

STATES OF JERSEY

HSSH Sub-Panel Telephone Masts Review

Public Meeting held at Hautlieu School

THURSDAY, 18th JANUARY 2007

Panel:

Deputy A. Breckon of St. Saviour (Chairman)
Deputy C.H. Egré of St. Peter (Vice-Chairman)
Senator B.E. Shenton
Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade
Mrs C. Le Quesne (Scrutiny Officer)
Mr. R. Glover (Principal Planner)

Deputy A. Breckon of St. Saviour (Chairman):

What I will do is I will give you a little bit of background in a moment. Just a couple of housekeeping exercises. If you do have a mobile phone please can you switch it off or put it on silent. And the housekeeping exercise, there are exits marked should the fire alarm go, that is the way you should be headed. The background to this is that I was elected by the States late last year and the other members of the main panel are Deputies Judy Martin, Roy Le Hérissier and Sean Power. The background to this sub-panel, which consists of Constable Mike Jackson, on my right, Senator Ben Shenton and Deputy Collin Egré, is that we were set up as a sub-panel and this could not be done straightaway because when I was elected no members of the main panel could be appointed for 2 weeks and following that the panel had to meet and agree to form a sub-panel towards the terms of reference of that sub-panel, so there was some delay. Having said that, work was going on. Information was collected. We have 3 substantial bundles of papers like that, so it was not a case of nothing was happening it was just that we could not go public because, as it were, we were not official but the work was going on behind the scenes with the Scrutiny Officers and myself. Thanks to those many people who made submissions in that time and the information that we collected. As part of this process Deputy Patrick Ryan took a proposition to the States to seek a committee of inquiry. After a particularly messy debate in the States he agreed to withdraw that and then there was still some public concern, so it was decided that there will be a joint Scrutiny Panel and as health was a concern it would be down to this panel to be the lead in that. Perhaps there was a perception that no one was taking any notice of those members of the public that had a concern and part of the role of Scrutiny - it is not there for my benefit - in part it is to engage and involve the public, and that is the reason we are here tonight. We have some handouts available. We also have

contacts with Scrutiny if anybody -- tonight is not the end of it, it is part of a process so if anybody wants to make submissions. I will just detail some of the stuff that is on the handouts. We have another meeting tomorrow night at St. Brelade's Parish Hall. Tomorrow afternoon and 3.30 p.m. we have a public hearing for Mr. Barry Trower who is in the Island. We are accommodating that although it is not part of the main hearings. Next week we have 3 days of hearings, and again the people we will be speaking to there are the 3 telecom operators and a host of other people including the World Health Organisation, and those hearings will be held in the States' Chamber. Also on 15th February, here we have invited 2 speakers, Dr. James Rubin of King's College, London, who is a researcher and lecturer at the Mobile Phones Research Unit. The other speaker will hopefully confirm very shortly, is Dr. John Stather who is Deputy Director, Radiation Protection Division, Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards, the Health Protection Agency. We have invited those 2 after considerable search of who we could invite who perhaps was not conflicted and perhaps could be seen as unbiased, although it is not always easy. So that is really where we are. We do have apologies from the Minister for Planning and there was a moratorium. Some people were concerned that when the moratorium was lifted that was the end of the matter, but this is part of the process and recently the Minister for Planning did give additional consents to a number of operators and he is willing to listen to whatever the outcome of this Scrutiny review is, and that would be referred to Health and if need be changes could be made. It needs to be based on evidence, not because somebody thinks it is a good idea - and that includes me. What we have done tonight is we have sorted out some background information really as part of the process to begin to see where we are and where we are going. What I would like to do is start with Deputy Collin Egré who will highlight some of the information that has been supplied to us by Jersey Telecom, and the reason we have gone to Jersey Telecom is they are the longest operator in the Island and they were the first to move with some of the technology, and I will ask Deputy Egré to do that work. We are comfortable sitting here, we have a lectern there, and then what we will do, at the end of the process, we will come back and ask you questions. Following that will be Richard Glover from Planning who will outline where Planning are, but obviously Richard is a civil servant so he is not going to answer political questions. That will be followed by Senator Ben Shenton who will give a précis of the report that was given to the Health Minister from the Health Department because they are not able to be here tonight, somebody will be here tomorrow night. Then it is open to questions from the floor at the end of that and if anybody would like to ask anything of us that opportunity will be given to everybody, and we will aim to wind up probably about 9.15 p.m. So that is really where we are, and I will ask Collin to continue.

Deputy C.H. Egré of St. Peter:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Firstly, thank you for coming out tonight on this rather windy evening. I have travelled from St. Peters and my wife said we might not get very many people here because of the actual weather conditions and people have been advised to stay at home. Just to give you a bit of my background. I have been fairly close to radio systems for nearly, more than I care to

mention, about 20 years of my life having spent a fair amount of time in the Royal Air Force as an air traffic control officer, so you can imagine I have been very close to that. I also hold a Master of Science degree which I took some 10 years ago in civil emergency management and in doing that degree one has to look at things very objectively when one is dealing with science factors. Now I have been asked to give a quick résumé on what Jersey Telecom provided the board with. I have condensed it quite a bit down because a lot of it is saying how good they are, and trying to get it condensed down to the factual element. In that part of the exercise the company states that the Jersey GSM (Global System for Mobile communication) Network was first opened in December 1994 and since then their second generation 2G Network has been enhanced and upgraded to provide 2G, and they say incorporating GPRS (General Packet Radio Service) offering high speed data and up to 80 kilobytes per second and a more recent third generation 3G mobile telephone communications infrastructure. The company also state that their mobile network is fully compliant with the international standards as required by license conditions of the telecommunications licence for Jersey Telecom issued by the JCRA (Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority) which state that: "The licensee shall develop and operate the licensed telecommunications system so as progressively to achieve standards in line with international best practice. Furthermore the licensee shall ensure that non-ionising radiation emissions from its licensed telecommunications systems are within limits specified in the guidelines published by the International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation Protection." I am sure you are all familiar with that, it is the ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection). "That it complies with any radiation emission standards adopted and published from time to time by the BSI (British Standards Institution), the ETSI (European Telecommunications Standards Institute) and European Committee for Electro-Technical Standardisation and other standards specified by the JCRA." They state that Jersey Telecom is complying with its obligation well in advance. In fact they said they were doing it before the JCRA stated they had to. Furthermore, they state that during the last few years that 2 surveys have been carried out, one by Ofcom and the other by the JCRA concerning the strength of signals being emitted by the Jersey Telecom mobile cell sites and they have both been shown, conclusively they say, that emissions are only a very small fraction of the safe levels recommended by the International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation Protection. The Jersey Telecom mobile network, they say, is continually being expanded and improved in order to keep pace with the local demand for mobile telephonic and data services. The internal mobile planning team of the company has for many years gained experience in designing mobile networks, and the Jersey network has been designed to satisfy traffic and coverage requirements, both of which are key to the planning and design of successful mobile networks. For them they say that the Island of Jersey has presented a number of design challenges given its geographical topography. They quote there are many hills, valleys and bays - and I think we know that - which require specific coverage solutions. Through the use of carefree position macro cell sites and the number of dedicated micro cell sites with small antennae, Jersey Telecom has been able to provide a mobile 2G network with over a 99 per cent geographic outdoor coverage and hopes to attain similar coverage levels for the 3G network. They also quote that given the close proximity of the

French mainland there is an international agreement about frequency use and the output power of some cell sites that they use and that this generally has led to the use of lower powered cell sites. They say it should be borne in mind too that the GSM does not lend itself to the use of high-powered cell sites, such cell sites would be able to transmit their signals easily to any handset however the output power of the average handset is less than a watt in its range and therefore its ability to communicate back to the cell site is very limited. The practical reality is that the power in each direction will be evenly balanced. Another problem that they say has caused them some concern is that Jersey is unique in being composed mostly entirely of granite and many of the buildings are also made of granite or concrete blocks. Granite is a very good absorber of radio waves at the frequencies used for mobile phone telephony and this makes 100 per cent indoor coverage difficult to achieve, and is another reason for having many low powered cell sites rather than few higher ones. They provide what they term as some key facts and they say that at present there are in excess of 102,038, as of December 2006, GSM customers. Jersey Telecom estimates that the mobile penetration is now reaching over 116 per cent. That in fact is saying that there are more mobile telephones than there are people which, you know, I find quite interesting as a statistic. The network supports both post and prepaid customers with prepaid roaming having been launched on 1st July 2004. Interestingly enough they state that mobile coverage is now almost 100 per cent across the Island with very high levels of in-building use achieved. The same standards are being applied to the roll out of the 3G network enabling customers to attain the benefits of a high speed data network. The network is based on the standard GSM 900 and 1,800 megahertz frequencies and more recently the 2,100 megahertz technology which is tied to G3. Call success rate for the GSM network services is in excess of 98 per cent with dropped calls well under one per cent. Interestingly enough they state - and I was not aware of this -- that off-Island calls are carried via 3 submarine cables: one direct to France, one to the UK via Guernsey and one directly to the UK in conjunction with 3 microwave links; 2 links to Guernsey and one to France. They offer in their conclusions in the report they gave to us, is that the company has been involved in providing a high quality mobile telecommunication service for the bailiwick of Jersey. It currently supports more than 100,000 subscribers and its resilience, modern network, which is continuously being expanded and upgraded, allow subscribers of both residential and business services access to the latest voice and data network facilities for both private and business use. They also state that the topography of the Island with the unique challenges this presents, the need to share the frequency spectrum between the mobile operators and the need to re-use frequencies to increase what they term as spectrum efficiency requires the use of many small cell sites rather than fewer more powerful sites. They say that independent surveys have shown conclusively that the emissions from all the Jersey Telecom cell sites are only a small fraction of the safe level recommended by the ICNIRP. Jersey Telecom in conjunction with its suppliers has the experience, they quote, and the expertise to build, operate and maintain an inherently safe mobile network. I will just re-advise you this was information that I have imparted to you which they sent us.

