

December 12, 2020
Mr. Stewart Bell
Global News
Sent via email: Stewart.Bell@globalnews.ca

Subject: Need for a correction in the Global News article *CSIS warns about conspiracy theories linking COVID-19 to 5G technology*.

Dear. Mr. Bell

We believe the statement *Both 3G and 4G technology were also the subject of conspiracy theories that linked them to cancer* undoes all the proper reporting in the Dec. 4th article “CSIS warns about conspiracy theories linking COVID-19 to 5G technology.”

We request that you review the material we present here on 5G and pre-5G radiation, and subsequently report a truly balanced story or minimally correct your conspiracy statement.

First, we want to make clear that we do not believe that 5G causes COVID 19 and that we condemn the burning of 5G towers and similar acts of violence. This is also stated clearly in our media release, May 14, 2020ⁱ launching our URGENT APPEAL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO SUSPEND THE 5G ROLLOUT AND TO CHOOSE SAFE AND RELIABLE FIBRE CONNECTIONS.ⁱⁱ

To briefly provide you with our credentials, ABM is a physician-epidemiologist who worked on the monograph prepared by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) when it classified non-ionizing radiofrequency radiation (RF) as a 2B *possible* carcinogen. ABM has since written an update, published in a scientific peer-reviewed journal, providing the rationale for raising the classification to that of a Group 1, *known* carcinogenⁱⁱⁱ. Tobacco and asbestos are classified in Group 1.

FC is former president of Microsoft Canada and now CEO of the non-profit organization Canadians for Safe Technology^{iv}.

Suggesting links to cancer and radiofrequency radiation is a conspiracy, is dismissive of the hundreds of international scientists and medical doctors who have signed appeals stating their concerns about the potential harmful effects of wireless devices, especially 5G. There are hundreds of peer-reviewed, published studies that show harm to humans and our environment from wireless radiation. As of November 29, 2020, 254 EMF scientists from 44 nations have signed an appeal to the WHO and United Nations member states^v expressing their concerns about the effects of wireless radiation on humans, including 5G. These scientists have published over 2,000 studies on non-ionizing radiation in the peer-reviewed literature. The 5G Appeal^{vi} was prepared by scientists and doctors who are urgently calling for the EU to halt the roll out of 5G due to serious potential health effects from this new technology. As of April 29, 2020, 361 scientists and medical doctors have signed the appeal. The BioInitiative Group^{vii} has reviewed 1,800 studies that show harm to humans and our environment from wireless radiation without heating tissue.

On November 1st, 2018, the US National Toxicology Program of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NTP-NIEHS) released the final reports of its 10-year, \$25 million study on cell phone radiation on rodents. Results showed “*clear evidence of carcinogenic activity*”^{viii}. The NTP study was reviewed by a peer review panel of 11 pathologists and toxicologists from academia and industry and one statistician in March 2018.^{ix} These findings were confirmed by a study by the Italian Ramazzini Institute that was conducted at lower intensities (below Health Canada limits) designed to mimic radiation from cell towers.^x

In 2011, the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified RF radiation as a possible carcinogen (Group 2B – the same category as lead and DDT, at the time). In 2019, they concluded that: "based on new evidence, non-ionizing radiation (radiofrequency) should be a high priority for re-evaluation of the classification"^{xi}

Canadian and other international experts have published peer-reviewed papers with proof that radiofrequency (RF) radiation should be re-classified as a *known* human carcinogen (as are asbestos and cigarette smoking).^{xii,xiii}

The Dec. 4th report downplayed the serious concerns about 3G, 4G and 5G technology. We would like to direct you to the article written about 5G and the burning of towers (masts) by our colleague, Dr. Devra Davis, an epidemiologist with outstanding credentials. Dr. Davis, among other notable accomplishments, helped to have lead removed from gasoline and smoking banned from planes:

Burning 5G Towers Across Europe is Harming Health, Wildlife And The Climate

<https://www.ibtimes.com/burning-5g-towers-across-europe-harming-health-wildlife-climate-2961326>

Here is a brief summary of the concerns about 5G.

