

Senate Science & Technology Committee

**RULES**

**2005-2006 Term**

- 1. Quorum of the Committee shall be five (5) members.**
- 2. The Chair shall determine which bills and resolutions are to be considered and the order in which said measures are considered.**
- 3. The Chair shall have the authority to refer bills and resolutions to subcommittees for study. Such subcommittees in turn shall have the authority to make recommendations on such measures to the full Committee.**
- 4. The Committee shall convene, recess, put all questions, and adjourn upon the order of the Chair.**
- 5. Any member or members of the committee who disagree with the majority report of the committee shall be privileged to file a minority report if they so desire.**
- 6. These Rules may be amended upon a motion duly made and subsequently approved by two thirds of the members of the committee.**
- 7. A bill, resolution, or other matter will be considered only after a presentation by its principal author or a legislator whom he designates to do so. In the event more than one member of the General Assembly has signed a measure, the principal author shall be the one whose name appears first in the list of authors.**
- 8. Where these rules are silent on a specific issue, the Rules of the Senate, as adopted, shall govern.**

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**January 31, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there were 4 bills on the meeting agenda.

**SB 395** (STATON, 18<sup>TH</sup>): Cellular Service; no contract shall require subscribers to extend/renew to obtain a change in level of service.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked at this time for Jill Johnson with GA PIRG please come and speak on behalf of **SB 395**. She said she thought the bill was good for the citizens. Wireless service carriers should not be permitted to longer contracts of 12 months unless a customer agrees in writing. Wireless service carriers should not be able to extend a customers contract **without first obtaining written permission** from the holder of the contract because most customers do not know that their service is being extended when they make any change on their current service. Customers should be able to change service without having to pay heavy penalties for certain changes. Lastly, any material changes made to contract by carrier should be given to customer in writing and the customer would have 30 days to agree with contract or allowed withdraw from the contract without any penalty.

The Chairman commended Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, for bringing the issue to the forefront. He also stated he had signed onto the bill because he felt that this was an important issue that needed to be addressed.

The Chairman stated it was the will of the Chair to put **SB 395** in a subcommittee for further study. He appointed Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, subcommittee chair, and appointed Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, and Shafer; 48<sup>th</sup>, as members of the subcommittee.

**SB 394 (Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>):** Computer System Security; persons falsely representing to be a business; prohibit; definitions; penalties/sanctions.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

Chairman asked if anyone had questions. There were no questions.

Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 394 DO PASS**, Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 241 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>):** Electronic Records/Signatures; legal effects; notarized documents; provisions.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill briefly and spoke on its behalf. He reminded the committee that **SB 241** had unanimously passed out of the Senate Science and Technology in the 2005 session, but that time had run out since it was a short session and it never made it to the House. He asked if no objections, that there be a vote on **SB 241**.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, moved that **SB 241 DO PASS**, Staton 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 425 (Goggans, 7<sup>TH</sup>):** Georgia Child, Family, and School Communications Protection; enact; provide conditions for registration.

Goggans, 7<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf. He stated this is a good bill because it protects our children. He stated that Michigan and Utah already have this law in place and it has been very successful.

Mathew Prince, CEO and cofounder, Unspam Registry and law professor at John Marshall Law School, was there to help answer any questions from the committee. His company, Unspam Registry, provides the service already law for the states of Michigan and Utah.

Mr. Prince explained the change in the substitute. A section was added which states that if someone comes into an establishment, they **MUST** sign an affidavit saying they are over the legal age of 18 before a company can send ads pertaining to tobacco, alcohol or pornographic materials.

Chairman asked if anyone had questions.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, asked for Mr. Prince to explain security issues.

Mr. Prince said there are 2 security issues, one is obvious, being that if you make a large list of emails, you don't want the bad guys getting access to this list. The second security issue is not so obvious that if you are a company complying with this law that your list never be revealed to the state or a 3<sup>rd</sup> party. So, Unspam Registry has designed a technology to keep both sides of the equation secure to ensure that the state never knows who is on the tobacco and alcohol and pornography list and the pornography never gives out an email address that the state doesn't already have.

Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 425 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE.**

The Chairman wanted to make sure there were no more questions before a vote. There were none.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, moved the bill be placed in a subcommittee for further study.

Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, withdrew his previous motion that **SB 425 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE.**

There was no second to Heath, 31<sup>st</sup> motion.

Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, then again, moved that **SB 425 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE.** Staton 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 455 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>):** Privacy; customer proprietary network information broker; obtain or release customer information; provide penalties; exceptions.

The Chairman stated it was the will of the Chair that there would be no vote on **SB 455** today and it would be in a subcommittee for further study. He appointed Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, subcommittee chair, and appointed Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, and Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, as members of the subcommittee.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 8, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, and Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there were two bills on the meeting agenda, and that both [SB 395](#) and [SB 455](#) were still in subcommittees.

The Chairman asked if anyone would like to speak or if there were any questions. There were none.

The Chairman announced that today was “High Tech Day”.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 1:40.

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 15, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there were 4 bills on the meeting agenda.

**SB 316 (Chance, 16<sup>th</sup>):** Obscenity; electronically furnishing material to minors; change provisions of crime.

Chance, 16<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone on the committee had a question for Chance, 16<sup>th</sup>, no one had questions.

Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 316 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 456 (Wiles, 37<sup>th</sup>):** Privacy; mobile telephone usage; unlawful to disseminate information without expressed consent of subscriber; penalties; exception.

Wiles, 37<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone had questions for Wiles, 37<sup>th</sup>.

Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, asked the Wiles, 37<sup>th</sup>, to explain how the bill would work with other states. Wiles, 37<sup>th</sup>, explained.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 456 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 455 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>):** Privacy; customer proprietary network information broker; obtain or release customer information; provide penalties exceptions.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf. He stated that **SB 455** was a companion bill to **SB 456**.

The Chairman asked if anyone had questions. There were no questions.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 455 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 395 (Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>):** Cellular Service; no contract shall require subscribers to extend/renew to obtain a change in level of service.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

Jill Johnson, Georgia PIRG, spoke and supported the bill.

Brandon Reese, Georgia Chamber of Commerce, spoke against the bill only because the Chamber has always been against the state passing laws dealing with personal contracts.

The Chairman asked Mr. Reese if other than the fact the Georgia Chamber of Commerce opposed any legislation dealing with personal contracts, were there any other reason they would oppose the bill. Mr. Reese stated, 'no.'

Steve Skinner, Cingular Wireless Service, and Chris Jones, Verizon, also spoke against the bill.

The Chairman asked if anyone had questions or if there were any debate on the bill.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, made motion to recommit **SB 395** back to senate subcommittee for further study since there were so many against the bill, and that maybe the wording could be changed to get the Georgia Chamber of Commerce to agree. Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 395** was recommitted to the subcommittee consisting of Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, and Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**February 21, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there was only one bill on the meeting agenda.

**SB 395 (Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>):** Cellular Service; no contract shall require subscribers to extend/renew to obtain a change in level of service.

The Chairman asked if any of the committee members had a question.

Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, had a question about the coverage area.

Jill Johnson, spoke on behalf of the bill and had a few concerns with some of the wording.

Steve Skinner, Cingular Wireless, stated that his client was still against the bill even with the changes.

The Chairman at this point of the meeting, 4:50 p.m., instructed Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, in the absence of the vice chairman and secretary, to take over the meeting so he could go and see if he could find another member of the Science and Technology Committee in order for a vote to be taken on **SB 395**.

Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, asked Mr. Skinner to answer any questions some of the members might have. He explained coverage area to Douglas, 18<sup>th</sup>, and other committee members.

The Chairman returned to the meeting and Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>, came in at 5:00 p.m. At this point there was a quorum of the committee.

The Chairman asked if anyone else had any questions or discussion.

Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, said he felt this was a bad bill and that the government should not be getting into contracts as such and that he did not support the bill.

The Chairman asked if any other questions. There were none.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 395 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, seconded. The vote was **2 YEAS** by, Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, and **2 NAYS** by Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>. The Chairman voted **YEA. SB 395 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

## **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **March 1, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in room 450 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, Vice-Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>; Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>; and Ex-Officio member, Thomas, 54<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there was one bill on the meeting agenda.

