

Health, Social Services and Housing Panel Telephone Mast Review

MONDAY, 22nd JANUARY 2007

Panel:

Deputy A. Breckon of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Deputy C.H. Egré of St. Peter

Senator B.E. Shenton

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade

Witnesses:

Dr. G. Langly-Smith (JMMCG)

Mr. M. Hocquard (JMMCG)

Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville

Deputy A. Breckon:

Welcome, gentlemen, I will just go through the procedures and how we got here, as it were. My name is Alan Breckon and I am Chairman of Health, Social Security and Housing Scrutiny Panel and under that is a sub panel where the Members of the Panel are Deputy Chairman Collin Egré of St. Peter, Constable Mike Jackson of St. Brelade, and Senator Ben Shenton. I am sure you know them all. We have terms of reference that were set up, and I will just remind you of those. It is a Scrutiny view into the telephone masts and the terms of reference are: "The sub panel will consider the concerns of the public relating to the perceived health implications as a result of the increase in applications for mobile phone mast installations following the recent expansion of the mobile telephone market. In undertaking this review, the sub panel will have regard to the advice provided by the Health Protection Department, international standards and best practice in respect of health precautions, health concerns raised by the public, and report its findings and recommendations to the States." Behind that, we have a procedure. It is slightly different for States Members, but I will ask Collin to remind you. The statement should be in front of you. You have a certain amount of immunity in these proceedings in that you can say things, but you cannot say things if you know them to be untrue. I will ask Collin to go through that.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Please excuse the formality of this particular statement, but, particularly for legal reasons, we have to go through it. It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement I am about to read to you on the table in front of you. "The proceedings of the panel are covered by parliamentary privilege through Article 34 of the States of Jersey Law 2005 and the States of Jersey (Powers, Privileges and Immunities) (Scrutiny Panels

PAC and PPC) Jersey Regulations 2006. Witnesses are protected from being sued or prosecuted from anything said during hearings unless they say something that they know to be untrue. This protection is given to witnesses to ensure that they can speak freely and openly to the panel when giving evidence, without fear of legal action, although the immunity should obviously not be abused by making unsubstantiated statements about third parties who have no right of reply.” The panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering our questions. The proceedings are being recorded and transcriptions will be made available on the security website. As an addendum to that, could I just ask you, when you are talking to us, to speak up. This system in here is normally on having a lot of people in here and they tend to project quite well when they are talking and I would ask you if you could do the same. I do not wish you to feel you have to become States Members, but I would ask you to project well. As far as Constable Murphy is concerned, you are in the same rules as would apply in your role as Constable in the House.

Deputy A. Breckon:

You already have immunity as a States Member, so you do not need it as a member of the public. It is slightly different, but that immunity still applies. We did supply you with a number of questions there as a guide. There might be things that you might wish to say deviating from that, and things that we wish to ask arising from that. What I will do in a moment is just ask you to introduce yourselves and anything you may wish to say in introduction. At the end you will have the opportunity to say things we did not ask you that are relevant to this inquiry. I would ask you to relax and enjoy this; you are not on trial for anything. We are inquiring into something and it is not an intimidating process. Answer as you feel comfortable between yourselves. If you wish to interchange how you answer questions or both respond to a particular point, then please do so. With the transcripts, what will happen is the transcripts from today will be copied to you in the next few days. If there is a mistake in there, it can be changed and you will be given an opportunity for a few days after that. After that, they will become a matter of public record. They will be on the website. Could I ask you to introduce yourselves for the benefit of the tape.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

My name is Granville Langly-Smith. I am a dentist and I am a specialist orthodontist and I am a certified cranial osteopath. My professional training and experience has given me a sound understanding of biological systems, and the more subtle electrical processes by which our bodies function. However, I come here not as a scientist but as a concerned resident with a significant amount of scientific knowledge and training. Would it be helpful to you if I submit what I have to say, because I think it covers a lot of your questions?

Deputy A. Breckon:

Maybe the others will introduce themselves first and we will come back to you.

Mr. M. Hocquard:

My name is Michael Hocquard; I am here as a private individual. I have a mast 34 metres from my bedroom window and I contracted throat cancer last February and one of my 2 dogs died of lung cancer the year before. I suppose I am somewhat involved in evidence that it is possible that it is attributed to the mast.

Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:

Dan Murphy, Constable of Grouville. I am here because I think basically I initiated this discussion by holding a meeting at Grouville Parish Hall because I had parishioners who were very, very worried about the proliferation of masts being applied for in the parish.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Can I say, as I said before, you are very welcome. You are not on trial for anything, so please relax. We are not here to intimidate or embarrass anybody; we are here as part of an inquiry. Following today, if there is anything you wish you had said, then get back to us. It is not the end of submissions; it is an ongoing process. If you would like to lead off and do that, then perhaps we could pick up questions from that.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I would like to say when I first heard that they were going to triple the emissions here on top of tetra, which meant quadruple the emissions and possibly 5-fold if another company came in, it did not sit at all with what I understand about the human body. It shocked me immensely. Then I started researching and the more I researched, the more convinced I am that there are severe dangers. After all, the human body is a wonderful electrical machine, a work of art, and is an excellent receiver of electromagnetic fields. Because we are made of water, we are excellent conductors. If anybody has held the aerial on a portable television or radio, you immediately get a better reception. There seems to be quite a lot of confusion in some quarters, but overall I think that people understand that microwaves, as in the microwave oven, have a thermal power and so obviously people are not talking about that, otherwise we would all be talking about being cooked. What we are referring to as the danger, which has not been fully substantiated but there is a lot of circumstantial evidence, is this business of the sub-thermal damage that can be done to biological systems. It is very simple in my head that there is no biological process in the body which is compatible with electromagnetic frequencies. We have these ICNIRP limits everybody talks about, and nobody is questioning that they are going to go above that and heat up the body. The thing about microwave radiation is that it is silent, insidious and, I believe, lethal over the long term. The emissions from telephone masts are microwaves but have pulsing modulation, so they have this pulsing which is very penetrating to the tissues of the body. It does not matter if they are high or low, they still have a damaging effect. Many scientific studies have been done and I am going to

