

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2415

2007 SENATE JUDICIARY

SB 2415

# 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2415**

## Senate Judiciary Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 31, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2425

Committee Clerk Signature

*Maria L. Solberg*

**Minutes:** Relating to implanted microchips in individuals.

**Senator David Nething**, Chairman called the Judiciary committee to order. All Senators were present. The hearing opened with the following testimony:

### Testimony In Support of Bill:

**Sen. Randy Christmann**, Dist. #33 introduced the bill. (Meter :45) This bill speaks for itself once you get to the point of the reason of the bill. He explained his journey of the bill, implanting livestock to driving a gravel truck for the county (truck having a "key card" monitor.

**Sen. Lyson** questioned (meter 4:20) how would this effect electronic monitoring on sex offenders? The committee discussed electronic bracelet's verse an implanted devise.

**Sen. Nething** stated the concerns of the bill are the employee and the employer only.

Discussion of the Federal Law

**Sen. Lyson** spoke of (meter 8:59) currently they implant chips in newborns. Would this bill prohibit this? No they have the consent of the parents.

**Jim O'Shanigh**, Dist. #31, (meter 11:18) Gave Testimony – Att. # 1

Steve Bitz, Attorney in Bismarck with Civil Libertarian concerns. (meter 19:13) Addressed the " product side of bill, spoke of U.P.C. codes and a 36 number microchip for individual products.

Discussed the human aspect of assigning I.D. numbers with a 33 bit chip, long term health

aspects and privacy issues. Spoke of reasons one may make a requirement comparing it to credit cards and car rentals. Spoke of current law. (meter 24:36) and how it would not protect you from this.

**Sen. Olafson** questioned the civil liberties of a person on parole or probation. Criminal have given up there liberties. Mr. Bitz does not believe they should have a chip either. This is a civil liberties interest that all should be free in there person. It would be an invasion of ones body. Discussion of this.

**Sen. Marcelles** spoke of homeland security and going through security systems for example airports. National I.D. card is what will be used at that time. Sen. Nething spoke of how he goes through security and shows them his card. Discussion of doing something voluntarily verses mandating.

**Irma Bitner**, Registered Nurse (meter 30:12) gave testimony – Att. #2

**Testimony in Opposition of the Bill:**

None

**Testimony Neutral to the Bill:**

None

**Senator David Nething**, Chairman closed the hearing.

## 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2415**

Senate **Judiciary Committee**

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 7, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 3055

Committee Clerk Signature *Maria L Solby*

**Minutes:** Relating to implanted microchips in individuals.

**Senator David Nething**, Chairman called the Judiciary committee to order. All Senators were present. The hearing opened with the following committee work:

**Sen. Lyson** made the motion to Do Pass SB 2415 and **Sen. Olafson** seconded the motion.

Reviewed the original hearing (meter 1:00) Spoke of no opposition, it would allow a parent to implant a child, and discussion of "ankle bracelet's". This is a bill that will change as technology changes; this is an employee protection bill. Definition of a person was reviewed. (meter 3:14) 12.1-15.

All members were in favor and the motion passes.

Carrier: **Sen. Lyson**

**Senator David Nething**, Chairman closed the hearing.

Date: 2-7-07

Roll Call Vote # 1

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2415

Senate \_\_\_\_\_ Judiciary \_\_\_\_\_ Committee \_\_\_\_\_

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken Do Pass

Motion Made By Sen. Lyson Seconded By Sen. Olafson

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Sen. Nething	✓		Sen. Fiebiger	✓	
Sen. Lyson	✓		Sen. Marcellais	✓	
Sen. Olafson	✓		Sen. Nelson	✓	

Total Yes 6 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Sen. Lyson

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

- a. For a tax exemption, within eighteen months after the month in which the first incremental oil was produced.
  - b. For a tax rate reduction, within eighteen months after the end of the period qualifying the project for the rate reduction.
5. To receive, from the first day of eligibility, a tax exemption or the reduction on production for which any other tax exemption or rate reduction may apply, the industrial commission's certification must be submitted to the tax commissioner within eighteen months of the completion, recompletion, or other qualifying date.
  6. To receive, from the first day of eligibility, a tax exemption under subsection 6 of section 57-51.1-03 on production from a two-year inactive well, the industrial commission's certification must be submitted to the tax commissioner within eighteen months after the end of the two-year inactive well's qualification period.

