To whom it may concern at Industry Canada,

My forte is in business development policy for sustainable high technology industry, foreign investment risks in high technology industry such as pharmaceuticals having led a major worldwide OECD study following the thalidomide catastrophe; as a balance sheet manager of one of the world's largest banks, I am very expert in policies for international and local banking structure, design and market operations, foreign exchange markets and economic policy, design for sustainable recovery following bad economic and banking policy and independent decision making. I have written and designed computer games for business training and strategy in the UK that we're used by hundreds of schools when no business schools existed there. I have advised on Atomic Energy commercializations such as lasers that now permeate industrial applications worldwide.

I am also a retired resident in Grand Bend formerly with the IMF / OECD / NBER / BBI and CIDA, who was placed by a decision of Industry Canada into an impossibly controversial position that could permanently affect my own health and that of my community, and the longevity of its residents. I do not take the matter lightly, and I know far more than I let on. Below you will find a letter to the Independent in Meaford. It was posted on three of my blog websites in countless countries and summarizes in very polite terms my view of the risks and political processes associated with cell towers for the world of readers and thousands and thousands of connected twitters to see and react to, as will surely happen.

The problem as I see it, when viewed from my hat as former adviser / expert to the OECD, with the present Industry Canada approach is that it places Canada in the category of losers like Russia in which commercial oligarchies are likely to benefit at the expense of the citizenry in the longer term. I can't imagine what the litigation and health costs might be to the Canadian community as clear from the notion of a possible Broad Spectrum disaster that would make tobacco related health issues seem like a picnic and possibly making thalidomide seem like a small event in comparison. Being also a former resident of Quebec for a longish period, I seriously wonder whether the lack of adherence on the part of Industry Canada officers and general government policy to civil rights will survive the test of possible Quebec succession and eventual breakup of Canada due to the short sightedness of its industrial development and health issue management policies.

It's your country as well as mine. I can choose to vacate it, should the bullying of small communities like those in Ontario that we're not consulted, continue.

Arthur Lake
Subject: Letter to the Editor concerning the proposed Rogers cell tower in a residential area in Meaford

Dear Editor,

My name is Arthur Lake and I live too close to a Bell cell tower at Southcott Pines in Grand Bend. My experience is not encouraging. A cell tower is a huge investment that completely overwhelms the ability of local residents to resist as an isolated community effort. The amount of money yielded from this investment is considerable and shared enough to persuade those in the community unaware of the health risks to forego normal precautions. People will disregard dangers to young children and newly forming life in order to share in the clear benefits that accrue with a cell tower in one's community. So the problem is intractable.

There are clear benefits which are immediate and obvious and these are set against the potential losses that are abstract and complex at the very least. The risks are set back in time and are discounted heavily compared with immediate benefits. No less real, the damage over time to individuals from cell towers does exist and has been measured statistically. As a trained statistician and econometrician reading at McGill, Western University of London, and Cambridge University, I am convinced that the existing statistics behind the studies already done should be sufficient to cause people who can understand such mathematics to realise that something extraordinary that we do not understand from the physical and medical sciences is going on in the neighbourhood of cell towers. Similar math applies to homes with WIFI left on 24/7.

So what are we to do. People on their own will almost unanimously vote to have cell towers much too close to their homes and places of activity. That is an undeniable fact and nothing you or I can do will change people's minds.

The consequences, however, are very different. Cellular tower radiation impacts the bodies of living creatures to slow down processes of regeneration and in many cases to actually stop necessary cell transformations and regeneration of microbial populations living within the human and plant organism. In Colorado, we find that trees to not produce the same vegetative volume or rebirth. So over time we see a broad spectrum effect on life of animal, microbial and plant forms. Why?

My best explanation is that is results from the overwhelming amount of information passed in bursts from cell towers and WIFI along channels of communication used in life processes at the cell and molecular levels. We certainly do not understand these processes.
But, there is a simple statistical test. Build a cell tower alongside a high rise building and
and the cell tower too close. Count the incidence of disease around the arc of the cell
tower antennas relative to areas below and above that are away from the radiation. What
you will find is clear observable evidence over time that something extremely dangerous
to health is going on and is a contributor to the disease creation in those near or closer to
the radiation. How close is safe? That depends on how long you are willing to wait. Such
studies have been done are universally frightening in their implications given the strength
of the communications industry, the rewards processes in play, the insider government
influence, those 'bribed' to speak on the industry's behalf, the mental discounting of long
term costs to those vulnerable to a broad spectrum of diseases, the lack of government
money for basic medical research and the unwillingness of the press to prioritize and
seriously investigate the issues and risks to health and living organisms from cell tower
radiation, the minimization of the voices of those advocating measures to mitigate real
health risks, the targeting of vulnerable groups in the marketing of cellular devices
(infants, teenagers, elderly, uneducated, those scientifically illiterate, the gullible addicted
users).

In a similar vein, we know that many people started smoking in their teens, but are now
decidedly dead from cancer in their mid fifties. So wait thirty years and most people will
finally be convinced. It won't be you and me. It will be the children of our grandchildren.

Is that the sort of risk future, we wish to give to our loved ones?

Cell towers are far more dangerous than cigarettes because they act on a broad spectrum
of living processes. This means they contribute to multiple health problems
simultaneously in ways you or science won't understand for another century.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Lake
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