

*normally see.*

---

# Letters to the editor

Letters to the editor are welcome, but writers are requested to keep their submissions to 350 words or less. Letters may be edited for brevity, legality and taste. Writers are also asked to furnish a telephone number where they may be reached during the day, and to sign their letters with their full name. Thank you letters will not normally be considered for publication.  
**Send your letters to [news@gulfislandsdriftwood.com](mailto:news@gulfislandsdriftwood.com)**

---

## Too many humans

I read Frants Attorp's "Forest ecologist calls for local deer cull" article in the Oct. 11 Driftwood.

He wrote, "The impact of deer over-population has been devastating for the local ecology." One could justifiably alter this sentence to read, "The impact of human over-population has been devastating for the local ecology."

The chocolate lily, and camas and fawn lilies, the Saskatoons, brambleberries, huckleberries, and all the beautiful cut down trees men-

tioned in the article probably once thrived quite happily where we now find sprawling houses, subdivisions, concrete roads, driveways and sidewalks. A word used by Tara Martin that quickened my pulse was "over-browsing." Consider these words: over-pollution, over-populated and over - development.

Her sentence that really got my hair standing on end is this one: "There is no longer any top-down control to keep the deer population in check." My question is, where is the top-down control to keep population growth, a stressful increase in automobile traffic, over-development, and

air, water and soil pollution in check?

Ms. Martin mentioned "Bambi syndrome." How about Planet Earth Syndrome?

**A. WHITFIELD,**  
SALT SPRING

## More to the story

I am grateful you made a mention of my March 2017 presentation and report made to the Islands Trust, Small Cells in a Wireless World, and for your acknowledgement of the microcell consultation resolution passed by the Union of B.C. Municipalities last month ("Galiano

LTC tackles communications tower policy," Oct. 18 Driftwood).

I am concerned, though, that in summing up the resolution's passing by saying: "However, anything deemed to be exempt from consultation at the federal level is also exempt on the local government level" you have:

1. Overlooked the power of local governments to affect change on a federal level; and
2. With this omission, given readers the false impression that the public being denied the right to have a say in wireless transmitters being placed by our homes is a fait accompli.

The following is a significant piece of follow-up news you missed. Over the next several months, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities will be discussing the UBCM resolution — which mandates that land-use authorities and the public be consulted when micro-cells are placed within 100 metres of schools, hospitals, and residences — with the federal government. The goal is to close the federal loophole that allows these wireless transmitters, which emit scientifically deemed harmful radio-frequencies 24/7, to be placed on existing structures like utility poles without pub-

lic input or often knowledge.

In the meantime, local governments are being advised to review and update their antenna siting policies and the municipal access agreements they have in place with telecoms, and to be aware that the Canadian Radio and Telecommunications Commission deems that local land use authorities may be liable for any environmental or personal injury that occurs due to the presence of radio-frequencies in the public right of way,

**OONA MCOUAT,**  
SALT SPRING

**MORE LETTERS** continued on 8