**SB 596 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>):** Delivering the Cure; Newborn Umbilical Cord Blood Initiative Act; provide for creation of commission; definitions; and donations.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup> presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, stated that as many knew, stem cell research had been the subject of controversy. He went on to explain that stem cells are not only found in embryo's, but also found in the umbilical cord, placenta tissue and amniotic fluid is also rich in stems cells which have been used for medical treatment, both curing and treating disease. He explained that in Georgia these post natal tissues are treated as medical waste in 99% of all pregnancies. He explained that SB 596 has 2 purposes; (1) To launch a newborn umbilical cord blood initiative with a goal of collecting and storing every umbilical cord from a newborn delivery in Georgia. So that the stem cells from that material from the umbilical cord and the other postnatal tissues as discussed in the bill can be used for scientific research and medical treatment. (2) Bans human cloning. Prohibits the manufacturing of a human embryo in Georgia whether it be for reproduction or experimentation.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, wanted to bring out in the meeting for those that had been alarmed by an article in the today's edition of the Atlanta Journal Constitution by a colleague, (Adelman, 42<sup>nd</sup>,) that said the bill criminalizes embryonic stem cell research. Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, stated that was flatly untrue, but that there is controversy over that issue, but the bill

does not address that issue in one way or another. Embryonic stem cell research is conducted with embryos from fertility treatment. He stated that the only thing this bill addresses as far as this issue goes, is that you can not create a human embryo for the purpose of conducting experimentation. He apologized for the falsehoods brought about to the bill by this article which appeared in the AJC.

The following spoke on behalf of [SB 596](#): Dr. David Hess, Chairman, Neurology Department, Medical College of Georgia. Dr. Hess explained exactly what stem cells were and how they are used in research. Dr. Jim Flowers from the Board of Regents, UGA, was with Dr. Hess.

The following is a series of questions and answers from the Chairman, Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, for Dr. Hess during his testimony regarding [SB 596](#).

Question: Does this bill prohibit embryonic stem cell research with embryos left over from fertility?

Answer: NO

Question: Are you aware of any embryonic stem cell research that is going on today that is done with anything else other than embryos left over from fertility clinics?

Answer: No

Question: It would be completely false to say that this bill criminalizes embryonic stem cell research?

Answer: As it is currently conducted, that would be false.

Question: Human cloning, right now, is not used to conduct embryonic stem cell research, is that right?

Answer: Since the Korean stuff has been shown...has been all retracted. They are the ones who reported that it worked. But currently, as of right now, there is nothing published that I know of.

Question: You indicated that one of the big values of embryonic stem

cells were that they are pluripotent right...and the umbilical cord stem cells while they are powerful, and have been shown to cure some 70-some... or treat some 70-some diseases, they are not pluripotent, is that right?

Answer: Yeah, the better term probably is multipotent for those.

Question: You were suggesting that you think that we are on the path toward being able to develop cells that are pluripotent, that are embryo-like, without having to create and destroy embryos?

Answer: I think there is a good chance of that. I think we are not there yet. We actually have some intriguing research in animals but, again, a lot of details that have to be worked out.

Question: Let me ask you this...do you think that if we prohibited human cloning, do you think that would move us more in the direction of being able to find these pluripotent cells without engaging in the ethical controversy that is associated with human cloning?

Answer: My personal opinion is yes.

Question: Do you think that public support for Science is important for science to advance?

Answer: Yes

Question: Do you think that a human cloning ban would help bolster confidence in science?

Answer: That is hard for me to say, depends on which part of the public you are talking about.

Chairman asked if there were any other questions for Dr. Hess. There were none.

The Chairman acknowledged Mr. Jim Flowers, Board of Regents, UGA. He asked him if he was aware of any embryonic human cloning being conducted at the University System of Georgia. Mr. Flowers, stated: No.

The following spoke on behalf of SB 596: Dr. Alan Einstein, Practicing Internist – Alpharetta and Duluth, Graduate of John Hopkins Medical School. Dr. Einstein has knowledge in core blood medicine.

**The following is a series of questions and answers from the Chairman, Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, for Dr. Einstein during his testimony regarding [SB 596](#).**

Question: You mentioned that President Bush has recently signed into law the National Umbilical Cord Blood Bank, and this is going to make available \$79 or \$89 million worth of grants. As you read the bill, do you believe that this bill is compliant with what the federal government is attempting to accomplish?