If the industrial commission's certification is not submitted to the tax commissioner within the eighteen-month period provided in this section, then the exemption or rate reduction does not apply for the production periods in which the certification is not on file with the tax commissioner. When the industrial commission's certification is submitted to the tax commissioner after the eighteen-month period, the tax exemption or rate reduction applies to prospective production periods only and the exemption or rate reduction is effective the first day of the month in which the certification is received by the tax commissioner."

Renumber accordingly

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**SB 2405: Transportation Committee (Sen. G. Lee, Chairman)** recommends **DO NOT PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2405 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**SB 2415: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Nething, Chairman)** recommends **DO PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2415 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**SCR 4016: Natural Resources Committee (Sen. Lyson, Chairman)** recommends **DO PASS** (7 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SCR 4016 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**SCR 4023: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Nething, Chairman)** recommends **DO NOT PASS** (4 YEAS, 2 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SCR 4023 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

#### FIRST READING OF HOUSE BILLS

**HB 1045:** A BILL for an Act to create and enact a new subsection to section 11-18-03 and a new subsection to section 38-18.1-06 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to filing of a statement of succession in interest to abandoned minerals; and to amend and reenact section 38-18.1-02 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to filing of a statement of succession in interest to abandoned minerals.

Was read the first time and referred to the **Judiciary Committee**.

**HB 1048:** A BILL for an Act to create and enact chapter 38-13.1 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to trusts for unlocatable mineral, leasehold, and royalty interest owners; and to repeal chapter 38-13 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to execution of oil and gas instruments affecting interests owned by absent persons.

Was read the first time and referred to the **Judiciary Committee**.

The Senate stood adjourned pursuant to Senator Christmann's motion.

William R. Horton, Secretary

2007 HOUSE JUDICIARY

SB 2415



## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2415

House Judiciary Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3/13/07

Recorder Job Number: 4945

Committee Clerk Signature

*W Penrose*

Minutes:

**Vice-Chairman Klemin:** We will open the hearing on SB 2415.

**Sen. Randy Christmann:** Sponsor, support this bill. This proposal was brought to me by some citizens, and I had never heard of this possibility really. Then as I got to thinking about it more, it sort of made some sense to me, that this technology as it progresses, that we want to make sure that things that seem bizarre don't start happening here. We can get leveraged into a lot of things by employer/employee relationships. There was a situation that really happened and got me thinking that it could happen again, when someone has authority over someone else they could require it. In a truck that I drove, there was a round steel wheel lug size object on the back of the cab wall. There was a key opening on there. I asked what those were and I guess years before that, apparently they were common, because you could buy these things on the market, there was a little card that went in there and somehow turned and during the day, as you were driving, that key kept turning and was marked in there, so at the end of the day the boss checked to see on the keyed log if there were any long spots besides your lunch and breaks where you weren't driving, and if you were taking a break. Well, in modern times, a person in authority, who wanted to monitor his employee's work habits, it does seem kind of ought there maybe, but it is possible. Just because someone does have authority over you,

doesn't mean that anyone ought to feel that they are required to subject themselves to implants or anything like that, where your employer could monitor you and find out where you are when you are off duty. It made sense to me, and I see no reason why we would need to not have this and that it could prevent some troubles in the future.

**Rep. Meyer:** I'm very familiar with how this works with cattle. I guess when they have the implants, they go to the scale, you can tell where they were born, and information such as that. Are you saying with these, they have tracking capabilities, because you don't have that with cattle now, because it reads through a scanner.