Mr. R. Glover:

My name is Richard Glover. I am a Principal Planner in the Planning Department. I am in charge of a team that deals with planning applications including all the applications for the mobile phone network that is being established or has been established by the 3 companies in the last 12 months and all the applications. What I would like to do is just go through what the planning process involves and how we assess planning applications, who we speak to, and what sort of information we take into account when we are determining the planning applications, or rather when we are making recommendations on the planning applications. It is important to stress from the beginning that with the exception of antenna that cannot be seen from public road and those inside buildings, all telecommunication equipment requires planning permission. What that means is there will be telecommunications installations that fall outside the control of the Planning Department. There are some within telephone kiosks that Jersey Telecom use. Because they cannot be seen they do not require planning permission so the Register of Planning Applications for telecommunications installations is not a comprehensive record of where the telecommunications installations are. But if it does require planning permission, once an application is received it is screened in the normal way as we would with any other planning application and then it is advertised in accordance with the Jersey planning law. This involves the use of a notice in the press and also a site notice that has to be displayed for a minimum of 21 days. When we receive the telecommunications applications a copy of it, of all applications, is sent to the Health Protection Service of Health and Social Services Department for their comment. I will come on to what we are looking for from them a bit later in my presentation. All telecommunication applications are assessed against a policy within the Island Plan 2002, and that is policy NR12. Policy NR12 states that: "Telecommunications development will normally be permitted where siting and design will not unreasonably affect the character of the area; all practical possibilities of sharing facilities have been explored; where there have been no unacceptable impact on residential amenity and the proposal is also in accordance with other principles and policies of the Island Plan." If we look at those in turn: in terms of siting and design not unreasonably affecting the character of the area. Each company when they first came to us we asked them to provide a network plan which identified all the sites or the vicinities of sites where they would require masts, where they would be able to share existing facilities and how many masts they anticipated they would need to provide Island coverage. In each case and for each application the operator has to demonstrate they have considered the best design solution in terms of the least intrusive visual impact on the area. If there are no lattice towers or rooftop sites in an area the companies have to apply for new masts. So if there is no existing infrastructure, be it buildings or structures, they have to apply for a new mast. What we have insisted is any new masts have to be the replica telegraph pole masts that people will have seen going up on the Island. Now this is something that the Minister for Planning personally insisted upon having seen some of the masts produced and steel structures that you can see either in France or in the UK. He felt that the replica wooden telegraph poles would have least impact in terms of where a mast was acceptable. Following on from this consideration is the second point of the policy which says all practical possibilities of sharing facilities have been explored. As I have said, at the beginning of the process each operator has provided a

network coverage plan and shown to us whether there is any infrastructure in the vicinity. One of the dilemmas that was faced by the Planning Department was that in order to insist on mast sharing for new masts the structures that would have to be erected would be considerably bigger than the wooden telegraph poles that we sought to support throughout the Island so rather than insisting that we had big structures along the lines of the ones like at Five Oaks or Les Platons we thought that it was less intrusive to have more of the smaller masts that were the replica telegraph pole type. The problem with the telegraph pole mast is they cannot be shared because of the height and because of the strength of the pole itself. It just is not capable to get more than one operator on each of those masts. Looking now at how we assess unacceptable impact on residential amenity; each application is individually assessed from the neighbouring residential dwellings. We have to strike a balance here between facilitating the development and how much impact it does have on people's dwellings and people's amenity. It is like all planning issues, there is never going to be an answer that satisfies absolutely everybody but I assure you that every application is individually assessed to make sure that the best possible location is taken for each one that we are minded to support. The last part of policy NR12 is that the proposal is in accordance with other principles and policies of the plan, and that section of the policy is repeated in all the policies in the plan to ensure there is no contradiction thrown up by any development. I said earlier that we asked for all the information that we would normally expect with a planning application, and that is plans, elevations, photo montages, site plans, to demonstrate exactly what is being applied for because a planning permit is a legal document that needs to be relied upon wholly and can be tested through the courts. But as well as that, for the telecommunications applications, we have also required the companies to provide extra information above and beyond those plans. One of the things we have said they must provide is an ICNIRP certificate, which is the International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiological Protection. That has to provide an estimated maximum emission level from that site. When the company identify a site they will have an idea or do their calculations, when they are looking at providing network coverage, what the emissions are likely to be from that site. Now detailing what they think the emissions will be goes beyond what the United Kingdom ask for with applications for telecoms installations but also goes beyond what the Stewart Report - which I feel many of you are familiar with or familiar with the name anyway - requires because both the UK and the Stewart Report only require a certificate of self-compliance. That is, the company would submit a planning application and say: "We promise that this will be below the ICNIRP levels." We have said we want to know exactly what those levels are estimated to be. It is this information that we send off to the Health Protection Department to seek their comments and they comment in relation to what the companies are saying the estimated emissions will be. We also consider all representations that have been submitted in connection with the planning application, and that includes people's concerns over the health impacts of the telecommunications base stations. But we consider those comments in relation to the consultation responses that we may get, or that we do get, from the Health Protection Department and we have to take a balanced view as to which of those carries more weight in terms of determining the planning application. If we approve a planning application we again go beyond what the Stewart Report and

practice in the UK, like putting a condition on that requires that -- essentially says we are not just satisfied with the certificate which says what the estimated emissions levels will be. We require the companies following the commissioning of that mast or that installation to go out and measure what the actual emissions are. They have to do that within 12 months of the site being brought into operation. Once we get that we then again forward that to the Health Protection Department who look at it in relation to the Stewart Report, ICNIRP guidelines and, indeed, the certificate that was submitted with the planning application. So we are confident that once commissioned the emissions will be in line with ICNIRP and, so far, have been in line with what the estimated emission levels will be. So far, and this is as of 15th January, per company we have had - these are the numbers of applications, but again I have got to stress this as well, this does not represent the total number of sites because there is sharing going on where sharing is available, say on rooftops or even at masts like Five Oaks and Les Platons. So these are the total number of applications we have had. From Jersey Telecom there have been 59 approved with 3 still outstanding; Cable and Wireless 51 have been approved and they have no outstanding applications; and Airtel, who are the latest company to enter the market, have 29 approved and there are 18 of their applications outstanding. The anticipated total installations for all 3 companies, and this is not masts, this is actual installations including ones on existing infrastructure and buildings, is 150 for all 3 of the companies. Of this about 70 to 80 will be on the replica telegraph poles. Forty are already in place of those poles. So the balance, the other 70, are on installations on existing lattice towers and rooftop sites. Recently the Minister for Planning has lifted the moratorium, which you will be aware of and that the Chairman referred to in his introduction, but that moratorium, once it was lifted, recognised the fact that this process was going to be ongoing. So since the moratorium was lifted on 8th January every application that has been approved has had an additional condition saying that the permission is conditional upon the outcome of this process. So whatever the sub-committee find there will be some comeback on the applications that have been approved, certainly in the recent past.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Good evening, everyone. I am sitting here as a member of Scrutiny and despite what a couple of letters said in the paper about me not sitting on Scrutiny I sit on 4 sub-panels, but there you go. In order for this review to carry any weight and influence the job of the Scrutiny Panel is to be objective, professional, unbiased and produce a report that is fact-based. I am also a parent of 2 daughters - 2 daughters that we would not allow to have a mobile phone when they were younger because we had concerns, but they are now teenagers so I fully understand the importance of the mobile phone to the younger generation. I, indeed, have a mobile phone that has either got a flat battery or is turned off at the wrong time. The States itself will give a lot of credence to our own Health Protection Unit and Stephen Smith, the Assistant Director of Health Protection, did publish a report on *Mobile Phones and Health - Mobile Phone Base Stations* dated April 2006, which you can get copies of. Stephen will be at the hearing tomorrow at St. Brelade's Parish Hall to report on his findings and we thought it was only fair just to give a brief summary of what his findings were. Stephen will be appearing before the

Scrutiny Panel next week and obviously we will question him on some of the observations that he makes but for the purposes of this meeting all I am going to do is just repeat what his conclusions were so that then if people do have questions that they can ask, they can ask of us tonight and maybe we can then make a note and ask Stephen when he comes to the hearing next week. The conclusions of the report was that: "There is a consensus among all of the expert groups who have looked at the potential for health effects, that the balance of evidence to date suggests that exposure to radio frequency radiation below NRPB (National Radiological Protection Board) and ICNIRP guidelines do not cause adverse health effects to the general population. To that end it is incumbent upon the States to ensure that any operator fully complies with those international standards and openly shows compliance." He goes on to say: "Currently there is little information available to the public and the Government about the siting of base stations and their potential to affect the health of residents. This leads to suspicion and mistrust. There needs to be a central database of information available covering the siting, number of transmitters and power outputs of the equipment. There is also a need to ensure that the current operator, Jersey Telecom, who has not had any scrutiny of past installations is also required to show compliance with the guidelines even though it may be recognised that part of that compliance, the equipment in use, is likely to be of an equal standard internationally to proposed installations." He goes on to give the following recommendations, and again this is dated 12th April 2006, so this 8 months ago: "The States of Jersey should ensure that all base stations are to be subject to the scrutiny of the planning applications process to ensure compliance with internationally agreed standards. There should be improved consultation by the network operator with the community prior to the selection of a site for a base station." I will read that one again because it is quite important: "There should be improved consultation by the network operator with the community prior to the selection of a site for a base station. Emissions from base stations must, as a minimum, meet the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure as expressed in the EU (European Union) Council recommendation. However, the States should seek to ensure that network operators voluntarily agree to comply with lower levels than international guidelines. Measurement of the actual levels of radiations from base stations must be undertaken following commissioning to show compliance and be a condition of the planning permit. Mobile phone network operators deliver with the States of Jersey a database of information available to the public on radio base stations. There is cross-industry agreement on the sharing of sites and masts for radio base stations wherever possible. Stephen D. Smith, Assistant Director Health, 12th April 2006." This is very much your meeting and a lot of you in the audience will be aware or have certain concerns. We do have public hearings next week. When you express your concerns we will make a note of them and ask the relevant people. Thank you.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Thank you, the 3 speakers for that. What I would like to do just before I throw this open to the floor is just run through and do a résumé of that so you have got that and then we can open it to the floor. As the speakers have said, they have raised a number of issues and it is the opportunity for you tonight to raise any questions that you may have from that so that we may put that to the people we have got

