

well you are taking a person's livelihood and if you take a persons means of livelihood, how will that person pay their child support? The answer to that is that the state is not going to take a persons means to a livelihood if it means they can't pay their child support, because obviously that would frustrate the very purpose of the state acting in our behalf which is to get more child support. And you say, well, how can we count on the state to do that? And my response to you, the state already holds its hand back on these people, because already under the powers that exist, these people can be thrown in jail. The reason they are not thrown in jail is because in part we don't want to take away their ability to earn money and pay the child support. So, if that is the real argument, if that is the thing that you are afraid of, then we should go back into the statutes and never allow these people to be thrown in jail. Right? But, we don't want to do that because we want the child support payed, we want reasonable techniques available to get people to do what they should be doing, paying their child support. These are two more techniques that will be available in the case of certain groups of people, not everybody in the case of professional licenses, but two more techniques that will be there as tools to work with for the purpose of getting more child support paid not for the purpose of keeping child support from getting paid. It astounds me to think that people would think that the state would apply the system in such a way as to defeat their own purpose. I mean I know a lot of bureaucrats and none of them are that dumb. In fact most of them are pretty intelligent, sensitive people. They are going to work to find out if errors are made, they are not going to work against their end goal, which is to get more child support paid. So I think that this whole idea that somehow we would take away people's livelihood, and by that means keep them from paying child support, is in fact a red herring in the sense that it is not something that has any institutional force behind it that would give you reason to believe that it would happen. The other thing that I wanted to mention is that we should be looking at experience in other states. Have all of these horror problems that have arisen, that have been mentioned on the floor, have they arisen in these other states, in these 30 other states that have one or the other or both of these revocation processes? No, they have not. There is no such experience coming out of any state of people erroneously having their licenses revoked or suspended, no such experience. Why is not our bureaucracy able to judiciously apply the system as well as any other state's