

# REES' Pieces

## Are Radiation Emissions Harmful?

I had another column for this month almost completed, when on Sunday evening, I accidentally ended up watching 16 x 9, a documentary on Global television. It immediately captured my attention because it was talking about radiation emissions, which are causing health problems.

The main focus was the small fluorescent energy efficient light bulbs, which look exactly like the ones promoted during the Christmas season by Nova Scotia Power a couple of years ago. Apparently the main problem is the mercury contained in the bulbs, emits ultra violet rays similar to those from the sun.

I missed the first 10 minutes of the program, but the remainder of the program was enough to motivate Dorothy and me to commit to remove any of the bulbs within the next week.

Several people who had unexplainable health issues were interviewed. Try as they did, the documentary team were unable to even get an interview with the Canadian Minister of Health, but after more than two weeks, were granted an interview. My analysis of the statement made by the government representative is they will conduct some tests and abide by the test results.

During the first few minutes of my viewing, I remembered we used to see signs in restaurants and cooking areas warning pregnant women and those with a pace-maker, a microwave was in use.

Back to the television documentary, one woman interviewed suffers from Lupus, and was further confronted with itching, red blotches, and hive-like welts. The program showed an expert testing one of the bulbs in her bedside table lamp. That particular bulb was emitting at the rate of 800+, when an acceptable level was in the range of 50.

The program further stated there is no legislation or guidelines in Canada on acceptable UV emission standards; however, there is enacted legislation in Britain. Not getting very far in getting answers to their questions form Canadian government authorities, the documentary team looked to Britain for answers.

One British expert explained that people who are super sensitive to light, even those who suffer from migraines, would be more likely to be affected than others who were more resistant. Health problems like Lupus, and other similar ailments, would make a person more susceptible to light, and the bulbs could further aggravate such sensitivities.

In another segment of the program, light bulbs in a horse barn were changed back to the incandescent bulbs, when a horse or the horses and staff started suffering unexplained ailments. The camera showed one beautiful horse, and after the commercial, the owner was feeding the horse a handful of grain, and commenting about him/her feeling better.

All of this causes me to wonder, if some of the migraine-suffering students could be connected to lighting in the schools? Are staff, who work long hard hours in the classrooms also suffering the affects from radiation-emitting light fixtures?

With Thomas Edison incandescent light bulbs to be banned from use in 2012, are we going to have a better light bulb, or would our health be better off with a kerosene lamp, or for families to sit in the dark to achieve better health.

How much testing did Nova Scotia Power conduct on the new bulbs before they were promoting in a partnership with the provincial government. If they didn't do any testing, did they ask for results of research into potential problems?

If results finally show, the new energy efficient bulbs are emitting UV radiation higher than permitted; will Nova Scotia Power be equally aggressive to assist us to change back?

All of this brings to mind a question to which I don't have an answer. Does dirty electricity exist? Are there potentially harmful side affects from other appliances in hour homes, could the electrical wires coming into our homes be harmful? When I see a "so called" professional testing a regular electrical wall outlet and getting high readings, I have to wonder.

I'm going to try to get a copy of Global's 16 x 9 Documentary, and then follow up with some professionals I know, as well as ask pertinent questions of professionals within the public service.

I'd be interested in receiving comments from readers, who saw the program, or are knowledgeable about the subject.

Maurice

# Letters to the editor

*This is an open forum for your opinions and comments.*

MAIL TO: *The Shoreline Journal*, P.O. Box 41, Bass River, NS, B0M 1B0  
(902) 647-2968; Fax: 902-647-2194 Email: [maurice@theshorelinejournal.com](mailto:maurice@theshorelinejournal.com)

**Hello Maurice,**

Just had a quick glance at the letters in this month's Shoreline at the Double C and Merna Perry's letter made me cry.

I was disappointed however to see no mention of Donna Benoit's contribution to the paper - it probably slipped her mind.

I can see us now, up in her mother's loft waxing, pasting, and sorting, then driving it to Borden, PEI for printing. UGG! Nightmare alley! Bet Linda H. remembers also!

We should give Donna the credit she and her family so readily deserves for keeping the Shoreline alive and well for those six or seven years after she bought it from me.

I intend, therefore, to reply to Merna's letter with a bit of reminiscing of my own - in a light-hearted fashion with a look back through my back issues.

**Regards, Ken Kennedy**  
(Founding Publisher)

**Dear Editor:**

I would like to bring the public's attention to the process of headstone care and maintenance. Many of your readers lovingly tend to family members grave sites, planting flowers and keeping the mown grass away from the bases. However, a word of caution should be given when considering either cleaning the stone yourself or having a business clean it for you.