quote some of those in a minute. They are constant, unremitting and cumulative. We were talking a little bit about the electro-sensitive people on Thursday night at Hautlieu and these people accumulate the effects of electromagnetic frequencies and it takes a long time to get it out of the body and get back to normal. Although the effect is not felt in the early days and they often evade the body's senses, they nonetheless are acting as a constant stress to our bodies; hence, the well-known term "electromagnetic stress". Continual bombardment by these emissions eventually leads to breakdown in biologic systems. DNA strands in our cell nuclei fragment and cells mutate, leading to cancer. I have references to all those. The constant stress response in our bodies leads to fatigue, exhaustion and thyroid problems and a lowered immune system. People just do not feel right and they do not sleep well because their stress responses are on alarm all the time: the fight or flight response that we have that gets us up in the morning. It is on all the time. Is this what we want in Jersey, and the increase in sick and exhausted people? The thing is, gentlemen, it is such an insidious process that people do not see a cause and an effect. You do not go bright red and keel over when the thing is switched on. It is slow, insidious and gnawing at the body and we all know what is like to be stressed. We know what emotional stress is but the body; it interprets electromagnetic stress exactly the same way and that is you get hypertrophy of the adrenal glands, you get involution of the thymus, that is the immune system and you get bleeding of the stomach wall. Now that is the stress response whether it be emotional, electromagnetic or any other type of stress that we have in our lives. The difference is with emotional stress is that we are very aware of it, whereas the subtlety of electromagnetic stress is that it evades the body's senses but still causes the same response and we have some details on that later on to prove that. Jersey is following the UK guidelines which are based on ICNIRP and the Jersey Health and Social Services document is largely based on the Stewart Report which in essence states more research is necessary and a precautionary approach to microwave emissions is taken. The Stewart Report was published 7 years ago and much has advanced since then. The following authorities show the potential dangers to health of emissions from base stations well below the ICNIRP guidelines. I have not put the figures in here everywhere but they are in the papers I have given reference to. Now, the most important one which I came across is the Ecolog Report. Now this was published only recently in English, literally last year but it has been around since 2000 at the same time as the Stewart Report was published but for some weird, unknown, mystifying reason, it has only just come up to the surface. It was actually commissioned by T-Mobile as an international study and the scientist did 220 peer reviewed studies and they are all in the back here, studies on the effects of electromagnetic radiation from mobile phones and telephone masts. The conclusions they had were there were effects on the central nervous system leading to MS and motor neurone disease, cancer initiating and promoting effects, impairment of certain brain functions, loss of memory and cognitive function, an increase in stress to the body resulting in breakdown and sleeping disorders, breakdown of the blood brain barrier leading to toxic effect on the brain leading to Alzheimer's. I think it is important to just clarify that point. We have a neurovascular system which is a protective mechanism for the brain. It keeps the toxins and parasites and junk out of the brain as much as possible. It is known as the blood brain barrier. With EMFs (electromagnetic fields), they have

found that that blood brain barrier opens up, so the brain is exposed and made more vulnerable to heavy metals, toxins and all the junk that we are exposed to in the environment. Reduction in fertility and a decrease in the sperm count, changes in the blood profile, especially clumping and acidity and what happens, they have done dark field microscopy which is a way of seeing blood cells under a microscope in simple terms and they see immediately if you are exposed to these EMFs that the red blood cells all clump together rather like piling up a whole lot of coins together and, of course, the thicker you get or the thicker sort of amounts of these cells you get, obviously are going to lead to thrombosis, a danger of thrombosis and cardiovascular problems because these clumps are going to turn into thromboses. I now come on to, funnily enough when I was horrified at what was proposed here in Jersey, I immediately looked around for some stuff in my own bookshelf and this is a post-graduate book which I read quite a while ago. It was actually published in 1990. It is called *Crosscurrents and the Perils of Electro Pollution* and it written by a man who I have a massive amount of admiration for. His name is Professor Robert Becker. He is a full Professor of New York University and he has twice been nominated for the Nobel Prize, so he is no dummy. Now, the first part of his book is actually looking at the good parts of electrical currents which can help the body to heal but we are not talking about microwaves; we are talking about direct current of very, very low voltage. He then dedicates the second half of the book to the perils of electro-pollution and he states and these are basically all verbatim except for one of the studies which I have given a précis because it so long. Page 187: “Scientific evidence makes only one conclusion. The exposure of living organisms to abnormal electromagnetic fields results in significant abnormalities in physiology and function.” Pages 214, 215: “All abnormal manmade electromagnetic fields regardless of their frequencies produce the same biological effects. These effects which deviate from normal functions and are actually or potentially harmful are the following. Effects on growing cells such as increases in the rate of cancer cell division, increase in the incidence of certain cancers, developmental abnormalities in embryos, alterations in neuro-chemicals resulting in behavioural abnormalities such as suicide, alterations in biological cycles and stress responses [you see, stress keeps coming up] in exposed animals [that includes us, we are animals]. If prolonged, leads to declines in the immune system efficiency, alterations in learning ability.” He then states on page 200: “The hazard comes from the fact that exposure to microwaves like exposure to any abnormal electromagnetic field produces stress. Prolonged stress results in a decline in the immune system competency and changes in the genetic apparatus, thus, the level of exposure that Governments say are safe are, in fact, not safe at all.” Now, I am just going to give you an example of 2 experiments which were done, to keep it short. On page 198: “The FDA Centre for Devices and Radiological Health report on the reproductive cells of male mice exposed to microwaves at the level below the thermal level. Sperm production decreased in the short exposure of 30 minutes per day for 2 weeks. Abnormal changes in the structure of the chromosomes of the sperm. When the exposed subjects were mated with unexposed females, a significant increase in miscarriages occurred. The conclusion: chromosomal abnormalities were produced by the microwave exposure at dose rates far below those producing a heating effect.” This is the one I have just précised here because it is rather long. “Dr. Arthur W. Guy’s study on rats at the

