



Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space

www.stopglobalwifi.org

Testimony of GUARDS (Global Union Against Radiation Deployment from Space)

In Opposition to AB2395 April 11, 2016

Before the Committee on Utilities & Commerce-Via Email

Assemblymen Chairs Gato, Patterson and members of the Utilities & Commerce Committee,

GUARDS is an international coalition against global WiFi from space, a complex technology of radiation and toxic chemicals endangering all life on Earth. We urge you to oppose AB 2395 and reconsider dismantling the AT&T phone lines.

There are many reasons wire lines, whether copper or fiber optic should be maintained. Their removal with a mandatory switch to wireless or voice over internet will increase people's exposure to microwave radiation, and many people who suffer from Electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) have medical reasons why they need a regular corded telephone. This Bill would violate people's right to basic essential phone service, especially to the elderly who do not use cell phones, and as well, limit ready phone access to children in case of emergencies. It will negatively affect call quality in areas that have poor reception.

Importantly, AP2395 would violate the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, several sections of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, and International Human Rights Law in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and harm the environment. Some researchers estimate approximately 3% of the population has severe symptoms of EHS and another 35% of the population has moderate symptoms such as impaired immune system and chronic illness (Havas, 2013). <http://wirelessrighttoknow.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Havas2013.pdf> Hallberg and Oberfeld published in Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine (2006) historical EHS data and project if past trends continue, that 50% of the total population is expected to suffer some level of EHS by year 2017 (http://www.next-up.org/pdf/EHS2006_HallbergOberfeld.pdf).

In a recent government report, "RADIOFREQUENCY ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATION AND THE HEALTH OF CANADIANS," <http://www.parl.gc.ca/housepublications/publication.aspx?DocId=8041315> , the Parliamentary Standing

Committee on Health discusses the need for the government to continue to make accommodations for those suffering from EHS as required under the Canadian Human Rights Commission:

Recommendation 5

That the Government of Canada continue to provide reasonable accommodations for environmental sensitivities, including electromagnetic hypersensitivity, as required under the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Violation of U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Increasing numbers of countries, such as Sweden and France, (as do the Canadian Human Rights Commission and European Parliament), recognize Electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) as an environmentally induced functional impairment or disability triggered by exposure to electromagnetic fields (including RF). Passing this Bill would contravene Article 1 to “*promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity*”; Article 3 “*Full and effective participation and inclusion in society*”; and Article 15(2) stating: “*Parties shall take all effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent persons with disabilities, on an equal basis with others, from being subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*”; since persons who get sick from using wireless devices would have no safe options to make or receive calls.

The European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) is an E.U. advisory body comprising representatives of workers’ and employers’ organizations and other interest groups. It issues opinions on E.U. issues to the European Commission, the Council of the E.U., and the European Parliament, thus acting as a bridge between the E.U.'s decision-making institutions and E.U. citizens. In February 2015, a formal letter of notice was sent to the EESC by the Radiation Research Trust (based in U.K.) and approximately 90 other organizations from around the world in support of millions of people—estimated to be between 22,000,000 and 37,000,000—throughout Europe currently suffering EHS due to RF exposure from the proliferation of radiofrequency radiation emissions and emitters (i.e., mobile phones, DECT cordless phones, cordless baby monitors, phone masts, WiFi, smart meters, the smart grid, etc.) (http://www.radiationresearch.org/images/rrt_articles/EM-Radiation-Research-Trust-Letter-of-Notice-Served-on-Mr-Richard-Adams.pdf).

Violation of International Human Rights

AB 2395 violates Article 3 of The UN Declaration of Human Rights, ratified by the General Assembly in 1948, which states, “*everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.*” Data exist showing RF radiation can cause serious biological effects at levels far below the existing FCC RF limits (www.bioinitiative.org). These effects include damage to DNA, which can lead to an increased risk for cancer and deleterious genetic mutations passed on to future generations. Decreases in sperm count and quality and increases in miscarriage and infertility have also been demonstrated in response to exposure to RF radiation.

Violation of U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child

Under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, states/countries are responsible for acting in their children’s best interest. In this case, that would mean opposing AB 2395 or similar legislative efforts.

In a letter to Congress, the American Academy of Pediatrics stated:

“Children are disproportionately affected by environmental exposures, including cell phone radiation. The differences in bone density and the amount of fluid in a child’s brain compared to an adult’s brain could allow children to absorb greater quantities of RF energy deeper into their brains than adults.”

<http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=7520941318>

No child should suffer involuntary RF radiation exposure, therefore forced to incur an increased risk of cancer, functional impairment leading to ill health or cognitive impairment, or genetic damage in *their* children.

