


# 5G CRISIS

AWARENESS & ACCOUNTABILITY



## How 5G Sites Are Being Blocked and Removed

Guest: Raymond Broomhall

*The contents of this presentation are for informational purposes only and are not intended to be a substitute for professional medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. This presentation does not provide medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. Always seek the advice of your physician or other qualified health provider with any questions you may have regarding a medical condition.*

**Josh:** Joining us on the summit today is barrister at law from Tasmania and Australia, Raymond Broomhall. Raymond, welcome to the summit.

**Raymond:** Thank you for having me, Josh. It's a pleasure.

**Josh:** Now, I'm so excited about this interview. Actually, we're doing this in two parts. The content you are bringing is tremendous and empowering for people and really regulatory, because you have created and have implemented a legal process in Australia and Tasmania. And that can be done in other countries that has resulted in hundreds of small cells sites and 5G installations being either prevented or removed, is that correct?

**Raymond:** It is thousands, not hundreds.

**Josh:** Okay. Excellent. I just wanted to understand it because I don't want to overstate anything. I want to really just be clear, because this is really, really big news. This is a huge part of the summit, is this process. I'm so glad to be able to -- First of all, in part one, we're going to talk about the results. We're going to talk about the theory, we're going to talk about the applicability and surrounding conversation about this process. And in part two, we actually are going to dive in 22 step by step points. Ray prepared a three-page document, we're going to go through step by step how you do this legal process. So yeah, let's dive in. Ray, I'm going to just read out your bio, so to give the audience a bit of background on you, and then I'll stop talking and then you can talk. How's that?

**Raymond:** Sounds great. Okay.

**Josh:** Go ahead.

**Raymond:** As we sign, Australia should be right mate.

**Josh:** Should be right mate. We were just talking about that before the call. Anyway, I need to go to Australia and New Zealand. It's definitely on my bucket list. So, Raymond Broomhall is a licensed and practicing barrister in Australia and Tasmania. And he's getting results dealing with 5G and stopping it, which is what we're going to get into.

And Ray specializes in out-of-the-box legal approaches, he's in very high demand throughout the world for his work specifically on electromagnetic radiation issues and small cell installations, and getting results there. He is considered to be one of the leading legal advocates in this field. So Ray, tell us about the result before we get into kind of the theory and overview. And then in part two, as mentioned, we'll do step by step walkthrough. Tell us about the results you're getting with this legal process?

**Raymond:** It's been a bit of a journey. And I guess the penny drops when I realized the best approach to it. And the beautiful thing that I've realized is that a lot of my work doesn't require actually going to court. The telcos have started to realize that it's in the too hard basket for them, they don't want to air their dirty laundry in court. And they decided to withdraw quite quickly.

The success I've had, I guess would be -- I'll start with probably Wilsons Creek, which was in New South Wales, South East side of Australia. And in New South Wales, it was an issue that we had with a telco who was building a tower, we put together a process where we talked about the criminal side of things, and also the precautionary principle issues. I'm the Counsel with the correct tools so that I could reject the development without having to have appeal.

And we were successful with that and stop the tower. And that's when the floodgates started opening. And we realized that a medical certificate was extremely important. And then I went to another issue where I had eight doctors in a street, who were having small cell 5G placed on a power pole next door to a child's bedroom on the street. There were eight doctors on that street, and they decided that they needed to engage me to assist. And at that time, I was also working with another 30 different organizations and communities throughout Australia with this particular network and this telco provider. So in essence, will taking on the entire network with this telco

provider. Now this telco provider already had 900 small cell facilities already established, which basically means that already placed on poles throughout Australia, and they had another 1600 to put through. So they'll propose that all up. We were looking, in that particular one network was 2500 small cell facilities.

**Josh:** So 2500 small cell facilities, 900 are already installed, and then another 1600 are planned. And this is nationwide across Australia or just in one state?

**Raymond:** That's state. They've already spent around 130 million dollars on the network. And basically the best thing is I put everything together, joined forces with the doctors, got an expert medical opinion to come forward. And then we had the telco actually attend a public consultation meeting. And we absolutely floored them at the meeting. We also encourage council to attend, which they did, and also members of local governments. And it got to the point where we were very successful with that, and they pulled the pin on it.

**Josh:** Wow. Now, just on the timeline here, help us to establish when was that process started? And when did you have the result?

**Raymond:** Okay. Well, it was basically in August, and we had the result in January.

Josh: Of 2018, and then the result in January 2019.

