

Sisyphus breaks down Rep. Kathy Sims' constituency letter:

The only sentence that is remotely accurate is the last one.

"The committee did not vote to end Child Support Enforcement. Those laws are still in place."--then you clearly did not listen to Yearsley and Keim when they said it would dry up funding if you don't pass it. Your listening capabilities during the hearing seemed to be trained solely to respond to the Agenda 21 dog whistle.

"The committee chose to not allow additional international mandates without protections."--the committee did no such thing. The committee killed a bill which had the consequence of drying up funding. There are ample protections in the bill and existing law. More importantly the "protections" of which you speak are to the benefit of deadbeats. And the consequence of your vote means that Idaho children without support would have no means to get it from the delinquent parent.

"Holding the bill was about protecting the due process and privacy rights of our citizens and assuring the integrity of our state's ability to study and evaluate issues independent of the coercive threats of the federal government."--that's a glorified teabagger way to say you're protecting deadbeats while leaving Idaho children with no means of support forcing them to depend on government programs for food, shelter and health care.

"Courts in Idaho would be obligated to accept foreign orders with few exceptions."--in exactly the same way the law has been operating for decades, only this time including foreign jurisdictions whose judicial system has been evaluated and deemed acceptable to our notions of due process. Moreover there is an exception in the event a court deems the particular order lacked due process or violated Idaho public policy.

"Implementing this bill would open federal databases in foreign countries."--only to the extent necessary to locate the deadbeats. This negotiation process has continued for 7 years since George Bush approved the convention and was three times approved by congress including 2 Republican majorities. Do you really believe for a second that GWB and congressional Republicans are going around handing keys to federal databases to any Tom, Dick or Iran?

"The committee wanted to add language to the bill to protect Idaho from enforcing objectionable federal orders [sic], but the federal government would not allow changes and uses intimidation to strong-arm approval of the bill." --now you're just talking gibberish. If you deviate substantially from the carefully negotiated language the decades long process must start over and Idaho children are without a means for getting support, unless you want to create a new and redundant state system of enforcement without federal databases while you create new and redundant system for providing for these children in the meantime.

"I cannot support any legislation that allows the federal government to use children as collateral to force its policies on Idaho and its sister states."--You're the one holding Idaho kids hostage, depriving them of support money. There's an age old idiom about looking gift horses in the mouth. You seem to be taking this one to the vet for a full colonoscopy. You're an IDAHO

legislator. Judging by the economies of Idaho's neighboring states, you need to be far more focused on Idaho. The sister states are doing just fine.