Any of these outcomes, which research supports as likely, violate children’s rights. Electromagnetic Radiation, Health and Children 2014 by Dr. Erica Mallery-Blythe, (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNFdZVeXw7M>) is a must-watch presentation about the hazard that RF radiation emitted by wireless technology poses to children.

Dr. Mallery-Blythe’s presentation references several U.N. Conventions on the Rights of the Child that would be violated by this bill including:

Article 3 (best interests of a child): The best interests of a child must be a top priority in all decisions and actions that affect children.

Article 23 (children with a disability): A child with a disability has the right to live a full and decent life with dignity, and, as far as possible, independence and to play an active part in the community. Governments must do all that they can to support disabled children and their families.

Article 24 (health and services): Every child has the right to the best possible health. Governments must provide good quality health care, clean water, nutritious food and a clean environment and education on health and well-being so that children can stay healthy.

FCC Investigation of Current Exposure Limits Underway

With the FCC finally beginning re-evaluation of current irrelevant and obsolete non-ionizing RF exposure (<http://www.mainecoalitiontostopsmartmeters.org/?p=1390>) guidelines, it seems imprudent to approve technology applications encouraging global proliferation of RF microwave radiation.

In the Inquiry the FCC requests comment to determine whether its RF exposure limits and policies need to be reassessed. Since consideration of the limits themselves is explicitly outside of the scope of ET Docket No. 03-137, the FCC opens a new docket, ET Docket No. 13-84, with the Inquiry to consider these limits in light of more recent developments. The Inquiry is intended to open discussion on both the currency of our RF exposure limits and possible policy approaches regarding RF exposure. <https://www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/radio-frequency-safety>

International Recognition of Need for More Conservative RF Safety Limits

Countries around the world are increasingly recognizing the risks of RF radiation and advising action to protect the public (http://www.cellphonetaskforce.org/?page_id=128). Even the U.S., as cited above, is

in the process of reviewing RF exposure guidelines. Countries such as China, Russia, Italy and Switzerland already have wireless radiation safety limits 100 times lower than the United States.

Canada: Previous Safety Code 6 Inadequate

In June 2015, Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Health (HESA) issued a report with 12 unanimous recommendations for increased caution, investigations, reporting and data gathering with regard to RF/EMF and wireless devices. Canada's Safety Code 6 provided guidelines for RF exposure virtually identical to 1996 FCC guidelines until recently (March 2015) when Canada reduced its maximum permissible exposure limits by nearly 50%. *"The [HESA] Committee agrees that the potential risks of exposure to RF fields are a serious public health issue that needs to be brought to the attention of Canadians so that they have the knowledge to use wireless devices responsibly and are able to make decisions about the use of wireless devices in a manner that protects their health and the health of their families."* The Standing Committee report shares themes including cancer, illness, fertility, autism, public awareness, school environments, and medical responsibilities. It discusses studies demonstrating adverse effects at levels below Health Canada's guidelines.

http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/HOC/Committee/412/HESA/Reports/RP8041315/412_HESA_Rpt13_PDF/412_HESA_Rpt13-e.pdf

RF Health Risks

A new compilation has been published of over 900 published peer-reviewed studies showing adverse effects from RFR exposure. The studies are organized in three categories and linked here. There are [700 Cell Phone Studies](#), [78 Cell Tower Studies](#) and [136 WiFi & Device Studies](#) listed. The listings contain an index by health effect type, and for each article the legal journal citation and an abstract with adverse health effects highlighted. <http://www.mainecoalitionstopsmartmeters.org/?p=1469>

Were you aware that Health Canada has acknowledged that some studies do find adverse health effects, as pointed out in a Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST) Fact sheet? The Fact Sheet (attached) shares:

1.2 Health Canada Admits Studies Show Harm at Levels Below Safety Code 6

Mr. Andrew Adams, Health Canada: In testimony before the Parliamentary Health Committee admitted there are studies that show harm below Safety Code 6 (virtually the same as FCC standards). Health Canada document "determined that 36 studies were of "sufficient quality for inclusion in the Risk Assessment" in the following categories:" Cancer is linked in 6 studies, brain/nervous system impacts in 13, biochemical disruption in 16 and development and/or learning behaviour impacts in 7.

The Standing Committee on Health (2015) examined the issues surrounding wireless radiation (radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation, RF), and the Committee—made up of federal Members of Parliament from NDP, Conservative, and Liberal parties—UNANIMOUSLY adopted 12 important recommendations after sharing that:

The Committee agrees that the potential risks of exposure to RF fields are a serious public health issue that needs to be brought to the attention of Canadians so that they have the knowledge to use wireless devices responsibly and are able to make decisions about the use of wireless devices in a manner that protects their health and the health of their families.