before us next week on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, and that is in the States' Chamber. So I will just run through a quick résumé of what each of them said. Collin gave us a little bit about his background with the related experience and he condensed how good Jersey Telecom were in a fairly succinct way. He mentioned that GSM came in December 1994 and Jersey Telecom say that in line with best practice they complied with the JCRA and, indeed, they were well in advance of some of the standards, and that was done by a survey by Oftel and the JCRA. They have many mobile cell sites, and some of these are low powered. They have 99 per cent mobile coverage. Granite could be a problem. They have 116 per cent saturation, we have more phones than people, over 102,000 we heard. They say that their roaming coverage is 100 per cent and the various technical aspects of that were described. The success rate of calls is 98 per cent. They have various links of sub-cables and micro and they share the frequency. They have many small cell sites, and they say that their initial emissions are only a small fraction of permitted standards. Richard Glover explained that some small telephone boxes fall outside the planning issue and they therefore do not have a comprehensive record of all sites. He explained how applications were screened, advertised and site notices, and were copied to the Health Protection Service, and all of this is done under the 2002 Island Plan and policy NR12. It is regarding siting design, sharing being explored and the Minister prefers replica telegraph poles which are wooden but cannot be shared. He also mentioned not insisting on the massive metal structures that exist at Five Oaks and Les Platons. He made reference to the Stewart Report and benchmarking for estimated levels and this was used also by the Health Protection Department. The number of applications, up until 15th January, Jersey Telecom were 59, Cable and Wireless were 51, and Airtel 29 and they also had 18 pending. The total installation was about 150 and of those 70 to 80 were replica wooden telegraph poles. The Minister for Planning has a preference for those. The moratorium was lifted, since then there has been conditional permits pending the outcome of this review, and I said in my early introduction, it is not a waste of time because should this review find something then those, and indeed others, could be reconsidered. Senator Ben Shenton mentioned the report produced by Stephen Smith, who is Assistant Director of Health Protection. He referred to the conclusions and the recommendations in there, in particular that States of Jersey should ensure that compliance happens with internationally agreed standards, there should be improved consultation by the operators, especially with the community; the emissions must meet minimum standards; their operators should voluntarily comply with lower levels than international guidelines; measurements should take place of actual levels and compliance should be shown; and the mobile phone network database of information should be available to the public so that you can access where things are and ask questions if need be. Also that a cross-industry agreement of sharing masts should exist and base stations wherever possible. So that is really a summary of where we have come from and part of the reason we needed to do that is to inform ourselves. As Ben Shenton said, it is about evidence-based so we cannot just go off and think what we do is the right thing. We need to go to the people who know and initially that was Jersey Telecom, there are some planning issues, and there was a report from the Assistant Director of Health Protection. So that is really where we are starting from but we do have a way to go. Also tonight we have 2 Scrutiny

Officers, Carol Le Quesne and Malcolm who have microphones. We are also recording the proceedings so if anybody wants to say anything. I will now do that, I will open it to the floor. If anybody would like to say anything you are welcome to ask questions of us. The proceedings are being recorded, and that is for our benefit because it is not always easy to get an exact note of everything that is said, so it is over to you.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

One of the things that has happened as a result of the development of telecommunications with cell nets is the increase of electro-sensitive people, and the figures are 3.17 per cent in Europe at the moment. These people find it just impossible to live in the environment of EMS (electro-magnetic fields). It is now recognised as a disability in many European countries, and in Sweden the Government supports these people. First of all they go to the efforts to protect their houses. They line their houses with copper mesh and paint them with graphite paint and they cover the windows with an aluminium thin foil, and if these electro-sensitive people - which by the way in Jersey would work out at about 3,000 people on 3.17 per cent - they are then taken out into the countryside where the Government have built special places for them to be able to live their lives. What contingencies has the States of Jersey made for people of Jersey

Male Speaker:

Can I ask you then; because that is a technical area you have touched on: how would that be proven that they have this electro-sensitive system?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Sensitivity?

Male Speaker:

Yes.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Sensitivity is rather like having a very, very severe allergy to certain foods and these people literally cannot sit in a room where they have anything that flickers, like neon lights or anything like that. They cannot have electric cookers. Any magnetic field really destroys them. It is as a result of the increase in electromagnetic frequencies throughout the world at the moment. This is a very real thing. I do have a paper here if you would like me to endorse what I have just said.

Male Speaker:

Again, can I ask you are there any known case of that in Jersey, or cases?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I do not know. I am just asking you if there are any contingencies for the possibility.

Male Speaker:

Obviously within the health service there is contingencies for everything. So if somebody has a proven illness or allergy then if treatment is needed then if that is a health issue then it would be treated.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

These people cannot live in electromagnetic fields.

Male Speaker:

Yes.

Dr. G. Langley-Smith:

So we are going to have wall-to-wall electromagnetic fields in Jersey with out three companies; there is gong to be no respite for these people.

Male Speaker:

Well you said these people, but how many? I mean who are the people?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I have just told you, the figures are 3.17 per cent of European population.

Male Speaker:

Okay.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

And it is becoming a big issue in Britain at the moment.

Male Speaker:

If I may just step in there, I was contacted by a lady that suffered from this type of illness. Unfortunately I did not take a note of her name, because she was on the phone for quite a long time about how she could not have a microwave in the house or anything else. She was quite distressed. It is obviously a question that we will be putting to the health unit. It is not something I had ever heard of before she telephoned me, to be honest with you.

Male Speaker:

My perspective, when you are talking about contingencies, one has to assess what the problem is

specific to Jersey, rather than Europe as a whole. And as I said, I am sure we will be asking the questions of the various people we will be meeting over the next few days - some very searching questions in those areas, because if, as you say, we are looking at -- you said 3.1 per cent?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

3.17 per cent.

Male Speaker:

3.17 per cent; if we are looking at that as a sample, we would be hoping to find some evidence of that through the health agencies. And it is only based on fact that you base your contingency plan to meet whatever requirements you need. And I will, again, be asking you some searching questions in that area.

Male Speaker:

I understand that Dr. James Reuben, who will be here on 15th February, may have some experience in that area. That is a question we will certainly ask of him, because I understand that is part of his research area, so we could certainly ask that question of him. We do have a note of that so we could do it. So it is Mr. ...?

Male Speaker:

Langly-Smith.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Mr. Langly-Smith. Thank you.

Male Speaker:

Maybe I could just make a comment on that and ask Dr. Langly-Smith in fact if your research is covered by -- we have information on the effect of pulsi frequency electromagnetic fields on human sleep, written by K Mann, *Neuropsychobiology*, is that the author of your paper perhaps?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

No, I have just picked it up in multiple papers because I have been searching into this. But the paper I have here is from Sweden.

Male Speaker:

Right.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I will just give you the name just for your ... it is Johan Bananda, Project Co-ordinator for Disability Issues, City of Stockholm.

Male Speaker:

I would ask if we could have access to that as well, that paper, and then we could follow that up.

Male Speaker:

There is also, I note, another publication on *Electromagnetic Hazards and Therapy* by an S Best, 2001, so there does seem to be quite a lot of information about. So clearly this needs further looking at from our point of view.

Male Speaker:

I assume after what you have been saying we are going to get some sort ... great. Thank you for that.

Mr. J. Drew:

Thank you. Jim Drew, from Trinity. As you know ICNIRP guidelines were produced to govern the thermal consequences of the radiation produced by telephone masts - that being the only known adverse effect at the time that the ICNIRP guidelines were produced nearly 10 years ago. That is confirmed in the report prepared by Stephen Smith. I am sure you accept that anyway.

Male Speaker:

Yes.

Mr. J. Drew:

As you know, there have been many reports published, and are available on the internet, concerning non-thermal biological effects. It is a controversial area. By the way, for everyone here, I am not a scientist so if you ask me a scientific question you are just going to make me look silly - go fire away. But reputable scientists, scientists who have been approached to provide advice to the UK Government, scientists who have been invited to provide advice to the European Union, others, have produced reports of laboratory experiments which demonstrate the potential for this sort of radiation to have biological non-thermal effects on living organisms. Others have challenged their results because they have been unable to reproduce those results. The first band have come back and said: "Well, that is because you have not tried to reproduce them in the same way" and so on. I do not advance the argument, I am not competent to do so, that there are adverse non-thermal biological effects. But I put it to you that there is a lot of smoke out there, suggesting that there might well be a fire. Against that background, my question for you is not a planning question, it is not a scientific question; it is purely political-social question. Given the doubt and the incredible consequences, if that doubt transpires to be correct, because we are talking about saturating the Island with this radiation, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52

weeks a year, year after year after year, a circumstance which you cannot reproduce in a laboratory, self-evidently, given the doubt, how can it be right for the leaders in our society, you the politicians, to sanction this? What possible justification can you advance, other than the merely economic, for running this potential risk with the health and safety of the entire population, on a balance of risk and reward? Is it not enough to ask the question to know the answer? Please respond and tell me how you counter that - anyone.

Mr. R. Stant:

Ray Stant(?). A comment briefly on really more of the technical side rather than the political side initially. I have read that G.J. Highland on the Select Committee on Science and Technology has done considerable work on this and he really concludes with a recommendation that several courses of action can be identified that would go some way to ameliorating the hazardous situation currently obtaining in the case of base stations. Principally, that is why ensuring that the field strengths to which the public are so indiscriminately and involuntarily exposed are kept well below the threshold values referred to in his paper. These are 1,000 times lower than the thermal levels, which are in the order of microwatts per centimetre squared. So once again, there has been considerable research done here, and I think risk assessment has to be based on this sort of research. I will pass you on to Alan to give you the political answer now.

