
"Microchip Consent Act of 2008"

H.B. 940: *"No person shall be required to be implanted with a microchip."*

The Microchip Consent Act of 2008 hit a snag March 6th as the House Rules Committee voted vociferously to keep it in committee, because some members don't thoroughly understand it.

The facts are these. While H.B. 940 (a) creates a law to prohibit anyone from being *required* (intimidated, coerced or physically threatened) to submit to a microchip implant, (b) it does not prohibit microchip implants in those that do not object.

Microchips, simple or complex, are privacy-invading devices.

A simple microchip to be implanted on or just under the skin may be comprised of only a 16-digit barcode that may be read from a few feet away.

A more sophisticated microchip¹ is designed for deep body implants and tracking by satellite.

This chip could be imbedded in a person's limb, torso, neck and head. It includes an individual identifier; a triggering and positioning component; a radio frequency, cellular, sound, light, and/or TV wave analog and/or digital technology; an integrated GPS receiver and a transmitter.

It responds and transmits through software programmed to evolve over time. Inside the person, an implanted chip could produce vibrations and shocks *via* GPS based signals or stations on land, sea or air. It accumulates retrievable data about body functions, acoustics (conversation or surrounding noise) and environmental surroundings. It is field programmable and may be interrogated on information it has monitored or stored. Whether it's dormant or semi-dormant within a person, the device could be remotely activated to send signals to a remote location.

Theft of information is easy. Cartersville Medical Center's February 21, 2006 article, "This Chip Could Be a Lifesaver," announced that 1,000 Americans had already volunteered "to get a microchip about the size of a grain of rice embedded in their arms" to expedite access to medical e-files. It's the 16-digit VeriChip developed by Applied Digital Solutions of Delray Beach, Florida. It costs about \$200 and can be injected under the skin in less than 20 minutes.

"Spoofing" your private data. Many are rightly concerned that microchips allow theft of identities and personal data as people come within range of a thief's "spoofing" mechanism. Even VeriChip's chief executive admitted that theft is easy when he said: "To grab information from radio frequency products with a scanning device is not hard to do, [though] the chip itself only contains a unique, 16-digit ID number. The relevant information is stored on a database." Cartersville Medical Center personnel said chips can't be read if they're more than a few feet away and, "You can't be tracked by satellite." However, the microchip information provided by the patent application for a "Method and Apparatus for Locating and Tracking Persons"¹ proves the existence of technology that, actually, *does* track by satellite.

¹ U.S. Patent Office application for "Method and Apparatus for Locating & Tracking Persons," by Dr. Peter Seth Edelstein, Menlo Park, California and Benjamin Theodore Nordell, II, San Mateo California. Filed on August 29, 2003 as Appl. No. 10/651,635, the applicant claimed priority of provisional application 60/409610, filed September 9, 2002.

Microchips in Humans Invade Privacy, May Be Health Hazard

On March 3rd an AFL-CIO official and I spoke before the House Judiciary Committee that was considering H.B. 940. The union official was concerned that workers could lose their jobs if they didn't comply with an employer's request that they be implanted with microchips, such as those required to open or close doors.

The Georgia Department of Corrections wants to implant microchips in prisoners. Other countries want to implant their prisoners, too. Also, in recent years, some U.S. schools have implanted students for scanning in lunch lines, just as microchips are used to bill vehicles for toll charges. A microchip doesn't harm a car, but it could be potentially harmful to humans.

My approach was a little different from the union official's, because I had before me the patent application for a microchip designed to function deep inside the human body. It's made of biocompatible materials that body chemicals won't disintegrate or corrode. It can be implanted on or within the torso, limbs, neck or head to track or control individuals from land, sea or in the air. "Readers" will be strategically placed so the chipped subject will never be out of range. Personal data imbedded in the chips *before* implantation and gathered *after* implantation will be stored and transmitted as programmed. Also, chips relay audio messages *to and from* the person or emit impulses that cause action and compliance as demanded.

Surgical implants may be unknown to the microchip recipient. It's entirely possible for individuals to be implanted with microchips *without their knowledge*. Though it would be unconstitutional, illegal, unethical, a gross invasion of privacy and subject the surgeon to criminal charges, it would be possible for a microchip to be implanted in a patient during an unrelated routine surgical procedure. So, my concern extends to deep body implants that require major surgery to insert and major surgery to remove, if they are *ever* removed.