**Sen. Randy Christmann:** First of all, with livestock, I think it is limited by cost. You can be tracked by your cell phone. So I don't know what the technology is for animals, but if the chip in your cell phone can track you, certainly a chip that can be implanted into you, I would think that if not now, in the very near future would be able to. I think it could be for cattle too, but the cost would be very high.

**Rep. Onstad:** A person may not require, does that also cover a state agency or corrections department. Sometimes there is a definition for that.

**Sen. Randy Christmann:** I would leave that to the wisdom of the Judiciary Committee. I told the Senate Judiciary committee the same thing. I would think that it would probably prohibit corrections from doing that, but I'm not sure of that. If the time came, and we wanted to exempt that because that was a good way to manage criminals, I wouldn't have any problems about trying to exempt them. I do think, though that it is unlikely that federal guidelines would ever probably allow us to do that. We're not able to do chemical castration of rapists, etc. We're not able to do things to people surgically, to criminals. I am kind of doubtful that we could do that anyway.

**Rep. Wolf:** What about a person covering corporations, what about if the microchip contained a radio frequency identification device, would that cover the GPS tracking or are we limiting this bill to just an identification microchip versus what could come in the near future, or we're not there yet.

**Sen. Randy Christmann:** I think radio frequency identification device would cover most everything that would allow someone to track you. I can't think of an example of something that wouldn't fall into that category. I think it covers it.

**Rep. Klemin:** Thank you. Further testimony in support.

**Jim Oshanyk:** (see attached testimony). On IV, on RFD's I thought it very appropriate that it was the last one on the page. He summarizes the whole thing very well. I would like to have you read that on your own time and so my main purpose of testifying this morning was to try and give you some documentation and tell you what it going on.

**Rep. Wolf:** I have a question about Alzheimer's, diabetes, etc. that a chip could be put into the arm and a hospital would have a scanner that would enable the doctor to know what is wrong if a person couldn't tell you their name, etc. if they were unconscious. So if there were medical concerns, could this be helpful.

**Jim Oshanyk:** There's good and bad in everything. You have some of both right here. We just feel that we want that privacy and whatever. I would just like to point out to you, in the highlighted portions, these are taking off more quickly in other countries. The Ministry of Health is testing these in hospitals there. But these are being used here for other things, such as complete financial transactions. I didn't cover this in my notes, but in my reading about chips, I read that down the road, you know Wal-Mart and all the big stores have them, and they are going to have it so that when you walk into a bank and you have a Visa/MasterCard, they'll say Good morning, Mr. so and so and they will be able to tell if you have a lot of money in the

bank, etc. I really don't like that. We just ask your support on this. This is a preventative thing, it's not going to cost anybody anything, but it is one step to put the brakes on.

**Rep. Koppelman:** As I look at this bill, is a class A misdemeanor enough of a deterrent.

**Jim Oshanyk:** Maybe what will have to be done is amend it, we designed a certain bill that went into the Senate Judiciary committee, this is what they came up with and maybe you will want to go a step farther and make the penalty heavier.

**Rep. Klemin:** Let me ask you a question. Let's say we've got an example, and this relates back to what Rep. Wolf was talking about. Let's say you have a parent with Alzheimer's and you are the guardian of that person. This parent is then in an institution where they can keep track of your parent. This bill says a person may not require another individual to have this device implanted. But this wouldn't preclude someone like you, as the guardian, from voluntarily agreeing with the institution that your parent could have this chip in order for them to be able to monitor your parent's activities better. Do you see this applying in that situation.

**Jim Oshanyk:** Well, it could be. There has to be a little give and take in how serious the proposition is. We're looking at this picture as an overall. It's even been brought up about prisoners and sex offenders. That means that they're not going to get this, we thought that you can put bracelets on their ankle or arm or whatever and do the same thing. We're trying to look at this problem overall, so that we can be free to walk around and do whatever we want. In regard to the question about the cattle, the cattlemen in SD, they're in protest. They really are. As far as that program is, it's any chickens, any cows, any horses, any pigs, whatever, it's got to be reported. Let's say you're a rodeo fan and you take your horse and go to Wyoming or Medora, you've got to call into this database and tell them that you're doing that. We're not doing anything wrong, why should we have to report in like this.