Mr. J. Drew:

Before you do so, can I just respond on that one? I too have read the work by Mr. Highland and some of it I understand, but probably not as much as you do. I have read his papers, and because I do not really understand I then took the trouble to call him and ask him the question bluntly: "Are the powers used by telephone masts" and I described the types that are being used here: "Are the powers sufficient to generate biological effects in people?" And quite properly and fairly he said: "It cannot be proven because there is the factor of duration, which has not been replicated in the laboratory. But as a scientific principle, as a theory the powers being emitted by the masts being erected in Jersey are sufficient to have the biological effects described." Whether they will have those adverse effects he would not commit himself to. He simply said: "It is a scientific possibility that they can and comparable experiments in the laboratory seem to support this" but his point was very emphatic. It is not correct to say that the masts do not emit sufficient power to have potential adverse biological non-thermal effects. He was very specific, he was very clear, he put it in nice easy layman's language and I do not think I misunderstood him. So that is the premise for my question. It is not that these masts could but are so weak that they will not or might, but they are being placed so discretely that they cannot. As located, with their current outputs, with their current density, the potential for adverse biological effects cannot be ruled out. You mentioned Mr. Highland, and that is why I have come back on that, and because I have spoke to Mr. Highland. Other scientists have also offered similar views and Sweden seem to be leading the field here, because I am gong to repeat Sweden - I read a couple of reports from there. But

those effects are out there. Mr. Highland is not saying it is proven either. You know, he is not some scaremonger saying this is clearly the case. He is saying it is the potential that is there. So I am glad we are going to have a political answer, because it seems to me I am asking a political question, which is that it just does not seem to me to be right the Government should take that sort of chance. I mean, no disrespect, but I do not think your scientific response has done anything to allay my fears. I do not think it is on a par with what I have heard elsewhere.

Male Speaker:

Can you repeat that? I did not hear that.

Mr. J. Drew:

Which bit did you not hear?

Male Speaker:

Just the last bit.

Male Speaker:

I think it was the fact that science is not necessarily given as the answer because there is so much conflicting information.

Mr. J. Drew:

I am sorry, I am totally rude and I have forgotten your name already, but the gentleman at the end offered me a scientific answer to the scientific element of the question and I am saying back, if I may, I do not think that your scientific answer to my question answered my question because it is not supported by the other evidence I have seen and heard. But essentially I am taking it that the science is there. It is really apolitical question, and politics ought to be about risk and reward, I understand that, but I do not see how you can make the risk/reward equation that is being made here.

Male Speaker:

Okay. Well let us get political then. You said the potential cannot be ruled out. So then it can be ruled in. How far can it be ruled in? Obviously with some of the scientific evidence a test would be the proof of that. And as you said, there is some doubt, and then with anything there is a risk factor. The justification for running the risk on the entire population: the balance, the risk, the reward, is that the population of Jersey have said, in no uncertain terms, is that they want competition in the mobile telephone world. For that there is infrastructure to be put in place for that to happen.

Mr. J. Drew:

Sorry, can I interrupt you on that point, because that is a point that has been made previously by others

apart from yourself, and I categorically reject your assertion that the community has asked for competition. In fact, and this is a very small sample, I have done a poll around my own residential area. We polled 101 residents. One resident was really indifferent to the idea and all the remainder, not a figure of speech; all the remainder rejected that idea.

Male Speaker:

Of competition?

Mr. J. Drew:

I believe that what the community of Jersey want -- and I cannot back this up with evidence but I throw it back at you as another unsustainable assertion, if you like. What the community of Jersey want are good value services, but I think they also want health and safety. I do not think that it is possible to make the assertion that the community, most of whom will not understand the economic issues underpinning that statement. I do not think it can be sustained as an argument that the community have said they want competition. Competition they want on a football field; competition they want on a badminton court. They do not care how the services arrive, so long as the services arrive properly and efficiently. And it may well be the case that competition was not the right answer, it may be that it was, but that is a matter for JCRA. The fact is the community have not made that statement, and I honestly do not know how you can make that.

Male Speaker:

Well they have to me, put it that way. You are expressing opinions there for other people that they do not want it and you are entitled to do that. But then we are evidence based, so if you can produce some evidence that say the community in Jersey do not want competition in the market then we will listen to that. It is evidence based so ...

Mr. J. Drew:

I understand what you are saying and I appreciate the challenge, although I think --

Male Speaker:

Can I just interrupt you? You also mentioned good value. Can you define good value in terms of Jersey Telecom as a single operator?

Mr. J. Drew:

No I cannot define good value.

Male Speaker:

You mentioned good value.

Mr. J. Drew:

Yes I did. On the basis that I do not think the community wants bad value, I honestly do not think that is a really sensible ground on which for us to have a disagreement. I think we both know that Jersey want good value. Everybody wants good value. It is like motherhood and apple pie. My point is this: you said that we, and I consider myself part of the community, want competition. Competition is not an end - it is a means to an end.

Male Speaker:

Can I just add something, which you may not be aware of, all right? Over this week and next week we are carrying out a survey, which hopefully is not biased in any way. One of the questions that we are asking of those people that we are surveying is that very question. In fact, there are three statements that we ask, and I am quite happy to read them out because --

Mr. J. Drew:

Yes please.

Male Speaker:

The three statements in respect to the need for service, and what we ask is for the general public to comment that either they strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or do not know, so it is one of those standard scales. The three statements are: "I believe mobile phone network coverage is adequate." Agree or whatever: "I welcome all competition in the mobile phone market." Which is the bit that you are talking about and, finally: "I welcome improved services in the mobile phone market." Now those are questions that we are asking the community.

Mr. J. Drew:

Absolutely, but surely it childishly obvious that does not support the statement made by Deputy Breckon. You have not given them the alternative. Yes, people will welcome competition, but not as an end, as a means to an end, but not if they think it is not the best means to that end. This is one of those survey questions which is clearly steered towards the result you want it to achieve. The result you wanted to achieve at the outset, which was stated by Deputy Breckon in, I believe, the paper reporting this, maybe it is right, maybe it is wrong, which is the object of the committee was to put people's minds at rest. I do not think that is the object of the committee. It is to find the truth.

The Deputy of St. Saviour No. 2:

I see the role of this panel is to view all the evidence that we have, coming from all angles and to make an objective assessment of what the situation is, without any previous view at all.

Mr. J. Drew:

I think that is right and I welcome that. I agree with you, I do not have a difference with you on that one. So we go back to my earlier point, which is that I am looking for an explanation as to how it can be that on the one hand a purely economic benefit, a better phone, can be weighed in the scales against a potential harm, which is doubt, which is a health risk, and for that economic benefit to have come out on top. When if you put that question to, I would have thought most people, I cannot say all, but it seems common sense: which is more important to you, having a better phone or having health, most people surely would say health. But the Government has come up with the different answer. They have said it is more important for people to have a better phone and we will take a risk on health. A do not know question. Unlike a drug company who will be told: “No, no, no you cannot market it until you prove it is safe” we seem to be taking the view: “Well it is all right to market this until we prove it is dangerous” and it must be done.

Male Speaker:

We are asking people of their understanding of the health risks associated with mobile phones and with masts. So what you are saying is where we are anyway. We are asking that of people, their understanding of that and where they go that from - whether it is from their own papers that they have read, from national newspapers, from friends or colleagues, so that is part of our assessment.

Mr. J. Drew:

As an aside, I am going to keep talking until somebody takes this off me, by the way. So you, you know, you lot down here. But most people cannot answer that question about that. I have tried to read the ICNIRP guidelines and it is baffling. We just look to the commentators. The commentators are out there. Scientists say: “There is a real danger, be careful.” It is not proven either way, and I am not saying it is proven either way, I am saying it is a real danger. But you have not answered my question, which is how do you justify taking that risk with my health purely so that I might have a better phone? It does not seem justified.

Male Speaker:

Yes, but this panel is not taking any risks with anybody’s health. We are investigating the situation. The terms of reference are there and that is what we are doing. We are, as they say, where we are. So what we are doing is we are looking at the situation we have and we will report on that, depending on what we find. Now the areas you have touched on, there are all sorts of opinion on that, and some of that is influenced by whoever paid them. As we know, some may have fairly deep pockets and can get a bias on that. Now what we are trying to do, this panel is trying to get behind some of that bias and get as much independence as we can. This will mean not only the people we have before us but many, many research papers, including some of the ones that you have touched on. As I said before we have got three bundles of papers to go through and there is some serious conflict in some of those opinions

that some say, like you have said: "The potential cannot be ruled out, but then of a scale of risk where is that?" Then there is people want services of all sorts. They want value for money, as you have touched on, or good value, and then there is a risk in crossing the road, so where does that lie in getting to the other side? So in everything we do when we get out of bed in the morning there is an element of risk. And part of what we are trying to do is make some assessment of all this in some areas very complex information - scientific, and that is why we need some advice on some of this and we are getting some updated papers on some of these issues so we can try and make this assessment. But not just us to make an assessment, to refer it to people who perhaps can, who have a more scientific and technical knowledge than ourselves, and this really where we are with that now. That is not any easy judgment call and we listen to all shades of views and opinions, and that is really where we are starting from. And we have started tonight with Jersey Telecom, the health report that was done here and the planning issues to move us on. You have touched on some, and the gentleman before you, sort of fairly complex areas there in that there is a technical aspect to that of which we are not qualified to comment.

Mr. J. Drew:

Am I allowed to come back on that or is anybody else anxious to get on with it?

Male Speaker:

Yes.

