

3 minute speech..

Regarding the Government planning survey and 5g

Safety is assumed in the survey but not one research paper exists to prove it is safe

In Scientific American this week an article was published called “We Have No Reason to Believe 5G Is Safe”

The EU ITRE report from April this year states that the unpredictability and interference patterns of the 5g waves are a problem,

Quote “it is currently not possible to accurately measure 5g emissions in the real world

Rolling out 5g out is an illegal experiment,

From the INTRODUCTORY NOTES of the survey

Point 1) Not all people and business expect or want constant connectivity. electro-sensitives, estimated at 800,000 in this country are very ill in an environment of constant connectivity. For them it is **NOT ESSENTIAL** Already we desperately need White zones for these people who are isolated and totally disempowered through lack of safe environments for them to live and work.

Point 2) It's **not an economic advantage** to those who cannot work, it is **not economic advantage** to weaken the workforce with chronic health conditions

Public Health England Guidelines are 20 years out of date, they only consider the heating effects and way higher than in other countries like Italy, Cyprus and Israel.

There are damaging effects from exposures well below the PHE guidelines linked to infertility, cancer diabetes, Alzheimers, all biological systems are affected.

The UK have doubled GBM brain cancers in last ten years and teenage health statistics are showing huge rises in mental health problems associated with neurological effects of mobile phones and wifi.

These are very inconvenient and challenging facts to the tech industry and to all of us. It is exciting to make leaps forward with new technology, quite irksome that there are these problems with it.

PHE rely on ICNIRP a review panel of members supposedly independent but known to have ties to industry. In 2006 the chairman resigned after it was found he was receiving money via an account at Adelaide hospital.

It took years for the health warnings on smoking to catch up whilst doubt was cast on the science.

We have to listen to the warning signs now. We have the peer reviewed science contradicting PHE and ICNIRP.

LOOKING AT The SURVEY QUESTIONS

1 These are all leading questions, 5g is not proven safe, hiding these masts is not the issue.

2 and 3

Taller and thicker masts mean more radiation, PHEs assurance it is unlikely to exceed limits. Unlikely is not good enough, it is irrational and unacceptable.

There aren't even instruments to measure mm waves of 5g available on the market,

4 5g antennas should not be placed on any buildings until proven to be safe. This is gearing up for driverless cars, do we really want them?

5 We have to urgently redefine safety limits for masts not give blanket permissions to densify the infrastructure. Already there are many cases of cancer clusters around masts without adding the potentially more dangerous 5g pulsed modulated beam formed waves.

(I hold up Sally Beare's research document with the details of studies on this at this point)

Question 6 on the survey is about how the changes will affect vulnerable groups. As defines in equality act 2010.

“The Equality Duty ensures that all public bodies play their part in making society fairer by tackling discrimination and providing equality of opportunity for all.”

Electrosensitives would definitely being discriminated against by increasing numbers and heights of masts.

Babies children, pregnant women the elderly are particularly vulnerable too as they absorb more radiation.

I urge you to research the health effects before responding to the survey.

The precautionary principle, proposed as a new guideline in environmental decision making, has four central components:

- 1) Taking preventive action in the face of uncertainty;
- 2) Shifting the burden of proof to the proponents of an activity;

- 3) Exploring a wide range of alternatives to possibly harmful actions;
- 4) Increasing public participation in decision making.

At the very least we have uncertainty, according to 253 scientists at 5gappeal.eu there is scientific certainty. We need the tech industry to take responsibility and prove safety and explore alternatives which they are not doing. Senator Blumenthal pointed this out in Senate in February this year.

We are trying to participate in decision making by bringing this information to your attention!

Matt Warman's letter from Central Government instructing councils to dismiss claims of harm has obviously not taken the time to go beyond the headlines about the science, over 2000 peer reviewed papers showing serious harmful effects should not be ignored.

As Digital Minister it is not his area of expertise but his appeals to you to override your duty of care is not acceptable while he is so little informed.

So please protect the people of Mendip and decide to apply the Precautionary Principle.