

Georgia insight

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

Georgia Message to Congress: Defeat FOCA!

The federal "Freedom of Choice Act" will not make abortion safe or rare but will instead actively promote and subsidize abortion with state and federal tax dollars and do nothing to ensure its safety. Therefore, the members of this body strongly oppose the federal "Freedom of Choice Act" and urge the U.S. Congress to reject it summarily.

S.R. 156 introduced by Senator David Shafer of District 48 on February 6th and **H.R. 334** introduced by Representative Jerry Keen of District 179 on February 18th remind us of a federal law that, if passed, could abolish all laws protecting unborn babies. Several times since 1989, Congress has introduced FOCA (Freedom of Choice Act), most recently in April 2007, with 109 cosponsors in the U.S. House and 19 in the U.S. Senate. FOCA is neither a benign political position nor one that can be overlooked, but a dangerous affront to the right-to-life philosophy of the majority of Americans, as well as laws protecting pre-born babies throughout the country.

Among the 550 federal and state abortion laws FOCA would invalidate are these in Georgia:

1. *The Woman's Right to Know Act* requiring a woman contemplating abortion to be informed of the (a) risks before she consents to the procedure, that an (b) ultrasound is available for her to undergo and view and (c) the required waiting period includes 24 hours for reflection.
2. *Georgia's Partial Birth Abortion law*, which restricts partial birth abortion, is very weak. During a partial birth abortion, a baby is vaginally delivered in breach position until only the head remains inside the mother. Then the physician deliberately punctures the back of the skull, removes the brain and kills the baby. A court settlement diluted Georgia's law.
3. *Laws restricting taxpayer funding of abortion* currently allow taxes to fund abortion only in cases of medical necessity. The Division of Medical Assistance, Department of Community Health, Policies and Procedures for Medicaid/Peachcare (sic) for Kids provides that funding.
4. *Parental Notification laws* now require at least one parent to be notified before a minor undergoes an abortion.
5. *Laws requiring that only licensed physicians may perform abortions*
6. *Conscience protection laws for medical professionals* objecting to participating in abortions
7. *Health and safety regulations for abortion clinics* found in DHR regulations

ACTION – Support S.R. 156. Call Health & Human Services Senators Thomas, Ch., 656-6436; Unterman, 463-1368; Goggans, 463-5263; Adelman, 463-1376; Balfour, 656-0095; Butler, 656-0075; Grant, 656-0082; Hawkins, 656-6578; Henson, 656-0085; Judson Hill, 656-0150; Lester Jackson, 463-5261; Orrock, 463-8054; Shafer, 656-0048; Smith, 656-0034; Tate, 463-8053; & Wiles, 657-0406.

ACTION – Support H.R. 334. Choose several Rules Committee Representatives Ehrhart, Ch., 656-5141; Lunsford, 656-7146; Mills, 656-5099; Hugley & Porter, 656-5058; Barnard, 656-5138; Burkhalter, 656-5072; Casas, 656-0254; Chambers, 656-3949; Channell, 656-7856; Coan, 656-6801; Cole, 651-7737; Cooper, 656-5069; Drenner, 656-0202; Greene, 656-0314; Hanner, 656-7859; Jacobs, 656-0152; Jones, 656-5024; Keen, 656-5052; Lane, 656-5115; Manning, 656-7857; Millar, 656-5064; Morris, 656-0152; Mosby, 656-0287; Parham, 656-0202; Parrish, 463-2247; Randall, 656-0109; Rice, 656-5912; Rberts, 656-5025; Austin Scott, 656-5132; Shaw, 656-7859; Lynn Smith, 656-7149; Vance Smith, 656-7153; Bob Smith, 463-2247; Smyre, 656-0116; Stephens, 656-5122; Len Walker, 656-0152; & Willard, 656-5125.

The Ethical Treatment of Embryos

“In vitro” means outside the human body. “In vitro fertilization” is the formation of a human embryo outside the human body by union of human egg(s) with human sperm. The result of that process is a human embryo that may be “transferred” (placed) into the body of a woman.

S.B. 169 introduced by Senator Hudgens of District 47 on February 18th would make it illegal for any person or entity to intentionally or knowingly create or attempt to create an in vitro human embryo by any means other than fertilization of a human egg by a human sperm. It outlines medical standards for the process, the use of the process and the judicial interests.

S.B. 169 seeks to place into law the fact that a living in vitro human embryo is a biological human being with the legal right to life and legal protection and is not the property of any person or entity. Therefore, it shall not be intentionally destroyed for any purpose.

This bill (a) restricts the use of in vitro human embryo creation to its transfer into a human female undergoing treatment for human infertility. (b) Transfers of embryos are limited to two within each treatment cycle, or three if the woman is 40 or over and is using her own eggs or embryos created with her own eggs. (c) Each embryo must be given an individual identification for facility use. (d) The names of the egg donor and sperm donor are recorded and (e) kept confidential. (f) In disputes, the judicial resolution will always be based on the best interest of the embryo/child. (g) Violators of these provisions may be fined \$500 to \$1,000 or censured or charged with unprofessional conduct or may temporarily or permanently lose their license.

History¹

S.B. 169 is based upon a bill passed in Louisiana in 1986, which established all in vitro embryos as legal persons entitled to legal protection. There has been no legal challenge to it in 23 years. However, the language in S.B. 169 has been updated to reflect changes in biomedical technology and medical standards since 1986.