Mr. J. Drew:

Three points straight away. And this is a complicated subject so it is very hard to keep a thread going. If I sound as though I scattering I apologise. One, you have referred to the fact that Dr. Langly-Smith and I have raised complex areas. The speakers on the panel lay great weight an emphasis and make numerous references to ICNIRP. I honesty do not know anybody that has any issues with ICNIRP. We all understand that the masts are within ICNIRP guidelines, we all understand that ICNIRP guidelines are silent on the health issues that are worrying us. Any answer to a question that we might make that begins or contains the words ICNIRP is clearly an answer to a different question. ICNIRP I have not got a problem with. The second point I want to make in terms of what you just said: realistically, and I promise you no disrespect at all in this answer. This debate about the biological effects of this radiation has been raging for not less than 10 years and possibly quite a bit longer and has been unresolved by some of the best scientific brains in the world throughout that period, including at least one Nobel Laureate. This committee is going to be, I submit, unable to do in the next month or two what the world scientific community has not been able to do in the last 10 years. So an attempt to bottom this out appears to me to be unlikely to succeed and, therefore, ought not to be a realistic goal of the committee, which is why I expressed my question earlier in the way I did, which is not that it is a scientific question, it is a political questions. If you accept my premise, which clearly you may not, that you are not going to be able to find an answer to the question is there or is there not a real risk of adverse biological

effects. If you are not going to be able to answer that, the only question that needs to be answered to put my mind at rest is: is it right to take that risk for that, I put it to you, very modest benefit? And it comes back all the time to that. If this were a drug you and I would not be arguing because we would both agree that the drug company cannot put its drug on the market until it is proven to be safe. The difference there is the person who takes the drug does so voluntarily. The person who crosses the road, to use your illustration really does not have a choice in any realistic picture of the world. But here we have a choice; the Government who you are advising have a choice whether or not to do this. I will not have a choice whether or not to be exposed to -- sort of leaving the Island. This is going to be saturation coverage across the Island. I cannot get out of it. It happens I am not one of Dr. Langly-Smith's electro-sensitive people, but nevertheless I feel I should have that choice if there is doubt. It is only that. I am not trying to prove to you that this stuff is dangerous. I do not know. I am not competent to form that view, but I am competent to form the view that there is a scientific body of opinion which ought to be listened to at least, and which has not yet been adequately refuted. The Airtel representative at a meeting in Grouville Parish Hall, before Christmas, made the statement it is impossible to prove a negative. It may or may not be true. The point is he is saying: "You are asking us to prove it is not dangerous." My answer to that is no I am not; I am asking you to prove it is safe. You are asking me to prove it is not safe and I cannot prove a negative. It is just semantics, it gets us nowhere. The only question that ought to be put to a government is: is it right for you to play a game of Russian roulette with the health of the entire community, in circumstances in which members of that community are denied all choice, all freedom of action, they simply have to go along with it and they are really genuinely scared of it.

Senator B. Shenton:

If I could stop you there because --

Mr. J. Drew:

No you cannot, Ben, I am still in full flood.

Senator B. Shenton:

Going back to Stephen Smith's report and it is a pity he is not here. This is I take it to be the official Government report on mobile masts here. He does say: "The expert went on to conclude that is not possible at present to say that exposure to RF radiation, even at levels below the national guidelines is totally without potential adverse health effect, and that the gaps in knowledge are sufficient to justify a precautionary approach." Now, one of the jobs of this panel is to find out what he means by "a precautionary approach" and if it is justified what they are going to do about it. We can only do that next week when we question him and find out what is going on. But we as politicians, I feel, do have an obligation to take a precautionary approach if there is doubt.

Mr. J. Drew:

Thank you.

Male Speaker:

Can we just pause a minute there because they need to change the CD for recording, so if you can just wait.

Male Speaker:

Okay. Right. Thank you.

Female Speaker:

My question is about value of houses. There are various properties in the Island where the masts are very, very close to residential areas. I know of 3 that are only about 75 metres away from their kitchen windows. Houses in Jersey are very, very expensive and people really struggle to get on the property ladder. Has the States thought that these properties are going to be very devalued by these masts? Are the owners going to be compensated? The value of their house suddenly could be halved and may even be unsaleable. The landowners, I hear, are being paid exorbitant prices to have the masts on their land. I have heard there is £60,000 paid to some farmers. Whether this is true or not, I do not know. But is there going to be compensation for these people who cannot sell their houses or who are devalued? What about the poor property owner who is being irradiated 24/7 by microwave emissions and cannot sell their houses?

Male Speaker:

If I may come in on this one with observations I have at present. Certainly, from the point of view of St. Brelade, where all property transactions come through the parish hall, I see no evidence of this at this stage. Once again, we would be interested to know if you have any evidence of this because I think it is fundamental matter.

Female Speaker:

01:42 (several inaudible words) people are going to be aware. In England, I understand that some estate agents are going into houses and testing for the power. A lot of people, the first question they ask is: "Where is the nearest telephone mast?" So this is going to happen here when we are tripling or quadrupling the number of masts. There are going to be more properties that are going to be close to masts. I know very well that a lot of people I know, the first question they will ask is: "Where is the nearest mast?" They will not buy the house. But these masts have been put up so close to these properties. Who is going to buy them? Would you buy a house with a mast 75 yards away from your kitchen window? I do not think so.

Male Speaker:

Interestingly enough, just to follow on once again from that, one of the lawyers always comes to the parishes with their property searches and it could be that we will be getting a question as to whether there is a mast in proximity because I would imagine that the parishes or Planning will be obliged to disclose this.

Female Speaker:

02:55 (several inaudible words) telecoms pay compensation to the property owners because the farmers and landowners are getting paid a fortune.

Male Speaker:

Firstly, what you have given us is some anecdotal evidence, and you have suggested up to £60,000. We will be testing that by asking the appropriate questions. We have already discussed that. So we will find out what sort of money is being paid for the hiring of land to put masts on. So we will come up with the definitive answer on that one.

Male Speaker:

Can I just help you here? This is what is going on in the rest of the world.

Male Speaker:

I am interested in Jersey. But carry on.

Male Speaker:

I know, but it is going to happen here. You do not think we are that different, do you? In Israel it has now been passed in Israeli Parliament 5106: "Compensations that will be given by the cellular companies to the local authorities for reduction of property value lawsuits because of the proximity to antennas." Also in the pipeline is the setting of distances from sensitive places. This is very recent.

Male Speaker:

Excuse me asking the question. Is that with regard to mobile phone masts or other radiating equipment?

Male Speaker:

Yes.

Male Speaker:

Thanks for that. Obviously, any evidence you have got we would welcome, so it is a case of -- and the scrutiny officers are here.

Male Speaker:

Certainly. Whilst I have got this in my hand, can I just ask you one thing: where does all this obsession with competition come from? Because I have asked a lot of people like Jim Drew and I really do not feel that it has been driven from the public. I have not seen any surveys or anything. It takes 2 for competition. So the sensible precautionary approach would have been to have brought in one other company and gone very carefully. I feel 3 companies with 3 times the emissions is a hell of a lot of EMF (Electric and Magnetic Fields) all over the Island and is a reckless approach. That is not a precautionary approach.

Male Speaker:

One of the questions that I will be asking, and, again, it is based on the science of the industry, when we talk about the number of units that are operating on the Island, because there will be 3 companies, it is very easy for people to assume that it is going to be 3 times the amount of transmissions. Now, what I want to check again and ask them from a technical -- because I do not know at the moment, is: we have a limited number of mobile phones. I do not think we are going to increase mobile phones to 3 per family. Let us say we run a round figure of 100,000 mobile phones. Is it going to be 3 times the actual EMF saturation because of having the extra masts or is it going to be the sharing of frequencies so they are only going to be operating at a capacity of 100,000 subscribers?

Male Speaker:

I think I can answer that. You will have 3 times the emissions because all the masts will be emitting.

Male Speaker:

Again, I will be --

Male Speaker:

I ask that myself.

Male Speaker:

Can I just explain? The competition does not come from us. It is the Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority who put in place to test where a monopoly exists and in this case it was Jersey Telecom. They have licensed other operators and they were under the umbrella of the former Economic Development Committee and now come under the Economic Development Minister. They were given licences and there were various conditions attached to that. We are interviewing the JCRA next week and that is certainly one avenue that we will explore. Can I just say, on a personal basis, I attended a youth forum about 2 years ago and I asked the young people, as young consumers: is there anything in Jersey that they felt they were being badly served? They said they felt they were being ripped off by Jersey Telecom and that there should be competition in the market because they did not feel there was a level

of service and they did not feel it was competitively priced. Now, that is a view that was given to me by young people. All of these young people had mobile phones and were fairly comfortable with it but were frustrated because the technology that was available then was second generation, not third, and were frustrated that Jersey Telecom was not modern enough. They felt they needed a kick up the pants and somebody should shake them up a bit. They were overpriced and the service was not good enough. That came from my experience with the Jersey Youth Form. Okay, so that is a different generation to us but they have rights, they have expectations as well and we have to take as many people's views and opinions in as we can. That is the reason why we are doing an independent survey. We are asking the people who do not ask us. We are going to various places around the Island. It is not just around the town; it is various locations. We have done some already. We will be doing the same over the next week or so to get a barometer, if we can, of how people feel about that. So it will be not that scientific but it will give us some feel for that and how that is. That has been part of our conclusions, really. So that is where we are with that. There was a feeling that with one operator, although, under the telecoms law and the JCRA, they could have put conditions on there. There was also the feeling expressed by them and the Economic Development Committee at the time that other operators were required and that is their decision, not ours. So that has come from somewhere else and we will give an opinion on that in the conclusions. But at the moment we cannot say where it is because others are going to tell us: "It is not my opinion," or anybody else. It is what other people are going to tell us, including yours, indeed. There is a lady here. Can we just ask the lady?

Female Speaker:

Yes. Hi. I have got so many things in my head it might sound a bit confused. But one thing I came here tonight, and will be applying to Scrutiny, my application will be based on the moral stance of this whole issue. Because I was in a parish meeting in St. Lawrence with the Constable and 2 deputies and we thrashed things out with the 2 people sitting here, 3 to 3 for over an hour, seriously concerned about this issue, for personal reasons as well, which I will be divulging lots of them. Basically the Constable did say that probably the outcome will be that no one will be able to prove or disprove the danger. So, again, I wrote a letter to the paper. What I feel like is a guinea pig. I am sitting in a property, rented property. My landlord has put up a mast in the field which is probably about 40 metres from my flat. I have heard nothing about it. I speak to the land people; they live opposite me. They have not spoken to me and anyway it was mentioned that people should have had information about what was happening or been consulted about any application in the area. I have had nothing. I have not noticed there was a little A4-sized application on a poster in that field - that I have not noticed in 3 months. The first thing I knew about this - perhaps I missed a couple of papers where the original application was in - was I opened it; it said: "St, Lawrence, the 26 masts, 1 11:08 (several inaudible words) where I live." Then I found out from the landlord and it is like that close. I have a 3 year-old son. Anyway, you know what it is like to be a parent. The other application is for opposite St. Lawrence Primary School, specifically opposite the nursery where my son attends. So basically it is just a bombshell to me, this whole thing.

