided in other countries, such as France and Israel, to limit the exposure of vulnerable populations, including infants, and young children in the school environment, to radiofrequencies should be adopted in Canada.

**Recommendation 10:** That Health Canada conduct a comprehensive review of all existing literature relating to radiofrequency fields and carcinogenicity based on international best practices

## **HESA Recommendations: Research**

**Recommendation 1:** That the Government of Canada, in collaboration with the health departments of the provinces and territories, examine existing cancer data collection methods to improve the collection of information relating to wireless device use and cancer.

**Recommendation 3:** That the Government of Canada, through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, consider funding research into electromagnetic hypersensitivity testing, diagnosis and treatment, and its possible impacts on health in the workplace.

**Recommendation 11:** That the Government of Canada, through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, consider funding research into the link between radiofrequency fields and potential health effects such as cancer, genetic damage, infertility, impairment to development and behaviour, harmful effects to eyes and on the brain, cardiovascular, biological and biochemical effects.

**Further information on the HESA hearings and 12 recommendations can be found at**

**[www.c4st.org/HESARRecommendations](http://www.c4st.org/HESARRecommendations)**