

## VALHALLA COMMITTEE For Environmental Health

---

Box 329, New Denver, British Columbia, Canada V0G 1S0  
250-358-2333 (office) 250-358-7950 (fax)  
[vws@vws.org](mailto:vws@vws.org) ♦ [www.vws.org](http://www.vws.org)

October 2, 2007

Robert Bradley  
Director, Consumer & Clinical Radiation Protection Bureau  
Health Canada

Dear Mr. Bradley,

I'd very much like you to understand that some of the underlying aggravation which hues my communication stems from the intractable position Telus has taken in stating they are coming in to make their cellular transmitter irrespective of the objections of the Village Council and Mayor of New Denver, the Chamber of Commerce, the Slokan Valley Economic Development Commission, the Healthy Housing Society and the Valhalla Committee.

While vainly calling for the adoption of the precautionary principle which requirement seems amply justified by the scientific reports adverse to Health Canada position, I can't help but believe that there are well placed persons in Health Canada that may recognize and even sympathize with our concerns, given the documentation, but whom do not (or cannot?) speak out given Health Canada's "official" position.

Surely to scientific minds such as yours, you must be troubled by the narrow parameters of the Health Canada tests, by the concerns for thermal effects while ignoring effects on human cellular life and DNA which improvidently falls outside the scope of Health Canada's reports. That the hazards to human health have been demonstrated in the very areas excluded by your parameters must cause some kind of embarrassment and concern to principled individuals within the Health Canada body and experts.

As you see from my letters, the contretemps generated by a business-as-usual approach has led to an aroused and irate citizenry. This is coalescing into a resistance based on health concerns particularly connected with hazards to children, and the repetition by Health Canada of its mantra "It's safe, it's safe" does not solace but indeed only inflames.

I think this situation requires some revised thinking and approach by yourself and Mr. Gadja. I say this because Health Canada's pronouncement of safety is the muscle behind the Telus intractability and indifference. And while we expect that the reports on our website ([www.vws.org](http://www.vws.org)) require considerable time to investigate through expanded testing parameters, until then the precautionary principle should be effected in New Denver at least.

My letter to Mr. Gadjia comments on the sense of closed mind inherent in his airy dismissal of the BioInitiative 610 page report as just a review of the literature. It ignores its content, summary and recommendations in a way which is shocking and unacceptable. Frankly I believe Mr. Gadjia's reply misrepresents the man and the scientist and I trust does not properly represent your view of the BioInitiative report.

As the situation worsens here it could well draw a great deal more media to us and a spotlight on many of the issues and contradictions I cite. My own view is that such a contretemps is unnecessary if the precautionary principle is seen to apply, especially when the protocols for assessing these principles fit the New Denver situation precisely.

Sincerely,

*Richard Caniell*  
Chairperson