- a. **There has been no testing to ensure that 5G technology is safe for humans and the environment**^{xiv,xv};
- b. **Health Canada's Safety Code 6**^{xvi}, **published safety limits for human exposure to RF radiation, does not protect Canadians' health**^{xvii,xviii,xix,xx}, **nor does it address environmental safety.** Health Canada's process in updating Safety Code 6 (in 2015) was deeply flawed^{xxi,xxii,xxiii}. Our guidelines lag behind those of many other countries^{xxiv}. They are based on the premise that RF radiation causes harm only at exposure levels that produce excessive heat^{xxv,xxvi}. This premise is outdated. Hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific publications describe biological effects and harms with exposures far below Canada's limits, in humans, plants, laboratory animals and wildlife such as birds and pollinators^{xxvii, xxviii,xxix ,xxx};
- c. **Wireless transmitters emit RF radiation, which is scientifically demonstrated to cause or contribute to numerous health effects** including cancers^{xxxi,xxxii}, sperm damage^{xxxiii}, reproductive harms^{xxxiv}, learning and memory deficits^{xxxv}, neurodegenerative, cellular and genetic damage^{xxxvi,xxxvii,xxxviii}. A growing number of Canadians also experience immediate and debilitating health problems such as headaches, irregular heartbeats, cognitive difficulties and insomnia, resulting in poor quality of life^{xxxix}. All Canadians are susceptible to developing such health issues, unless their ever-increasing exposure to RF radiation is curtailed;
- d. **There are environmental harms to birds**^{xl,xli}, **pollinators**^{xlii}, **trees**^{xliii} **and other species reported by scientists,**^{xliv,xlv} however there are no environmental guidelines for RF radiation^{xlvi};
- e. **The default in Canada is for most, if not all, of our wireless devices and antennas to be "always on", i.e., transmitting;**
- f. **In 2015, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Health (HESA) published a report** entitled *Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Radiation and the Health of Canadians*^{xlvii}.

Its 12 recommendations addressed several of the issues mentioned above, and included a national awareness campaign about the harmful effects of wireless technologies and how to reduce risks. The report received all-party support and was tabled by the Conservative (2015) and Liberal (2016) majority governments. In 2010, a similar report was published^{xlviii}. None of the recommendations have been implemented^{xlix,l}.

There are significant, quality, peer-reviewed, published scientific research on this topic that we would be happy to review with you if you are interested in understanding the links between cancer and radiofrequency radiation and other harm to humans and our environment.

5G has not undergone any long-term health safety testing. That is not disputable. What we know about the pre 5G frequencies (2G, 3G and 4G) is of great concern. 5G will use these pre 5G frequencies as well as others not widely used previously for modern day devices such as cell phones. A well-balanced program of 3G, 4G and 5G fully exploring the health issues would be timely, and we urge you to consider another report on this topic.

We would be glad to be interviewed in a program on 5G and health risks. Please contact us for more information or for suggestions on others you could interview.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Anthony B. Miller

136 Charles Street,

Port Hope, ON,

L1A 1T3



Frank Clegg

Canadians For Safe Technology

P. O. Box PO Box 33

Maple Grove Village Postal Outlet

Oakville, ON, L6J 7P5

Dr. Miller, Professor Emeritus at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health of the University of Toronto, is a physician epidemiologist specializing in cancer etiology, prevention, and screening. He has been a longtime advisor to the WHO and was Senior Epidemiologist at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). He served as Director of the Epidemiology Unit of the National Cancer Institute of Canada and Chair of the Department of Preventive Medicine and Biostatistics at the University of Toronto. He has been awarded the Medal of Honour by the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer, and in 2019 was named a Member of the Order of Canada.

Frank Clegg has spent his 40 year career in the technology industry, most recently as President of Microsoft Canada. He cofounded Canadians for Safe 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 cellular antennas and to provide information on how to use wireless devices more safely. C4ST works with all levels of government to create healthier communities for children and families.

ⁱ [Urgent Appeal to Suspend 5G Rollout – Canadians For Safe Technology \(C4ST\)](#)

ⁱⁱ [Appel 5G Appeal](#)

ⁱⁱⁱ Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102)<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935118303475?via%3Dihub>

^{iv} www.c4st.org

^v International EMF Scientists Appeal. <https://www.emfscientist.org/>

^{vi} <http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/>

^{vii} <https://bioinitiative.org/>

^{viii} National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Sciences. (2018). 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, 384.

