

Mr. Dean Prevost
President of Connected Homes and Rogers For Business
Rogers Communications
333 Bloor St E
Toronto, ON M4W 1G9



Via email: m.crippsoliver@rci.rogers.com
Michelle Cripps, Advisor, Office of the President,
Rogers Communications

April 13th, 2021

Dear Mr. Prevost,

Re: Request: 1) for the scientific evidence upon which your statements made on March 19th at a media briefing about safety of radiofrequency radiation exposures are based; and 2) for the reasons for not choosing safe fibre-optic connections to the premises (FTTP) instead of wireless connections.

Mr. Prevost, in my previous role as President of Microsoft Canada I had the opportunity to work with Ted Rogers, John Tory and other executives at Rogers and was impressed with their commitment to Canada.

I was disappointed to hear you make, what I believe are, false statements at the Eastern Ontario Regional Network Media Briefing, March 19, 2021 regarding the Cell Gap Project.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=knsXoWMY5aE>

This may have been from misinformation you received. After reading the material contained in the appendices (following my signature), I ask that you publicly acknowledge that there are indeed serious, potentially harmful, health consequences from exposure to wireless radiofrequency (RF) radiation such as that emitted from cell tower antennas and small network antennas. However, should you have evidence from the peer-reviewed literature to conclusively show safety, I ask that you send it to me. I am especially interested in your claim that 5G is safe. We are not aware of any studies that show the long-term effects from 5G.

Mr. Prevost, given that wired connections, e.g. fibre optic cables to the premises (FTTP), are superior in many ways, please provide the reasons for not choosing safe, non-radiofrequency radiation emitting fibre-optic connections instead of wireless connections, e.g. from macro cell tower antennas and small network antennas. The opportunity is for Rogers to do as you say: provide service that *is* safe. Canadians need fibre-optic cable to the premises for fast, high-bandwidth, secure, reliable, resilient and climate-friendlier telecommunications.

Thank you for your attention to this extremely important issue. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



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

ABOUT CANADIANS FOR SAFE TECHNOLOGY (C4ST)

C4ST is a national, not-for-profit organization that is concerned with the health and safety risks of unsafe wireless technology. We are a volunteer-based coalition of parents, citizens and experts whose mission is to educate and inform Canadians and policy makers about the dangers of the exposures to unsafe levels of radiation from technology and how to use wireless devices more safely and to work with all levels of government to create healthier communities for children and families. <https://c4st.org/>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. List of cell tower and base station studies showing adverse health effects.