University of Washington, Journal of Medicine, America. Rats were continuously exposed to high frequency microwaves of 2.45 Gigahertz at .5 Microwatts per centimetre cubed, 20 times lower than the safe thermal limit. Exposures lasted for long as 25 months [so it is quite a long time] and 155 different measures of health and behaviour were collected. In the irradiated subjects, 4 times as many developed tumours than in a controlled group. The cancers were mainly limited to the pituitary, thyroid and adrenal glands.” Now those, just to help you, are the major endocrinal organs involved with stress. We have what we call the triad axis. We have the pituitary up here, thyroid and adrenals and they talk to each other through neuro-chemicals and hormones and it is interesting, all the rats had these cancers and tumours of those organs. This experiment indicates that chronic exposure to microwaves at levels 20 times below the established safe thermal level produces profound stress and ultimately exhaustion of the stress response system as shown by plasma cortisol levels. He finally says: “The overall instance of cancer is slowly increasing year by year and the relationship between field exposure and those types of cancer that are on the increase is evident. The distinct possibility that genetic effects of a wide variety may occur with chronic field exposure is disturbing in view of the fact that, generally speaking, such defects are permanent and are passed on to succeeding generations.” Number 3; electro smog in the environment by the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forest and Landscape 2005. This states: “The negative impacts of non-ionising radiation on our health have been scientifically established and are undisputed. Biological effects can occur at levels well below internationally recommended hazard thresholds. Since scientists are unable to indicate how harmful these effects are, it is advisable to take certain precautions.” Now, I put this number 4 in because I would like to try and get over to the panel that this is a global issue and this lady, Eileen O’Conner is a mast victim, she developed breast cancer in the little hamlet of Wishaw near Birmingham and she has now started lecturing because in this hamlet, just under 80 per cent of the people who were surrounding this mast and it was up to 500 metres away, all developed anything from cancer to electro-sensitive type symptoms. Mrs. Eileen O’Conner is a member of the Electromagnetic Field Discussion Group, EMFDG which is chaired by Sir William Stewart, chairman of the Health Protection Agency, founder member of the Electromagnetic Radiation Research Trust and Human Ecological Social Economic UK. The following is an excerpt from an open letter by Eileen O’Conner to the media of Sutton Coldfield: “I was invited to give the EMF Discussion Group a presentation about base station emissions and health concerns on 16th October 2006 at the Health Protection Agency in London. I presented evidence of electro-sensitive symptoms and the cancer clusters including motor neurone disease in the hamlet of Wishaw. I spoke about the enormous impact this has had on my life and the lives of family, friends and neighbours [and that is what is beginning to happen here in Jersey as you saw at the meeting]. I talked about how I started the campaign after developing breast cancer in 2001 at the age of 38 which I believe could have been due to living 100 metres from a 22.5 T-Mobile phone mast for over 7 years. I also presented evidence gathered over the last 5 years and informed the EMFDG that I am now networked at the highest level and I am linked up with doctors, scientists, politicians and the media and campaigners throughout the whole of the UK and the world. I demonstrated that it is a global issue, that some countries have taken dramatic

steps to remove phone masts and many others are operating at different guidelines. I also provided independent scientific evidence which provided statistics showing evidence that people and animals are suffering the symptoms at levels below the current ICNIRP guidelines. This backs up the health complaints made by the public worldwide.” Number 5: Professor Rudiger from the University of Vienna stated that genetic toxicity is caused by these radio frequency microwaves. This is one of the key elements in knowing and understanding tumours. It is the first event that must take place in the cell before there is any chance of a tumour occurring. The well respected Professor Adey, a fellow of the American Academy of Scientists and a distinguished visitor to the Royal Society of Medicine says of my own research in parallel to similar studies in Russia: “Shows that radio frequencies in the lower microwave range affect enzyme systems that regulate growth and division of white blood cells.” I think it is important just to explain that we cannot function without enzymes and enzymes are affected by EMFs. The Freiburger Appeal which you are aware of, I do believe, by now, an important appeal from German doctors and other health professionals reporting an increase in observed cases of learning, concentration and behavioural disorders; headaches, migraines, nervous and connective tissue pains, sleeplessness, daytime sleepiness, chronic exhaustion, the extreme fluctuation in blood pressure, hard to influence with medication, heart rhythm disorders, brain degenerative diseases and epilepsy, cancerous afflictions, leukaemia and brain tumours. After a carefully directed inquiry, they found a clear temporal and spatial correlation between the appearance of disease and exposure to pulsed high frequency microwave radiation from mobile phone masts, mobiles and cordless phones. The following international authorities have questioned these ICNIRP guidelines. Barrie Trower from the Independent Research visiting on Friday and scientific advisor to the Radiation Research Trust, having had many years of experience studying the effects of microwaves, he states in his address to the Welsh Assembly on wireless telecommunications, 3rd October 2006: “The safety level set by our Government which is for short-term heating effect only, is incorrectly relied upon by decision makers for planning applications for masts. Both the International Commission for Electromagnetic Safety and the US Environmental Protection Agency agreed on this. It is invalid for communities living near masts.” He also states in his address to the Court of Appeal in January 2005 that: “The WHO’s guidelines are based on the short-term effects of this radiation. No long-term experiments have been done in the terms of safety levels. Further, no experiments have been done to determine the safety levels from the mast microwaves exhibited by all microwave communication systems. The ICNIRP guidelines, also the NRPB guidelines are based purely on the thermal effects; no account whatsoever is given to the effect of the electrical and magnetic waves interacting with the physiology of the body at sub-thermal levels.” Now, Ecolog has called these guidelines of ICNIRP to be reduced immediately and they state that they should go down, I am going to talk in watts per metre squared but it is, you have probably discovered by now, that everybody catalogues this in different ways. It can be microwatts, it can be watts, it can be per cubic centimetre, square centimetres. I am talking in watts per metre squared because the Planning talk also in watts per metre squared and to keep it all flowing in one dimension. So, the Ecolog Report states that the precautionary limit should be 0.01 watt per metre squared. Before I go on to that, I will just talk

