

## **Passed: S.R. 827 Urges U.S. Withdrawal from SPP/NAU**

**S.R. 827** passed and should be applauded by everyone because it addresses an issue that affects the very existence of the U.S. as a separate and independent sovereign nation, with federal and state constitutions and laws that make it unique. Senator Nancy Schaefer's S.R. 124 introduced in 2007 failed to pass. It, also, urged Congress to stop merging Mexico, Canada and the U.S. into one country – a North American Union – to operate as the European Union operates.

After failing to get the required majority on the first vote, S.R. 827 seemed headed for the same fate as her 2007, but thanks to Senator Seabaugh's motion to reconsider, it passed on April 2<sup>nd</sup> by the bare minimum of 29 votes.

To explain the importance of S.R. 827, Senator Schaefer provided each senator with several documents describing the 2005 SPP agreement between the U.S., Mexico and Canada. The first was an article published in *The Constitution Home Edition* Friday, September 7, 2001 entitled, "Our Opinions: Bush, Fox should pursue union similar to Europe."

The second document she supplied was a copy of the announcement President Bush released from the White House in 2005. It was entitled, "Joint Statement by President Bush, President Fox, and Prime Minister Martin: Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America."

She, also, gave the senators duplicates of the August 6, 2007 letter to President Bush from 22 U.S. Congressmen, including Georgia Congressmen Phil Gingrey and Tom Price. The following paragraphs from that letter indicate grave concern over the unauthorized agreement.

"As you travel to Montebello, Canada later this month for a summit with your Canadian and Mexican counterparts, we want you to be aware of serious and growing concerns in the U.S. Congress about the so-called Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) you launched with these nations in 2005.

"...We share your desire to promote good relations with our neighbors to the north and south. The SPP process, however, is being conducted in a secretive manner with a view to 'harmonizing' U.S., Canadian and Mexican policies, regulations and practices in ways that may actually undermine our security and sovereignty. For instance, measures that would make it easier to move goods and people across borders could have the effect of further weakening this country's ability to secure its frontiers and prevent illegal immigration.

"The House of Representatives last week overwhelmingly and on a bipartisan basis adopted an amendment barring Transportation Department officials from participating in SPP-related meetings in the future. This vote is an indication of the serious concerns felt by those of us in Congress and by our constituents about this initiative – concerns that will only be intensified if pursuit of the SPP continues out of public view and without congressional oversight or approval."

## ***Senator Schaefer's Q. & A. Explanation of SPP/North American Union***

### **What is the Security & Prosperity Partnership of North America, also, called the North American Union?**

It is an agreement crafted and signed on March 23, 2005 by the then President of Mexico, Vicente Fox, the Prime Minister of Canada, Paul Martin and President George Bush.

### **How was this action taken?**

The formal agreement, signed by the three heads of State, was accomplished without the approval of Congress or the American people.

### **How old is the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America, also known as the North American Union?**

It has been written about and talked about for years. In 2001, the *Atlanta Constitution Home Edition* carried an editorial on the North American Alliance with Canada and Mexico similar in scope to the European Union (see separate page).

### **What is the ultimate goal of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America or North American Union?**

To integrate the U.S. with Mexico and Canada.

### **What is the purpose of SR 827?**

SR 827, like last year, calls for the Senate of the State of Georgia to urge the U.S. Congress and the Georgia Congressional Delegation to use all their efforts, energies, and diligence to withdraw the U.S. from any further participation in the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America.

### **What else does the Resolution seek to accomplish?**

It also asks our Congressional Delegation to withdraw the United States from any activity which seeks to advance or fund or in any way promote the harmonizing of policy structure to complete any form of North American Union.

### **Has this type of Resolution been passed in any other state?**

This resolution has been passed in the House of 19 State Legislatures and officially passed in both House and Senate of three other states. It passed recently in the Utah Senate and passed last year in the Utah House. At present, five other states have this Security and Prosperity Resolution up for consideration.

### **Is the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America or the North American Union similar to the European Union?**

Yes, and it might be added that Europeans did not realize what was happening until suddenly the Euro replaced their national currencies. Savings were devalued, borders were removed, and immigration laws were useless. Some National flags, for which their forefathers had fought and died, were replaced by the flag of the European Community. However it was too late to stop the train. They were the European Union.

### **So what ultimately is the SPP and NAU all about?**

It is not about prosperity. It is about the loss of the U.S. sovereignty and the loss of our independence and our way of life. The U.S. is the only Nation created to protect Natural Rights. To end 232 years of sovereignty including our God given principles handed down to us by our Founding Fathers would be tragic.

## ***Passed: H.B. 280, Prohibits Sale of Marijuana-Flavored Candy***

*“Every lick is like taking a hit!” – Sales Slogan*

**A Message to Cobb County students: thanks for lobbying.** On April 1<sup>st</sup>, a group of Cobb County students clad in white t-shirts printed with red slogans announcing their opposition to the sale of “chronic candy,” lobbied senators to pass H.B. 280, because drug-flavored candy is being sold in their neighborhood. Right now, any child with \$4.00 can buy a “pot sucker” or other marijuana-flavored product in neighborhood stores, but *soon* that will be illegal.