Need

It is apparent from the recent birth of octuplets to a southern California woman, that the fertility industry needs government oversight. This industry is one of the MOST lucrative medical fields and among the LEAST regulated, causing a serious compromise to the standard of care for the women and children involved. With bio-tech industries coming to Georgia, NOW is the time to develop regulatory oversight that would protect our women and children.

Legal Considerations

1. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect conduct relating to abortion as provided in Chapter 12 of Title 16 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated.
2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create or recognize any independent right to engage in the practice of in vitro fertilization or to create in vitro human embryos by any means.

ACTION – Support S.B. 169. Call Health & Human Services Senators Thomas, Ch., 656-6436; Unterman, 463-1368; Goggans, 463-5263; Adelman, 463-1376; Balfour, 656-0095; Butler, 656-0075; Grant, 656-0082; Hawkins, 656-6578; Henson, 656-0085; Judson Hill, 656-0150; Lester Jackson, 463-5261; Orrock, 463-8054; Shafer, 656-0048; Smith, 656-0034; Tate, 463-8053; & Wiles, 657-0406.

¹ Source: Mike Griffin, Legislative Director, Georgia Right to Life, 706 436-2646
Georgia Insight

UPDATE! H.B. 38 is Dead!

When Representative Setzler's H.B. 38 requiring personal permission for a microchip to be implanted in or on your body died in the State Capitol late Tuesday afternoon, I realized this. Some legislators think we're, just, "human resources" whose bodies they have a right to control. Representative Setzler did a superb job presenting reasons H.B. 38 should pass. When he asked me to speak for his bill, I did. The following are the last two paragraphs of my presentation:

"From the day I was born, the only item that has been exclusively mine is my body. It's not the property of anyone else. A doctor cannot take out my appendix without my permission. My personal information has always been protected because it belongs to me. The Constitution of the U.S. assures me that I can be secure in my person. The Constitution of the State of Georgia says, "Protection to person and property is the paramount duty of government and shall be impartial and complete.

"As legislators, you have a unique opportunity to protect Georgians from forced microchip implants that invade our privacy, open us to untold manipulation or intimidation and are very dangerous to the human body. Please pass H.B. 38. It's an extremely important piece of legislation. Thank you."

Then, they, summarily, tabled it.

In that meeting Representative Lindsey, a member of the subcommittee, explained the groups he already thinks should be implanted with microchips – law enforcement personnel, senior citizens with Alzheimer's disease, prisoners who are flight risks, pedophiles on probation and mentally handicapped individuals.

He didn't add us to his list, but we're all NEXT! Incidentally, when Roy Barnes was governor, a law was passed to give ultimate control to governors during times of declared emergencies. A key area of that increased power is in health care. Incredible as it may seem, it's entirely possible, under that law, for a governor to require all of us to have electronic tracking devices tattooed on or implanted in our body. Of course, it would be promoted as a "safety factor."

Electronic Tracking Devices

H.B. 16 introduced January 16th by Representative Levitas prohibits the electronic tracking of another person's movements or whereabouts without the other person's consent. However, a registered owner, lessor or lessee could consent to a tracking device on his personal vehicle.

ACTION – Support. Call Judiciary – Non-Civil Committee Representatives listed below under H.B. 306.

H.B. 306 introduced February 6th by Representative Len Walker provides for electronic pretrial release and monitoring of criminal defendants. Although the original bill did not identify the monitor as an electronic bracelet or anklet, that was the author's intent. So, he allowed an amendment to prohibit the use of microchips for monitoring defendants. That change is vitally important. Representative Lindsey clearly stated that he wants five categories of people to have microchip implants. They would be first. Then, eventually, everyone will be implanted.

ACTION – Ask whether the amendment remains. If so, support. If not, oppose. Call Judiciary – Non-Civil Representatives Golick, Ch., 404 651-7737; Hatfield, 656-0109; Bearden, 656-0287; Abdul-Salaam, 656-0325; Abrams, 656-0220; Benfield, 656-7859; Byrd & Mangham, 656-0126; Cole, 651-7737; Collins & Everson & Ramsey, 656-0188; Cooper, 656-5069; Franklin, 656-0152; Knox, 656-6831; Levitas, 656-0202; Lunsford, 656-7416; Randall, 656-0109; & Setzler, 656-0177.

Our Freedoms, They're Almost Gone

Where were we when they were taken?

By Sue Ella Deadwyler

- **Public schools have decided students belong to them, so they teach anything they want, often over parental objections.**
- **Judges think they know what's best for children, so they make decisions that have always been the purview of parents.**
- **Health professionals think children have a right to be sexually active, so they offer contraceptives, treatment and abortions behind parents' backs – all value neutral, of course.**
- **Administrators think they know how students should be medicated, so they have children put on mind-numbing drugs.**
- **Freedom OF religion has become freedom FROM religion without the tiniest change in our constitutions.**
- **Political correctness has replaced honesty and truth.**
- **Government has decided our property doesn't belong to us, so they take it and sell it to someone with deeper pockets.**
- **Government views our money as theirs, so they take what they want and we try to live on what's left.**
- **The Department of Education decided local school boards are impediments to progress, so schools that can't get what they want locally can go directly to the State and get it there.**
- **Then, schools that can't get what they want from the State are now encouraged to go straight to the Federal government that's eager to oblige.**
- **Now, I'm told legislators can by-pass their governor if he won't take the "bail-out" money and states will get it anyway!**
- **Next up is regional government and we won't have any influence over that, because regional officials are appointed. Right now, I don't have a clue who does the appointing because we've been in Region Four for years and I have never heard of an election for leaders in Region Four, have you?**

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