

Dr. Yolande Grise,
President
Royal Society of Canada
Walter House
282 Somerset West
Ottawa, ON
K2P 0J6



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

July 15, 2013

Re: Conflict of Interest on the Expert Panel Review of Safety Code 6: Potential Health Risks of Radiofrequency Fields from Wireless Telecommunications Devices.

Dear Dr. Grise;

Regarding the response to my letter of May 25th, written at your request by Geoffrey Flynn Secretary of Expert Panels for the RSC, I am deeply disappointed by the Royal Society and its disregard for its own published rules for conflict of interest.

Since I wrote I noticed several national news outlets and the Canadian Medical Association Journal have exposed your panel Chair Daniel Krewski for a conflict he did not disclose. I have since been informed that Mr. Krewski resigned over the undisclosed conflict.

He resigned not because you or Mr. Flynn enforced your published conflict of interest rules as we requested, but only after he was “caught” with an undisclosed and significant conflict of interest.

The Royal Society must recognize its responsibility to enforce its own high standards for conflict of interest. Otherwise the Canadian public is not protected from the vested interests of industry and government agencies who may manipulate regulation in their favour. This panel is a method to check against such manipulation, not to protect it.

Other significantly conflicted panel members include John Moulder of Wisconsin. Dr. Moulder has testified that he earned hundreds of thousands of dollars from electric utility companies acting as an expert witness. He is on record many times denying the health risks of over exposure to electrical radiation.

He has co-written scholarly articles denying the potential for cancer from wireless with other of your panel members.

He has consistently denied the health effects of electrical radiation with statements such as when he testified in 2005 against a professor at the University of Illinois who developed brain cancer after exposure to unusually high levels of electrical fields. It is reported that during the hearing Dr. Moulder claimed that, "**power-frequency magnetic fields do not cause any kind of brain cancer under any exposure, intensity and duration**".

Through this type of biased testimony Dr. Moulder has carried on business as an industry consultant in the role of professional expert witness with a pattern of denying the suspected or identified risks of electrical radiation. He has no place on a panel examining whether there is risk from electrical radiation. His opinion is predetermined and his conflict is both significant and obvious.

There is a multitude of independent scientists qualified to sit on this expert panel and provide unconflicted analysis, including several who testified to the HESA panel of Canada's Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health in 2010. There is no reason to appoint conflicted scientists when unconflicted scientists are available.

I note that in your excellent editorial published in the Globe and Mail on Jan 4th of this year you wrote about the "responsibility of the government to solicit and develop the best scientific advice possible in formulating public policy."

The panel that has been assembled by the Royal Society under your leadership is so deeply conflicted as to suggest it is representing industry advice, for industry interests, and not the interests of science or public health. It is a sham. We respectfully informed you of this in our letter of May 25th and you were aware of these conflicts well before the media began to investigate, but you chose not to enforce your rules.

We request that you will correct this approach by escalating the matter beyond the level of those directly involved and enforce the strict rules of conflict of interest that Canadians expect from the Royal Society.

Since Mr. Krewski resigned, Mr. Flynn has employed the unusual tactic of writing on your website that he believes the Canadian Medical Association Journal mischaracterized his interview and that he so regrets Daniel Krewski leaving (undisclosed conflicts notwithstanding) that, "the Royal Society will not comment further on the work of the Expert Panel on Safety Code 6 until the panel's final report has been completed, peer-reviewed, and submitted to Health Canada, the sponsor of this report."

His statement is unacceptable and, as noted, highly unusual. If the CMAJ is wrong, have you sought a correction? In addition, is it the Society's policy to permit such bizarre statements on its official web site?

We respectfully reiterate our request that this panel be disbanded and a new one formed with strict adherence to the Royal Society's published conflict of interest guidelines.

Secondly we request that the conflict disclosure statements by John Moulder and the other remaining panel members be immediately made public. Full public disclosure of conflicts is standard Academic protocol and should not be kept secret from the Canadian public.

Finally, we would like to know how you arrived at these particular 8 panelists. Were they selected from a field of experts by the Royal Society? Or were these names provided by Health Canada?

I will greatly appreciate it if you personally respond to this letter, and to all of our questions.

Sincerely,

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

Frank Clegg,
CEO
C4ST - Canadians For Safe Technology
frank@c4st.org

cc: Mr. Terence Young, MP Oakville, Ontario