

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: Accelerating smart meter deployment

Organisation: None

First Name: Cameron

Last Name: Appleford

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: none

Comments: As a person whom has reported having been seriously injured by EMF and experiencing the great lengths the government has gone to silence me, I understand that it is pointless to appeal to your sense of decency, instead I will appeal to your self serving rationale. While the Australian Government may apply the word official when commenting upon possible health concerns it must be noted that "official" does not mean true, factual or scientific.

The official position is NOT based on science nor is it based on the precautionary principle, it is a position based on economic and commercial interests. This is noted in the World Health Organisation's 2002 publication "A FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING HEALTH-BASED EMF STANDARDS. In regards to studying biological effects from EMF they state quite clearly that it is NOT researched at all, as it will affect industry and profits. - "This approach will result in an unduly conservative standard which could not only restrict technological advances but would be unacceptable in terms of the loss of benefits accruing from technology; all for protection against questionable risks. This approach has been the basis for some Eastern European standards, leading to significantly lower exposure limits." Also note that ARPANSA claim NO responsibility in regards to their recommended exposure limits and that the responsibility will become the liability of the owner operator of that device/s. Further more any person that makes a decision knowing of potential health concerns could legally be held responsible should personal injury or death occur. The incidence of reported health concerns is growing rapidly and will continue to exponentially keep growing in conjunction with the roll out of more wireless infrastructure.

While both Government and Corporations have had legislation in place to allow for profits over health and environment, however personal liability is still applicable should that person making decisions know of the actual health risks. The risks and known harm are well established as has been demonstrated in both scientific and historical application such as it's on going use as a weapon (Havana syndrome), the current application of mm waves for medical as well as the over 2000 scientific peer reviewed studies held by ORSAA.org as well as the 5000 + studies collected from both US and Russian research and compiled by the US Navy. Be on the right side of history, your actions will always be remembered. No one wants the surveillance in their homes, no one needs this technology, only corporate interests wants such things such as data mining and government have always wanted a control system that would rival the classic dystopian book 1984. We do not want this and imposing such will breach a number of human rights once again being open to legal challenge as will the assault in the form of high transient radio/microwaves entering homes through the electricity in addition to the MW signals being utilised by the not so Smart meters without any permission and as it is considered a toxic emission and harmful therefor could legally be considered assault.

Finally while you may think that the health issues only affect a small part of the population so therefor we can go on suppressing the evidence, the truth is huge amounts of the population are affected and showing signs of EMF injury and or interference such as the rise in Anxiety, stomach

issues, brain fog, memory issues and the list goes on. It will not be too long before this cannot be easily covered up and the consequences of such will be far reaching. Choose your path wisely.