

SB. 340 Prohibits Sanctuary Policies

The story of sanctuary cities, often left untold, became public on November 19, 2001, when New York City's mayor-elect Michael Bloomberg said, "People who are undocumented do not have to worry about city government going to the federal government. We will provide the services, whether they are health care services or education for their children or anything else we can do, irregardless [sic] of the federal government rightly trying to make sense out of our immigration policy. ... My job as mayor is to make sure we deliver the city services. It is the federal government's job to make sure we get control of our borders and have an appropriate immigration policy."

The last sentence in the above statement is a direct violation of a law Congress passed in 1996, expressly, prohibiting just such arrogant actions. In 1997 Giuliani defended New York City's practice of providing sanctuary for illegal aliens, but lost the case in a federal district court. Also in 1999, a three-judge U.S. Circuit Appeals Court concluded that the New York sanctuary situation was nothing more than an unlawful refusal to enforce federal immigration laws.

Bloomberg's statement became common knowledge outside New York City, when *Forbes* magazine published Dan Seligman's article, "Illegals with Legal Rights," on January 7, 2002. But the situation in New York didn't originate with Bloomberg, who, simply, continued the practice former Mayor Rudy Giuliani defended so adamantly in court. But, the sanctuary city plan didn't originate with Giuliani, either. Democrat Mayor Ed Koch created it by executive order in 1989 and each succeeding mayor followed his lead.

A 2002 estimate put the number of illegal aliens in New York City at 400,000 who were never tracked and lived as though they were citizens. However, the 24-percent of them convicted of crimes wound up in prison and *then* they were tracked.

San Francisco has had a sanctuary policy since 1980. Los Angeles' city council directed the city police commission to issue Special Order 40, forbidding police inquiries about the immigration status of anyone apprehended for crimes. The *Los Angeles Daily News* explained it this way: "The effect has been to make L.A. an asylum for illegal aliens, a place where all could come to escape the law."

S.B. 340 was introduced on January 15th by Senator Pearson of District 51. It would prohibit counties, municipal corporations and other governmental departments and agencies from enacting or enforcing a policy to prevent local officials or employees from reporting the immigration status of any person or would prevent them from cooperating with federal officials or law enforcement in order to uphold immigration laws.

ACTION – Support. Contact Veterans, Military and Homeland Security Committee Senators Douglas, Ch., 404 656-0503; Staton, 656-5039; Tolleson, 656-0081; Brown, 656-5035; Jackson, 656-5114; Jones, 656-0502; Murphy, 656-7127; and Thompson, 463-1318.

H.B. 940 Requires Consent before Spy-chipping Humans

Are gang members implanted with microchips when they enter U.S. jails?

On January 13th, the online edition of *The Independent* put a contemporary subject in glaring perspective – “Prisoners ‘to be chipped like dogs.’” The article reported a British plan to surgically implant machine-readable microchips under the skin of thousands of prisoners to “create more space in British jails.”

The chips would be inserted under the skin in order to track 17,000 offenders now required to wear ankle bracelets to enforce home curfews. Reports are that almost 2,000 individuals allude tracking *via* ankle tag monitors every year. They tamper with the tags or simply tear them off. So, regardless of health risks or the invasion of privacy, they’re building a case for implanting spychips in humans, just because current technology enables them to do it.

Although the chips they’re considering are as small as two grains of rice laid end to end, the amount of information on the chips would be limited only by officials that have them implanted. That means, the wearer, probably, will have no idea what the implant reveals or who can read its contents, whether it’s only the person’s name and address or his family and medical histories, criminal offenses, religion, ancestry, associations, attitudes, etc.

Spychips are already used in dogs, cats, cattle and airport luggage. A recent example of a spychipped dog is Ella, the friendly pooch of recent murder victim Meredith Emerson. Global Positional System (GPS) technology could, not only be used to track chips, they could modify behavior *via* conducted electric shocks that can prod animals and humans into submission.

The British plan is to inject in the back of the arm a “toughened glass capsule” containing a computer chip, a copper antenna and a “capacitor” that transmits data that can be retrieved by an electromagnetic reader. The article gives as an example the United States, where implanted chips are used to track the movement of gang members within jails and that’s only the proverbial tip of the iceberg. Someone has already proven that chips can be cloned, simply, by bumping into a chipped person and siphoning the chip’s unique signal in a matter of seconds.

Following laboratory experiments, reports in 2006 revealed rats and dogs implanted with RFID developed malignant tumors that surrounded and fully encased the chips. The premature deaths of most of those animals were attributed to the implants. After considering the research, Dr. Robert Benezra of the Cancer Biology Genetics Program, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York said, “There’s no way in the world, having read this information, that I would have one of those chips implanted in my skin or in one of my family members.”

H.B. 940 was introduced January 16th by Representative Ed Setzler, whose more comprehensive bill, that protected consumers from privacy-invading uses of spychips, did not pass last year. H.B. 940 states, “No person shall be required to be implanted with a microchip.” If this passes, violators would be subject to a daily \$10,000 fine for each violation. If physical violence, threats, intimidation, retaliations, condition for employment, promotion, etc. are aimed at persons because they refuse the implant, the acts would be defined as violations.

ACTION – Support. Call House Judiciary Committee Representatives Willard, Ch., 404 656-5125; Lindsey, 656-0296; Hatfield, 656-0109; Bruce, 656-0314; Crawford, 656-0213; Fleming, 656-5024; Golick, 651-7737; Jacobs, 656-0152; Lane, 656-0109; Oliver, 656-0265; O’Neal, 656-5103; Stephenson, 656-0126; Teilhet, 656-0298; Thomas, 656-0314; Tumlin, 656-0177; (ex-officio) Wilkinson, 463-8143.

