Georgia insight

"She hath done what she could."
Mark 14:8a

A Tragic Death by Legal Rejection: Victim, H.B. 940 Microchip Consent Act

Ethical use of microchips means recipients must consent before implantation. That's why the H.B. 940 mandate, "*No person shall be required to be implanted with a microchip*," is needed. It upholds a person's constitutional right to refuse a microchip implant, but others desiring an implant may get one from a surgeon who follows State Board of Medical Advisors regulations.

Since the U.S. does not regulate radio frequency identification devices (RFID), H.B. 940 was a straightforward consent-before-implantation way to protect Georgians. It failed to pass, due to confusion about what *could* happen when there's no law to prohibit forced implants in humans.

The situation is very serious because small privacy-invading chips can track or control whatever item or whatever human is implanted. Microchips can be "sniffed" by electronic devices that scan RFID implants and can instantly beam "live spam" (customized ads) toward shoppers. Reportedly, thieves have no difficulty "spoofing" (stealing) identities from microchip implants.

While "passive" tags can be scanned up to 20 feet away, "active" tags with internal batteries – as in chips scanned at toll booths – can continuously send signals to low-orbiting satellites. The industry's standard-setting group, EPCglobal, reports that broadcasted data can be easily intercepted and misused by high-tech "spoofers."

The rush toward implanting items, animals and humans is driven by the power it affords data collectors and the vast amount of money to be made. Reportedly, during the 50 years between 1955 and 2005, the total number of radio tags sold amounted to 2.4 billion. Remember. That's the total number of sales for *five decades*.

Then consider this. Just last year, 2007, global sales of tags reached 2.24 billion, meaning more were sold in *12 months* last year than were sold in *600 months*, previously. Within ten years, sales are expected to be over 1 trillion, bringing $25 billion into the industry world-wide.

As technology fine-tunes microchips, they're becoming unbelievably small. The latest models are practically undetectable but just as powerful. On September 8, 2007 Hitachi[1] introduced the world's smallest and thinnest RFID tags, measuring 0.05 x 0.05 millimeters. They replaced Hitachi's mu-chip, the former tiniest microchip that measured a whopping 0.4 x 0.4 millimeters.

A Web site photograph of the speck-sized mu-chip placed on a human finger is mind-boggling in itself. But, Hatachi's *new* "powder type" tags, that are *60 times smaller* than mu-chip, defy the imagination, especially, considering this fact. The tiny chip's 128-bit ROM stores a unique 38-digit number – the same storage capacity of the mu-chip that's 60 times larger.

Last year, Mu-chips were used to prevent ticket forgery at the Aichi international technology exposition. The latest "powder" chip is so small it can be incorporated into thin paper, like that used in paper money and gift certificates. If it were sprinkled over crowds, individuals on which the "powder" settles could be tracked later with publicly placed tag "sniffers" (scanners).

[1] "Microchips Everywhere: a Future Vision," January 29, 2008, by Todd Lewan, http://seattletimes.nwsource.com
"RFID 'Powder' – The World's Smallest RFID Tag," http://www.tldm.org/News4/

Another Bill's Tragic Death by Legal Rejection: S.B. 415 Protected Children

S.B. 415 *was* a good bill, but it was arbitrarily gutted, watered down, made worthless without the author's knowledge or input. So, rather than accept her bill that had been transformed into do-nothing legislation, Senator Nancy Schaefer took S.B. 415 off the table and it's dead.

Changes S.B. 415 Would Have Made

During two terms in office, Senator Nancy Schaefer was deluged with constituent accounts of horror stories, charges that the Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS) seized their children without proof of parental abuse or negligence. The stories were similar, though they came from all directions. Parents told first-hand how DFACS treated them and their children during the seizure process, as well as while the children were retained in custody.

On February 6th she introduced S. B. 415, hoping to change the law to provide more protection for parents and their children. She found that current Georgia law allows DFACS to, arbitrarily, seize and retain children up to seven days without evidence of abuse or neglect. So, a section of S.B. 415 would have reduced retention time to three days, after which the children would be returned to a parent or guardian, unless sufficient evidence proved they had been mistreated.

Since current law requires closed hearings in three categories of cases – child delinquency, deprivation of a child or an unruly child – she decided open hearings could provide more accountability. Because delinquent and unruly acts are easily spotted, closed-door hearings about those conditions weren't such an urgent issue. The big concern was the closed-door deprivation hearings that may be decided on purely subjective reasoning.

Therefore, the bill focused on requiring all child deprivation hearings to be open to the public, since secret decisions about what constitutes child deprivation could allow corruption to blossom. To assure accountability from all parties involved, S.B. 415 requires deprivation hearings to be open to the public. But at the same time, it allows a parent or guardian to present a written request to have their hearings closed.

Under current law, the Department of Human Resources (DHR), DFACS, its employees and agents have total immunity from liability in the care and supervision of children. So, agency personnel can consent to the unlimited medicating of children and, whether the drugs are appropriate or help or harm the child, DHR and DFACS personnel are not held responsible. That would change under S.B. 415 that requires DHR and DFACS to stop medicating children if a parent or guardian objects. Also, DHR and DFACS agents would be responsible and liable if the children experienced seizures.

A huge incentive for agencies to take children without sufficient reason can be traced back to the federal Safe Families Act that Congress passed in 1997. It offers financial incentives for state agencies to present children for adoption. While that could be a good thing, it's now bordering on "legal kidnapping," not only in Georgia but, reportedly, throughout the country. Unethical officials are being charged with taking children from good homes and adopting them out, simply, for money. For each child adopted out of state child protective systems, agencies may receive from $4,000 to $6,000 in federal money. Adoptions of special needs children may bring the greater amount. To counteract that, S.B. 415 prohibits any state entity from applying for financial incentives provided under the Safe Families Act.