Answer: Yes, I think in theory everything is exactly what would put us in compliance with the federal guidelines. The guidelines for how the rest of the funds will be distributed will be a little more in semantics. But we will be within this platform and then it would have to be a little more specific regarding the banks, et cetera. But in general, the way it is written, it will comply with the federal guidelines. If we don't... if we put anything in regarding embryonic stem cells and human cloning it will then fall outside of those guidelines.

Question: And would not be eligible for the money?

Answer: And would not be eligible, correct.

Question: You are familiar with the bill introduced a couple of weeks ago that created a similar bank but that allowed human cloning, the bank set up under that bill would not be eligible for federal funding, as you understand the program?

Answer: Yes, the bill prior to this, and that was the suggestion I gave them, that taking that out would then allow us to be part of something that I think is moving forward at a rapid pace.

Question: Have you had an opportunity to review the scientific definitions that are laid out in the bill?

Answer: Yes I have.

Question: Are you comfortable that the definitions are scientifically accurate?

Answer: Yes, the way they read.

Question: With particular regard to the definition of human cloning, is that a scientifically accurate definition?

Answer: Yes it is. There have been different definitions around the world regarding what that definition is, however looking at it and looking at the consensus of approximately six states that already have bills and the nine that are coming up, six of which I have been involved with, all of those bills this is consistent with those definitions.

Question: And it is consistent with science as you understand science, correct?

Answer: Correct, and like I think... once again you brought up the point about the public earlier. I think the public is interested right now in how government can help them directly. The way you build support for the public is, in regards to the government's role in healthcare or the way it effects them in science, I think is make these specifically how does this effect me or my family now, and this is a way we can affect them now.

Question: Let me ask you a couple of other questions just to clear up some confusion that has been generated this morning by an opinion piece that was printed in the morning's Atlanta Journal-Constitution. As you read this bill, does this bill stop embryonic stem cell research?

Answer: It doesn't change anything that is going on right now.

Question: Does it criminalize embryonic stem cell research?

Answer: I don't believe it does.

Question: And currently human cloning is not used in embryonic stem cell research, correct?

Answer: Correct.

Question: And currently the federal government wouldn't provide funding for stem cell research that included human cloning, is that correct?

Answer: That is correct.

Question: And so human cloning is a theoretical possibility that hasn't yet yielded any sort of medical treatments, is that right?

Answer: That is correct. There was the one claim in Korea and that's been found false.

Question: Do you have an opinion on whether or not banning on human cloning will increase public support for science?

Answer: I believe it will in the sense that it will force science to do things under a standard. And that standard would then be putting more effort in to looking for ways to form these other methods without human cloning.

Question: Do you support the human cloning ban that appears in this bill?

Answer: The way it is now, yes.

Question: And you believe it helps bolster the bill overall in terms of what it is trying to accomplish with non-embryonic stem cell research, right?

Answer: Yes.

Chairman asked if there were any other questions for Dr. Einstein. There were none.

Next speaker recognized by the Chairman was Dr. Gerry Sotomayor, OBGYN, Babies for Life. The Chairman explained that Dr. Sotomayor had met with him a few months earlier and was the one responsible for [SB 596](#) being introduced because he had explained to the Chairman how

umbilical cord is rich in stem cell and was being thrown away as waste.

Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, commended the panel on their hard work and the good work they are doing.

Speaking on behalf of the bill: Nina Vincent Sewell, retired research at Emory, and research at Oxford University; stated the bill was a great bill and written very carefully without the fear of creating a human embryo in a laboratory for the purpose of conducting medical experiments.

Dr. Marle Cyete, Emory Stem Cell Research, spoke against the bill because she didn't think it was broad enough.

The Chairman asked if they agreed on the bill and it's intent and that the only disagreement they had was to whether or not a human embryo should be able to be created in a laboratory for research. Dr. Marle Cyete, stated, "that is correct".

The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions for Dr. Cyete. There were none.

Dr. David Machacek, UGA, spoke against the bill and concurred with Dr. Marle Cyete.