**Rep. Klemin:** Thank you. Further testimony in support.

**Steve Bitz, Attorney:** I am a resident of Bismarck and reside in District 47, which is the district of Rep. Klemin. There are three areas that I would like to discuss this morning: 1) health impacts; 2) privacy issues and 3) civil liberty issues. Before I get into my testimony, I thought I would address the question you had asked about the minor child. My perspective on that would be that a parent would be able to give informed consent, and have it done, even if this bill were passed. Before I get into the details of the technology that is driving my concerns this morning, and a lot of the legislation that has been passed or has been considered in other states and that is two-fold. First of all there is a product identification aspect and also a human identification aspect to it. As many of you are probably aware, back in the 1970's the Uniform Product Code that put an identification code on each product, the merchant marked for each individual sale. This particular box of tea that I have here is not going to appear any different on the scanner than the same similar box of tea that has the same number on it. One bottle of Coke is the same as another bottle of Coke. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and 103 of the largest multinational corporations have proposed changing that product identification system from going from Uniform Product Code to a Product ID code. What would happen is that each individual product would be implanted with a separate microchip, then everyone's product could be the same product but have different UPC code, so you could track where it went, who bought it, etc. They are going to do that by implanting a radio frequency identification device with a certain number of bytes within that device. A 23 byte device would allow the corporation or company to identify each and every car that was produced in the world; a 29 byte chip could identify every computer; 33 bit chip could identify every human, 54 byte chip – every grain of rice, which obviously isn't going to happen, and the 96 byte chip would allow us to number every grain of sand on the face of the earth. Obviously, this is not the objective, but just to give you some information on how that would work. Our concern here

is not so much with the product identification part of it, as it is with the human aspect of that. The auto identification center which is the organization of these corporations at MIT, has also suggested in addition to changing just that, that we have a pervasive global system of identification networks everywhere. Basically meaning that with these tracking devices as you are walking into Wal-Mart or Target they would be able to tell, if these things were implanted in your clothes or shoes, exactly what size clothing and shoes you were wearing. They would be able to identify what you are wearing, and so forth. In addition to that, with SmartCards, they would be able to identify how much money you have in your accounts. We're not getting into that issue, but the technology is certainly available. So we're not dealing with science fiction issues here, it is definitely available. My concern this morning is the human identification aspect of that. It has been suggested already, that not too long ago, by former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, that every American should be implanted with a microchip to link their medical records and that military dog tags should be replaced with a Verichip implant. So conceptually the ideas are out there to do that. Now the question is, whether or not, people should have the opportunity to be implanted with the microchip. This bill is not dealing with taking away the right for someone to give informed consent. My first concern is obviously the health impact on this. We do not know at this point what health consequences are of having the microchip implants. Radio identification devices implanted under the skin have antennae and they actually receive a radio frequency signal, they respond back, and shoot through the skin and back and forth. We do not know what the health impacts of that result in, we don't know if it is safe at this point. The next issue would be privacy issues. If you had a microchip, you don't know at any given point whether or not that microchip is being read or if it's giving off data about you. So that can be done without your knowledge. The third issue would be civil liberty concerns. Folks should have a right to be secure in their

person and possessions. I guess the question would be, what is the likelihood that the microchip implant would be required to participate in commerce or to enroll in the university or to obtain government benefits or those types of things in the future. One point that I would like to make right now, even with our currency, it says that it will pay for all debts public and private. You can go to certain computer stores now that will not accept cash, and I'm not just talking about over the internet, you actually have to pay with a credit card. As a United States citizen, obviously, we should be able to pay with that currency. So what is the likelihood, at some point in the future, that it could be required that people have a microchip in order to participate in commerce or to have access to services. That would be my concern. The other question that was asked, is this bill comprehensive enough, does it deal with all the issues. I don't think so. I think it is a starting point. I actually had looked at some other language, but I didn't bring it in, simply because I thought well we're better off starting with something than nothing at all. I think there are other issues that need to be addressed. But I think this is a starting point for us.

