

Sous toutes reserves – Without Prejudice

The following is a letter sent to Mayor Worth of Pierrefonds-Roxboro expressing grave concerns regarding a Rogers Telecommunication tower to be erected at St Barnabas Church in Pierrefonds-Roxboro

September 26, 2010

Arrondissement Pierrefonds-Roxboro,  
13665 boulevard Pierrefonds, Qc

Re : INSTALLATION of a ROGERS COMMUNICATIONS TOWER on the site of St Barnabas Church

Dear Mrs. Worth,

My confreres and I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the consideration you gave to our stand against Rogers' Communications proposed tower, at the town council meeting held last September 7<sup>th</sup>. It so happens we had scarce time to prepare, as none of the concerned citizens had been advised beforehand. This in itself left us suspicious and with a bad taste in our mouths, as we felt Rogers was underhandedly attempting to go ahead without our knowledge. (We were under the impression that they had to advise all citizens within a certain proximity). Despite this, however, as I'm certain you were able to observe, we were able to assemble a very solidaristic group of citizens who voiced a myriad of objections, the most weighty of these, in my opinion, being health-related.

Without a doubt, this proposed tower would be a hideous eyesore on this out-of-the-way secluded street. However, in view of the vast scientific evidence available worldwide showing significant adverse health effects on people living near cell phone towers, the health issue is our principal concern.

Many studies have shown that children are at the greatest risk, and in view of this we question whether due diligence was used by Rogers in selecting this site, which is roughly:

- 48 metres from the door of a garderie which houses 80 children aged 18 months to 5 yrs. of age, 11 hours per day, 5 days per week
- 18 metres from the door of a pre-school which also houses 24 children, also aged 18 months to 5 yrs. of age, 5 days per week.

(This despite the fact that the studies have shown the danger zone to be within **400 metres**, and of course, the closer the worse).

It's not that we ourselves are in any particular hurry to die, but we feel strongly that especially our young children should not be subjected to **involuntary 24-hr.-a-day microwave exposure**.

To our detractors, let me point out that there have been numerous cases worldwide where cell phone towers have been taken down, a number of them because of their proximity to schools. The **Scottish parliament** has already ruled against siting towers near homes, schools, and hospitals. Europe's top environmental watchdog group, **European Environment Agency (EEA)**, is calling for immediate action, and, as regards masts, suggests action to reduce exposure to vulnerable groups such as children. Even in the **U.S.A.**, the **California Public Utility Commission** has urged the cell phone industry to not locate towers near schools or hospitals. And these are but a few examples.

So, you see, people in other civilized parts of the world are taking a stance to protect their children against this perceived evil. It seems that only we Canadians and our neighbours to the south have been slow to react to it (and yet it is to be noted that in the U.S. brain tumors are the second leading cause of cancer death for children and young adults).

There appears to be a long history of corrupt science funded by big business on our continent. Way back in 1948 the largest booth at American Medical Association's convention was that of Camel cigarettes, boasting "More doctors smoke Camels than any other cigarettes." 35 years later, when cell phones came onto the market, they did so without any pre-market safety testing. Health studies were suppressed in the 4-trillion-dollar-a-year industry. And still now in 2010 it seems our federal governments (Canada & U.S.A.) continue to show disregard for the health and well-being of the community, and remain subservient to industry. And yet it is their moral and legal obligation to protect our health and welfare.

Unfortunately, the U.S. has behaved like a meek valet to the industry, instead of a vigilant protector of the public interest, giving them what amounts to carte blanche in siting of their towers, via the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The industry that year lobbied Congress with \$39 million to ensure passage of that law. The Radiocommunication Act of Canada, which is administered by Industry Canada, seems to have patterned itself after that of our American neighbours, as it to a great extent binds the hands of the municipal authorities. In an article in the Gazette of Sept. 13, 2010, entitled "Health Canada criticized for recalls", a large distributor of children's products accuses Health Canada of ..." blindly following American regulators". This, unfortunately, appears to be true and is lamentable.

Some might say we're making a mountain out of a mole-hill. Our man from Rogers assured us that..."il n'y a pas d'études", and so did the minister from the Church. Should we entrust the health of our young to these 2 parties (who stand to reap significant profit) or should we perhaps heed the warnings of more renowned experts such as Karl Muller, a former physics lecturer at Wits University of **South Africa** who stated "Every single study into general health around a mast carried out anywhere in the world has found a consistent pattern of health problems." I should like here to list but a few of these studies, every one of which has shown significant adverse health effects on people living near cell phone towers:

- **France**, 2002, survey study by Santini et al.
- **Netherlands**, study entitled "Effects of Global Communications"
- **Spain**, a study called "The Microwave Syndrome" by Gerd, Enrique, Manuel...
- **Israel**, study published in International Journal of Cancer Prevention, Vol. 1 No. 2, April 2004
- **Germany**, November 2004 ,the Naila Study
- **Cyprus**, 2007, The Preece study
- **Japan**, study done at Japan's National Institute for Environmental Studies
- **Nigeria**, study done by Kato Mivule
- **India**, The Delhi High Court ordered a study of health risks caused by mobile phone towers and residents in Shalimar Bagh are demanding the demolition of a mobile phone tower in the residential area
- **London, England**, the Towers of Doom study. The English study showed that the top floor residents of the apartment building where 2 towers had been installed on the roof had 10 times the national cancer rate.
- Similar results have been obtained in Spain, **Egypt**, **Poland**, and **Austria**

Some of the other findings of these studies were as follows:

- The Israeli study showed the cancer rate increased 4-fold within 350 metres
- The German study showed the cancer rate increased 3-fold within 400 metres

Without a doubt, these people also were all assured that everything was safe, that there would be no health problems, as we are being assured now. However, we are fortunate to have several years of observation and countless studies showing this to be untrue. It also worth noting some actions in recent years around the world which show that it is not only we here in Pierrefonds who are apprehensive, and with good reason:

- In Israel residents destroyed all phone masts in their town due to clusters of over 200 cancer
- The **Orange phone company** was forced to remove its mast tower on a building in Bristol, England

At the 2006 meeting of the International Commission for Electromagnetic Safety in Benevento, **Italy**, 42 scientists from 16 countries signed a resolution arguing for much stricter regulation of EM fields from wireless communication.

