

Dear Idaho Representative

Below please find some bullet points about the revised bill in question. This was compiled by an INDEPENDENT analyst, NOT the AG of Idaho. Some reps have claimed that verbiage has been added to "protect" Idaho citizens. I think if you look just briefly at the way our federal government and the UN works you will see why most do not believe that is possible.

Also ask yourself WHY is this so important to Mr Otter? What political motivation could there be for him to force this issue after it has already been rejected in the original discussion. Rushing and forcing legislation is a sure sign of something not being right.

I have heard some say something like, "We need to do this for the CHILDREN!" I have seen so many times when children have been used to push bad laws and regulation on the citizens. There are also several dozen other states that have not acted on this matter. Probably because they see the problems associated with being forced and bribed with money to act with money that has been laundered through the federal government.

I am all for making sure the children are taken care of, but not at the expense of the rest of the citizens AND those children.

This can be stopped in committee. Please make it so.

Xxxxxx xxxxxx

SB.1067 PROBLEMS WITH FAMILY SUPPORT ACT.

- **SB.1067 implementing the Uniform Interstate Family Support act integrating the Hague Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support (“ the Convention)...is unconstitutional. It violates Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution.**
- **Integrating The Hague Convention Treaty into state law was a collaborative effort between the US State Department, the HHS/OCSE and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (ULC) which is a United Nations NGO. The ULC’ s goal is the development and implementation of harmonized and integrated laws across the U.S. But they have now moved to integrating international law into Idaho law under what will be a totalitarian European regime.**
- **Amendments made to the non-substantive sections of the bill do not correct the problem since the problem is the integration of an international treaty into state law. The federal mandate and how the state was to deal with the UIFSA 2008 model legislation were clearly spelled out. The substantive sections and language were to be implemented verbatim.**
- **Certain articles of the Convention are defined in such a way as to leave an open door for abuse of privileged access to information for purposes not specified.**
- **The timing and the lack of qualification concerning the reference to Articles in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in the Preamble of the Convention leave open the possibility for the state to be obligated under the UN Convention whereas the United States is protected by the Amendment process in the Senate Advice and Consent.**

- **The federal government' s extortive use of a mandate under the principles of cooperative federalism is unconstitutional and is doubly so since the subject of the mandate is itself unconstitutional.**
- **The European Commission is paying for the controlling hub (bridge) of the international child support enforcement system that they' have named *iSupport*. The Hague Conference will develop and control the system. This puts the U.S. in a dependency position with respect to the system. This is the same position Idaho is in now with respect to the federal system.**
- **It' s not clear if U.S. personal information available through federal systems will be protected in terms of access to the system and who has control of the funds for child support payments made through the bridge.**
- **Once implemented all decisions related to the UIFSA and Hague Treaty Provisions will be made by the Secretariat General of the Hague Convention. Idaho will be held hostage to this international authority.**