**Rep. Dahl:** If someone were to have a microchip implanted in you without your consent, wouldn't that already be a battery.

**Steve Bitz:** That's a good question. Wouldn't common law in statutory doctrines of battery and engaging in privacy apply in this situation. My response to that would be, that the burden is on the person being wronged. For example, if somebody wrongfully implanted a chip in me, the burden would be on me to go and prove my case in court. I would have to prove that this happened. This particular bill provides a penalty and really puts the burden on the wrongdoer. I think it specifies and makes it more clear in statutory form opposed to common law doctrine.

**Rep. Klemin:** Thank you. Further testimony in support.

**Irma Bitner, registered nurse:** (see attached testimony). I don't want to have mandatory implantation of the verichip.

**Rep. Klemin:** Thank you. Further testimony in support.

**Alfred Schultz:** Support. This is an invasion of privacy and of our rights. I would hope that you would vote against it. You have heard all kinds of arguments about it this morning. I am in favor of the bill.

**Rep. Klemin:** Thank you. Further testimony in support. Testimony in opposition or neutral. We will close the hearing.



## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2415

House Judiciary Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3/14/07

Recorder Job Number: 5028

Committee Clerk Signature

*Penrose*

Minutes:

**Chairman DeKrey:** We will take a look at SB 2415.

**Rep. Klemin:** We spent a lot of time on this three line bill.

**Rep. Koppelman:** I move an amendment, I would like to change it from a class A misdemeanor to a Class C felony. I just think a class A misdemeanor, if you are going to do this, we make it a stronger penalty.

**Rep. Klemin:** That's actually a year in jail, is not a minor thing.

**Chairman DeKrey:** Shouldn't we say that they may not do it unless ordered by a court. We may have sexual predators, we have felons out there, and this could be a law enforcement tool. I just don't think that we should absolutely nix it completely.

**Rep. Dahl:** I don't think you can do this right now.

**Chairman DeKrey:** I don't think so either.

**Rep. Klemin:** I would say that technology, for the court to order that, is way off yet. We're just getting to GPS bracelets.

**Rep. Meyer:** One of the things that this can be used for are for parents and grandparents with Alzheimer's. In just visiting with a few people the other day, if you have a parent that has Alzheimer's and the language in here says you can't, as the child get this for your parent.

**Rep. Klemin:** We had several people that testified that this does not preclude informed consent, does not preclude voluntary implantation. This does not preclude a guardian from authorizing this for their ward.

**Rep. Meyer:** But does this language say that, the language doesn't say that.

**Rep. Klemin:** It says "you may not require somebody to do that", and requirement vs. voluntary.

**Rep. Meyer:** If I'm a child that wants to have that into a grandparent or parent that has Alzheimer's, that person may not give you that consent. That was my point.

**Rep. Kretschmar:** You would have to be a guardian.

**Rep. Klemin:** You would have to have a guardian appointed to give that consent. If they are incompetent, they have to have a guardian anyway.

**Rep. Wolf:** When it says that a person may not require, does a person cover corporation, etc. is that written in the code. When I look at the bill for Washington and Oklahoma, some are defining what person means.

**Rep. Klemin:** We have a definition, that's why every time you see one of these bills where the legislative council gets to go in and change words around, where it may have said person before, but you meant an individual, they always changed that to the word individual. That's why on line 7, you'll see the word "individual" there. So person means a natural person, or any kind of legal entity.

