We are appalled that proposed amendments to Industry Canada’s Antenna Tower Siting Procedures do not include a complete change to Sec. 4.2 Public Reply Comments. The notion that, in this country, the concerns of citizens whose lives and personal well-being may be negatively affected by the installation of a telecommunications antenna situated in the vicinity of their homes are "not relevant" is outrageous.

In an industry which is seeing growth at the rate of 5% per month, it is clear that the demand for service is growing at the same rate. As Canadian citizens, we insist on the right to protect ourselves and each other from harm to our persons and to our livelihood by proponents who seek to fulfill that demand at all costs. Further, we reject the prohibition on discussion of the effect a proposed antenna system may have on property values. Canada’s Charter Rights and Freedoms enshrines the right to own property. We believe that we also have the right to protect the value of that property from erosion by willful and careless actions of others.

Finally, we categorically reject the statement in 7.1 Radio Frequency Exposure Limits that "Current biomedical studies in Canada and other countries indicate that there is no scientific or medical evidence that a person will experience adverse health effects from exposure to radio frequency fields, provided that the installation complies with Safety Code 6."

Notwithstanding that Safety Code 6 is currently under review, it is woefully inadequate and bears little comparison to the considerable body of scientific evidence available today. In addition to a failure to address non-thermal effects of radio frequency exposure, Safety Code 6 does not address current standards of frequency range let alone set a precautionary outlook for the future. Proposed amendments as outlined in the consultation document are minimal and unsatisfactory.
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