**Raymond:** That's correct. Yes.

**Josh:** Okay. Excellent. And so, I mean, that's significant. Have you heard of anyone else in the world really doing a process like this that is actually not only stopped, but reversed small cell and 5G towers?

**Raymond:** Not I know of doubt. As far as I can see, I'm probably the only person that's been doing this. I do have some counselor assist me and other lawyers. So I do have a small network and a small team that are with me on this. But yes, it's been interesting.

**Josh:** Now, you're licensed as a barista at law in Tasmania and Australia, correct?

**Raymond:** Yes. Tasmania is part of Australia. So in Australia, we have seven states and territories. So I can practice in pretty much anywhere I want to in Australia. Yes.

**Josh:** Okay. Now, you're going to be teaching us a process. That, is it directly applicable? Can it be used in other Western countries? Tell us about its international applicability first before we kind of dive into how it works.

**Raymond:** Yes. The way I see it is that it's actually very simple and very common sense. On this when your viewers listen to it, they'll actually understand that it should be applicable pretty much worldwide, I would think.

**Josh:** And just to the viewer out there; in part two, we're actually walking through as mentioned, but we're making the document template and guides, everything as a free included downloadable, so stay tuned for part two. So let's dive into how this works. Ray, just give us, not the step by step the level of detail, but the theory. How have you developed and what do you use in your legal action that has resulted so far in this very significant level of success?

**Raymond:** I guess the best way to explain it is it's all about putting not only the telcos but also councils, also members of parliament, any decision maker on notice that this thing, literally maybe non ionizing electromagnetic radiation, actually has a potential risk of harm. And to establish the evidence for that so that anything that's written -- when an objection is put into a telco that there is explicit evidence that backs up that claim.

So in essence, getting a medical doctor or medical practitioner to have a look at the science, realize that yes, there's -- they're saying that there no established health effects. They will we have turned that around and said, well, non established health effects, okay. Well, that means that there's no scientific certainty as to whether or not it's safe or actually causes harm. There are thousands of studies out there that indicate that it is actual harmful.

So therefore, the precautionary principle kicks in, which basically means when there is scientific uncertainty, then you must err on the caution. And so what I've done is, in effect, got medical practitioners to assess the science, and it's up to them to come up whether or not they believe that it's harmful or not, or it's got a risk of harm. Now, once my client has received this medical advice, then the fear of this particular electromagnetic radiation being emitted onto them from their neighbor, which is a telco, is enough to start criminal action in a court. And I can explain that later. But that's basically the principles. So in essence, we use the precautionary principle, we circumvent federal law where they try and use telecommunications acts and federal standards, such as in Australia, we call it the ACMA. In the US, I think they call it the FCC, F triple C or whatever it's called.

And basically what it is, is we would have worked around that. And I realized that the trick is to bypass all that and go straight to the Criminal Code to assist and then we apply for restraint orders or threatened to apply restraint orders, and that's enough. When they realize that not only the telco, but their employees that anybody that's in the decision-making process, including counselors in councils. Anyone that's agreeing and allowing an assault to actually occur against my client is enough to instigate restraint against them in a court of law.

**Josh:** Wow, that's excellent. So you're using the medical system and the authority that the legal system, you know, holds -- the medical system holds, in other words. Like, the authority that the legal system recognizes when the doctor writes a note with regards to the health and/or well being, and/or mental or physical state and risk of harm for their patient, then that carries legal power and weight.

**Raymond:** Yeah, exactly. Because who is responsible for health? Is it a scientist? Or is a doctor? It's as simple as that.

**Josh:** Sorry to interrupt. But I mean, even the agencies don't even have proper scientists. They're mostly just engineers, but please continue.

**Raymond:** That's correct. Well, there are psychologists who don't have medical training, there are all sorts of things. And the issue is that really, in our society, a doctor's opinion -- that's why they're doctors, that's why they're medical practitioners, it's up to them to set disseminate what's out there and to diagnose their own particular patient. And to assess the risk of -- and assess what's best for their patient. And that's the trick. That's it.

**Josh:** Wow. So what are you finding in terms of the number of doctors that are termed willing once they are appraised or educated on the science? Like are doctors responsive to writing letters like this for their clients?