about the other countries. Russia, China and other European countries are rejecting ICNIRP guidelines saying they are far too lenient and are far, far too high and altogether too dangerous, i.e. they are being precautionary. Many countries now, are fixing lower limits having considered ICNIRP guidelines to be too high. According to a study in June 2000, which is admittedly 7 years ago and things will probably have changed by then, prepared by Alistair Philips of Power Watch, these are the following values in watts per metre squared. Australia is 2, Poland is 1 and 0.1 for stationary people, Italy is .1, Russia is .1, Toronto Health Board is 0.06 and Salzburg in Austria is 0.001 and New Zealand, a proposal by Dr. Neal Cherry, I am not sure if it is an actuality this, but it was a proposal at that time in 2000 to be 0.0002, that is 3 noughts and a 2. According to the Planning and Environment Department, Jersey is proposing a maximum level of .3 watts per metre squared although they state that all 3 operators could operate at the ICNIRP reference level and this would still be considered taking a precautionary approach. In other words, this could be 10,000 times higher than Ecolog because the precautionary approach allows 10 watts per metre squared on a 2,100 megahertz telephone mast. It would also be a 100,000 times higher than Salzburg. So, it is clear from the above figures that other countries fundamentally disagree with what is happening here. September 2002, the University of Vienna and Catania, Italy, 19 of the world's top scientists met to discuss electromagnetic waves. This was known as the Catania Resolution. They stated: "We take exception to arguments suggesting that weak, low intensity EMF cannot interact with tissue. There are plausible mechanistic explanations for EMF induced effects which occur below ICNIRP guidelines and exposure recommendations from the European Union." The Helsinki Appeal of 2005: "The Helsinki Appeal from the EMF team, Finland, calls on the European Parliament to act promptly in the adoption of new safety standards in the European Union. Physicians and researchers feel great concern about the proportionary principle not being sufficiently applied to electromagnetic fields. They are requesting that the standards recommended by ICNIRP be rejected." The survey by Dr. Henry Lai of Washington University, Seattle, 2003, emissions from base stations: "The amount of evidence of biological effect and the characteristics of these are so alarming that all effort should be dedicated to find a way of minimising these effects." So, there are some scientific things to look at there. There are some papers to look at and that is just some of mountains out there. I have tried to choose the most erudite, the most plausible.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Can I just ask you a question and that was from Eileen O'Conner, in there is an assertion that some countries have taken the dramatic steps to remove phone masts. Is there anything you could supply that says that is happening anywhere?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Yes. I can only refer you to her document here which I can give you a copy of and it is happening out in Malaysia, I do believe, where they have been pulling them all down.

Deputy A. Breckon:

What I am thinking, you do not have to do that now, you could obviously supply that.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I will give it to you at the end.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Yes, then we can copy that and give you that back. Sorry to interrupt. Would you like to continue there or do you want to --

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I am just going to wind up because I was going to give some recommendations if that is all right.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Yes, please carry on.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I have 3 basic recommendations but I would just like to add another 2 small ones and I will start with the small ones first. Firstly, I do believe the Health Department needs to take more responsibility for what is going on here. The way it works, as far as I can see by the meeting on Friday at the St. Brelade's Parish Hall, is that they wait for a telephone call from the HPA if anything moves or changes and I think they should be studying some of these papers because they are genuine papers; they are very important papers and if I can find the time running a busy practice to do this, I really think they should. They need to be better informed, better educated on this subject. The second thing is I do believe, at the end of the day, the whole Island needs better educating on the whole subject. People are trusting and they assume; they assume that everything is fine, everything works. Governments would not allow anything to be dangerous in our lives. I do believe they should know that there are question marks and I do believe, at the end of the day, there should be something like a referendum to say: "Do you want to expose yourself to possible health risks but have a more efficient telephone system or would you like to reduce that risk and have maybe not quite as sufficient a system?" I do believe it needs to be put on a democratic process. To the lay person, a precautionary approach would indicate using caution, going carefully, not being reckless. If competition is so absolutely necessary, a precautionary approach would have been to introduce one competitor to Telecoms, not 2 or possibly 3. With each company having its own network, this potentially quadruples the emissions that were pre-existing. This does not seem to be using a caution in any manner of speaking especially as we already have Tetra here which is microwaves; again it is exactly the same on a very slight subtly different basis. Number one; I recommend, therefore, that we limit the telephone companies to two to thereby satisfying the requirements for competition and minimising the health risks. Number 2; the siting of masts are far too close to people's homes and

working environments. I have seen some outrageous ones in the Island and Michael here, is going to talk to you in a minute and he has had one so close to his home, I think it is just a disgrace. In France, 4 of their 20 proposed laws are to limit maximum power any person may receive to one 9,000th of ICNIRP which, in simple terms, is 0.001 watt per metre squared as in Salzburg. This is on the statute books; it has not gone through. It is to go through this year. Have exclusion zones of 300 metres from houses and sensitive buildings. Their number 11 is planning permission compulsory for all equipment and number 19; use of phones forbidden in schools. Also regarding the proximity of masts, in the Santini Report, there is a definite correlation between the distance a telephone mast is sited and the severity of symptoms of those living in the nearby vicinity and you can take a very brief look at this. I am going to give you this document. You can see that everything gets less. These are the symptoms getting less the further you get away from the mast. I, therefore, recommend that no mast is situated closer than 300 metres to sensitive areas such as residential areas and schools. Number 3; as can be seen in the preceding table from Power Watch research in June 2000, it is possible to run a mobile network at a maximum power of 0.001 watt per metre squared as the city of Salzburg has done. I recommend that Jersey should be aiming for this figure and certainly not as high as 0.3 watts per metre squared which, as you can see, is 300 times higher than Salzburg. Dr. Neal Cherry of New Zealand has recommended the only safe level emission is 0.0002 watts per metre squared. Dr. Gerd Oberfeld has also published the Microwave Syndrome which was a Spanish study whereby inhabitants near base stations contracted multiple symptoms when the power was 30,000 times lower than that of Jersey and then there was the Professor Abel Rasoul in Egypt, a Professor of occupational medicine at the University of Menoufrya, concluded in a report in 2006 that inhabitants contracted symptoms around base stations with power of .00002 watts per metre squared i.e. 15,000 times lower than the maximum proposal in Jersey. Gentlemen, this is Jersey. It has been my very happy home for well over 30 years. It is a little Island, 9 by 5. It is ludicrous to pack all this electromagnetic smog into such a small space. We are playing with people's lives, not just their quality of life, but their actual lives and I do believe we are not taking a fully precautionary approach. You see a precautionary approach by the telecommunications industry is basically saying that as long as you do not put the wattage above 10 watts per metre squared is a precautionary approach but I just do not believe anybody could see that as commonsense. I think we need a large dollop of Jersey commonsense over this. I see you as the thin red line between life as we have known it and a future, potential catastrophe in terms of all our health and the health of many generations to come. Now, I know we have a great lust for telephone communications. I know there is a massive demand but this is nothing new. There have been great demands for things like cigarettes, asbestos and all that stuff. Also, people tend to forget the famous Thomas Midgeley Junior who invented lead in petrol and when they put tetra-ethyl lead in petrol in the 1920s, the automobile industry in America went wild about it. Now, they knew that lead was dangerous and it poisoned you but they went into complete denial when all the workers in these plants developed horrendous neurological symptoms and many of them died. In fact, one of the spokesmen for the company when the Press eventually got to hear of it was heard to say that these people are all really dying because they are