VeriChip Corp. sells doctors a "starter kit" of 10 hypodermic syringes, 10 VeriChips and a reader for \$1,400. Patients will pay out-of-pocket \$200 for the implant, because they're not covered by insurance companies, Medicare or Medicaid.

However, price is only one consideration. Health may be at risk. Between 1990 and 2006, six articles said between 0.8% and 10.2% of laboratory mice and rats developed malignant tumors around or near implanted microchips. Two articles reported micro-chip-related cancer in dogs.

H.B. 940 is very important, not only because it says, "No person shall be required to be implanted with a microchip." It further protects individuals with this statement. "The voluntary implantation of any microchip or similar device may only be performed by a physician and shall be regulated under the authority of the Composite State Board of Medical Examiners."

Requiring a microchip to be implanted in a human would be a crime. The person committing the crime could be charged at least \$10,000 for each day the chip remains implanted after the subject discovers the implant. The crime is called "battery" in Georgia.

ACTION – Support. Contact Rules **Republican** Representatives Ehrhart, Ch., 404 656-5141; Parrish, 656-0213; Mills, 656-5099; Barnard, 656-5138; Bridges, 656-5143; Burkhalter, 656-5072; Casas, 656-0254; Channell, 656-7856; Coan, 656-6801; Cooper, 463-8142; Fleming, 656-5024; Golick, 651-7737; Keen, 656-5052; Lane, 656-5115; Lewis, 656-9198; Lunsford, 656-7146; Millar, 656-5064; Ralston, 656-5943; Rice, 656-5912; Roberts, 656-5025; Austin Scott, 656-5132; Vance Smith, 656-7153; Smith, 656-7149; Bob Smith 463-2247; Stephens, 656-5122; Len Walker, 656-5139; Willard, 656-5124; and **Democrat** Representatives Hugley, 656-5058; Porter, 656-5058; Cheokas, 656-0325; Hanner and Shaw, 656-7859; Jacobs, 656-0152; Mosby, 656-0287; Parham, 656-0202; Randall, 656-0109; Smyre, 656-0116.

H.B. 1219, Tax-Paid Citizenship Expenses for Illegal Aliens

If you decided to become a citizen of another country, do you think that country would step up to the plate and pay whatever it cost to grant that citizenship? If you know of a country that would do that, please let me know. In the meantime, let's defeat H.B. 1219.

H.B. 1219 was introduced by Representative Pedro Marin who has tried, desperately, to get legislation passed to give driver's licenses to fellow Hispanics, including those that come here illegally. I was stunned at the boldness that prompted him to introduce *this* bill, because it adds yet another incentive for illegal aliens to tap into even more free benefits for themselves, their spouses and their dependents. Because his bill *does not exclude* illegal aliens, I believe they could qualify for this benefit.

Believe it or not, H.B. 1219 authorizes foreigners who apply for N-400 naturalization to recover the expenses they incurred during the citizenship process. The applicant would register as a permanent Georgia resident and would qualify for an income tax credit up to \$300 to recover his expenses, if the family gross annual income is \$41,300 or less. If they paid under \$300 in taxes, the unused amount could be claimed against succeeding years' taxes.

The tax credit, also, covers the cost of citizenship *classes*, as well as *English language classes* for the applicant, the spouse and dependents age 18 or older. Also allowed as tax credits would be as much as \$300 in citizenship expenses for members of the United States armed forces.

This bill was introduced on February 19th and went to the House Ways & Means Committee, where it remains.

ACTION – Oppose. Contact House Ways & Means Committee members Representatives O'Neal, Ch., 404 656-5103; Knight, 656-0152; Jones & Harbin, 463-2247; Rice, 656-5912; Abrams, 656-0224; Jamieson, 656-0202; Mills, 656-5099; Mosby & Sims, 656-0287; Roberts, 656-5025; Royal, 656-0265; Scott, 656-0254; Turner, 656-0325; Williams, 656-3904.

S.B. 506, The SHAPE Act

The elementary school I attended is different now. Out front an ornate brick structure provides digital announcements. Since buildings and parking areas cover the former play-ground, students have no place to let off steam, exercise or play during recess. So, they're getting fat.