1. Abdel-Rassoul, G., El-Fateh, O. A., Salem, M. A., Michael, A., Farahat, F., El-Batanouny, M., & Salem, E. (2007). **Neurobehavioral effects among inhabitants around mobile phone base stations.** *Neurotoxicology*, 28(2), 434–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuro.2006.07.012>
2. Blettner, M., Schlehofer, B., Breckenkamp, J., Kowall, B., Schmiedel, S., Reis, U., ... Berg-Beckhoff, G. (2009). **Mobile phone base stations and adverse health effects: phase 1 of a population-based, cross-sectional study in Germany.** *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 66(2), 118–123. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2007.037721>
3. Bortkiewicz, A., Zmyslony, M., Szykowska, A., & Gadzicka, E. (2004). **[Subjective symptoms reported by people living in the vicinity of cellular phone base stations: review].** *Med. Pr.*, 55(4), 345–351.
4. Bortkiewicz, Alicja, Gadzicka, E., Szykowska, A., Politański, P., Mamrot, P., Szymczak, W., & Zmyslony, M. (2012). **Subjective complaints of people living near mobile phone base stations in Poland.** *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 25(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13382-012-0007-9>
5. Dode, A. C., Leão, M. M. D., Tejo, F. de A. F., Gomes, A. C. R., Dode, D. C., Dode, M. C., ... Caiaffa, W. T. (2011). **Mortality by neoplasia and cellular telephone base stations in the Belo Horizonte municipality, Minas Gerais state, Brazil.** *The Science of the Total Environment*, 409(19), 3649–3665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.05.051>
6. Eger, H., Hagen, K. U., Lucas, B., Vogel, P., & Voit, H. (2004). **[The influence of being physically near to a cell phone transmission mast on the incidence of cancer] Einfluss der räumlichen Nähe von Mobilfunkseanlagen auf die Krebsinzidenz (in German).** *Umwelt Medizin Gesellschaft - Verlag-Ges.*, 17(4), 1–7. Retrieved from <http://www.baubiologie-brandenburg.de/studien/NailaStudieOriginal.pdf>
7. Eger, H., & Jahn, M. (2010). **Specific Health Symptoms and Cell Phone Radiation in Selbitz (Bavaria, Germany)—Evidence of a Dose-Response Relationship.** *Cell*, (3). Retrieved from https://www.emrpolicy.org/science/research/docs/eger_selbitz_2009.pdf
8. Eskander, E. F., Estefan, S. F., & Abd-Rabou, A. A. (2012). **How does long term exposure to base stations and mobile phones affect human hormone profiles?** *Clinical Biochemistry*, 45(1–2), 157–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2011.11.006>
9. Gandhi, G., Naru, J., Kaur, M., & Kaur, G. (2014). **DNA and Chromosomal Damage in Residents Near a Mobile Phone Base Station.** *International Journal of Human Genetics*, 14(3–4), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09723757.2014.11886234>
10. Gandhi, Gursatej, Kaur, G., & Nisar, U. (2015). **A cross-sectional case control study on genetic damage in individuals residing in the vicinity of a mobile phone base station.** *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 34(4), 344–354. <https://doi.org/10.3109/15368378.2014.933349>
11. Gómez-Perretta, C., Navarro, E. A., Segura, J., & Portolés, M. (2013). **Subjective symptoms related to GSM radiation from mobile phone base stations: a cross-sectional study.** *BMJ Open*, 3(12), e003836. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003836>
12. Gulati, S., Kosik, P., Durdik, M., Skorvaga, M., Jakl, L., Markova, E., & Belyaev, I. (2020). **Effects of different mobile phone UMTS signals on DNA, apoptosis and oxidative stress in human**

- lymphocytes. *Environmental Pollution*, 267, 115632.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115632>**
13. Hutter, H.-P., Moshammer, H., Wallner, P., & Kundi, M. (2006). **Subjective symptoms, sleeping problems, and cognitive performance in subjects living near mobile phone base stations.** *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(5), 307–313.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2005.020784>
 14. Levitt, B. B., & Lai, H. (2010). **Biological effects from exposure to electromagnetic radiation emitted by cell tower base stations and other antenna arrays.** *Environmental Reviews*, 18, 369–395.
[https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1139/a10-903](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1139/a10-903)
 15. López, I., Félix, N., Rivera, M., Alonso, A., & Maestú, C. (2021). **What is the radiation before 5G? A correlation study between measurements in situ and in real time and epidemiological indicators in Vallecas, Madrid.** *Environmental Research*, 194, 110734.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110734>
 16. Navarro, E., Sequra, J., Portoles, M., & Gomez-Perretta de Mateo, C. (2003). **The Microwave Syndrome: A Preliminary Study in Spain.** *Electromag Biol Med*, 22, 161–169.
 17. Oberfeld, G., Enrique, N., Manuel, P., Ceferino, M., & Gomez-Perretta, C. (2004). **The Microwave Syndrome: Further Aspects of a Spanish Study.** 3rd International Workshop on Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields, Kos, Greece.
 18. Rodrigues, N. C. P., Dode, A. C., de Noronha Andrade, M. K., O'Dwyer, G., Monteiro, D. L. M., Reis, I. N. C., ... Lino, V. T. S. (2021). **The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil.** *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031229>
 19. Santini, R., Santini, P., Danze, J. M., Le Ruz, P., & Seigne, M. (2003). **[Symptoms experienced by people in vicinity of base stations: II/ Incidences of age, duration of exposure, location of subjects in relation to the antennas and other electromagnetic factors].** *Pathologie-Biologie*, 51(7), 412–415.
 20. Santini, R., Santini, P., Le Ruz, P., Danze, J. M., & Seigne, M. (2003). **Survey Study of People Living in the Vicinity of Cellular Phone Base Stations.** *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 22(1), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1081/JBC-120020353>
 21. Santini, Roger. (2002). **Study of The Health of People Living in The Vicinity of Mobile Phone Base Stations.** *Pathol Biol*, 50, 369–73. Retrieved from http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/scalar_tech/esp_scalartech23.htm
 22. Singh, K., Nagaraj, A., Yousuf, A., Ganta, S., Pareek, S., & Vishnani, P. (2016). **Effect of electromagnetic radiations from mobile phone base stations on general health and salivary function.** *Journal of International Society of Preventive & Community Dentistry*, 6(1), 54–59.
<https://doi.org/10.4103/2231-0762.175413>
 23. Sivani, S., & Sudarsanam, D. (2012). **Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review.** *Biology and Medicine*, 4(4), 202–216.
 24. Wolf, R., & Wolf, D. (2004). **Increased incidence of cancer near a cell-phone transmitter station.** *International Journal of Cancer*, 1(2). Retrieved from http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/news/20050207_israel.pdf
 25. Yakymenko, I., Sidorik, E., Kyrylenko, S., & Chekhun, V. (2011). **Long-term exposure to microwave radiation provokes cancer growth: evidences from radars and mobile communication systems.** *Experimental Oncology*, 33(2), 62–70.
 26. Zothansiyama, -, Zosangzuali, M., Lalramdinpuii, M., & Jagetia, G. C. (2017). **Impact of radiofrequency radiation on DNA damage and antioxidants in peripheral blood lymphocytes of humans residing in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations.** *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2017.1350584>

