

Revolt news²⁹⁷ of 6-4-10 and other issues are sent bcc and free. To subscribe or unsubscribe, simply email or use the contact at the Revolt web site. Email addresses which fail for three consecutive issues will be removed in any case. For further information please see <http://www.revolt.co.uk/>.

Statements made by the editor or by other parties and quoted for information do not necessarily represent the views of Revolt. Criticism of government and industry, and grievances from members of the public, are in the nature of Revolt's work, though we try to give credit where it is due. Revolt is strictly non-party-political and regrets any offence which may be inadvertently caused.

1. UK government department DECC was found by the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) to have exaggerated claims about climate change. The two adverts have been banned. Exaggeration, whether by scientists or politicians, may seem like a way to persuade people to support their argument. But when revealed, it can damage credibility and trust, and tends to be counterproductive in the long run. It's the old story of crying wolf. It can apply to exaggerated or false assurances, as in the classic BSE affair, just as well as to scares.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/em/-/1/hi/uk_politics/8571353.stm

2. The new Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) issued a newsletter 31-3-10, its April Update. There is an item on electricity line exemptions from requiring development consent. This is just to continue existing exemptions (as in s37(2) of the Electricity Act 1989) into the new system. The key exemptions are for lines on the installer's own premises and for lines below 20kV supplying a single consumer. Otherwise s37 consent is required for overhead electric lines of any voltage.

3. The new system for electricity line consent in England and Wales derives from the Planning Act 2008. The old "section 37 consent" of the Electricity Act is replaced, for lines of 132kV or more in England and Wales, by development consent under sections 31 and 33(1)(h) of the Planning Act 2008. These high-voltage lines (132kV or over) are classed as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Presumably the old s37 consent will still apply to lower-voltage lines.

4. To keep up with IPC policy, plans and projects, visit their helpful website. There is a neat UK map showing all projects under consideration.

<http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/>

5. Felicitations to defenders of the Tyrella Beach in the Lecale AONB in Northern Ireland (news^{296.2})! John Peacocke writes: The Tyrella AONB in Co. Down NI has been saved from derogation with a ministerial visit to the freezing dunes on 31 March.

6. Northern Ireland group Safe Energy for Armagh & Tyrone (SEAT), no connection with the group defending Tyrella Beach, are still calling for letters of objection to NIE's proposal for the 400kV interconnector (news^{292.5}). Letters should be sent to Divisional Planning Manager, Planning Service Headquarters, Millennium House, 17-25 Great Victoria Street, BELFAST BT2 7BN and should refer to the Planning application for North-South 400 kV Tyrone –Cavan inter-connector with pylons and associated site works, Reference O/2009/0792/F.

7. A public meeting is scheduled for 27-28 April in Ottawa to receive testimony on Health Canada's Safety Code 6 in relation to national policy on radio frequency (RF) EMFs. The meeting is to be before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health (HESA). Concerned citizens are hoping to get suitable experts to testify to complement the expected "usual suspects" for industry and government.

8. The above public meeting in Ottawa is concerned with RF EMF. Health Canada also sets the national guidelines on ELF EMF covering power frequency. The summary position is at <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/iyh-vsv/environ/magnet-eng.php>.

9. Health Canada states its position as: "*Health Canada does not consider guidelines for the Canadian public necessary because the scientific evidence is not strong enough to conclude that exposures cause health problems for the public*". It all depends on what you mean by "*conclude*" – that is on what standard of proof. The sentence conceals the existence of substantial evidence giving rational grounds for concern, short of conclusive proof.

10. Health Canada's approach is revealed at the start of its web page when it summarises the "issue" with the words:

"There are concerns that daily exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) may cause health problems. These concerns are reflected in a number of reports that have attempted to link EMF exposure to a variety of health issues, including childhood cancer."

Note Health Canada's gratuitous use of the word "*attempted*". What does that suggest to the reader? That these scientific studies set out to fabricate a link when there really isn't one? The language tells us more about its author (Health Canada) than about the scientific evidence. It looks like Health Canada is doing the "attempting", to suppress the evidence and to spin to reassure the public.