^{ix} https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/about_ntp/trpanel/2018/march/roster_20180328_508.pdf

^x [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 - ScienceDirect](#)

^{xi} *Report of the Advisory Group to Recommend Priorities for the IARC Monographs during 2020–2024* https://monographs.iarc.fr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/IARCMonographs-AGReport-Priorities_2020-2024.pdf

^{xii} Miller, A. B. et al. (2018). Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environmental Research*, 167, 673–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043> <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043> and <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30196934>

^{xiii} Hardell, L., & Carlberg, M. (2018). Comments on the US National Toxicology Program technical reports on toxicology and carcinogenesis study in rats exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 900 MHz and in mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 1,900 MHz. *International Journal of Oncology*. <https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30365129>

^{xiv} 5G Appeal of International Scientists. 5G Appeal, September 2017. <http://www.5gappeal.eu/>

^{xv} United States Senator Richard Blumenthal. (2019, February 7). Press release: At Senate Commerce Hearing, Blumenthal Raises Concerns on 5G Wireless Technology’s Potential Health Risk. Retrieved

-
- April 22, 2020, from <https://www.blumenthal.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/at-senate-commerce-hearing-blumenthal-raises-concerns-on-5g-wireless-technologys-potential-health-risks>
- ^{xvi} 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. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-risks-safety/limits-human-exposure-radiofrequency-electromagnetic-energy-range-3-300.html>
- ^{xvii} Pall, M. L. (2015). Scientific evidence contradicts findings and assumptions of Canadian Safety Panel 6: microwaves act through voltage-gated calcium channel activation to induce biological impacts at non-thermal levels, supporting a paradigm shift for microwave/lower frequency electromagnetic field action. *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 30(2), 99–116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/reveh-2015-0001>
- ^{xviii} Declaration: Doctors Call for Protection from Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure. (2014, September 28). Retrieved July 13, 2014, from <http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hc-resolutions/medical-doctors-submission-to-health-canada-english.pdf>
- ^{xix} Declaration: Scientists call for Protection from Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure. (2014, July 9). Retrieved July 13, 2014, from <http://www.c4st.org/images/documents/hc-resolutions/scientific-declaration-to-health-canada-english.pdf>
- ^{xx} Canadians for Safe Technology. (2014). Relevant scientific studies (140) omitted by Health Canada in its scientific review of draft Safety Code 6 (2014), Canada’s safety guidelines for safe exposure to radiofrequency/microwave radiation. Retrieved from <http://c4st.org/minister-health-response-hesa-recommendations/>
- ^{xxi} Webster, P. C. (2014). Federal Wi-Fi safety report is deeply flawed, say experts. *CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association Journal = Journal de l’Association Medicale Canadienne*, 186(9), E300. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.109-4785> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4050007/>
- ^{xxii} Huh, N. Y. (2014, April 15). Canadian scientists urge more research into safety of wireless technology, saying recent report downgrades cancer risk. *National Post*. Retrieved from <https://nationalpost.com/health/canadian-scientists-urge-more-research-into-safety-of-wireless-technology-saying-recent-report-downgrades-cancer-risk>
- ^{xxiii} Webster, P. C. (2015). Scientists decry Canada’s outdated Wi-Fi safety rules. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 187(9), 639–640. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.109-5061> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4467923/>
- ^{xxiv} Clegg, F. M., Sears, M., Friesen, M., Scarato, T., Metzinger, R., Russell, C., ... Miller, A. B. (2020). Building science and radiofrequency radiation: What makes smart and healthy buildings. *Building and Environment*, 176, 106324. [Figure 3] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106324>
- ^{xxv} Cook, H.J., & Steneck, Vander, Kane. (1980). Early research on the biological effects of microwave radiation: 1940-1960. *Annals of Science*, 37, 323–351. https://www.magdahavas.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Cook_1980_early_research.pdf
- ^{xxvi} 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. [See Section 2. MAXIMUM EXPOSURE LIMITS, paragraph 2 - first sentence.] <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/health-risks-safety/limits-human-exposure-radiofrequency-electromagnetic-energy-range-3-300.html>