APPENDIX B. The following is a sample of the thousands of peer-reviewed studies that have shown radiofrequency (RF) radiation affects living organisms at levels below the thresholds in Canada's guidelines. Proven effects include: increased cancer risk, sperm abnormalities and DNA damage.

- Evidence from peer-reviewed literature can be found on these websites: Physicians for Safe Technology,¹ C4ST,² Environmental Health Trust³ and TechSafeSchools.⁴
- Miller et al. (2018)⁵ present the science for upgrading wireless radiation (such as that from cell tower antennas) to a Group 1 *known* carcinogen classification by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer. Asbestos and cigarette smoke are in Group 1.
- The USA National Toxicology Program, National Institutes of Health, \$30 million study found **clear evidence of carcinogenicity** in a large-scale animal study.^{6,7,8}
- The Italian Ramazzini Institute duplicated these findings of cancer from exposures to radiofrequency radiation at cell tower emission levels.⁹
- The Switzerland BERENIS report has identified the likely mechanism of damage from radiofrequency non-ionizing radiation (previously it was thought that the energies from NIR could not damage DNA).¹⁰
- There are over 30 studies showing DNA damage at exposure levels below Health Canada's Safety Code 6 (2015) limits.¹¹
- Other studies have been collated by C4ST¹² and were featured in the CBC TV program "The Secret Inside your Cell Phone" (Wendy Mesley).¹³
- C4ST recently contributed to a safe technology Appeal, which provides only a small portion of the sound science upon which our concerns are based. The Appeal includes 5G technologies. See: "Urgent Appeal to the Government of Canada to Suspend 5G and Choose Fibre Optic Connections,"¹⁴ "Supplemental Material,"¹⁵ "Engaging Your Member of Parliament (MP) about 5G" and "C4ST Fact-checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies, including 5G."¹⁶ More than 20,000 Canadians have signed the Appeal.
- US State of New Hampshire report.¹⁷ The report contains 15 recommendations to address inadequate federal protections, educate the public on risk management, engage the medical community, install safe hard-wired technology and monitor and map radiation exposures. I, along with medical and scientific experts, presented at the hearings.
- Recommendations of the Canadian House of Commons Standing Committee on Health (HESA).¹⁸ This was passed unanimously by an all-party committee. Health Canada has not done anything substantive in implementing the recommendations.
- See this recent Dutch court decision: "Health Impact of Cell Tower Cannot Be Excluded."¹⁹
- Medical doctors and other experts:
Two recent medical conferences on the issue of health impacts of wireless radiation; both offered Continuing Medical Education (CME) credits for MDs.^{20,21}
- Wired connections are always the better option compared to wireless.²²

APPENDIX C. Safety Code 6 is outdated and inadequately protective of Canadian's health.