working too hard.” That is how ludicrous people get. We now have things like: “Oh, it is all psychosomatic” but there is a lot out there to say that there is a great truth that things are not psychosomatic, they are very real. Our present Government is developing one of the densest areas of electro smog in the world. We are going to have wall to wall emissions, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year with no escape. Every green field will become an electric field contrary to nature’s environment. I fear many casualties in the long-term both humans and animals alike. There have been some 40 studies on farm animals when they have been affected by mast emissions; increased miscarriages, low milk yields and severe foetal abnormalities. Once these animals were removed from their environment, they recovered. When the animals returned, they instantly became ill again. Gentlemen, the evidence is there. I do believe that we can make this Island, I think this could be an opportunity to make this Island and keep this Island a beautiful and safe place and the more this goes on with the telecommunications industry, there are going to be more and more electro-sensitive people around in the world. Barrie Trower was over here on Friday. He told me he is rung all the time to know if there are any places for these people to go on holiday. Now, would it not be nice if we could keep Jersey as an eco-friendly place, a green place, a beautiful place. Let us keep it a safe place. It is no good having a lot of wealth here. Our real wealth is our health. Thank you.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Would you like to add to that, Michael, or do you want to wait until the end?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

Michael Hocquard here as a private individual. I live, I think it is well known, I live above Gorey and the mast next to my home is only 30 metres from our bedroom window. The photograph that I am showing there has been shown in the evening paper a number of times and sometimes it is shown from the other angle. That photograph was taken from the top of Gorey Castle, in fact, by my doctor, Simon Slaffer and so he emailed back to me a little while ago and, as I say, that photo appears in reverse taken from our balcony in the evening paper on a regular basis. We have lived in the house for 14 and a half years. The mast, the small mast, Telecom has put a small mast there about 12 years ago after we had been there about 2 years and slowly but surely, it has grown and now we have 3. They have been forced to put the latest mast up, so I have no idea what the emission situation has been over the years. As I say, in February, I contracted throat cancer. I have not smoked for 31 years, so it is not smoking. Interestingly, my dog died 2 years ago from lung cancer and obviously did not smoke either. I was not aware until I read the evening paper that Mr Trower was saying that various symptoms like the lack of sleep, the ability to sleep, my wife certainly is awake every night reading at 3.00 a.m. in the morning and so on, so we are too close. Unfortunately, we are so close to the thing that has probably destroyed the value of our house as well which obviously is a major problem to us. It will be difficult to sell now with all the fuss going on, so we have to stay there which is not good news. Obviously, from my point of view, I believe what Granville is saying here is the right thing is that the sensible option is whilst there is

definitely doubt, we grasp it by the neck and say: “We want to remove all masts from within 300 metres of people’s houses” and workplaces because, of course, where I work there is another one within 100 metres of where I work, so I cannot really avoid it. It is a little bit difficult. We are thinking in terms of investigating and literally enclosing the house in foil including the blinds. I am told that foil may stop the emissions coming in. We are putting foil under the carpets upstairs and in the roof space and relining all the walls before putting more plaster back on. Whether it is good, we do not know. I do not think Granville has had this study. Somebody involved with the zoological area sent me a paper on the possible effects of electromagnetic fields and phone masts on a population of white storks which was carried out in 2005 and the result of it is 40 per cent of the nests which would have been 200 metres from the mast, 40 per cent failed to produce any young whereas nests further than 300 metres away, only one failed to produce any young. So, it is definitely affecting, in my view, human health and also animal and bird life. It does seem that it is time that Jersey said enough is enough. I know we have opened the doors for all these mobile phone companies and I know the fact but unfortunately, from my point of view, with this current mast here, Jersey Telecoms have gone there without the requirement for planning permission because they were a States body at the time and obviously knew what was best for everybody and carried on without requiring planning permission. It could be that there should be a retrospective situation with ones that are there without planning permission.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

When did you first have health concerns about the mast?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

To be fair, it is only about 3 years ago the mast became huge and I kept saying to my wife: “Why are you not seeing these things” and she said to me, she had a little argument with me and said: “Why is it that I have not noticed the application in the evening paper?” and I said: “Well, why have you not?” and it turned out, of course, no application had even gone into the paper and would say it was around that time and you read a few things in the Press that obviously the main concern was that the day that I found I had throat cancer.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Previous to that, you had no health concerns about the small mast.

Mr. M. Hocquard:

It never occurred to me that our dog had died 18 months earlier than that of lung cancer could possibly have anything to do with the mast but obviously, now we have put 2 and 2 together. Equally, you could say it is only in the last year or so that we are all getting very concerned of our masts. In fact, I would say I have stirred things up by getting a petition going in May last year which figured in the evening paper and the television.

The Connètable of St. Brelade:

Whose land is the mast on?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

It belongs to Property Services. It is a German bunker and it is on the top of the German bunker. The German bunker is below the ground.

The Connètable of St. Brelade:

Have you made any representations to Planning subsequent to this?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

I presented the petition to Freddy Cohen, Senator Cohen in the Royal Square and I have had a number of contacts with the Planning Officers since then. Senator Cohen, quite correctly I am sure, pointed out that apart asking Telecom to remove the mast, because it was before his time, there was nothing he could do about it. There is obviously now applications for more masts going in there and, of course, my biggest concern was I do not want them to triple the number of masts apart from the fact we do not open the curtains in part of the house because you see the mast and the point is being reminded of the mast. There is talk that Cable and Wireless have got permission to put another mast about another 150 metres away. From my point of view, I am much happier that it is 150 metres away because I was told by Planning that another mast, in fact, everybody must have masts up there but it seems wrong to me. I would be happier to have it 150 metres away in the hope that every metre away lessens the chance of my -- coming back with more cancer.

The Connètable of St. Brelade:

How many yards away?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

This one is 34 yards away from my bedroom window. It is a bit close.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Just before we continue, Constable Murphy, is there anything you would like to add?