But one thing I keep coming back to is that the politicians are supposed to be here to look after us. We are the uninformed and I am the penniless at the moment. Not the penniless but I have no money. The landlord is getting a huge amount for that mast in the field. Perhaps he can cover any compensation needs he needs in the future if their health deteriorates. But I have not got that assurance. But the other thing is we keep talking about: well, the youth want this and the youth want that. I appreciate they have a voice. But surely the youth and everybody else have to be informed before they make it. For example, when you are going out asking people did they want competition in the next week or 2, really, that should be asked after the conclusions of this and everybody has been told in a language that they understand, specific to their situation, whether, it is land owner, house owner, whoever they are, whatever, whether they have got something close to them or not, what the likely implications for them are. Then ask them, "Would you rather have competition and a better mobile phone or what would you do then?" That is when you are going to get your true result.

Male Speaker:

Yes. We can certainly follow that up. That is an individual application but --

Female Speaker:

Yes. Also, the other thing on the planning application: there is a whole new development being put next door to us, of 13 houses, that is not even on the planning application. I do not think that any of those houses there know that they have just moved into this property owned by the landlord as well. I do not think they are aware of that either.

Male Speaker:

But we did hear from Richard Glover from Planning that the applications are screened, they are advertised. There is a site notice within 21 days and a copy goes to the Health Protection Service so --

Female Speaker:

I know that all that has happened. I am just saying I have missed the boat and I am alarmed.

Male Speaker:

It has happened, has it?

Female Speaker:

You are listening to me because that is my situation but making a bigger point about the moral issue: my main foundation for everything and everyone I have spoken to, and I have spoken to a lot of people since then. I am running on -- we are the custodians for the younger generations. What are we leaving behind our children in 30 years' time?

Male Speaker:

Exactly. Yes.

Female Speaker:

I do not want to look at my 3 year-old child sitting in what I perceive as a very dangerous situation and just saying: "Oh, well. Okay. Maybe the mast will go in a year" even. I do not want to think about the longer-term impact of it all. We are thinking of moving before that mast comes. We are probably going to move before it comes. But we have moved twice already in the last 3 years and we have not got any money, so, again, maybe I could get some help with costs for that.

Male Speaker:

Yes. But, again, you see, this is part of the process because what you tell us is news to us and we will certainly note that and we will check that all of that has been done. There are issues there that you have raised about proximity. I have had a number of discussions with the Planning Minister and what he has said is that he is adopting a precautionary approach. Now, if that is not the case then if you let us have the details of that, then we will certainly do that on your behalf. This is part of the reason we are here. We are here to listen to what you want to say. It is difficult with the application that you mentioned because obviously we do not have a knowledge of that. But we can find that out because we will have it on file. But we will have that on file.

Female Speaker:

Yes.

Male Speaker:

Okay. The other lady there. Yes.

Female Speaker:

Thank you.

Male Speaker:

Just a quick one. If I could just say something about the precautionary approach. Planning is following the Health and Social Securities recommendations and the Stewart Report regarding ICNIRP guidelines. I would just like to give some idea of what is happening in the world. ICNIRP has got a recommended power of 10 watts per square metre, okay? Salzburg, which is now looked upon as the safety gold standard, is 0.001. That is 10,000 times the difference. Now I know we are trying to run our systems on a lower power than that, but we should be looking at Salzburg, not at ICNIRP.

Male Speaker:

Again, if there is any information there that you want to share with us, it is all --

Male Speaker:

It is all in my submission.

Male Speaker:

Yes. Okay. Yes. The lady there. Did you want to ...?

Female Speaker:

Well, I would just like to say that it was with a bit of a shock that we realised that we were going to have a mobile phone mast very near us. We live terribly near St. Lawrence Primary School. So I have been wrongly complacent, thinking: "We are so near the school. It will not be too near us." But I was very wrong. It is going to be 175 metres from our house and at one point it is less than 300 metres from St. Lawrence Primary School. I was at this meeting with our Deputies and the Constable the other evening. I must say, they seem sympathetic but they do not think there is much they can do. That surprises me. But what surprised me even more, this evening I went up to the community centre to just ask them whether they knew that this telephone mast had been passed, and the community centre was closed tonight. Usually it is full of children after school. But I took the liberty of knocking on a couple of doors because I have seen the people who live in the houses, just at the junction between 02:53 (inaudible) and going off towards Hampton. I knocked on their doors and went in and was welcomed and I just said: "I do not know whether you realise there is a mast here". They did not. I said: "Have you got children at school?" They said: "Yes". They had not been informed by the school about these masts. I find that amazing because I think that the parents should be involved with a petition, given the opportunity. I think the headmaster dealt with it on his own and he managed, apparently, to persuade the planning people to move the mast so that it would be 300 metres. But 300 metres is nothing.

Male Speaker:

I think we do have some record of that particular one and I think there was an issue of proximity to that. I cannot be certain exactly about the location but it was reconsidered, I know, by the Minister of Planning. I think representation was made by the representatives of St. Lawrence on that. I know that the head teacher was involved as well because somebody brought it to his attention. I think he made representation. It was perhaps with that that it was moved. But I do not know. But we would have the details. If not we can certainly get the details and find out. But, again, if there is anything on that that you would like to let us have, please do so.

Female Speaker:

These mothers, it was very short notice. But they were really rather alarmed, if not very alarmed, and very grateful to me for knocking on the door. They are writing to Scrutiny and going to look up the

Jersey Masts Concern website.

Female Speaker:

Just to add to that: I just feel people have not been informed enough. I just feel there have been these little things in the paper about, "Write to Scrutiny". But definitely in that school the parents have not been asked for individual representation to Scrutiny. But elsewhere people sometimes do not really read the paper or they are not very literate or they are not so -- I am the type of person who -- in a way it is all coming to a head now and it is getting out into the public now. But the end of the scrutiny applications is the 26th, which is really close. I am just gathering information at a rate of knots. I have got several pieces of paper of what I want to put together and represent to you. Yet people are hearing today, with days to go, and I have not got time to go round and network. I do not know if that is just me individually but that is another feeling I have, a feeling of a bit panicked about it.

Male Speaker:

Yes. Well, could I say from our point of view: if you want to make a submission, put something in, and then put something else in, please do that. Do not feel that you have to have a bundle of information before you do that. If there is something you find, depending how you want to do it, we have the contacts of the scrutiny officers. Not everybody has email but we still have envelopes and stamps and we can give you addresses, contacts. You can make telephone contact with people. We can do whatever we can to make that as easy as possible because we are not here to obstruct anybody who wants to make their submission. Please do not feel that you have to have everything there correctly tagged and bundled. If it is a bundle of papers and you think: "This could be of interest to you" we have got, as I say, 3 bundles like that already. So, please, whatever it may be.

Female Speaker:

Maybe some people are put off by the thought that there is all the technical argument and today you have to be totally factual because you are saying you are only accepting factual information. But in a way all of my issues are sort of on the moral and so on. But it is a fact that I am concerned with them and emotionally and so on. So, you know --

Male Speaker:

But people's concerns, albeit emotionally, are part of a problem which exists.

Female Speaker:

Yes. I am part of the health issue.

Male Speaker:

Anyone who suggests that because rightly or wrongly because someone is concerned about something,

the very fact they are concerned is part of a problem. That is part of a health problem.

Female Speaker:

Hear, hear. Thank you.

Male Speaker:

May I just say that I think the issue has come to light? To be honest with you, before I was contacted by concerned people I never gave mobile phone masts a thought, to be perfectly honest. May I just say that I think the Evening Post has done some excellent coverage on the issue and I notice 07:28 (inaudible) is in the audience here tonight as well. So the profile has been raised quite considerably over the last couple of months.

Female Speaker:

You mentioned the precautionary approach. Well, in Greece, and we can follow on from the schools here, on 10th August 2006 they signed a bill which prohibits the mobile telephone masts' radar and high voltage lines to be within 500 metres of any school. Also in New South Wales, exactly the same thing has happened. So they are taking precautionary effect and it seems to me that 500 metres is a much safer distance than even 300 metres. Schools are our next generation. They should not be near anybody. But schools are definitely very, very important.

Male Speaker:

As I said before, my understanding from the Minister of Planning was that he was adopting a precautionary approach and if there is evidence to suggest that other people are suggesting distances that you have just mentioned there, then we obviously would be interested to receive that because that could be part of our submission to him and to the Health Protection Team. If that is the case elsewhere and there is something that they have good cause to do that, then we would certainly be interested in that.

Male Speaker:

If it is any consolation, there is an application to put a mast on the land not far from La Moye School. I did write to Planning and ask them to leave this one alone until the results of this report were produced because I am concerned that it is not only close to the La Moye School but also close to a local housing estate. So I would like to be satisfied in my own mind that there is no danger to the children locally.

Male Speaker:

Yes. Oh, there is a lady there, sorry.

