

Right Honourable Prime Minister Justin Trudeau
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON
K1A 0A2



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

February 2, 2022

By email: justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca, pm@pm.gc.ca

Dear Right Honourable Prime Minister Justin Trudeau,

Subject: Request for clarification regarding your public comments on January 31, 2022 regarding “tin foil hats” and whether it relates to Canadians’ concerns about wireless radiation and their health

In your public address on January 31, 2022, about the “Freedom Convoy 2022” you stated:¹ “... the concerns expressed by a few people on Parliament Hill right now are not new, not surprising, are heard, but [they] are a continuation of what we have unfortunately seen in disinformation and misinformation online - conspiracy theorists about microchips and God knows what else that go with the tin foil hats.”

I am writing as the Chief Executive Officer of Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST), a national, non-partisan, not-for-profit organization that is concerned with the health risks of wireless technology. C4ST is a volunteer coalition of parents, scientists and citizens whose mission is to educate Canadians and policy makers about the dangers of exposures to unsafe levels of radiofrequency/microwave radiation from commonly used wireless devices and network antennas. We work with all levels of government to create healthier communities for children and families.

I spent my 40+ year career entirely in the technology industry before retiring as President of Microsoft Canada. I have met with experts from institutions around the world² and have concluded that our current implementation of wireless technology is not safe, and I am especially concerned with plans for 5G and wireless technologies’ impact on children.

My request is for clarification about who you meant to include as “tin foil hats” and ask that in the future you use terms that are not derogatory to Canadians with disabilities, or those who support other perspectives.

To make a statement that combines concerns about vaccination mandates, micro-chips and “tin foil hats” along with disinformation and misinformation online is inaccurate and disrespectful to Canadians who have legitimate health concerns related to exposures to wireless radiation. Those Canadians include thousands of C4ST members and the more than 20,000 Canadians who have signed the “Urgent Appeal to the Government of Canada to Suspend the 5G Rollout and to Choose Safe and Reliable Fibre Connections”.³

There is more than ample scientific evidence to support health concerns. More than 250 scientists from 44 nations, who have published more than 2,000 peer-reviewed papers on the biological or health effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (EMF) radiation, made the following statement on May 11, 2015⁴: “These findings justify our appeal to the United Nations (UN) and, all member States in the world, to encourage the World Health Organization (WHO) to exert strong leadership in fostering the development of more protective EMF guidelines, encouraging precautionary measures, and educating the public about health risks, particularly risk to children and fetal development. By not taking action, the WHO is failing to fulfill its role as the preeminent international public health agency.”

In 2011, the World Health Organization’s International Agency for Research on Cancer (WHO-IARC) classified wireless radiation in the radiofrequency/microwave range [radiofrequency electromagnetic fields, RF-EMF], which includes cell phone, cell tower antenna and Wi-Fi radiation, as a Group 2B, *possible* human carcinogen.⁵ Dr. Hardell and his brain cancer research team, whose work was used, in part, to reach this determination, is now calling for a Group 1 *known* human carcinogen classification, based on newer research.^{6,7} Asbestos and cigarette smoke are in this Group.

WHO-IARC has slated, as a high priority, the re-evaluation of this type of radiation based on more recent scientific evidence demonstrating clear evidence of carcinogenicity in laboratory animals.

On August 13, 2021, a USA Federal Appeals Court ruled⁸ that the USA Federal Communications Commission (FCC) must "provide a reasoned explanation for its determination that its guidelines adequately protect against harmful effects of exposure to radiofrequency radiation unrelated to cancer" and justify its testing procedures for cellphones and other wireless devices. Health Canada references the FCC in defending its Safety Code 6 guidelines that it claims protects Canadians. Please see Appendix A for concerns regarding Safety Code 6.

We also would call your attention to the document "*C4ST Fact-checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies, including 5G*"⁹, which corrects, what we believe is, misinformation provided by Health Canada and Innovation, Science and Economic Development.