Oops! Hit a Bump: H.B. 301, Prohibits Dog Fighting & Related Conduct

Bill's Author Opposes Senate Amendment

We can thank 165 representatives and 54 senators that voted YES on this bill. It wasn't unanimous, but it was close! Only six said NO in the final vote. Maybe those votes will be repeated when they vote on the final version. If the author insists and the Senate agrees to remove its amendment, the bill would return to its original intent – prohibition of dog-fighting.

Background

Publicity about Michael Vick and his dog-fighting business has tapered off, since he and his buddies were convicted, sent to prison, their property was confiscated and their dogs were impounded. But the subject is far from dead.

Last week the Senate passed H.B. 301 that was introduced by Representative Bobby Reese over a year ago in February 2007. However, before passing it unanimously, the Senate amended it to accommodate a request from the Humane Association of Georgia that all impounded animals would be neutered or spayed at the owner's expense. The Association statement was, "If [owners will] accept the animal back neutered, you know they just want the animal. If they won't accept it back, then you know they just want it as a fighting or breeding machine."[1]

Since the author objects to the change, a conference committee of three representatives and three senators may be necessary to work out the bill's final language. Then it would go back for final "agree or disagree" votes in the House and Senate, but it could not be further amended.

Had the Vick dog-fighting ring been exposed before, or as, H.B. 301 was introduced, no doubt it would've passed immediately. But, while the legislation languished in committee for over a year, dog fighting hit the headlines, brought down dog owners, trainers, promoters and participants. That jump-started H.B. 301 that penalizes people who train innocent, loving dogs to be vicious killers so trainers, owners, spectators and gamblers can get rich on gory brutality.

With the Vick story ringing in everyone's ears, H.B. 301 passed the House just two weeks after the session began *this* year and was poised for passage in the Senate the next day. In two days it was favorably reported into the Rules Committee and, finally, passed the Senate March 12th, but with a catch. The Senate amended it with language unacceptable to the bill's author.

Punishment provided by H.B. 301 requires stiff penalties for staging or funding dog-fighting events or supplying the animals involved or gambling on dog fighting. Property owners, renters or facility managers will be penalized if they allow dog fighting or gambling on their premises. Charges will be filed against promoters and advertisers of dog-fighting events, as well as those crossing state lines for the purpose of buying and selling dogs for dog-fighting events.

The crime of dog fighting will be a felony, with a first conviction punishable by one to five years in prison and $5,000 fines or both. Penalties for second and subsequent convictions will be one to ten years in prison plus $15,000 fines and each violation will be a separate offense.

Whether or not they gamble on the fights, spectators won't get off scot-free, either. A first conviction will be a misdemeanor, but the second will be elevated to a felony, punishable by sentences up to five years in prison and at least $5,000 fines. Penalties will be incrementally increased for each additional conviction.

[1] Is it the Humane Association responsible for judging all owners' motives for having pets? Since the Association wants all dogs neutered or spayed, is H.B. 301 the way to force that on all impounded animals?

S.B. 461, Anti-Bullying Bill

Bad When Introduced, Acceptable When Changed

For the past several years we've had a rash of bills against bullying. Some have been helpful. Until recently, bullying was easily defined, easily detected and controlled, because the bully was, usually, some big student who picked on smaller or more timid kids at school. But that was before anti-bullying became a strategy of activists whose goal is to intimidate anyone that disagrees with alternate lifestyles.

Pro-homosexual activists began quietly opposing bullying without revealing their motive. Soon they added anti-bullying efforts to safe-schools programs. Now, it's evident that their definition of safe schools demands the silencing of all opposition to alternate lifestyles. To *require* the elimination of negative comments about alternate lifestyles, pro-homosexual activists are focusing on legislation to stifle any negative comment about sexual orientation. Such bills have been offered several times in Georgia but have never passed in the hate-crime language activists prefer. So, they're using the safe-schools tack to accomplish their goal through legislation.

In its Winter 2001 Volume 1, Edition 1 of the *Georgia Freedom Fighter* the ACLU announced the receipt of a $100,000 gift to encourage gay and lesbian law students to choose careers in public interest law. The first recipient of the fellowship was a third-year student at Georgia State University School of Law who became director of the Georgia ACLU anti-bullying project called "Making Schools Safe" in Georgia, especially for homosexuals. That project has been in Georgia since 2001, initially funded by the local philanthropist's $100,00 gift. He was the Georgia president of ACLU when he made that donation.

The article explained that the project would "bring together teachers, attorneys and students to help education professionals gain the tools and skills necessary to *end bullying and harassment in Georgia's schools, with an emphasis on understanding and ending anti-gay harassment*."

Bullying is not new, but there's never been such a push to deny students the freedom to disagree with different attitudes, actions or words. *Bully prevention week* is a project of radical pro-homosexual activists who expect all children to stop opposing alternate lifestyles and affirm all sexual orientations instead. The sponsor of *no-name-calling projects* is the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, GLSEN that loves Iowa's anti-bullying policy that will allow homosexual programs in schools. Those same activists were *not* happy when Ohio left "sexual orientation" out of its anti-bullying law.

The Improved Version of S.B. 461

Likewise, they *will not be happy* with Senator Chip Rogers' S.B. 461 that, thankfully, was drastically changed, actually rewritten, in committee before it passed the Senate March 11th. The original language was subject to misuse by homosexual activists that are intent on denying students the freedom to express negative opinions about alternate lifestyles.

The version the Senate passed requires local school boards to adopt and put in student and staff handbooks a policy to prohibit bullying by *any one toward anyone* K – 12. S.B. 461 requires habitual bullies to be assigned to alternative schools after the third bullying incident in a school year. S.B. 461 went to the House, but had not been assigned to committee at this writing.