Female Speaker:

Yes. What I want to say is basically there is a planning application which has been passed less than 100

metres from my home, despite my protestations, my writing to various Senators, my Deputy, et cetera. Whilst it is vitally important that my children are protected at school, and I understand and, in fact, I think Senator Vibert is not allowing the erection of any more masts on actual education land. Obviously he cannot have them in -- he cannot define other people's choices in close proximity. What I would say is that my children sleep in their beds for 10 hours a day. I have 2 children, my youngest and my eldest, who will be beaming directly into their bedrooms for 10 hours a day. They are at school for 6 hours a day. Whilst they are being protected at school, and I hope there is nothing put on the land at school, and I have made my protest to Planning. Nobody visited my home. David Watson from Airtel, in fairness to him, did visit my home and directly spoke to myself and my husband and even suggested that he may move the mast, which I pointed out to Planning, which was not responded to. This is going on in our homes as well as our schools. I choose to protect my children. I have 3 young children. My eldest is 10. I do not allow him to have a mobile phone because I do not believe he needs a handset, for a start. But I do not have the choice for him, in his own home. I make lots of choices for my children: healthy diet, exercise, so on, and I cannot protect him from this. It is devastating as a parent not to be able to protect your child.

Male Speaker:

Again, you say you have objected to Planning, have you? You have done that. So as that becomes a matter of public record then obviously that will be passed to us.

Female Speaker:

11:52 (several inaudible words) application was passed on the very first day of the end of the moratorium, without a visit from anybody from Planning.

Male Speaker:

In effect, what you are saying is: it was passed by Planning and it is Airtel themselves who suggested they are going to move the mast after discussion with you?

Female Speaker:

The gentleman from Airtel, the CEO from Airtel, came to visit my home and spoke directly with myself and my husband. He did not make any promises. Obviously, he cannot do. He said anything that he would decide would be subject to planning procedures. But within reason he thought he may be able to relocate. But, in fairness, the mast is erected less than 100 metres from my home and probably 150 metres from 12:32 (inaudible) Wineries. Where can he move it to? We are limited by the amount of land we have in Jersey. We understand that we need competition to a certain extent - 3, maybe 4 operators seems extreme to me and to a lot of people I speak to. There is a general apathy from people I speak to. "Well, it is been decided. Look, the Planning Minister has already said that these masts are okay and these sites have been chosen by these people in conjunction with the Planning Department."

There is a sort of apathy that: “Well, what can we do now? It is all decided.” I have to say that I try not to be apathetic about it but I feel rather defeated now. Sorry to 13:14 (several inaudible words).

Male Speaker:

Yes. You are right because if people stay silent and there is an assumption that whoever it is will continue and do whatever they are doing, and you are right to do that and that is the correct course of action. But we would pick that up. But if there is any submission you want to make to us to just bring that to our attention, then please do because again it is about ordinary people speaking up about how they feel. Then we can look at the issues surrounding that, that procedures have been followed. What you are saying falls within recommendations because this was said before. It should be referred to the various authorities including Health and they should give an opinion on that so we can trace all that too.

Female Speaker:

13:56 (several inaudible words) spaces. One department in the States is hardly likely to go against another and if the Health say it. I cannot argue. I am not a scientist. I am a mother and wife and that is it. I am just speaking as I find it for my children and I have tried to protect them and I cannot protect them. There are countless other families in the same position as me. We are in danger, I think, of being in close proximity to a mast wherever we go in the Island if we allow this proliferation to continue: 26 masts passed in a day. It is quite a frightening statistic. You have an apathetic electorate. They cannot even be bothered to vote in respect of who is going to govern their Island on many, many issues. To expect people to submit on this issue, I think, is -- we have only got to look at the turnout tonight. People will be apathetic until it comes to a field near them.

Female Speaker:

They will just accept.

Male Speaker:

I think it is important to note that in our questionnaire there is a fundamental question. One of my colleagues I am sure will read it out. Perhaps, Alan, you would just read out the question pertaining to the backyard?

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, mobile phone masts were asking: “Do you believe that mobile phone masts pose a health risk? Where do you gain this opinion from?” There are a number of options there: “Would you accept more phone masts in your parish? Do you believe that there will be any health risks associated with having a phone mast close to your home? Increasing competition; the market will require changes to phone masts, would you prefer to see ...” again, there are a number of options there. The idea is to find out how people feel about that because, like you say, you express an opinion where before perhaps you did

not. And we are asking you as well about safety guidelines and perhaps procedures that should be adopted. We are also asking about the mobile phone network coverage and whether people own mobile phones and their perception of health risks associated with that. The idea is to get people's perceptions because, like you say, and the lady there says, if nobody expresses an opinion then how do you know and how do we know. So, we are trying to do that independently and unbiased because some people have some strong views either way and we are trying to get a balance of that view and opinion from at least a couple of hundred, maybe more, of people from the local community.

Female speaker:

Are we not shutting the gates, you know, to quote a saying? Because what are we going to do? If we have already said there are 3 licences out there already and there is a potential fourth licence, what are we going to say to these companies: "Sorry, go away, we do not want you any more"? They are not going to lie down and play dead for that. You know, it is these multinationals coming in to a little island. Jersey is going to say, or maybe Jersey Incorporated is going to say: "We do not want our business reputation spoiled by the fact that we are going to kick these people out of business". We have given them the go ahead. We have given them -- the CEO of Airtel has got a very lovely office at St. Helier. You know, I am sure they have put up millions of pounds a head of erecting these masts. What can we do? You know, are we really far too late in this? I mean, I have come to it late because I saw a site notice in a field near me and I did not appreciate really the infrastructure that had to be put in place. Yes, we all want our mobile bill to go down to £10 a month instead of £20 a month. But people were not informed of exactly how the infrastructure would affect us visually and also, I mean, we cannot disprove or prove, as Mr. Drew has said several times, the scientific facts. I do not think that any one of us, no disrespect to the people here, but I do not think any one of us is scientific enough to know; to disprove what Health have said and we are standing against Health just as individuals and it is enormously difficult to do that because I am not a scientist.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, that is one of the reasons that we have looked around to see who we get to inform us and who we could question on that. And indeed, in a couple of weeks time, who could you question on that on some of these very issues because, like you say, we are not qualified to do that. What we can do is we can collect evidence, set it against each other and see where we are on that and then seek an opinion. And if there is issues there then we have to give that to professional people and say, well -- and it is being done elsewhere, so it is not a new line. But having said that, it is something that we have to do and test that. The other thing you mentioned is, you know, it has been going on for some time but we have not been in existence for some time and we have inherited this situation. What we are trying to do is make the best of this and there is lots of international views and opinion from other people I have mentioned from different countries and from regions in the UK. Regions in the UK have looked at this as a Scrutiny; in Wales it was looked at; there are views of the UK Government. So there are all sorts of things that we

can go back to. What we have to try and do is reach some conclusions that we can make recommendations. Now, if that includes areas of concern then we have to do that. And if decisions have made that have to be reconsidered, then that has to happen as well. I think what the Planning Minister has said is that the last, as was mentioned, 26 things that were given. The reason why there are 26 is because there was a moratorium. They were processed but no decision was given. And that happened on 8th January and the reason for it was, and I understand, that there was some legal challenge to not processing the applications and if the Planning Minister had not done that then he would have been challenged possibly in court because the operators in various guises were waiting to process that. But what he did do is -- I had a conversation with him, he respects this review and he said: "I do not want to make the full planning consent. I will make a conditional consent and if the findings are such then it is a 12-month thing which, if we do not find anything, would flow and become a full consent". But if there is something, he can then revisit that and he has given that assurance and that is really because of the position he is in. Obviously it could be challenged because permissions were given in the past which were not necessarily his. I should be fair to him there, they were somebody else's. And the other thing with that is, of course, Jersey Telecom has been doing various things for years and really none of us knew much about it.

Female speaker:

Planning is picking up the pieces. You know, they have to put an infrastructure in place where licences have been granted. They have to deal with the decision that has been made a little while ago: that 3 or 4 operators can come here and somehow that has to be facilitated. And I understand their position with regard to that. They are not the decisions makers. They have not said: "Oh come here and stick up your masts wherever you like". They are just dealing with the reality of what has been decided and asking people whether they want competition when we have already granted licences. I was never asked before if I wanted competition. I doubtless would have said: "Yes, I would not mind my mobile bill being a bit lower. I have to be in touch". I mean, schools expect you to be in touch when your child is at school nowadays and I resisted for a long time. But, the fact of the matter is, I think we have to think seriously about how we could accommodate so many.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, certainly we will look at that within the review and we are questioning the JCRA next week. Yes, one of the things we will be asking them -- we have got a list of questions to ask them and certainly competition is one about mast sharing. There is a range of questions that we will be asking them about so we can certainly encompass what you said there, and thanks for your contribution. But again, you see, this is a situation we have inherited. It is not of our making. So, as they say, we are where we are so what we will try to do is make the best of this at the moment and produce a report that reflects where we are; how we have got there. And if people have concerns, and the authorities that were given by the experts, the end thing that we get then: where we are not qualified we will ask somebody else to give us

an opinion on that. We have got people on board to do that.

Female speaker:

I was just wondering how far you could go with what you are doing. I mean, the individual masts; people seem to be cropping up who have individual problems and individual masts. I feel that if we are really going to work on the whole Island, because everybody in the Island is affected, and it is about density and so on. Okay, how you go back to each application and, you know, can you do visits? Look how many places are near, what type of establishments there are. Then there needs to be a fair approach to everybody because I am aware that certain people have had people behind them who have managed to get the application delayed or, as you were saying earlier, perhaps there has been a protest group that might have affected the decision. Perhaps the school one again will be changed because of a school and lots of children. But my little lane is not -- it is not about my little lane but my little lane has not got lots of people or lots of pressure going on. And there are probably other places where there are people sitting there perhaps, or people who do not realise. Someone said to me: "I have seen a mast right in the middle of an estate". Perhaps people there just do not really realise what impact that might have on them. And so, in a way, it needs to come from you that you are going out, finding out about that and informing those people as well. Do you know what I mean?