And closer to home, in the U.S.A., the International Association of Firefighters in 2004 voted to oppose any more cell phone towers and antennas being placed on or around fire stations. Also, in Portland, Oregon, on July 12, 2010, citizens met to oppose placement of cell towers in their neighbourhood. There is also the case of the petition in Simcoe, Ontario, December, 2007, where a cell tower was installed close to a school and hospital).

Perhaps Industry Canada, our man from Rogers, and the cleric concerned would like to provide evidence to refute the opinions of some leading international authorities on the subject, e.g.:

- Dr. Neil Cherry, Ph.D. biophysicist from **New Zealand**...."To claim there is no adverse effect from phone towers flies in the face of a large body of evidence."
- Drs. R.& D> Wolf of Pediatrics and Dermatology centers in Israel, a statement lifted from a very detailed study entitled "Cancer Near a Cell-Phone Transmitter Station"..."**Cell phone towers can Kill You**"
- Dr. Gerard Hyland, Physicist, 2-time nominee Nobel Prize in Medicine..."Existing safety guidelines for all phone towers are completely inadequate.

Some other experts who warn of the severe adverse health effects are:

- Dr. Olle Johansson, Neuroscientist **Sweden's** Karolinska Institut
- Dr. Henry Lei, Research Professor, Bioengineering Dept., University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Robert Kane, Ph.D., former Motorola Senior Research Scientist

Over 100 scientists and physicians at Boston and Harvard Universities Schools of Public Health have called cell phone towers a radiation hazard.

Dr. George Carlo, chief scientist for the largest study ever conducted on cell phone radiation, predicts an **epidemic in brain cancer**.

EPA analysts have recommended that EMR be classified as a "**probable human carcinogen**".

And again, close to home , most recently Dr. Magda Havas, Ph.d., Professor at Trent University in Peterborough, Ont., on the subject of Wi-Fi systems, wrote: "You will be told by the federal government (Health Canada and Industry Canada), as well as by the provider, that this technology is safe provided that exposures to radio frequency radiation remain below federal guidelines. **This information is outdated and incorrect** based on the growing number of scientific publications that are reporting adverse health and biological effects below our Safety Code 6 guidelines."

Are the Rogers man and the cleric telling us that all these people, despite their credentials , don't know what they're talking about, or are all these people from around the world lying to us? Yes, I think I smell a conspiracy theory. How naive. After all, the Rogers fellow, when questioned, couldn't even tell us how much power this equipment would put out. Would they have us believe that the results of all these studies have been falsified? It is often said that when it comes to your health, seek a second opinion.

Well, because the health of our children is at stake, I have sought out I believe it's 18 opinions worldwide (count the countries in bold print). And I can provide many more.

Did I hear correctly..."Il n'y a pas d'études"? It seems there are none so blind as those who will not see. Perhaps the money is blocking the view of the truth. In my opinion, we have overwhelming evidence obtained by experts versus the opinion of a couple of venal adversaries. We are willing at any time to pit our evidence against theirs. Otherwise, we recommend they go away quietly (install it somewhere else), and we shall do the same. Otherwise, if they persist, we shall open a can of worms to the media on a grand scale. I don't believe the church nor Rogers needs the negative response this might occasion. They are truly showing an impudent disregard for the health of our young children. They choose to disregard all the evidence that was cited for the sake of money. Truly the public could not go unfazed by this news, should they be made aware of it.

In case Rogers should be unwilling to abandon this project, one of my confreres is presently in the process of getting a petition signed by the residents. If that is not sufficient to block it, I am hereby requesting that we take it to referendum. We request your aid and guidance, as we are not knowledgeable in procedural matters. We rely on your support, as you are our only and last resort and ally. We, by the same token, are willing to assist you in any way we can to resolve this matter.

We realize your hands are tied to a great extent, and that's why we the citizens have put so much effort into this battle. We are after all a democratic society, we believe in strength in numbers, we have the numbers on our side, we consider it a crucial issue, and we know that we are right. We also know other localities have managed to nix similar undesirable projects. We know Dr. Patry's office is aware of this issue, and some of the documentation he has seems to support our position.

As I mentioned earlier, we are a very strong and determined group, and even if this tower were to be erected, we would continue our fight and hopefully have it taken down. (It's been done in other places). Hopefully it won't come to that. We would never be able to accept that one individual, who doesn't reside in our arrondissement, whose church doesn't pay any taxes, would get the final word (over the unanimous objection of the taxpayers) in such a vital issue .....a matter of life or death, we consider it.

My confreres assure me that, especially in view of the shameless disregard shown for the health of their children, this battle would escalate into a war.

Feel free to contact me at any time if I can be of any help.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter. I remain,

Yours truly,

P.S.: As for the cleric's contention that he was concerned about the weak signal, I would like to point out that my neighbours and I receive maximum signals. As for his opinion that there is a need for a tower in the area, if he were in a prime location Rogers would certainly not have solicited St. Luke's Church (only to be rejected ) some 500 metres away, before approaching him.