

April 4, 2006

Gord Follett  
P.O. Box 13754, Stn. A  
St. John's, NL, Canada  
AIB 4G3

Dear Gord Follett:

Making remote wilderness areas more accessible is an ecological disaster. Many communities, both council and non-council, have the deplorable task of cleaning up years of environmental abuse. Indiscriminate dumping, car wrecks and lack of education have left the youth of our province with a poor example.

The question I have to ask is this, if we cannot get a handle on this problem why should we be allowed to compromise the safety of more remote wilderness areas? Every time we make a new road for cabin development, we also expose these areas to increased poaching and human waste. (An example would be washing portable toilets in our ponds or brooks-yes, it happens!) It takes very little negative activity to destroy an ecosystem and at the rate we are going there won't be any wilderness left for future generations. The North Shore of Conception Bay is a perfect example of this. Pristine wilderness areas, like Clifty Pond, have already been used as a dump site for car wrecks and recent cabin development.

In conclusion I ask anyone who has an environmental bone in their body, especially the youth of our province, to step up to the plate and make an environmental difference. Government policies that are being implemented right now could affect you for years to come. If you are a hiker, berry picker or hunter and enjoy the great outdoors, do whatever you can to protect and preserve it, because once environmental safety has been compromised it's usually forever. I think limited access is the best form of conservation and it can fit any government budget.

### **Extra Cost**

**More Access Roads = More Cost for Enforcement**  
**= More Roads for Polluters and Poachers**  
**= More Stress on the Biodiversity of an Area**

Yours in Conservation,

Anthony O'Leary

cc: Juanita King, the Muse

Concerned Scientists of MUN

Protected Areas Association of Newfoundland

Sierra Club of Canada