A number of years ago I had the pleasure of working with Certified Stone Mason Heather Lawson of Bass River on a restoration project here in the Belmont Cemeteries. Over the course of this project I began to learn that a stone is an invincible object. In time headstones, particularly the old limestone and sandstones, build up a natural coating which serves to protect the surface of the stone.

The lichen which covers many headstones causes them no harm and actually helps to protect it. If you feel the need to clean this lichen off do so with hot water and a very soft plastic scrub brush only. Once you have cleaned the stone be sure to rinse it thoroughly to remove the lichen spores which will grow back in time.

Never use any kind of chemical, especially bleach, which will damage the surface of the stone and hasten the deterioration of it. Cleaning should not be frequently repeated, as particles of stone are washed away in even the most careful cleaning procedures. Avoid sandblasting

and high pressure spraying also.

Another issue is the practice of painting the lettering in to make it more legible, this too will cause irreparable damage to the surface.

If you come across an old stone which is lying on the ground the best, short term solution for the stone is to prop it up on an angle with a piece of 2X4. This will keep the moisture from lying on the surface of the stone.

If you choose to hire a business to do work to your ancestors marker be sure they are certified to do the work properly. Keep in mind there are only a hand full of Certified Stone Masons in Nova Scotia.

The following is an interesting paragraph from an information sheet written by Deborah Trask of the N.S. Museum entitled Unless you have a Masters Degree in Chemistry, DO NOT even consider cleaning grave-stones:

"For the most part, they are not dirty. If you feel they really are dirty, you must first determine the nature of the "dirt" and the stone material. A good general rule of thumb is to experiment on your own face first, and if you are happy with the result, then that cleaning method may succeed with the stone. Also, remember that stone is a natural and generally porous material (as soft and sensitive as your skin) and you may simply push whatever it is that you find undesirable on the surface, further into the stone itself!"...

**Sincerely, Stacey Culgin**

**Dear Editor:**

I have been following the "little debate" in the editorial section for the last little while. That debate being the one that started with Mr. Spencer's views on the movie "Expelled". Now, after reading several views on each side, I find myself being drawn into the whole thing and feeling the need to add my two cents worth.

I must confess, that I hold no PhD's in anything nor have I attended any Bible colleges nor seen the 7 wonders nor been to the moon or any place further than about a 8 hour drive away from home. I am, for the most part, pretty much the normal, plain old human being. Now that we have established my credentials, let us get to the meat of things.

I have never read BeHe's book. But I do follow the whole mousetrap thing. As I understand it, his argument was that if you removed a part of it, it would no longer be a mouse-

trap. Now the argument against this, was something to the extent that you could use part for a tie clip or a paper weight or whatever. True enough, but it would no longer be a mousetrap. The example is used with regards to all of the amazing things that make up each tiny cell in our bodies. BeHe taking the stance that if you removed any part, it would no longer function correctly. That makes sense. Sure it may still be a "something" but it would not be a human cell, which we kind of need it to be since we are, in fact, human.

Now if I recall correctly, Mr. Spencer finished off a quote given by someone else. "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications, my theory would break down." But what is left out is the very next line which states "But I could find no such case." I have a small issue with that. Darwin, who could find no such case, was writing this 150 years ago. You know, back when they thought blood cells were just globs of plasma basically. He was not saying that last portion with the advantage of modern day technology and knowledge. Darwin did not even know DNA existed let alone what it would have been like, nor did he have any vague idea of what actually was within each cell of our bodies. So of course he could find no such case. So the somewhat obvious question is "has modern science found any such case in which his theory breaks down?" No scientist, but am curious to know how that applies to things like DNA and those cool little machines (for lack of a better word for them) that make up every cell in our bodies.

Now this has turned into somewhat of a theological discussion. Okay, more than somewhat of one. I do find myself wanting to draw a bit of attention to the fact that this started as a debate about Darwin and his theory of evolution and not about the existence of God. But we have, none-the-less, gotten to read opinions on that topic as well. So allow me to step away from Mr. Spencer's original debate for a quick moment or two, and toss a quick penny into that side as well.

The evil done in the world is given as the big example against God. But that is kind of unfair, isn't it? After all, we won our

independence in the beginning, did we not? Remember the story of Adam and Eve in the garden? They choose to use their God given free will to disobey - to rebel (kind of like our kids do to us) - against their Father, God. And He loved them enough to not force them into line nor wipe them out and start over, but instead He let them choose their own paths and come to Him on their own, in their own timing (again, kind of like we go through with our own children from time to time). But onto modern evils.