Mr. Prime Minister, as you must be aware, there are Canadians who are adversely affected by exposure to wireless radiation, experiencing headaches, sleep disturbances, heart abnormalities and other adverse effects when over exposed to wireless devices. Many are physician diagnosed. These include people from all walks of life and sadly, also children. Some are unable to work and have lost their homes and are on disability benefits. The term "tin foil hatters" is sometimes used for these individuals. This can only further marginalize them as well as being hurtful.

We hope that you, and your staff who prepare your remarks, will always give due respect to Canadians, to those with electrosensitivity, as well as the many others who volunteer their time, energy and resources to create healthier communities for children and families by raising awareness of the health risks of exposures to radiation from wireless devices.

We look forward to your response as to what you meant by "*tin foil hats*". Was it intended to refer to those with electrosensitivity and the thousands of Canadians concerned about wireless radiation and health? If not, what did it mean?

Sincerely,



Frank Clegg

CEO, Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST)

frank@c4st.org

Cc: Anita Anand, MP Oakville, Honourable Minister of Defence

Appendix A

Concerns about Health Canada's Safety Code 6.

- Safety Code 6 was established in 1979, with very minor revisions in 1991, 1993, 1999, 2009 and 2015. Exposure limits only protect against acute heating from common wireless technologies' emissions.
- During the Safety Code 6 (2015) revision, 140 relevant studies were omitted.¹⁰
- Safety Code 6 is based on outdated science from 1929^{11,12} that assumes tissue must be heated to be harmed. This has been disproven by hundreds of studies.
- Health Canada has never completed a proper review, i.e., one based on international standards,¹³ of the peer-reviewed, published literature.
- Health Canada has never published any of its analyses on non-thermal effects to justify its claims that Safety Code 6 protects Canadians.

- Health Canada has never published any of its analyses to support its ongoing claim that staff “*continue to monitor all domestic and international scientific evidence on radiofrequency EMF and health*”. Nor has Health Canada provided summaries of what evidence has been reviewed.
- Switzerland, Italy, China and Russia have cell tower emissions standards that are 50 times more protective than Canada’s.
- Evidence from peer-reviewed literature can be found on these websites: Physicians for Safe Technology,¹⁴ C4ST,¹⁵ Environmental Health Trust¹⁶ and TechSafeSchools.¹⁷
- Dr. Anthony Miller, an eminent Canadian physician, recipient of the Order of Canada and former advisor to the WHO-IARC, has published in the peer-reviewed literature (2018)¹⁸ the scientific evidence for reclassification of wireless radiation, such as the intentional emissions from cell tower antennas, as a Group 1 *known* carcinogen by the WHO-IARC. Tobacco and cigarette smoke are in Group 1.
- The USA National Toxicology Program, National Institutes of Health’s \$30 million study found clear evidence of carcinogenicity in a large-scale animal study.^{19,20,21}
- The Italian Ramazzini Institute duplicated these findings of cancer from exposure to radiofrequency radiation at cell tower emission levels.²²
- The Switzerland BERENIS report has identified the likely mechanism of damage from radiofrequency non-ionizing radiation (NIR) (previously, it was thought that the energies from non-ionizing radiation could not damage DNA).²³
- Due diligence is recommended. See this recent Dutch court decision: “*Health Impact of Cell Tower Cannot Be Excluded*”.²⁴
- Two recent medical conferences covered some of the serious health impacts of wireless radiation. Both conferences offered Continuing Medical Education (CME) credits for medical doctors.^{25,26}
- A five-minute video where I challenge the statement made by a Rogers’ Communications president that “5G is safe” can be found at: <https://c4st.org/clegg-safety-challenge/>

¹ <https://www.cpac.ca/episode?id=25938d1e-e4a3-492e-a6a0-0d3ec00db7d5>

² I've met with academics from Harvard, Yale, Columbia, McGill, the University of Toronto as well as an expert advisor for the World Health Organization and one of the lead scientific authors of the first Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and co-recipient of the Nobel Prize with past USA Vice-President Al Gore.

³ URGENT APPEAL to the Government of Canada to Suspend the 5G Rollout and to Choose Safe and Reliable Fibre Connections: <https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/>

⁴ <https://www.emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>

⁵ WHO/IARC Press Release: https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf

⁶ Hardell, L., et al. (2013). Use of mobile phones and cordless phones is associated with increased risk for glioma and acoustic neuroma. *Pathophysiology: The Official Journal of the International Society for Pathophysiology / ISP*, 20(2), 85–110.