**H.B. 280 passed the Senate at 8:26 p.m. on April Fool’s Day.** From its introduction until it passed, H.B. 280 was changed five times, but the effect remained the same. No doubt, the Senate appreciated the lobbying Cobb County students did that morning. They worked hard for that day at the Capitol. In March, over 50 youth and community leaders held a press conference in Marietta to gather support for H.B. 280 and weeks later they came to lobby the senators.

**History.** For three years a bill to prohibit the sale of marijuana-flavored candy has been tossed around the legislative process. The first bill was Senator Vincent Fort’s **S.B. 511** introduced in 2006 to prohibit the sale of drug-flavored products available in some metro Atlanta stores. Although his bill was designed to protect children from drug use later in life, it died.

**H.B. 280** was introduced February 2, 2007 by Representative Judy Manning to accomplish the same thing – prohibit the sale of marijuana-flavored products to minors. Her bill was assigned to the House Children and Youth Committee, which she chairs. Although she reported having received death threats after introducing that bill, she proceeded to get it out of her committee and onto the House floor, where it passed 133 to 26 on March 20, 2007. However, it stayed alive in the Senate until this year, where it finally passed 42 to 3. These are the facts:

- Marijuana-flavored products are defined in H.B. 280 as any product, including lollipops, gumdrops, or other candy, which is flavored to taste like marijuana or hemp. It may be called “chronic candy,” “kronic kandy,” or “pot suckers.”
- Cultivating a taste for marijuana *via* drug-flavored products is dangerous. Consider the University of Michigan’s 2004 Monitoring the Future Study report that 16.3 percent of eighth graders, 35.1 percent of tenth graders, and 45.7 percent of twelfth graders had used marijuana at least one time in their life. Also, the 2002 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration revealed that the younger children are when they first use marijuana the more likely they are to use cocaine and heroin and become drug dependent as adults.
- The 2001 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse confirmed that marijuana is this nation’s most commonly used illicit drug and more than 83,000,000 Americans age 12 and older claimed they had tried it at least once.
- H.B. 280 makes it unlawful for any person knowingly to sell, deliver, distribute, or provide to anyone under the age of 18 any marijuana-flavored product in the State of Georgia.
- Violators will be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a \$1,000 fine for each offense. Each sale will constitute a separate offense.

## ***Passed: H.B. 301 Strengthens Georgia Law Prohibiting Dog-Fighting***

Representative Bobby Reese introduced H.B. 301 on February 8<sup>th</sup> last year, but it got no traction until the Michael Vick episode made news all over the country. However, it did pass this year, after going through seven versions to get all the kinks worked out. Now it's on its way to the governor's desk to become law when he signs it or automatically by July 1<sup>st</sup> if he doesn't.

Passage of H.B. 301 makes everything connected with dog-fighting a serious felony. Violators will be anyone that owns or cares for or transports or trains or sells a dog to fight for money or just for fun. Also, those that are spectators or gamble on dogfights or, knowingly, allow such events on property they own or lease or manage will be prosecuted for violating this law.

Any dog intended to fight or involved in fighting will be impounded and neutered or spayed at the owner's expense. Impounded dogs will be returned to owners if this law hasn't been violated. Animals used in a dog-fighting business will be confiscated, along with property on which the event occurred. If the animals are rehabilitated, they may be adopted.

A first conviction for any of these charges will be punishable by one to five years in prison and a \$5,000 fine or both. Any conviction after the first can be punished up to ten years in prison and \$15,000 or both, with each violation prosecuted as a separate offense.

But rest assured this law does *not* affect the training of dogs to hunt or recover wildlife or participate in hunting or fishing. You can also rest assured dogs can still be used to work livestock or law enforcement or keep pests away from agricultural operations.

## ***Dead: H.B. 917 Appoint Chief Elections Officer***

H.B. 917 died because it would take the election process out of the hands of the elected Secretary of State and turned it over to a chief elections office who would be hired. H.B. 917 was introduced by Representative Mary Margaret Oliver to strip the Elections Division from the Office of the Secretary of State and completely eliminate the State Board of Elections.

The Secretary of State is an elected official that serves four-year terms and can be replaced by voters. An extremely important responsibility of the Secretary of State is to coordinate and oversee state and local elections. H.B. 917 would have changed that and other problems would have surfaced, as well.

The *Constitution of the State of Georgia* requires candidates for the office of Secretary of State to be citizens of the U.S. for at least ten years and legal residents of Georgia for the four years just prior to being elected to office. Those elected must be honest enough to provide a bond and security and at least 25 years old when they take the oath of office.

This bill did not require these great qualification for a chief elections officer who could be hired from anywhere in the world, could be a resident of any state or country, could be younger than 25 years old and would be out of voters' reach. In addition, H.B. 917 guaranteed an appointed chief elections officer a five-year contract and a salary that could increase but never decrease. H.B. 917 would have created another government agency. Simultaneously, it would have reduced the power of citizens, by replacing an elected official with an appointee that would answer to a supervisor, but not to voters.

---

*Georgia Insight* is a conservative publication financed entirely by its recipients.