***Surprise!* English already is Georgia's Official Language Current Law Needs Amending**

S.B. 335 prohibits local and state governments from penalizing employees or job applicants by giving preferential consideration to those that speak a foreign language.

Title 50 of the Georgia law designates English as the state's official language that must be used for public records, public meetings and official Acts of the State, including government documents, records, meetings, actions, or policies. But, the illegal alien invasion has caused a major problem that has surfaced in districts across the state. The situation developed when some employers decided to place added burdens on their workers by preferring employees or prospective employees that are bilingual or multilingual. Some deny promotions if otherwise deserving employees qualify for additional responsibility or increased salaries. Current law does not prohibit such discrimination.

Although state law, clearly, says English is our official language, Section (c) of that law authorizes state agencies, counties, municipal corporations and political subdivisions to decide whether to use or print official documents and forms in *other* languages. So, local governments may file or record official documents and forms in foreign languages, if they are accompanied by an English translation of the document or form.

Over the years, bills have been introduced to repeal Section (c), so *all* official documents and forms would always be filed in English, regardless of the document's original language. One such bill was defeated several years ago when a representative said Georgia business would be harmed if official documents had to be filed in English. And, two years ago, Representative Bobby Franklin of District 43, knowing the confusion caused by multilingualism, and the cost of printing documents in various languages, introduced such a bill, but it died in committee.

S.B. 335, introduced the first day of this session by Senator John Douglas of District 17, adds a new section to the above law to protect government workers in his district and other areas. It prohibits any state agency, county, municipality, or any political subdivision from using the ability to speak a foreign language as a condition for being hired, fired or promoted.

With the influx of illegal aliens, at least one local government found it necessary several months ago to pass an ordinance to protect the jobs of employees that speak only English. Fact is some companies were pressuring employees to become proficient in another language or lose their jobs. Also, they preferred to hire bilingual job applicants instead of Americans that speak English only, although the job description didn't require the use of a foreign language. The employers, simply, wanted to accommodate consumers that speak little or no English.

This is a very serious problem. Not only are illegal aliens breaking the law to come to the United States and taking jobs from American citizens, employers are beginning to reward their lawlessness and penalize workers who were born and reared in this country, simply, because American workers may not be fluent in a foreign language.

So which language must we learn – Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian, German, Arabic or, maybe, Spanish? Whichever, it is, it's wrong for business to cater to foreigners at the expense of workers that are, also, their fellow Americans.

ACTION – Support. Call Public Safety Chairman Senators Murphy, Ch., 404 656-7127; Mullis, 656-0057; Chapman, 656-0045; Butler, 656-0075; Carter, 651-7738; Davenport, 656-7586; Douglas, 656-0503; Grant, 656-0082; Jackson, 656-5114; Jones, 656-0502; and Seay, 656-5095.

Don't Forget How Much Illegal Aliens Cost Taxpayers

Most of us have been bombarded with the false notion that we benefit from cheap labor provided by illegal aliens, but there are down sides to that cheap labor. If you ask unemployed Americans how much it cost them to lose their jobs because illegal aliens will work for less money, you'll learn that it cost them their steady job and many years of that salary. Then, ask informed taxpayers how much "cheap labor" costs them and you'll get an ear full. Here's just a smidgen of what's happening.

The Center for Immigration Studies report on "The High Cost of Cheap Labor, Illegal Immigration and the Federal Budget" was more complete than most, because their research focused on two different things, rather than one. (a) They compiled the amount of money it costs American taxpayers to support illegal aliens. (b) When they compared that amount with the total taxes illegal aliens pay *into* our system, they learned that their suspicions were really true and the difference was astonishing.

Since almost two-thirds of illegal aliens have less than a high school education, records prove that households headed by illegal aliens cost the federal government \$10 billion *more* than their contributions in taxes. These are the actual figures. In 2002 illegal aliens gobbled up \$26.3 billion in federal benefits, but paid only \$16 billion in federal taxes. That created a net financial deficit of almost \$10.4 billion in federal taxes. If you care to break that down further, you'll learn that each household headed by illegal aliens received \$2,700 *more* in benefits every year than the same household paid in federal taxes.

The Center reported another significant fact that's been kept under wraps. It's, especially, important because it explains how amnesty would, actually, affect our tax system. You'll be surprised when you consider this scenario. If illegal aliens were granted amnesty and, then, paid taxes and used services at the same rate of *legal* immigrants with the same education level, the *annual* cost to taxpayers would *increase* from \$2,700 per household to nearly \$7,700 per household. Therefore, if amnesty is ever granted to illegal aliens already here, the cost to taxpayers would be \$29 billion, *almost triple* the federal deficit illegal aliens cause right now.

Those figures reveal the drain on *federal* taxes, but *state treasuries* are being emptied, too. In March 2003, another Center for Immigration Studies report stated that 18-percent of immigrant households had incomes below the poverty line and 21-percent of those are on welfare. Each year, states estimate their governments spend between \$11 billion and \$22 billion in benefits to immigrants that comprise 11 percent of the population, but 20 percent of the poor population.

The cost of healthcare for illegals is astounding. They know they can cross the border and give birth in an American medical facility without paying a dime. They know babies born in this country are instant U.S. citizens and eligible for every benefit at taxpayer expense. They also know the baby's parents will stay with the new U.S. citizen and get more welfare benefits, more medical care, food stamps, free education, free school lunches and tuition breaks for college.

I'm explaining this so we won't get so accustomed to supporting illegal aliens that we stop fighting, shrug our shoulders and keep on rewarding them with every benefit imaginable – all at taxpayer expense – the same taxpayers that struggle to make ends meet, themselves.

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