⁷ Coureau, G., et al. (2014). Mobile phone use and brain tumours in the CERENAT case-control study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 71(7), 514–522.

⁸ [https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/\\$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf](https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/FB976465BF00F8BD85258730004EFDF7/$file/20-1025-1910111.pdf)

⁹ C4ST Fact-checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies, including 5G. 2021. <https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/eng/fact-checker.php>

¹⁰ Canadians for Safe Technology. (2016). Summary graph of 140 studies omitted during the last revision of Safety Code 6. See Figure 3 in: References of over 200 scientific studies and six (6) reviews reporting potential harm at non-thermal (not heating) levels of radiofrequency/microwave radiation that are below Safety Code 6 (2015). http://docs.c4st.org/Studies/original-references_of_over_200_scientific_studies_showing_potential_harm_at_levels_below_safety_code_6.pdf

¹¹ https://www.magdahavas.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Cook_1980_early_research.pdf

¹² www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/consult/_2014/safety_code_6-code_securite_6/final_finale-eng.php See Section 2. MAXIMUM EXPOSURE LIMITS, paragraph 2 - first sentence

¹³ Rooney, A. A., et al. (2014). Systematic Review and Evidence Integration for Literature-Based Environmental Health Science Assessments. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1307972> <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/10.1289/ehp.1307972> Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24755067>

¹⁴ Physicians for Safe Technology: <https://mfsafetech.org/>

¹⁵ C4ST: <https://c4st.org/>

-
- ¹⁶ Environmental Health Trust: <https://ehtrust.org/science/top-experimental-epidemiological-studies/>
- ¹⁷ TechSafeSchools: <https://www.techsafeschools.org/>
- ¹⁸ Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., Davis, D. L. (2018). Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environ. Res.* 167:673–83
- ¹⁹ National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. “Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies in Hsd: Sprague Dawley SD Rats Exposed to Whole-Body Radio Frequency Radiation at a Frequency (900 MHz) and Modulations (GSM and CDMA) Used by Cell Phones.” *NTP Technical Report 595*, 2018, 384.
https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/htdocs/lt_rpts/tr595_508.pdf.
- ²⁰ Smith-Roe, S. L., Wyde, M. E., Stout, M. D., Winters, J. W., Hobbs, C. A., Shepard, K. G., ... Witt, K. L. (2020). Evaluation of the genotoxicity of cell phone radiofrequency radiation in male and female rats and mice following subchronic exposure. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 61(2), 276–290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/em.22343>.
- ²¹ National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. “Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation.” <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones/index.html>.
- ²² Falcioni, L., Bua, L., Tibaldi, E., Lauriola, M., De Angelis, L., Gnudi, F., ... Belpoggi, F. (2018). Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission. *Environmental Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037>
- ²³ Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN). (2020). BERENIS - Swiss expert group on electromagnetic fields and non-ionising radiation. Retrieved January 27, 2021, from <https://www.bafu.admin.ch/bafu/en/home/themen/thema-elektrosmog/newsletter-beratende-expertengruppe-nis--berenis-/beratende-expertengruppe-nis-berenis.html>
- ²⁴ Dutch Court: Health Impact of Cell Tower Cannot Be Excluded. (2020). <https://ehtrust.org/dutch-court-health-impact-of-cell-tower-cannot-be-excluded/>.
- ²⁵ Environmental Health Clinic, Women’s College Hospital, Toronto. (2019, May 30). Ontario Doctors Warn of Rising Health Care Costs after 5G Roll Out. Retrieved from <https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/ontario-doctors-warn-of-rising-health-care-costs-after-5g-roll-out--845905505.html>
Also: Medical Conference Teaches about Illness from Too Much Wireless Radiation. (2019, May 31).
<https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/medical-conference-teaches-about-illness-from-too-much-wireless-radiation-803331223.html>
- ²⁶ EMF Medical Conference 2021 – Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of EMF Associated Illness. (2020).
<https://emfconference2021.com/>