Connètable D.J. Murphy:

Yes. I first became aware of this when we had an application go in at Fauvic for a mast quite close to the home of the Cummings family and we protested to Planning and we asked about it and we were fobbed off basically and told that there was no choice; to use Senator Cohen's words: "The administrative economic developments seemed very keen on getting these up." That was the actual

statement and we went to see them instead with the Cummings family and he said: "Well, you have got to have them. You have just got to take it and that is it. It is going up." Now, that mast is now 25 metres from their front door, 25 metres from their front door and Mr. Cummings is in remission from cancer of the eye, many years ago. We then had another 2 applications, one of which is on Grouville Hill on which again, is within, I think, about 50 metres from somebody else who is also in remission with their cancer. Having then started doing work, I obviously cannot compete with the knowledge which has been shown here by Granville but what I can say to you is this that there seems to be the Health and Social Services are putting an awful lot of reliance on the Stewart Report and the Stewart Report, they are very happy to quote it as saying there is no problem but at the end of the Stewart Report, it says there must be more investigation into this and it is not happening. The Stewart Report has been taken as read for the portions they want to be as read and they are not taking any notice whatsoever of the caveats which we put in the end, I think, paragraphs 118, 119 and 120. If you take those into consideration, it does insist that there should more investigation into this situation which is not taking place over here.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Thank you. I would just to stay a few things. First, we did give you a list of questions and we also sent an email to one of the members of your group and we did that really because Jersey Mobile masts have appeared and we did not really know what they were, so the questions that you have covered by one to 9, we have had answered and we assume that you yourself have not prepared any research papers because of the --

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

No, I have not.

Deputy A. Breckon:

In effect, the questions you had have been answered by an email that we had back a few days ago, so we have that on record in another way, so we do not need to waste the valuable time we have here with going there, so I propose that one to 9, we would omit from this hearing because we know the answers to them in effect and then what I would like to do is probably we are questioning a number of people and this issue, if you like, has become topical but what I would like to know of you is that if any of you before, maybe as a planning issue if not a health issue, have raised any objections with either Planning or perhaps the Jersey Competition Regulatory Authority because when they issue a licence for a mobile or for a landline, in effect, they have to advertise and they have to give 28 days and it goes out to public consultation. So, what I am asking you is have you made any representation there in the last 18 months or 2 years or you know anybody that has?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

No. I know somebody in the concerned group who has --

Deputy A. Breckon:

Would that be a planning issue or a health issue?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I believe it is a mixture and that is personal, where they have been requesting for the proposed mast to be put further away from where they all live.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

What procedures are you aware of at the moment in ways of making contact with government/JCRA in progressing your concerns?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I have not been in contact with JCRA at all. I have been more trying to contact the Health Department, who have ignored every proposal.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Can I just interrupt here and say that the JCRA, I am told every time we tried to approach them or to nail them down some way or another, have put their hands in the air and say: "It is nothing to do with us, it is all to do with the Health Department." Everything has been passed on to Health, everything.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, that may be so to some extent, but they do issue licenses and those licenses are conditional on meeting certain standards, including health and safety. Now, were there to be a concern, they can change those standards, and in other areas perhaps a regulator does listen to the public as well as the operators and bear that in mind when they issue a license, because it is not just a case of giving the license, they have to comply with conditions of that now if there is something in UK or international standards that says that should change, then they have to listen to that and they can do that. So they do have that.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, but unfortunately, Chairman, that is balanced by the fact that the mast company is then put under pressure to cover a certain percentage of the Island before the license becomes live.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Yes.

The Connétable of Grouville:

They are told they must cover, I think it is 92-98 per cent, so in my opinion, health has taken very much a back seat on this and economics has taken a front seat, the driving seat.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

When you describe a system that can be operated, a network that can be operated at very low levels, at those low levels is it not true that there would have to be a significant number of smaller aerials putting out a lot lower power to affect that network?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

That is true. But I do believe that would be a lot safer for everybody than having big whammies all over the place.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

So, that, in fact, except that it would have to be a lot more on a lower power.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Yes, to keep the power lower you would have to have a lot more micro-cells. But these would be small.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

In one of your recommendations you suggested a referendum. What are your views on how people should be educated before a referendum is taken? Because, if a referendum is taken, I would suggest, now, a lot of people that are so engrossed in having their own mobile phones and children having mobile phones, unless there is some form of education, how do you think a referendum would serve us at the moment?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I think there would have to be an education process first. I really do believe they would have to have a very fair presentation of what is going on, and so I think you would have to say: "There is some doubt about the health aspects of telephone masts."

The Deputy of St. Peter:

In what sort of way would you see this being put across?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

You could put some of the best studies out; you give them the ECOLOG report to look at. It is not complicated; it is not a particularly complicated document to read.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

One of the points you made out, if I can use the term, of the utopia of electromagnetic reduction in Jersey, you will be aware that there are other sources of electromagnetic emission?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Indeed, yes.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Things like we have 2 radars here, which are pulse radars, and we have 2 channel radars, and lots of other elements. What is your view on that and the overall effect that it could have on the population?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I believe it is like we are just adding to the amount of smog, in a reckless way. We already have plenty in our lives, we do not need any more, I can guarantee you.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Can I just ask, mobiles have been with us for a number of years now, why have you only now raised your concerns? Why did you not raise your concerns a number of years ago?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I am probably like everyone else, it is an evolutionary process of learning, and with my postgraduate studies have started learning about things on the planet and wider issues from my original professional qualification, and hence I have books like this in my bookcase, I did not go out and buy that specially. So, as you become more educated to what is going on in the world and the planet generally, you suddenly realise that things are not good at all. I mean mobiles are not good for us, you only have to look at a thermographic picture, that is a sort of photograph of heat, going through a child's head, it is something like 85 per cent radiated. It is massive.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Were you aware that Health and Social Services, in April 2006, did bring out a report on mobile phone base stations? When did you become aware of this report?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I became aware of that recently, when I started looking into the whole situation.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Can I ask you what your opinion of the report is, because a lot of politicians will put a lot of emphasis on the findings in the report?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

It states twice that there is doubt and a precautionary approach is required. It states it in the second page here at the top, it says: "A precautionary approach is required because there is doubt."