**Rep. Wolf:** It talks about the violation as a class A misdemeanor, which is a year in jail. But in the other states, it talks also about a year in jail or a fine of up to \$10,000. Do we want to put anything in about a fine.

**Rep. Klemin:** A class A misdemeanor, it is already in the alternative under our penalties.

**Rep. Wolf:** Is it \$10,000 fine.

**Rep. Klemin:** It is 1 year in jail or \$2,000 or both.

**Rep. Wolf:** We don't want to increase the fine on that, can we increase the fine.

**Rep. Klemin:** Well, we could by ....

**Rep. Wolf:** Could we leave the year in jail but increase the fine.

**Rep. Klemin:** I don't believe you can.

**Rep. Kingsbury:** I don't want to go this direction, I am going to vote against this.

**Chairman DeKrey:** Is there a second to the Koppelman motion.

**Rep. Koppelman:** In that case, I move a Do Pass.

**Rep. Griffin:** Second.

**7 YES 6 NO 1 ABSENT**

**DO PASS**

**CARRIER: Rep. Koppelman**

Date: 3/14/07  
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2415

House JUDICIARY Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken Do Pass

Motion Made By Rep. Koppelman Seconded By Rep. Griffin

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman DeKrey	✓		Rep. Delmore		✓
Rep. Klemin	✓		Rep. Griffin	✓	
Rep. Boehning	✓		Rep. Meyer		✓
Rep. Charging			Rep. Onstad		✓
Rep. Dahl		✓	Rep. Wolf		✓
Rep. Heller	✓				
Rep. Kingsbury	✓				
Rep. Koppelman	✓				
Rep. Kretschmar		✓			

Total (Yes) 7 No 6

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Rep. Koppelman

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**SB 2415: Judiciary Committee (Rep. DeKrey, Chairman) recommends DO PASS (7 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2415 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.**

2007 TESTIMONY

SB 2415

*Same  
to  
House*

*HH #1*

*1-31-07*

**Senate Bill 2415**

**I. I would like to thank the chairman and his committee for allowing me to speak in favor of this bill.**

**II. As of now there are 7 states that have introduced or considered legislation in 2006 related to RFIDs.**

**A. Rhode Island which considered a bill to restrict the use of RFIDS for the purpose of tracking the movement or or identity of an employee, student or obtaining a benefit or services. (1)**

**B. New Hampshire legislature passed a law on May 24, 2006 creating the Commission on the use of Radio Frequency Technology to study the benefits and potential privacy implications. (1)**

**C. In Georgia, a resolution was adopted on March 28-06 to create the House Study Committee on Biological Privacy. (1)**

**D. Legislation was introduced in New Jersey on May 15, 2006, to prohibit requiring an individual to have a microchip implanted, to require an informed written consent before implantation, and to entitle those implanted to have the microchip removed at any time. (1)**

**E. The state of Washington is presently working on legislation. (2)**

**F. Wisconsin has passed Wisconsin Act 482. (3)**

**G. I am proud to say North Dakota's Legislature is currently considering the Implanted Chip.**

**H. Colorado has a bill which will become effective on 9-1-2007. (4)**

**I. Oklahoma is presently working on a bill. (8)**

**J. In all there have been at least 17 states working on RFIDs. But not all of the states have worked on implants. (1)**

### **III. CHIPS CURRENTLY IN HUMANS:**

**A. Two U.S. Employees were injected with RFID Microchips at company request. This was done at Cincinnati, Ohio. (5A)**

**B. An officer in Mexico had himself and 200 people injected with the chip. (5B)**

**C. Chips could be used in hospitals, schools, and prisons. November 12, 2005 In Chattanooga, Tenn. People with mental retardation are being offered a device that could save lives in case of medical emergency. It's a microchip that would be implanted under the skin. But there are questions about this cutting-edge technology**



**to people who can't make decisions for  
themselves. (6)**

**IV. Privacy concerns and Summary**

**(7)**

**I thought Monbiot on RFIDS was very appropriate .**

