

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

June 19, 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,

Thank you for the response from Mr. Flynn on June 5th, and for your invitation to attend the public meetings in Ottawa. Please put my name on the agenda for a verbal submission. I will make every effort to attend in person, but reserve the privilege to submit via video conference if necessary.

I also thank you for your offer to nominate a peer reviewer. I will consult with our scientific advisors as to a neutral party who will be adequately credentialed, and adheres to the Royal Society's criteria for Independent panels, including conflict of interest guidelines.

I must be direct in stating that such participation will not change the fact that your panel selections consist of members with significant conflicts of interest. Most notably, your chair Mr. Daniel Krewski has recently been the subject of an investigation by the Canadian Medical Association Journal, which reported on June 18th that he received \$126,000 from Industry Canada in 2008/09 to convince a reluctant Canadian public that Safety Code 6 is legitimate.

In your June 5th response to our letter Mr. Flynn stated that these conflicts are "largely known to us" but in yesterday's article the Canadian Medical Association Journal states that Mr. Krewski failed to report this conflict to the Royal Society.

It begs the question, which conflicts did your panelists declare, and which did they fail to declare?

Sun Media has also reported on this conflict stating that Mr. Krewski's contract for Industry Canada was to "assist in addressing what the department believes is opposition often based on misperception and misinformation with respect to cellphone antennas."

In order to participate in this review process we require access to the conflict of interest disclosure statements made by Mr. Krewski and all panel members.

It is standard process in scientific proceedings for participants to declare their conflicts. These conflicts are publicly reported in peer reviewed journals, medical conferences, and meta study analyses.

Kindly forward the conflict of interest disclosure statements by all panel members in your response.

If other members of your panel have also failed to report their significant conflicts, then this panel would not withstand review under Canadian Parliamentary standards of conflict, the Prime Minister's Office or any other legal or public standard for conflict of interest. Given the importance of the task for this panel the highest standard must be adhered to, not a relaxed one.

There must be a separation between an industry and the regulation that controls it. Safety Code 6 has been the deferential document used by every level of Canadian government to avoid investigating the reported health effects in dozens of situations in recent years.

Given your published conflict of interest guidelines it is unreasonable not to relieve Mr. Krewski from this assignment.

The conflicts by your other members have been adequately addressed in our previous letter and still stand despite disclosure. We still believe that this panel is so significantly conflicted that it cannot avoid making a predetermined conclusion. If you cannot disband this panel in favor of one that adheres to your own published guidelines for conflict of interest, please inform me of which authority we should report this most serious of transgressions.

Sincerely,

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

Frank Clegg,
CEO
C4ST - Citizens 4 Safe Technology
frank@c4st.org