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Can I just ask how you became aware of that particular report?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Through somebody whom had a mast put up near their house and they had done some research. That was quite a few months back now.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

That is the first time that you became aware of that report?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Yes.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Again, being devil's advocate here, there would be people who would say that in current society we are living longer, we appear to be more healthy, and yet what we are saying is there is a counter argument here that that perhaps may not be true. How would you counter that argument?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I think it is to do with quality of life. I believe that potentially the human body should have a very long lifespan and that there is no reason why we just do not die of old age. But, unfortunately, people get sick and we have to say: "Why are people getting sick?" I believe there are about 4 countries left in the world, or 4 areas in the world, where cancer does not exist, and they are usually spiritual places out in the open, do not have electromagnetic emissions and have very little hydrocarbon emissions, and basically very little pollution. But, unfortunately, even in the beautiful parts of Nepal now they have mercury in the streams, they have everything tainted because of China, and the world is becoming a sadder place. It is horrendous what is going on. On the other hand, we have medical knowledge and medical advances going hand-in-hand with that. So people are kept alive longer, but what is their quality? Quality is what it is all about. That is why I came to Jersey, for quality of life.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

We have referred to the Stewart Report and the ICNIRP findings and it appears that government generally is referring to these 2 particular bodies of evidence. Do you recognise any of the studies that

you have mentioned as being more definitive in the areas of electromagnetism for instance?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I do believe the ECOLOG is normally, it was commissioned by the mobile telephone industry itself.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Do you get the impression it might have been suppressed for a bit?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Yes, I think that is exactly what happened, and the 220 peer reviewed studies is pretty good, and they all came, I mean, there is one bit here, you know that they do not mess around, the bit on cancer here: "Given the results of the present epidemiological studies, it can be concluded that electromagnetic fields with frequencies in the mobile telecommunications range do play a role in the development of cancer. This is particularly notable for tumours of the central nervous system." And so on and so forth. It is all here.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

So, in effect, what they are saying is, it is a catalyst for cancers to develop.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Yes, what they say in the studies is that I think all of us have a little bit of cancer in us and it is a balance between our defence systems and those cells that are not behaving themselves quite right, so as long as we keep our immune systems up those cells will behave, and if we eat properly and we have reasonably balanced lives. But if we are being hacked at every day by these emissions, as I explained at the beginning, the body interprets that as stressful situations and the immune system goes down.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Are you aware of any local studies in the professional arena where Jersey has been looked at so that they get a good database of where cancers are occurring?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I have to say I do not have any, I do not know if there are any studies here in Jersey as to say what the rates of cancer are. I have heard that it is higher than Britain and that is from one or 2 fellow professionals in the medical world, but it is only hearsay and I would not like to state it as fact.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Again, it is only hearsay, I believe that Jersey does have a higher rate of cancer, but part of it is to do with granite.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Some say it is granite, some were talking about Cap de la Hague. I do not know, it is supposition.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Can I just pick up on the point regarding property values; I know your wife mentioned this on Thursday night. Have you any evidence to support this at all, the fact that property values may be affected by masts?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

To be fair, I am saying that I am pretty confident that if I put my property on the market today it would realise a lot less than I would expect if the mast were not next to it, particularly in view of the current high profile of the mast.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Do you think that the fact that the States receive a lot of revenue from renting out the land for the telephone companies to put a base station on; do you think that causes a conflict?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

That is obviously a factor, but it is a fairly minor factor, but the big factor to me is that the States should be taking care of people's health and should be saying that they should not be so close to people's homes. When I hear about Mr. Cummings with a mast 25 yards away and going through the process where you go to the Development Minister or whatever and he says: "No, no, no, we have to have the mast." But surely there must be other places to put masts. It just seems ludicrous if they put them so close when we do not know, when there is doubt, and there is still serious doubt, and unfortunately, whether it is asbestos or smoking or whatever has gone over the years, we have seen this happen so many times and it will happen again and I suspect that microwaves from telephone masts are going to prove, in time, to be a disaster.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

Would you agree, though, that mobile phones are a necessity in modern life?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

Unfortunately, I have one in my pocket. But I do not know, it seems to me we coped perfectly well not all that long ago. We talk about mobile telephones have been around a long time, they have not been around in the proliferation that they are today. When they started, very few people had them. I remember when I was down in South Africa in the 1980s, I think they started with mobile phones, they had 5,000 throughout the entire country and you paid thousands of pounds for them. So I do not think

they have been around as long as we think.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Dan, just to clarify a point, going back to what you said before when you were making representations on behalf of Mr. Cummings, those representations were made to the Minister for Economic Development.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes. I was going to come back to that because there was another point in there when you were talking about the one at St. Mary's. We were told that this particular mast had to go on this particular site because it was the only one that had a direct line of fire to the next mast, which was going to be on Mont de La Greve Lighthouse. So it was not a question of having it somewhere else. This is why I say the economics were driving the aesthetics of it. In fact, they said: "Right, that is the only place we can use that mast where we are going to get maximum power, so it has to go there", and there was no argument about it. It had to go there and that was it.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Was there any interaction with Planning at this stage?

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, this was talking to Planning.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

I just want to clarify this, the Economic Development, when you made your first representation, was it to the Minister for Economic Development?

The Connétable of Grouville:

It was all done through Planning.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

So the mast had to go...?

The Connétable of Grouville:

Had to go on that pumping station site. They tried to move it, they tried to move it somewhere else, and I thought I had him there, because the other site had a restrictive covenant on it, I was rather hoping they would go for that one, but unfortunately they did not, they went for this other site. That was it. It was a fait accompli.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

May I just ask Ben Shenton, just you were asking Mike Hocquard about the mobiles, it is interesting that Professor Challis, who is doing this future study, which was in the Times on Saturday, he was quoted a long time ago as saying that: "The British government would dearly like us to admit that these phones and their systems are safe, but in my heart I cannot say that." He is quoted as saying that.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Again, just to clarify the point, you are not saying that you want to dispose of the mobile phones. What you are saying is what we ought to be aiming for is a network system that operates on a far lower power base.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Lower power, masts away from sensitive sites and people's homes. The trouble is the topography of Jersey is such that it is a collection of houses dotted all over the land, but we had an up and running system and even with that I do believe people were being effected by microwave. Incidentally, it is very interesting that Dr. John Walker, who has done a lot of study on cancer clusters, I was reading his report and he said that the throat is one of the most sensitive and vulnerable areas to electromagnetic emissions. So, for competition, we only need 2 people for competition, and I do not believe this small land of ours can bear this weight it is being asked to --

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Again, going back to the point you made about this network on low power, obviously, to have a network that will function and therefore have a mobile system that will function, all these smaller base stations, low-powered base stations, will have to be situated close to where people live, because you need that many more of them to make the network.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

The micro cells, yes, but if it is very low power I would have said that is a lot safer. If you brought it down to 0.001 watt per metre, you are talking about a lot more safety.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

You spoke earlier on about microwave length and the affect on 2:45:47 (inaudible) time of lower wavelengths. Now, it is my understanding that the 3G network uses lower wavelengths and clearly the market is going towards a 3G network with its requirement for more data on mobile telephones. Are you aware of any scientific knowledge that might pertain to the lower wavelength aspects of the whole scenario?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I know Barry Trower was talking about 3G frequencies as being a lot worse. He does say that in his stuff, but that is all I know from what he said, rather than what I have said.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, I spoke to him the other day and his knowledge on 3G seemed to be fairly limited I felt. It appears to me that the scientific research at that end may be, at this stage, lacking and it would be interesting to know if there was anything out there.