**Raymond:** Yes, very much. And once people realize that -- the whole issue is this; if we go to court, it's got nothing to do with how the doctors assess this, okay? It comes down to how the patient sees whether or not the fear of electromagnetic radiation is true or not, or if they established a reasonable fear inside themselves that this is going to harm. I don't have to explain how a doctor came to that conclusion in court at all. That's the beautiful thing about it. All I have to do is, say; a doctor has given opinion, my client has established a reasonable fear backed up by that expert opinion that this is going to harm and that's all I need. I don't have to go into the science. And the worst thing is, I learned that a long time ago was that if I had experts; engineering, physicists, and everybody in court, there was always a counter

argument raised by the other side. And what I've done here is completely removed that.

**Josh:** Yeah, because it's not like the other side, so to speak. And that easily have a doctor write a note about that individual. You know, it's basically like you're trumping, so to speak, their defense completely by --

**Raymond:** Completely throwing them out of the window. And once doctors understand this and realize that they do have the freedom to diagnose and treat etc. And all it is, is I'm saying, is this particular person -- all I'm asking the doctor, is this is safe? My client is down and consulting their doctor and say; excuse me, doctor, they're going to start putting this tower right next to my house or they going to put small meter in or whatever, 5G small cell facility, whatever it might be." "Excuse me, Doctor, can you please tell me? Can you look at science, please, and tell me if it's safe?"

**Josh:** Yeah. And on the legal side, tell us about -- you send notices.

**Raymond:** Yes.

**Josh:** And tell us about how you use and invoke criminal law and how the legal side of the process works.

**Raymond:** Well, how it works is that; anything in law, you always have to put the other side on notice, so that they are under -- and it's all about consent. And what you're doing, in a sense, is you're withdrawing your consent to be irradiated by electromagnetic radiation. Now, the Criminal Code for example, in -- and I'll just use a good example of a definition of assault, so that you understand what that means. And then you'll understand it sort of makes sense. But in Queensland; I'll just use this particular state because each state is different. And you'll find that in Australia, we have a slightly different context as to what assault is, and you'll find the same thing in the UK, US etc. But assault is really the principle that we're working on here.

And I'll just read this to you. And this is the Queensland Criminal Code Section 245. And it says definition of assault. "[a] person who strikes, touches, or moves, or otherwise applies force of any kind to, the person of another, either directly or indirectly, without the other person's consent, or with the other person's consent if the consent is obtained by fraud, or who by any bodily act or gesture attempts or threatens to apply force of any kind to the person of another without the other person's consent, under such circumstances that the person making the attempt or threat has actually or apparently a present ability to effect the person's purpose, is said to assault that other person, and the act is called an assault."

Now, when I refer to the applies force issue, "applies force includes the case of applying heat, light, electrical force, gas, odor, or any other substance or thing whatever if applied in such a degree as to cause injury or personal discomfort"

**Josh:** Interesting how both electrical force and injury, and personal discomfort which probably includes fear. Both of those --

**Raymond:** Is correct, yeah. So you can have injury in the form of anxiety and some form. Or you could have it in the form of personal discomfort. And that's all I'm doing. I'm just addressing the personal discomfort issue, if that makes sense?

**Josh:** Now, just to back up; this is the criminal -- the definition of legal assault use within the criminal legal sphere.

**Raymond:** And the reason I use that particular section in the Queensland Code is because Queensland is probably the most codified in all states in Australia. And you'll find that that codification means that it's got all the common law in everything -- basically all the common law since time immemorial, has been developed to form this particular definition of assault, and you'll find that will probably apply pretty much worldwide.

**Josh:** Now, common law is still active in United States, right? Because there are some people who says it's no longer.

**Raymond:** Yes, and common law is just basically case law. So when a Supreme Court case is handed down, when they interpret certain legislation or a particular act, their interpretation becomes case law, common law, as we say.

**Josh:** Okay. I quickly want to ask you, before we dive into the next layer of understanding; you're using notices, you're using common law. Many of our viewers will know that in 2017, I helped to bring forward an organization called InPower Movement, doing a liability process, using common law using notices and using commerce. And have since entrusted that organization, like my cofounding partner, Cal Washington and the board. Really quickly, what's your perspective on the notice of liability process that InPower is doing?

**Raymond:** Mine is a little bit different in that I'm not going into -- I can't really answer. I had to look it up, I just can't remember it. Like there's a lot to it. I think in essence, it's very similar in that we've got a notice of liability issues. So by sending a warning and objection notices is really what we're doing. And

attached to that notice, is a legal advice, which explains the law and the legal liability either in both in the civil and the criminal sphere. And in that, we also attach the medical evidence to it as well. So really, it's just those three simple documents, which is enough to tell guys to listen. So in essence, it's a warning and objection notice, which is basically just a cover letter, really. And in that notice, we talked about saying we don't consent to being radiated by electromagnetic radiation. We don't consent to it being coming from your property onto my property. That's it, basically. And then we put it together and send it off.