The following spoke against the bill for basically the same reasons as above. The bill does not go far enough in research and should include being able to create human embryo's for medical research: Mr. Ron Grabb, Parkinson patient; Mr. David Braun, Parkinson patient; Stephen Riddell, Juvenile Diabetes Foundation; Russell Medford, President and CEO, Biomedical Genics;

Mike Jones, Shepard Spinal Center; said they were supporting the bill, but was opposing the bill because he didn't go far enough with the research.

Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup> had to leave the meeting. The Chairman asked if he would like to speak before he left. He commended the Chairman for all his hard work and was glad to co-sign this bill. And, wanted everyone to understand that getting legislation passed was a process and that they were a long way from getting this bill passed and signed into law, but they were definitely headed in the right direction and he hoped that the bill would pass out of committee today so the process could start.

With that, Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup> left the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

There was a discussion among the committee members about what exactly how far medical

At this point, the committee discussed tabling the bill. But, the Chairman did not want to do that. They had a discussion as to whether to come back and hear further testimony after Senate Rules Committee met. Some wanted to vote on the bill, but some of the members were not ready for that. The Chairman decided to adjourn the meeting until the next day, March 2, 2006 at 2:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

## **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **March 2, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in room 450 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, Vice-Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>; Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>; and Ex-Officio member, Thomas, 54<sup>th</sup>; Ex-Officio member, Rogers, 21<sup>st</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there was one bill on the meeting agenda. This meeting was a continuation of the discussion of **SB 596**, and we would hear further testimony from those who was in support of the bill and those who opposed the bill.

**SB 596 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>):** Delivering the Cure; Newborn Umbilical Cord Blood Initiative Act; provide for creation of commission; definitions; and donations.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup> presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

Adelman, 42<sup>nd</sup>, spoke against the bill and asked for all members to please consider this bill and take it serious about the issue at hand. He complained about the 2 Ex-Officio members present. The Chair reminded Adelman, 42<sup>nd</sup> that this was a rule that had been voted on and passed by the full Senate.

The Chairman wanted to comment that since Adelman, 42<sup>nd</sup>, was speaking that this bill would stop all research from embryo's already being used for research from abortion clinics, etc. He wanted to make perfectly clear that this bill in no way would stop that from happening. He wanted the committee to know that this bill did not address that issue whatsoever.

The Chairman went over the bill and the definitions in the bill. He had asked experts about the definitions and they stated to him that they were medical and scientifically sound.

One change was made on the substitute. The definition of human cloning to make it more clear. It removed the language “living organism.”

Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, stated he thought the committee was moving way too fast on important issue that he felt the members did not fully understand. He felt it was totally out of line for the Chairman to ask the committee to vote on the bill. The Chairman again spoke and told Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, that he was trying to go through the bill line by line and that he did not know if the Senate rules allowed for a member of the committee to be excused for ignorance of the subject matter.

At this point, the Chairman asked Dr. Allen Einstein to please come up and explain the definitions to the committee and to answer any questions one may have, and for the benefit of Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, answer any questions he may have. Zamarripa, stated there were at least 20 things he needed to be explained. The Chairman told him that Dr. Einstein would go over each line and explain every definition.

Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, stated he had a problem with the definition of “human cloning.” The Chairman stated he was satisfied with the definition because of the overwhelming scientific testimony.

The Chairman went on to explain the next other part of the bill which creates the Georgia Commission for the Newborn Umbilical Cord Blood Initiative. The bill instructs the Commission on what is expected and how to conduct the business of collecting the newborn tissue. It states the bank shall make the tissue available for scientific research and medical treatment. It states any person giving birth in the state of Georgia may contribute post natal tissue and fluid to the bank. Starting June 30, 2007, that all physicians and hospitals in the state shall inform their pregnant patients of the opportunity to donate post natal tissue and fluid to the bank, not later than the 3 trimester of pregnancy.

Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, asked how many states have moved in this direction. The Chairman stated that the packet the committee members had been given had a study by Senate Research which stated 6 other states have completely banned human cloning.

Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, wanted to amend to change wording of human cloning. But, Chairman said his amendment would change the meaning of human cloning for the purpose of the bill.

Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>, made motion to **amend SB 596**. Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, seconded.

The Chairman asked for all in favor of amendment: Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23; vote for the amendment. Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>; Rogers, 21<sup>st</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>; voted against the amendment.

Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, made a motion **SB 596 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, seconded. Vote was 5 to 3. Cagle, 49<sup>th</sup>, Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Thomas, 54<sup>th</sup>, Rogers, 21<sup>st</sup> voted for the bill. Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, and Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup> voted against the bill. Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>, did not vote.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**March 7, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>; and Ex-Officio member, Thomas, 54<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there were 3 bills on the meeting agenda.

**SB 541** (Hill, 32<sup>nd</sup>): Electronic Mail Address; no person shall transmit any message containing advertising material; penalties

Hill, 32<sup>nd</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions. There were no questions.

The Chairman asked if Jim Flowers who was there on behalf of the University of Georgia, was happy with the substitute. He said yes.

Thomas, 54, moved that **SB 541 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**HB 1055** (Keown, 173<sup>rd</sup>): Public schools; Internet safety policies; adopt and implement.

Keown, 173<sup>rd</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none.

The Chairman asked if the state librarian was in favor of this bill. Keown, 173<sup>rd</sup>, stated he had received a call from the state librarian and they were in support of the bill.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, moved that **HB 1055 DO PASS**. Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**SB 596 (Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>)**: Delivering the Cure; Newborn Umbilical Cord Blood Initiative Act; provide for creation of commission; definitions; donations.

Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, presented the bill. He stated that the **SB 596** had been presented and discussed and had been reported out with a do pass recommendation. However, over the weekend he had made the decision to recommit **SB 596** back into the Science and Technology so the members could take one last look at the bill since it is of such great importance to the citizens of the state of Georgia.

The Chairman stated that it was apparent that the proponents of human cloning were willing to do everything in their power to block the newborn umbilical blood bank. In order to preserve the bill, he stated he had a new substitute drawn up that he had reviewed with the ranking minority member. He stated about 20 lines had been eliminated from the bill that made reference to human cloning. He asked that the committee please favor the substitute and vote it out so that the bill could move forward in order that the state enact newborn blood initiative and then deal with human cloning during the interim.

The Chairman continued by walking the committee members page by page through the new substitute to **SB 596**.

After presenting the changes, the Chairman asked if there were any questions or any comments.

Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>, made the comment that he would vote to move the bill out of committee, but with reservations. But, that he was committed to work with the chairman during the interim to try and perfect the legislation.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, stated even though he still had concerns with the bill, he would vote in favor of the bill.

Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>, thanked the chair for his hard work and his efforts for bringing this bill forward. He stated he will move healthcare forward into the next generation. He also stated it had been very controversial,

but he felt in his short tenure in the Senate that this was by far the most important piece of legislation he had voted on and would vote on for a long time.

The Chairman asked if anyone else had a comment or question or discussion on the bill. No one spoke.

Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, moved that **SB 596 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Thomas, 54<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary

**SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**March 22, 2006**

The Senate Science and Technology Committee meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m., in room 125 of the State Capitol, by Chairman David Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>. The following members were in attendance: Senators Shafer, 48<sup>th</sup>, Chairman; Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, Secretary; Douglas, 17<sup>th</sup>; Golden, 8<sup>th</sup>; Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>; Powell, 23<sup>rd</sup>; and Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman introduced committee members and support staff and welcomed guests.

The Chairman then stated that there were two bills on the meeting agenda.

**HB 1307 (Loudermilk, 14<sup>th</sup>):** Georgia Register; publication; change certain provisions.

Loudermilk, 14<sup>th</sup>, presented bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, moved that **HB 1307 DO PASS**. Zamarripa, 36<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

**HB 1290 (Hill, 180<sup>th</sup>):** Telephone service provider; customer records; prohibit sale or transfer.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, presented the bill and spoke on its behalf.

The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none.

Heath, 31<sup>st</sup>, moved that **HB 1290 DO PASS BY SUBSTITUTE**. Staton, 18<sup>th</sup>, seconded. The vote was unanimous.

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Science and Technology Committee was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Senator Bill Heath, Committee Secretary

/s/ Anna E. Boggs, Recording Secretary