The United Federation of Teachers shares on their website: “Wireless radiation is emitted by the myriad of wireless devices we encounter every day. It was once thought to be relatively harmless. However, we now know that wireless radiation can cause non-thermal biological effects as well, including damage to cells and DNA, even at low levels.” They provide tips to their members to reduce exposure and to protect their pregnant mothers. <http://www.uft.org/our-rights/wireless-radiation>

In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), a committee of the World Health Organization (WHO), classified RF radiation as a Group 2B possible human carcinogen in the same category as lead and DDT. Alarmingly, several scientists who were members of the IARC working group involved with this classification now conclude the risks are much greater than originally thought. For example, Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski warns that RF should be classified as a Group 2A probable human carcinogen, and Dr. Lennart Hardell reports that several studies indicate a Group 1 human carcinogen classification is justified, placing RF in the same category as tobacco, asbestos, and benzene. <https://betweenrockandhardplace.wordpress.com/2014/08/14/carcinogenicity-of-cell-phone-radiation-2b-or-not-2b/>

Recently, in 2015, more than 200 scientists from 40 countries having over 2,000 published peer-reviewed journal articles to their collective credit in the field of biological impacts from RF/EMF appealed to the U.N. and the WHO for greater precautions with regard to exposures from wireless technologies. This is the latest in many such alerts to the health effects of RF/EMF exposure <https://www.emfscientist.org/>.

Environmental Impacts

A parade of studies continue to be published implicating wireless technology in the die-off of forests, the demise of frogs, bats, and honey bees, the threatened extinction of the house sparrow, and damage to the DNA of the human species. It is vital to the continuation of life that large parts of Earth are spared the incessant radiation that accompanies wireless technologies.

- “The Report on Possible Impacts of Communication Towers on Wildlife Including Birds and Bees” commissioned on 30th August 2010 by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India (based on a review of over 900 studies) http://www.moef.nic.in/downloads/public-information/final_mobile_towers_report.pdf
- “Impacts of radio-frequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) from cell phone towers and wireless devices on biosystem and ecosystem – a review,” http://www.biolmedonline.com/Articles/Vol4_4_2012/Vol4_4_202-216_BM-8.pdf
- Balmori, A. “Electromagnetic pollution from phone masts. Effects on wildlife,” *Pathophysiology* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.pathophys.2009.01.007 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19264463>
- October 31, 2014 presentation to the Manitoba Entomological Society, reviewing 91 studies on the effects of RF/MW radiation on honey bees, insects, birds, etc: https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/mobilfunk_newsletter/0RUPGTI4qQY

Access to Essential Services and Call Quality

With many senior citizens not having cell phones, this Bill would deny them essential services. Having a landline could save their lives in an emergency where they need to call 911, particularly during power

outages when cell phones are often not charged or the network has also lost power. With senior citizens often living away from family, it is important that they have a ready and simple means of communication for not only their health, but emotional wellbeing.

It is also important for younger children to have access to landline. For example, citizens have reported that having a landline available for their children, saved their lives. In an article 'Pro & Cons: Should I keep a Landline for Emergencies?', <http://www.apartmenttherapy.com/pros-cons-should-i-keep-a-landline-for-emergencies-197013>, one reader wrote about a specific situation in which a landline saved her life. She wrote: *"To each their own, but I collapsed suddenly while alone with my young child. A true medical emergency can leave you unconscious before you even realize what's happening. My child knew where the phone was. She had no clue where my cell was."* Being that many phones are password protected, it would not help even if the child knew where the phone was, and younger children especially would be prevented from calling 911 in an emergency such as a break in or fire. Furthermore, cell phone service is not reliable in all areas, and the call quality poor. With the known health effects, and government reviewing radiation standards, adding more cell towers and increasing RF exposure is not the answer.

Please consider our comments as reasons AB 2395 should be opposed. In brief, those reasons include insurance industry recognition of serious risk to health (<https://smartmeterharm.org/2015/03/18/lloyds-of-london-excludes-liability-coverage-for-rfemf-claims/>), demonstrated detrimental biological effects at levels far below existing inadequate RF safety limits, radiofrequency radiation currently classified "possible human carcinogen" by the World Health Organization, personal security risks, restricted access, inferior call quality and resultant violations of U.N. Conventions and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Sincerely,



Ed Friedman
42 Stevens Rd.
Bowdoinham, ME 04008
207-666-3372
edfomb@comcast.net

Marcey Kliparchuk
10859-147 Street
Edmonton, AB, Canada, T5N 3E1
780-760-0872
marcey.klip@yahoo.ca