**Josh:** Excellent. So the first thing you do is the notice, and that invokes your terms, right? And so do people do this as an individual or people coming together in groups to do this process. How does that work?

**Raymond:** You can do it both ways. And I've had groups of say people that have set up not for profit organizations and associations. And we've put, for example, Wilsons Creek, we went on that level, with the Randwick City Council issue, which was the 5G TPG set up where we had over 2500 sites gone. We use the group issue there. There's other towns have been doing where it's just individuals where that's been successful. It really you can do it either way.

**Josh:** So you mentioned the second one; the Randwick City Council, is that right? You did a process at the local level with the City Council? And then it had a federal like country wide effect, is that what you're saying?

**Raymond:** Yes. So how it works is that, in essence, you're putting them on notice. You're saying I don't consent to this. This is technically constitutes assault, if there's intention on the other side to actually harm us. Now, the trick is, is that when you put them on notice, you're saying, hey, I've got a medical opinion; this thing, electromagnetic radiation, in my opinion, and it's a reasonable fear that I have, because the doctor says so, that this is going to harm. Now, there's no assault yet. It's when they then act on that and say, "Look, we're disregarding the medical opinion. Therefore, we're going to proceed. And we're going to install the facility and we're going to radiate you." That's a threat. And that's a threat to assault.

So it doesn't actually kick in, technically, until they make a positive action to start the emitting process. And they don't have to build it yet, they just have to tell you; we are going to proceed. We're not listening to your advice, or etc. Then that gives us the catalyst to taking the call.

**Josh:** Brilliant. So what about the scenario where the other side goes silent and they don't respond at all?

**Raymond:** Well, then in my notice, one notice that I've drafted up I say this, and I'll just read it very quickly. "If you intend to disregard my fears concerns and the medical advice and make it known to me by the literal conduct that you will precede, regardless, then I'll treat such intentional conduct as an intentional threat to physically assault my family and myself with electromagnetic radiation." So in essence, if they're quiet, and they don't feed back, you just say, well -- and I will say this. "Please note that if you fail to respond to this 14 days from the day of this letter that will be deemed by your omission to respond that you intend to radiate my lane. I will therefore have no choice but to seek remedy in a court of law." So you have to put that in your letter. Yeah.

**Josh:** you have to, essentially, politely issue a warning or a threat, right?

**Raymond:** Yes. It's been very calm, saying, look, we just let you know about, you know, I've got an obligation to inform you that what you're possibly doing, does have some liability issues to you. I don't think you realize what you're actually doing to me, but I'm going to let you know anyway. And there's no excuse after you've got my warning notice. And my objection notice, medical medium, if you continue then you're really just open yourself up for all sorts of liability.

So what this notice actually does is, it sets up everything; it sets up criminal liability, it also sets up compensation for civil issues. So let's say in the future, you find that you've got a personal injury; for some form, it's quite found that in 10 years time that, yes, it does cause cancer. You already had this setup in place by this simple letter, to protect you and to set up your liability issues right there, because they were informed that it does cause harm; what's called a potential risk, and they've completely ignored it at their own -- and they've been reckless and negligent in the issue.

And then we talk about shielding, where you can get compensation for shielding for your home. That's all in part of the legal advice that I would give. And there are all sorts of things. So it's a very technical document; the legal advice, but what it does is it covers all scenarios. So when a meter gets a legal opinion, which covers everything literally saying, "Well, you're going to be liable if you don't listen" And we're ready to go.

**Josh:** Wow. So there's a couple of follow up questions I want to ask because this is so significant. I mean, it really makes intuitive sense here and it's crossing over from you going from the private side, you're sending a notice on the private side. And you're able to leverage the medical system to then take it into a court, which they don't want to do.

**Raymond:** And the trick with this too, is it's not going into the Supreme Court. When I first started this, I was going to the Supreme Court causing my client absolute fortune, and getting nowhere was like spinning our wheels. And that was sort of just delaying tactics, etc. Now, I realized that the trick was -- I was still restrained that going to this lower courts, into the county courts, the local courts, the magistrate's courts, the very simple courts. And doing simple things like apply for Peace and Good behavior order, or restraint order, it's just simple ones.