Mr. M. Hocquard:

Again, we are coming back to a thing about doubt, whether 3G is worse than 2G or whatever it was before. In reality, surely people's health should come before the necessity to have this phenomenal 100 per cent coverage of the Island. If we lost a little bit of coverage in Boulay Bay or something like that and people's health was saved, or people's lives were saved, because we are not just talking about quality of life for people, we are talking about people dying from this, or possibly, and there is this word "possible", but very possible, surely, somebody should be shaking the tree here and saying: "Let us get these things away from people's workplaces, people's schools and people's homes." Reduce this intensity and let us only have 80 per cent coverage in the Island. So what? We have landlines; we managed with landlines very well until about 15 years ago.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

One idea put forward by Environment was to have a few masts that have sort of major size masts where all the network operators share the mast. Is that something?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

When you look at places like the North Coast, you see Fremont and all these monster masts with the television and everything else, and they are getting incredible coverage, why can we not have some very high masts that beam down to little ones that perhaps push everything with minor emissions? Why can we not look at it that way?

Senator B.E. Shenton:

The Environment Minister says that the smaller masts, and more of them, is more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. M. Hocquard:

I do appreciate that and I do appreciate I do not want an even bigger one next to my home, but I would rather have a larger one next to my home that did not give emissions, but I do not think that would be the case, it would be, I assume, stronger emissions.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Can we get rid of this impression that they are telephone poles? They are not, they are twice the diameter of telephone poles, they are much higher than telephone poles. They have lots of aerials and things hanging off them, which telephone poles do not have, so they do not look like telephone poles, believe you me, when you see them up.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Again, you are talking about aerials and the proliferation of aerials. As the point that you just made, the smaller the base station, I think they are called “pico”, the less power output you need to maintain the network, and as a consequence less risk is there. If you have bigger masts they are beamed down, there is no point in having a big mast that does not pick up a signal anyway, they are beamed down by about 15 degrees, these big masts, because they still have to pickup, but they would have to be of a higher power and it is the power that we are talking about as the problem.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

Absolutely, but it is also the number of companies, because we have more networks, and that is the problem. Every mast that goes up is going to be emitting, whether it is day or night, and even if the amount of emission is quite low at nighttime, they are still emitting. There are studies here, which, as I have already stated, have caused problems for people around masts even at very, very low emissions.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

What advantage do you see, if any, in having multi agencies using a single mast?

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I do not see any advantage in that whatsoever.

Mr. M. Hocquard:

I do not think there is any advantage from the health aspect anyway. But interesting question, if Jersey Telecoms is sold and if it happened to be sold to one of the 2 existing ones who come in here, will the JCRA be saying we must get another one in? Will we be looking for somebody to have another license? It is a ludicrous, crazy thing, really, is it not? We do not need it and will they be struggling in the end and they all suddenly decide we have to put our prices up to survive, because it just does not work in such a small environment.

Deputy A. Breckon:

If I can ask you a general question about how you feel about access to the Authority, the Authority being government or any of the departments or Ministers, information they may have had, did they share it, any research, did they share it, do you think you were helped adequately, were they user friendly or do you feel you have been impeded, or could you just relate your experience? Because, as a policy, the

government is supposed to be connecting with the people, not disconnecting.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

If I may just say that I contacted the Health Minister and the Medical Officer for Health requesting a meeting with Barrie Trower, because I felt his information as a scientist, first-hand, should have been listened to by them, as well as going through Scrutiny. I contacted them 3 times and then Dan, here, said he would try and arrange something and he contacted twice and we had no reply, we were completely ignored, which I think is so discourteous and very undemocratic and a disgrace.

The Connétable of Grouville:

The Health Minister did offer to read any papers I could get for him written by Professor Trower, but he was too tied up with HSS (Health and Social Security) business to see him.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

So we had no response?

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, I received an email only, I think, Saturday morning. It was the same time that I received the email from the Panel telling me we could not have any money to bring somebody else over. Good call.

Deputy A. Breckon:

For the record, Constable, can I remind you, as a Member of the Public Accounts Committee, if you think, bearing in mind I am not suggesting it is in any way similar, but there was this scandal about the amount of flowers and money given when the accountant said: "Make the case for the Public Accounts Committee", and you can consider that.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Too late.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Well, it would have to be done retrospectively if you could make the case.

Senator B.E. Shenton:

We do have a fair mixture of witnesses coming to see the Panel and obviously we have an awful lot of submissions as well, and then we will be putting the case forward to the Minister and hoping that they will listen.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Is there any thing, we have no more questions of you, is there anything you would like to say for our benefit that we may have missed or you would like to add to what you have already said? Take a minute or so, it is not a problem. As I say, this is part of a process, it is not the end of a process, so there may be something that you have referred to there that we would like to see or something that comes to light tomorrow or the day after, it is not a problem if you want to get back with anything else.

Dr. G. Langly-Smith:

I just feel that people like Professor Robert Becker, who is an absolute giant in the scientific world, as I say twice nominated for the Nobel Prize, you know, we really have to listen to these people. It is not just all fluffy talk.

(Added by witness as comment to amended transcript: "Recommendation that someone goes to Salzburg and sees their system and talks to people who are in the business community and see how they have adapted.")

Deputy A. Breckon:

Mr. Hocquard, anything you would like to add?

Mr. M. Hocquard:

Only just reiterating the point, there is doubt, there is uncertainty, and we should be erring on the side of caution, and I do not believe it is too difficult to say: "Let us get these things away from people's homes and people's places of business and from schools", and I am sure you gentlemen can push this forward and get this done.

Deputy A. Breckon:

Thank you very much indeed for your presentation and your time and effort. We will now adjourn until 3.30 p.m.