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, what is said in the recommendations of the Assistant Director of Health is that the people should be aware of where everything is. I do not think that probably happens at the moment. But what we are doing next week, we have got the 3 operators in, and their line of questioning would hopefully reveal the sort of detail that you are looking for because we heard about some of the planning issues, where we were on that. The questions to them would be along the lines of: "What do you propose for the future? What do you need to provide a service within the Island if somebody does it?" And: "What do you need? The sharing that goes on: how much do you co-operate? How much do you frustrate each other?" That is the sort of thing that we will asking of all of them really because -- and it is being said there are things now that are not massive things - unless we are aware of them then we would not notice them if we drove past or whatever else, if they were disguised as something else. So really what we want to know is, we want all the details. We want to know what their infrastructure plans are and the idea is, in the end that we can tell you what that is because we can get that information one way or another. And I think with that it does not necessarily give people a comfort but at the same time you should know because, as the lady mentioned over there before, people might not be aware of it. And as you mentioned, knocking on other people's doors, that should not be the case. People should be aware of it and with that, I mean, this would be published and everybody does not have access to a website, but we can make the information we collect as freely available as possible and that would include obviously, we are going back to the parish halls and saying that this information is there, go and get it, go and have a look and then get back because this panel inquiry is part of the process. It is not the end of a process

because there is still some debate to be had in the conclusions; who is doing what and what goes on from there. And that might include concerns that you still have because you have not been given all the insurances. Now, I am not saying that we can satisfy everybody with the outcomes but what we will do is if we need detail, if we need research then we will dig as far as we can so that we may get an informed opinion on the situation in Jersey being relevant to what other people are doing, whether it is about safety, distances, precautions, limits, whatever. But we need advice on this because some of this is technical, for a number of reasons, about specification of operations; it is about medical things; it is about scientific and it is about who has produced what, why, who they will sell it to; who has paid them, indeed, for some of the things. We have gone far and wide to get people who perhaps can inform us rather than us just getting the information from people who might say that the operators - they would say that, would they not? So, we are going to go further than that. So, we do appreciate people's concerns and that is part of it and please do not feel frustrated that you have to make -- you know, that everything is in correct order. If there is anything that you want to do then please let us have it.

Female speaker:

One thing I want to ask is, are the masts, say at night time, continuing to emit as much radioactive or microwave radiation as they are during the day time? Do they quieten down or are they just emitting it all the time?

Male speaker:

They only emit when somebody calls them. If there are a lot of calls going on there will be far more emissions. So, I would imagine --

Female speaker:

At night time they go quiet.

Male speaker:

They go quieter.

Male speaker:

That is not quite correct. If somebody has their mobile on and they are asleep, that mast will be emitting.

Female speaker:

So, you mean that if their mobile is switched on to receive calls, then the mast will be picking up --

Male speaker:

Yes, 24 hours a day.

Female speaker:

Thank you very much.

Deputy A. Breckon:

And again, with some of these issues if there is a technical issue then we can ask that question of the operators about the level of activity and how that works in reality over 24 hours. Obviously, any equipment, whether it is for gas, electricity or mobile phones, is based on demand and overlap of cells and with electricity cables and gas pipes and water and things. As I say, the infrastructure things are based on demand. So, presumably, that would be the same. But there are levels of activity and again, that is a technical question that we can ask them.

Male speaker:

Personally, I think that it is important in the short term, whilst we have this question of health, proof against commercial pressures; I think it is important that the radiation levels are consistently monitored from the various aerials in the Island so that at least we know they are under the requisite readings that are recommended by the Stewart Report.

Female speaker:

Mr. Egré, in your talk about telecoms you said that the emissions are only a very small fraction of that allowed. What is the fraction? Can telecoms mention what is the fraction?

Deputy C.H. Egré:

It is a question we will ask Telecom when they come and sit before the panel.

Female speaker:

Because Senator Cohen as a J.P. stated that they were going to be here. They were going to be 1,000 times lower than the guidelines. That sounds good until --

Deputy C.H. Egré:

That sounds very good but statements like that have to be tested.

Female speaker:

-- you hear that Salzburg is 10,000 times lower than the guidelines. Well, that is very different to what Senator Cohen said what we were going to have which was 1,000 times. Also, you talk about 3 operators, what about Tetra? Nobody has mentioned the fact that Tetra also emits emissions. Where are they? Do we know where the Tetra masts are? And does Planning know where the Tetra masts are?

Male speaker:

We are covering Tetra.

Male speaker:

Absolutely.

Female speaker:

So, in fact, we have four operators already. We have Tetra plus the 3.

Deputy C.H. Egré:

Yes. The point you make is well made. Tetra is a different system. It is not tied to mobile masts; it is tied down to emergency services. It has been here for some time. It is on second generation because the first generation was not as good as the second generation, but we need to test those arguments by asking the people who know the answers.

Female speaker:

Does Planning know where they are?

Male speaker:

I will answer that one. As I said, not all installations require planning permission. Tetra certainly does not require planning permission. It is permitted development because it is undertaken by departments of the States. They are exempt from the need to make planning applications for their installations under the planning law.

Deputy C.H. Egré:

These are questions that we are going to test. Now, interestingly enough, looking at the UK site, which I am sure you have done, it gives the locations of a lot of the masts in the UK. We can highlight it and it comes out with the type of mast and the power output. It indicates where Tetra's are as well and specifically describes it as Tetra masts. Now, I feel, knowing a little bit about the difference between the 2 systems, that we do need to know where these Tetra masts are. It is something we are going to test and ask those very questions.

Female speaker:

And one last question, completely different from that one. I know a lot of people have been sending messages to Scrutiny and Scrutiny said they were going to put them up on the message board on their website. Well, there is nothing.

Female speaker:

They have got a new one being launched. There is not much difference --

Female speaker:

But you have other messages up on their message board on other subjects, on Overdale and so on. Is there something about the number on the telephone mast that you are not bothering to put them on?

Female speaker:

(microphone offline)

Male speaker:

Be reassured, there is no attempt to hide anything.

Female speaker:

(microphone offline)

Deputy A. Breckon:

Can I ask if there is anyone who has not asked a question who would like to do so? Anyone who has not asked a question? Is there any other question from anybody who has asked a question?

Female speaker:

I do not know; I am not sure if I covered this before, the date being on 26th where you have to have your applications in by. Could it, in the light of the fact that the applications have not been available to the public and, therefore, you know, people can not look at each others' applications -- it cannot be extended in any way?

Deputy A. Breckon:

No. Please do not feel there is a guillotine going to come down on the 26th. You have to put some date and whichever side of the line you say, well it is too soon or it is whatever. But what we cannot do is we cannot say: "Well we are doing an inquiry and send us something in March because we have to do it by that". But if it was by the end of the month or if was a week later then it is not the end of the world because obviously we are still taking evidence but we have to draw a line when you sit down and then consider the evidence and we are doing that as we go along. But if your submission came in a week after that then, as I say, it would not necessarily be barred. But having said that, if we had 200 submissions 3 weeks late then we have a problem if we are starting to deliberate and it influences the outcome, the evidence. So, the reason for that is there has got to be some date and we are under some pressure with the other work so that Scrutiny has got to use the time as effectively as we can and that is why, really, we have brought the meetings together. Next week there are 3 days of hearings. We have a

dozen, or round about that, people to see and then we are bringing people to the Island. We have gone out to do that bit the idea is to keep it focussed. Now, for example, we are not seeing them until 15th February, so as I say, if your submission came a week late I do not think it is a problem. But we had to put some date and whatever date is it is not going to please everybody.

Male speaker:

This is in regard to responsibility and all the masts that are going up on various people's land in Jersey here. I really hope it does not happen and I hope we have the good sense to ameliorate the situation, but if it does happen and people get sick, there are many, many examples -- I have been devastated absolutely knocked over backwards by what I have read from material around the world, epidemiological studies and anecdotal things admittedly, but there are a lot of people getting very, very sick with electromagnetic susceptibility, there is no doubt about that in my mind and that is a commonsense situation. If people do get cancer clusters round these masts, who is responsible?

Deputy A. Breckon:

That is a question we will be asking. It has been raised elsewhere and there are a number of issues about operation, land ownership, siting and things like that. But we are raising these questions and that is on our list of things to ask of a number of people next week. We have had some preliminary opinion but obviously it is an area that we want to explore because it is an issue, liability insurance and things like that.

Male speaker:

There is no insurance. Insurance companies will not cover it.

Deputy A. Breckon:

I did not say there was no insurance, I said liability and insurance is an issue. I did not say there was none; I said it was an issue.

Male speaker:

Right, because the insurance companies are not giving indemnity.

Deputy A. Breckon:

We have already sent out a number of questions to people and what we are asking of them is them to tell us what they do and what they have got in the areas that you have touched on. Obviously, if that is the case we will report that. Whatever they tell us we will report it and we will also test it with our insurers; things like Lloyd's of London.

Male speaker:

They will not touch it.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, you say that.

Male speaker:

They have made a statement. They will not touch it. They will not touch anything to do with the EMF.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Okay, well that is certainly on the agenda for things to do. Anyway, I would just like to thank everybody for attending. Hopefully you have found it informative and you have felt that perhaps somebody is listening to you, and I can give you that assurance. Our investigation continues. I would just like to conclude by thanking the technical people at the back who have recorded this, and will make sense of that, and will produce a transcript of this which will be available. As we move on obviously there is some work to do. To the Scrutiny officers, Malcolm Orbell(?) and to Carol Le Quesne who set this up. If there are any handouts that you want please take what is there. If there is any information you want we also have the report from the Assistant Director of Health. There are various things around, whatever you want to take, apart from the laptop computer - please feel to do. I just would like to thank my fellow members, Mike Jackson and Ben Shenton, Collin Egré and Richard Glover from Planning. Again, we will be at St. Brelade's Parish Hall tonight. We did not know what sort of attendance we would get. We did not know it was going to be blowing a gale but when you organise these things, you know, when it was put on the telly or whatever. But we thank you very much indeed for your attendance and I can give you an assurance what is said -- do not feel that you are being ignored because your opinion does count and the concerns you have will be listened to and they will be taken into account in our final conclusions which, hopefully, will be in the first quarter of this year, by the end of March. Bearing in mind, if you want to make a submission we have said towards the end of January, but as soon as possible around then would be appreciated. So, I will just close and wish you a safe journey home. Thank you very much.