Like if your neighbor is being naughty you know, being disruptive to you and is becoming a real problem, you can go and seek restraint in the magistrate's court. And that's exactly what I'm doing; is going through the simple side of it. And you'll find the telcos don't know how to deal with it because they expect everything to go on the Supreme Court. And here I am coming through the local courts.

And I'm starting to realize that this is the principle: keep it simple, stupid. And it's working.

**Josh:** Well, so in the liability side now, it's really interesting because those who've been following the electromagnetic radiation issue and the big cover up there with respect to agencies for years, know that they're -- for example, big insurance, underwriters don't cover electromagnetic radiation or wireless product -- is a harm from the actual products. Like, Lloyds of London doesn't, Swiss Re, this top 300 companies in the world recently issued an announcement that basically say; specifically, 5G is the highest long term risk rating. And meanwhile, it's not covered by -- Okay, so tell us more about the liability side.

**Raymond:** Well, you are totally right. Insurance will not insure electromagnetic radiation issues at all. And I guess, the best way to explain is looking at this file. I had a really good look at the tobacco industry and the specialized industry, and as to how it all work. And the spin doctoring that they were doing, how they weren't listening to science. The Erin Brockovich scenario where there's actual cases that they know that it does harm, and they just trying to hide in spin doctoring. And in essence, that's what literally I'm uncovering and keeping it simple, but uncovering it and providing that liability. You'll find that, a good example would be the misleading terms that are currently being used. And I find that extremely frustrating. I think it's very, very erroneous that they're doing this.

You'll probably notice that in restrain legislation -- and I'm pretty sure you'll find that pretty much throughout the world, that it's called non ionizing electromagnetic radiation. Now, the spin doctors then turn around saying no,

no we're going to start calling it electromagnetic energy. That sounds better. Okay. "Oh, let's go call it that." Now, they start to call it radio waves.

**Josh:** Yeah. Because people are familiar with the idea of having radio stations transmit.

**Raymond:** Yes. And so what that's doing is it's creating -- it's almost negligent and reckless in what they're doing by dumping it down and moving it from legislation. So we have specific definitions in the legislation that says it's electromagnetic radiation, period. And here they are turning it around. These are the people that are supposed to be protecting us. The federal agencies that are protecting us from this, yet they're the ones that are dumping it there. They're the ones saying that it's perfectly safe. No, it's not. Then doctors are telling us it's not. And there are plenty of peer reviewed studies out there. And when you start saying we're dumping it down this way, it's extremely misleading. And that's opening them up to liability, and they don't realize what they're doing.

**Josh:** When you and I were talking previous to this conversation, Ray, you were telling me about what you're doing more recently? I think you said with public notices and newspapers and such. Why are you doing that? How does that work? And just tell us about that.

**Raymond:** Again, that's the consent principle. It's all about whenever you see someone that wants to build a town planning, for example, they always have to be told; you have to put in public notices and put an advert in the public notices, so everybody knows. If there's a new law that's been made or change, it's usually putting that in the public notices. And all we have to do, in essence, is put a medical opinion, a legal advice in the public notices so everybody knows. This is all about informing them that this stuff poses a real risk of harm to us, and putting that liability issue out to them. And that the precautionary principle must kick in. At the moment, they're all speaking that there's scientific uncertainty.

Well, if there's scientific uncertainty, then the precautionary principle must kick in, which basically means we must hear on the side of caution.

**Josh:** This is really interesting, because everybody kind of common sense, you know, intuitively knows that we need to get back to the precautionary principle. If we want our species to continue, we can no longer allow corporate, big government interests to push the envelope as far as they can get away with further and further every day, it seems like. We can no longer allow that. By the precautionary principle and recognition of it, we the people

through processes like this, are the ones to bring that back into effect, like that system is not going to self regulate, is it?

**Raymond:** No, it's not. And one thing that I've discovered in Australia, and you will start to see the same in the US, is that the industry self regulates this. There's nobody out there testing these towers on an independent basis to make sure that they're behaving themselves. And one thing that we're doing is we're chasing, and we'll have it very soon. It's called Nada 3006. And what that does is -- it's exactly the same. We found out that there's only three in the entire country in Australia that they using.

And you think about it, there are thousands and thousands of towers in this country. But there are only three of these devices that are used to going out there to measure. And two of them are owned by the regulatory authority. And so what we're going to do, is going to -- and I'll tell you what, this will scare the pants off the industry, because they'll realize that we're going to go out there with independent, the correct devices to measure these things. And I'll tell you what, they've been self regulating, they've been doing it for too long. And it's about time we went out there and test the muscle. And I can't wait, quite frankly.