But, are schools supposed to fix kids so they won't be fat or skinny? If S.B. 506 passes, it would add another bizarre project for schools. Representative Joseph Carter introduced it as the "Student Health and Physical Education Act" or SHAPE. It requires local schools to conduct physical fitness testing of students and comply with state physical education instructions.

Translated, that means beginning in the 2008-2009 school year, each local school system would conduct confidential a fat-finding body mass index testing of each student two times each school year – once during the fall and once during the spring - and report the results after each testing. Beginning July 1, 2009, the governor would be kept up-to-date with an annual health status report of each school in each school system.

A new position would be created in the Department of Education for the "voluntary" project, to which reluctant school systems would, certainly, comply when they're designated as an "unhealthy school zone." But, the section requiring physical education for students is great!

ACTION – Oppose unless the measuring of student body fat is deleted. Contact Health and Human Services Representatives Cooper, Ch., 404 656-5069; Rynders, 656-7855; Carter, 656-0213; Byrd, 656-0126; Collins, 656-0188; Dempsey, 656-0126; Hembree, 656-5146; Jerguson, 656-0287; Keown, 656-0177; Loudermilk, 656-0152; Lunsford, 656-7146; Maddox, 656-0152; Millar, 656-5064; Parsons, 463-2247; Peake, 656-0188; Rogers, 463-2247; Sellier, 656-0265; Sims, 656-0109.

H.R. 1305, House Study Committee on Firearms

Representative Tim Bearden's H.B. 89 introduced January 22, 2007 would allow licensed gun carriers to conceal their weapons. It passed the House February 12, 2007 and the Senate began committee deliberations in a few days. Two months later it passed the Senate, but was changed by the Rules Committee. Despite that action in 2007, H.B. 89 was left until this year, when it was targeted for defeat by lobbyists that are paid to fight more lenient gun laws.

Although H.B. 89, overwhelmingly, passed the House twice and the Senate passed it by a three-to-one vote, it's still in limbo. It's dead for this session unless the House appoints three members to a conference committee to settle the language. The Senate *did* appoint three conference committee members, but the House is taking a different approach.

So, Representative Bearden introduced H.R. 1305 to create a House Study Committee on Comprehensive Firearms Law that would recommend ways to protect the constitutional right of law-abiding Georgians to keep and bear arms under both the state and U.S. Constitutions.

Five representatives may meet five days to study Georgia gun laws and their affect on peaceable and law-abiding citizens. Any recommendations they submit to the 2009 legislature must ensure the proper protection of the constitutional rights, the right of self-defense and the safety of the public.

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.

S.B. 535, Clayton County's Dilemma Prompts Legislation

The Clayton County School Board situation turned grim when The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) threatened the district with loss of accreditation. After bad reviews of Clayton County schools in 2002 and 2003, a SACS Special Review Team reported that accreditation should be revoked unless significant changes are made by September 1st.

On February 15, 2008 Dr. Gloria Duncan, Interim Superintendent of Clayton County Public Schools was notified of major problems in the school system. Just nine days later on February 24th, in an *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* half-page ad, Clayton County Chamber of Commerce urged Clayton School Board members to resign. Also, asking them to resign were the district's teachers and local residents that marched the streets with banners demanding their resignations.

During the March 3rd meeting, a board member was voted off and another promised to resign soon. So, the governor's floor leader, Senator Ronnie Chance, introduced S.B. 535 to provide future incentives for school systems to maintain accreditation. The bill allows state funds to be withheld from school districts, unless *every* school in the system maintains accreditation.

The bill further requires schools not accredited by July 1, 2008 to be accredited by June 30, 2010 or local board members would be subject to recall. If a recall is necessary, school board members could be immediately removed by a simple majority referendum vote. Within 30 days of a recall, State Board appointees would fill the vacant seats and serve the unexpired terms.

ACTION – You decide whether to oppose or support. Contact Senate Education and Youth Committee Senators Weber, Ch., 404 463-2260; Carter, 651-7738; Thomas, Don, 656-6436; Balfour, 656-0095; Douglas, 656-0503; Fort, 656-5091; Moody, 463-8055; Ramsey, 463-2598; Tate, 463-8053; Thomas, Regina, 463-7784.

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