

# 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: Robert Rabinovitch, President and CEO  
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Raymond Carnovale  
Vice President and Chief Technology Officer

Dear Messrs. Rabinovitch and Carnovale,

Further to my reply to your letter dated September 21, 2007, for which I thank you: Although the CBC claims to rely on Industry Canada for the base-line appraisal of location cellular transmitters on CBC towers, Industry Canada, in its requirement to see that Code 6 guidelines are met, reverts back to Health Canada for the Code 6 content. This round-robin, which inculcates Telus in its chain, studiously avoids the fact that Health Canada's parameters for its tests and approval are too narrow, according to substantial adverse science, to protect human health. Should you, must you be concerned with this contradiction?

The issue complicating the position of the CBC on the installation of a cell phone transmitter on the existing CBC tower in New Denver, BC, concerns the question as to when, in matters of public health, the Precautionary Principle should apply. This question – taken up in the previous letter to you (Notice of Accountability) and repeated in this committee's recent letter to Greg Gadja of Health Canada — was just recently before the court in the Sunshine Coast RDCK case, in which the Attorney General of BC filed with the court his concurrence with the application of the Precautionary Principle.

I copy below my reply to Mr. Gadja's response dated September 28, 2007. We believe we have gathered together by reference, and through the presentation of complete reports on our website ([www.vws.org](http://www.vws.org)), a clear demonstration of substantive reasons for concern about hazards to public health. The Precautionary Principle comes to bear when there is controversial science, and where the hazardous effects are not well settled but in contention.

The issue as to Telus and the CBC seems to hinge on how much notice of substantive evidence of hazards has been put before you both. After much consultation we've been led to believe that Telus and the CBC are not relieved of their responsibility in engendering a hazard to public health because they rely on Health Canada. This point was made clear to me when it appeared that Health Canada arrived at its blanket approval confirming the safety of cellular transmission and phone usage by using extremely narrow testing parameters which effectively exclude the very mechanisms through which brain tumours and extensive injury to health have been repeatedly linked to cell phones and transmitters. .

The evidence from the science adverse to Health Canada has considerable stature and far-ranging implications. We believe that the failure to apply the Precautionary Principle will not exonerate the parties who claim they relied on some authority, when that authority has been shown much evidence of damage, including ongoing fatalities, and has closed its corporate mind to it.

I doubt that you believe Germany has lost its national mind when it informs its citizens not to use cellular phones (or Wi-Fi) but to use landlines instead. Or that the 610-page report published by the University of Albany in September of this year has simply brought together incompetent evidence albeit from highly qualified expert scientists and medical doctors.

At what point must the parties such as yourself, bent on endangering or contributing to endangerment of public health of New Denver residents, against the wishes of the Mayor, the Village Council, the Chamber of Commerce, the Slovan Valley Economic Development Commission and a majority of Village residents, be required to stop and think? We believe your continued insistence that there is no endangerment, while refusing to recognize the formidable extent of study which demonstrates the danger, constitutes a wanton disregard of the public welfare at least with respect to New Denver.

What are we, what is the public, to think – given substantial warnings by world expert scientists and medical doctors that cellular phone transmitters and phone usage is particularly dangerous to children and teenagers – when the CBC tower you permit Telus to lease is between 30 and 50 metres from a children's playground?

What can Telus or Health Canada do for the CBC, given Health Canada's arguable, even refutable, narrowness of test parameters and its admission it has never conducted on-the-ground studies of cell phone transmission and phone use on human health, if CBC becomes a culpable corporation in the court of public opinion because it makes possible the damage that may be done to the public in New Denver? The residents in New Denver are aroused and some are angry while becoming ever more aware that the vaunted CBC is also ignoring world-wide reports. Why – because it wants the profit from leasing its transmission towers? We believe the CBC is better than that in principle and in fact.

Presumably, you as CEO are aware from a CBC program last week that some New Denver residents were canceling all their elective or optional Telus services in outrage at Telus's highhanded insistence that they will install their transmitter (only possible through the CBC's profit-concern to lease its facilities) irrespective of the opposition of residents and their various representatives. This has forced us to amass a large amount of compelling evidence to support the demand that the Precautionary Principle must be used in New Denver. It will also, we believe, reveal something like corporate arrogance exhibited by Telus in insisting on intruding into our community *because it can*. I stated in a recent radio interview that Telus was acting as a corporate bully not as a good corporate citizen, but it is the CBC which makes their deplorable conduct possible.

Sincerely,

*Richard Caniell*  
Chairperson