I have heard it said that man is naturally good at heart. I do not believe that. Simple example: think of the tiniest of things you can do wrong (sin). Probably would have to be a lie, right? But is a lie so tiny? A lie can cost you a friend, your family, a marriage. It can make you kill someone else, make someone kill you, or cause you to take your own life. Wars have been fought because of lies. So lie is actually pretty nasty. So if man were, in fact, naturally good then lying would be a rare thing. Maybe 10% of the population of the planet would ever tell a lie or not tell the truth (since not telling the truth when you have a chance to is also a lie in essence). But is that a true number? No. A more likely number is 95% or more (probably the more) do in fact lie. So since man is not good at heart and mankind has freewill, it is somewhat safe to say that we, as human beings, are quite capable of doing unspeakable things all by our lonesome. So using the evil, that we do ourselves, as an example to support there being no God hardly seems fair since it is our freewill that causes most of our own problems. It is worth noting however, that in spite of anything we do, God is willing to welcome us back anytime. Anyways that is my cent on that one.

We have all gotten to read what each side has to say. But let's face it, no one can tell you what to believe or not believe. You have your own free will that you can use to make up your own mind. Personally, I do believe in God. I did not always and once upon a time, I would have argued at least as much as some people have against the notion that there was one. That was a few years back now. But I can understand the arguments against (both God and creation), since I have been there myself. I guess the biggest thing it comes down to is that it is up to you, the reader, what you believe about life on this planet and what comes after you close your eyes for the last time. No one can make up your mind for you. In the end, it is a personal thing. It is "your" life after all.

Thank you for your time.

**Troy Hopkins, Truro, NS**

## Londonderry Community Council News

**By Sally Richard**

The month of July slipped by too quickly and with lots of overcast days. It seems unfair to come out of a long harsh winter, followed by disappointing summer weather wise. It certainly is not cottage or camping weather. The hail storm at Sutherland's Lake was quite unusual. The hail was as large as nickels, dimes and quarters and even larger in Truro. Londonderry did not get the hail. No doubt it was very hard on gardens and crops.

Margaret (Spence) Kelly was home for a few weeks with her granddaughter visiting her brothers Kim and Terry Spence. Marg said she came down from Toronto on the train and thoroughly enjoyed the train trip. Cal Matheson and his wife Lori drove to Saskatoon, SK recently. Cal will be in Saskatoon studying to be a Corrections Officer. Lori returned home by plane. Ed Langille and Carlotta Priest visited their close friends Marilyn and Curtis Adams at their new home in Newfoundland. Ed and Curtis

got sometime in fishing. Curtis and Marilyn are neighbours of Ann and Mike Matthews formerly of Folly Mountain.

Our condolences are sent out to Winnie Spencer and family on the passing of her sister Lee (Higgins) Wood of Springhill. Also to Verna (Carroll) Walker and Donna Pitman on the tragic passing of Cindy (Carroll) Worthington of

*continued from page 5*

**The Shoreline Journal** (circ. 1300) is a monthly community newspaper serving communities along the Glooscap Trail from Truro to Parrsboro, Nova Scotia serving the communities of Belmont/Debert, Wentworth/Londonderry, Onslow/Masstown along the shore to Great Village, Bass River, Economy, Five Islands and Lower Five Islands. It is published on the last Wednesday of each month (earlier in December) with a deadline of the 20th of the month.

**MAILING ADDRESS:** The Shoreline Journal, P.O. Box 41, Bass River, Nova Scotia, B0M 1B0.

**PHONE:** 902-647-2968; **Fax:** 902-647-2194 **Toll Free** 1-800-406-1426; **Cell:** 902-890-9850 • **E-MAIL:** [maurice@theshorelinejournal.com](mailto:maurice@theshorelinejournal.com)

**EDITOR PUBLISHER:** Maurice Rees • **ADVERTISING & CIRCULATION:** Dorothy Rees

Canadian Publications Mail Products Agreement #4686039, ISSN #1209-9198

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:**

**LOCAL SUBSCRIPTIONS:** B0M / B2N - \$23.00, PLUS HST = \$25.99 • **ALL PARTS OF NS:** \$26.00 plus HST = \$29.38

**ALL OTHER AREAS OF CANADA:** \$28.00, plus HST = \$31.64 • **USA SUBSCRIPTIONS:** \$40.00

**HST:** #890564404RT001. Printed by Advocate Printing & Publishing Ltd, Pictou, Nova Scotia

All rights reserved. Material published in The Shoreline Journal may not be reproduced in an form without prior approval of the publisher. Material to be returned to sender must be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope.

1996 Heritage Award recipient. Listed with Canadian Advertising Rates & Data (CARD) and Bowden's Media Monitoring Service.

The publisher is not responsible for minor errors in ads, which do not lessen the value of the item(s). The publisher is not responsible for space beyond that portion of the advertisement containing the item(s) in error. Letters to the editor are subject to editing or rejection, must be signed by the author and contain a phone number.