We recognize that Health Canada is responsible for setting the safety guidelines (Safety Code 6) for the radiation from wireless technology and ISED relies on Safety Code 6 for its management of industries' use of wireless technology. However, we would like to raise the following concerns about Safety Code 6.

- **Note that Health Canada's Safety Code 6 (2015)²³ has not been updated to include much of the evidence listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.**
- Safety Code 6 was established in 1979 and has only had very minor revisions in 1991, 1993, 1999, 2009 and 2015.
- During the Safety Code 6 (2015) update, 140 studies were omitted.²⁴
- Safety Code 6 is based on the science from 1929^{25,26} that assumes that 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., a review based on international standards,²⁷ of the peer-reviewed, published literature. Nor has Health Canada ever published any of its analyses on non-thermal effects to justify its claims that Safety Code 6 protects Canadians.
- Health Canada has also never published any of its analyses to support its claim to "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.
- China, Russia, parts of Switzerland and Italy have standards that are 50 times more protective than Canada's.

¹ Physicians for Safe Technology: <https://mdsafetech.org/>

² C4ST: <https://c4st.org/>

³ Environmental Health Trust: <https://ehtrust.org/science/top-experimental-epidemiological-studies/>

⁴ TechSafeSchools: <http://techsafeschools.com/>. (2021).

⁵ Miller AB, Morgan LL, Udasin I, Davis DL. 2018. Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environ. Res.* 167:673–83

⁶ 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.

⁷ 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>

⁸ National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. "Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation." <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones/index.html>. (2020).

⁹ 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>

¹⁰ 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>

¹¹ Panagopoulos, D. J. (2019). Comparing DNA damage induced by mobile telephony and other types of man-made electromagnetic fields. *Mutation Research/Reviews in Mutation Research*, 781, 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrrev.2019.03.003>

-
- ¹² Canadians for Safe Technology. (2017, March 5). 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://c4st.org/?s=200+studies>
- ¹³ The Secret Inside Your Cellphone. CBC Marketplace. Wendy Mesley. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wm69ik_Qdb8
- ¹⁴ URGENT APPEAL to the Government of Canada to Suspend the 5G Rollout and to Choose Safe and Reliable Fibre Connections. <https://www.appel5gappeal.ca/>
- ¹⁵ Suspend 5G Appeal. Supplemental Material. <https://c4st.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Supplemental-Material-for-Suspend-5G-Canada-Appeal.pdf>
- ¹⁶ C4ST Fact-checks Government of Canada Webpages Regarding Health Risks and Wireless Technologies, including 5G. 2021. <https://c4st.org/>
- ¹⁷ Abrami, Patrick, et al. (2020). Final Report on Commission to Study the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving 5G Technology(RSA 12-K:12-14, HB 522, Ch. 260, Laws of 2019). US State of New Hampshire. <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/Statstudcomm/Committees/1474/Reports/5G%20final%20report.Pdf>, 390. f
- ¹⁸ Lobb, B. (2015). Report: Radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation and the health of Canadians Report No. 13 - HESA (41-2) - No. 13 - House of Commons of Canada, 42. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Committee/412/HESA/Reports/RP8041315/hesarp13/hesarp13-e.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ Dutch Court: Health Impact of Cell Tower Cannot Be Excluded. <https://ehtrust.org/dutch-court-health-impact-of-cell-tower-cannot-be-excluded/>. (2020).
- ²⁰ 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. <https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/medical-conference-teaches-about-illness-from-too-much-wireless-radiation-803331223.html>. (2019, May 31).
- ²¹ EMF – Medical Conference 2021. (2020). Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of EMF Associated Illness. Retrieved from <https://emfconference2021.com/>
- ²² Schoechele, Timothy. "Re-Inventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks." *National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy Washington, DC*, 2018, 156. <http://electromagnetichealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Wires.pdf>
- ²³ Health Canada. (2015). Limits of human exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic energy in the frequency range from 3 KHz to 300 GHz. Safety Code 6 (2015), 24. Retrieved from http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ewh-semt/alt_formats/pdf/consult/2014/safety_code_6-code_securite_6/final-finale-eng.pdf
- ²⁴ 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
- ²⁵ https://www.magdahavas.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Cook_1980_early_research.pdf
- ²⁶ 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
- ²⁷ 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> Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24755067>