-
- ^{xxvii} Russell, C. L. (2018). 5 G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications. *Environmental Research*, 165, 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.016>
- ^{xxviii} BioInitiative 2012 Report. (2012). A rationale for biologically based exposure standards for low-intensity electromagnetic radiation. Sections 5-11,14,15,20. C. Sage, and D.O. Carpenter (Eds) *BioInitiative Working Group*. <https://bioinitiative.org/>
- ^{xxix} Lázaro, A., A. Chroni, T. Tschulin, J. Devalez, C. Matsoukas, and T. Petanidou. “Electromagnetic Radiation of Mobile Telecommunication Antennas Affects the Abundance and Composition of Wild Pollinators.” *Journal of Insect Conservation* 20, no. 2 (April 26, 2016): 315–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-016-9868-8>
- ^{xxx} Miller, A. B., Sears, M. E., Morgan, L. L., Davis, D. L., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. L. (2019). Risks to Health and Well-Being From Radio-Frequency Radiation Emitted by Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00223>
- ^{xxxi} 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). *Environmental Research*, 167, 673–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>
- ^{xxxii} Hardell, L., & Carlberg, M. (2018). Comments on the US National Toxicology Program technical reports on toxicology and carcinogenesis study in rats exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 900 MHz and in mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 1,900 MHz. *International Journal of Oncology*. <https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606>
- ^{xxxiii} Houston, B. J., Nixon, B., King, B. V., De Iuliis, G. N., & Aitken, R. J. (2016). The effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation on sperm function. *Reproduction (Cambridge, England)*, 152(6), R263–R276. <https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-16-0126>
- ^{xxxiv} Magras, I. N., & Xenos, T. D. (1997). RF radiation-induced changes in the prenatal development of mice. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 18(6), 455–461. <https://bit.ly/2wPRFTL>
- ^{xxxv} Aldad, T. S., Gan, G., Gao, X.-B., & Taylor, H. S. (2012). Fetal radiofrequency radiation exposure from 800-1900 mhz-rated cellular telephones affects neurodevelopment and behavior in mice. *Scientific Reports*, 2, 312. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00312>
- ^{xxxvi} 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>
- ^{xxxvii} National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. (2018). 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*, 384.
- ^{xxxviii} National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Sciences. (2018). Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies in B6C3F1/n mice exposed to whole-body radio frequency radiation at a frequency (1,900 MHz) and modulations (GSM and CDMA) used by cell phones. *NTP Technical Report 596*, 260.
- ^{xxxix} Clegg, F. M., Sears, M., Friesen, M., Scarato, T., Metzinger, R., Russell, C., ... Miller, A. B. (2020).

-
- Building science and radiofrequency radiation: What makes smart and healthy buildings. *Building and Environment*, 176, 106324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106324>
- ^{xi} Engels, S., Schneider, N.-L., Lefeldt, N., Hein, C. M., Zapka, M., Michalik, A., ... Mouritsen, H. (2014). Anthropogenic electromagnetic noise disrupts magnetic compass orientation in a migratory bird. *Nature*, 509(7500), 353–356. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13290>
- ^{xii} Fernie, K. J., Bird, D. M., Dawson, R. D., & Laguë, P. C. (2000). Effects of electromagnetic fields on the reproductive success of American kestrels. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*: PBZ, 73(1), 60–65. <https://doi.org/10.1086/316726>
- ^{xiii} Expert Committee. Ministry of Environment and Forest. India. (2011). Report on possible impacts of communication towers on wildlife including birds and bees. 88 pages. Indian Environmental Portal. Retrieved January 18, 2019, from http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/files/file/final_mobile_towers_report.pdf
- ^{xiiii} Waldmann-Selsam, C., Balmori-de la Puente, A., Breunig, H., & Balmori, A. (2016). Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 572, 554–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.08.045> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27552133>
- ^{xv} Cucurachi, S., Tamis, W. L. M., Vijver, M. G., Peijnenburg, W. J. G. M., Bolte, J. F. B., & de Snoo, G. R. (2013). A review of the ecological effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF). *Environment International*, 51, 116–140. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29655646/>
- ^{xvi} Russell, C. L. (2018). 5 G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications. *Environmental Research*, 165, 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.016>
- ^{xvii} Government of Canada. (2017). Health Environment, Healthy Canadians, Healthy Economy: Strengthening the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999. Retrieved July 5, 2017, from <http://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/ENVI/Reports/RP9037962/envirp08/envirp08-e.pdf>
- ^{xviii} Government of Canada. (2015). Radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation and the health of Canadians. *Report of the Standing Committee on Health (HESA)*, Ben Lobb, Chair., 13th Report, 31pp. <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/HESA/report-13/>
- ^{xix} Government of Canada, (2010). An examination of the potential health impacts of radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation / Joy Smith, MP, Chair. : XC62-403/1-1-03E-PDF - Government of Canada Publications - Canada.ca. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/385118/publication.html>
- ^{xx} Government of Canada. (2016, October 6). Government Response - 8512-421-78 - House of Commons of Canada. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/HESA/report-2/response-8512-421-78>
- ⁱ Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST) Reply to Minister Philpott’s response to HESA 2015 Report on Safety (2017, February 16). Retrieved from <http://c4st.org/minister-health-response-hesa-recommendations/>