**Josh:** That's excellent, Ray. And so just to kind of dive in to that term, that self regulate term. The way that I had asked the question was they're not going to self regulates meaning self correct, unless acted upon by other forces. And the other version, the other definition of self regulate, of course, is that they are controlling the governing agencies, so they're self regulating in that regard, but not in the regard of self correcting in terms of doing what's right.

**Raymond:** Well, what we're currently uncovering here, this is something I think everyone's going to -- I mean, I've been doing a lot more than just this. I've been doing a lot of things in regards to; let's talk about hospitals, and let's talk about schools. Who authorized to put Wi Fi into children's wards in hospitals, pilot programs?

And also put them into schools, who said it was safe. Now, we're currently going on a campaign right now where we're sending out Freedom of Information requests -- to the part of education, for example. And it's come back saying, well, who advised you? They're telling us that it was the health department. And then we go to the health department under refer, and they say we never advise the state government, Department of Health in regards to that.

So what we've got, is we've been lied to. And there's been an issue where we've got to uncover the truth. And the only way is that people like yourself and

everybody out there that want to get out there, and realize that there is some issues out there with -- the industry is not being regulated, it's not being policed. And it's about time that we as people did the job for them. It's all about people power does work sometimes.

**Josh:** Yeah. Especially when they can leverage properly like you're teaching people how to do, which strongly appears like you're uncovering something hugely significant. Let me ask you; there's several I think, to come to mind of individuals that you have told me about that are/ or have been in very high level positions within the system in Australia that are now coming over authentically seeing the scope of risk and getting on the side of people and supporting specifically your work. Tell us about those couple of -- and there's a growing number of them, tell us about that?

**Raymond:** It's incredible. I've got -- where do I start. I've got a lot of people who are getting very concerned from high level doctors in the medical profession, from celebrity down in the game, and also some very high profile politicians and lawyers. I guess one person I could sort of get off the top of my head would be the former Speaker of the House of Representatives for the entire Australia federal parliament. He's honorable Peter Slipper. And he is actually on board and he's actually taking advises as we speak in regards to electromagnetic radiation issues, and I work with him as well now. It's been great. So we've been building up that team. He's a barrister now, and he's always been a lawyer before he got into politics. So he had the Speaker of the House controlling both sides of Parliament, the Prime Minister and the opposition. And he's obviously no longer doing that. But now he has moved from that pool. He still has a lot of connections in politics, and obviously he has a lot of credo, and he's great.

And the other person I've got is a gentleman by the name of Greg Melick. Greg Melick is SC; Senior Counsel, as some people might know it as a QC or a Queen's Counsel. He's the current Integrity Commissioner or Chief Commissioner for the Integrity Commission here in Tasmania. He's also the Deputy President; the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. And he's also the National President of the RSL, which is the Returned and Services League. He used to be the secretary member for the National Crime Authority. And he's also the president for the International Criminal Reform Committee, which is having a huge conference very soon.

**Josh:** At this point in the interview, the recording actually cut out, so we're going to go back to a previous and unreleased conversation I had with Ray for his closing thoughts in this part one.

**Raymond:** And I'm going to tell you one little thing that really kicked it in for me. And Erin Brockovich, I've seen how she acted and what she did, and that's sort of the gap that I have in me at the moment. When she found the smoking gun, what I found it in Australia; there was the chief medical officer for Telstra, was a gentleman called Dr. Bruce Hocking. And Dr. Bruce Hocking did a study around telecommunications tower in Sydney. And he found a high incidence of cancer classes for childhood leukemia in that area. In two studies, not one but two, he got a peer reviewed, published in the Australian Medical Journal, and guess what? He was sacked. Okay.

And then we'll realize that -- the industry everybody knows. And the latency periods that you see for Schwannomas, etc. You know, gliomas and brain cancers, the whole bit. You know, there's a latency period of 40 years. There is issue with sperm. You know, there have been the DNA changes. And, you know, everybody's libido is going. There are all sorts of issues. And one thing that I -- what seems to make sense to everybody in regards to electromagnetic radiation, is everybody is noticing they're not getting enough sleep because their melatonin levels are decreasing. And because the electromagnetic radiation is almost as if the sun is in your room 24 hours a day.

When I explain the melatonin issue to them, it makes everybody; "Oh, you're right. I have noticed a big decline in my sleep patterns, and it's getting worse. I'm really, really worried." And I didn't think I'd ever get back this -- Six years ago, when I look back to who I am today. It's a big concern.