

## 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

To: Darren Entwistle,  
President and CEO of Telus

Steve Jenkins  
General Manager, Interior South, British Columbia Region

Dear Messrs. Entwistle and Jenkins,

Last week the CBC ran a program disclosing the fact that residents in New Denver are canceling their optional or elective Telus services in their outrage at the highhanded tactics Telus has evinced in New Denver. In another interview, I was forced by the circumstances to describe Telus as a corporate bully, not a responsible corporate citizen, because it flouts the huge resistance to cellular phone concerns in our village. Indeed, despite the fact that the Mayor and Village Council of New Denver, the Chamber of Commerce, the Slokan Economic Development Commission and a majority of residents do not want cellular transmitter activation or cellular phone service, Telus intends to proceed *because they can*.

The exercise of your corporate muscle in the face of New Denver resistance is based upon Telus's refusal to acknowledge a massive amount of adverse science worldwide, reporting great hazard to health through cellular phone transmission and usage. There is, in short, substance to the controversy, substance to Germany's warning to its citizens to not use cellular phones but to use land-lines due to health concerns, substance to the 610-page report published by the University of Albany this September. These worldwide reports are not presenting baseless findings, but Telus's profit concerns seems to induce a kind of blindness. This is a wanton disregard of the health hazards and a pointed violation of the necessity of adopting the Precautionary Principle when legitimate scientific controversy exists connected to health hazards.

This committee's last letter to Mr. Gadjia of Health Canada, copied to you in our notice of accountability, sketched the Precautionary Principle. It was just recently accepted by the court in the Sunshine Coast RDCK case, in which the Attorney General of BC filed a brief supporting the exercise of this principle even when specific health hazards had not been proven. Yet, Telus evidently does not believe that a precautionary approach is required. Copied below is my reply to Mr. Gadjia's September 28 response, which further states the unavoidable applicability of this Precautionary Principle.

We've had lengthy discussions with consultants as to how exonerative is your reliance on Health Canada's pronouncements. What would be the impact if it were to be demonstrated that Health Canada's narrow parameters for testing hazardous effects exclude from consideration the very grounds on which health hazard and fatalities are being reported worldwide? Where is your corporate responsibility, being apprised by our organization and by the Village of New Denver, of evidence adverse to your intent and position, if you simply close your corporate mind, eyes, ears, to the nature of the documented dangers? Is it exonerative that Telus relies on Health Canada when it is *your* company's actions which propose to endanger us, irrespective of their approval? You may find it a question of company profits, but we consider it a question of our health and safety. Can you justify the Telus intrusion into our village, especially in view of specific warnings of enlarged injury to the health of children, when – in the face of this evidence – Telus means to activate a transmission tower within 30 to 50 metres of a children's playground?

Telus, as a corporation, is dealing with an aroused, even an angry citizenry, backed by its Village administration, its business community and its environmental forces. It is becoming increasingly versed in the hazard reports and is being forced by the proposed intrusion by Telus to make public these facts in every public forum to which residents can gain a voice. Does it serve your company's profit concerns to ignore all this?

We trust that saner values will ultimately triumph, if not through your reconsideration, then by the fierce resistance you can expect from a community which feels victimized and threatened by your company's tactics. We believe a successful case can be made to justify the grounds for our concerns and a demand for the immediate adoption of the Precautionary Principle. Personally, I hope that this entire contretemps can be brought swiftly to an end by calling the issue a draw. Surely, you'll see that the evidence displayed on our website ([www.vws.org](http://www.vws.org)) justifies the public concern. It would be improvident to ignore it.

Trusting this may yet be amicably resolved once you reconsider all the factors, I am

Sincerely,

*Richard Caniell*  
Chairperson