

The link I sent yesterday giving the news on the decline of men being directly related to the decline of fatherhood shows that single mothers (custodial parents in the vast majority of child support cases) are not feeling an economic attack in today's economy.

The news program details how it is men who are struggling economically.

This bill was mandated for Maryland under the State's plan for adhering to U.S. HHS directives to receive federal matching funds.

A review was made by HHS over 18 months during the Obama Administration. The overwhelming directive was to right-size child support obligations. Maryland's child support taskforce began AFTER the Obama Executive order to HHS was delivered.

As the man from PG County testified, when obligations are too high, Child Support Enforcement yanks licenses. If the obligations were reasonable, he would not have HAD job insecurity. Neither he nor the lobbyist (who is not an activist, not a management-level employee) from JOTF would have a very embarrassed face if they were to explain to NCPs the bill details. If they were to explain how - under the bill Del. Dumais drafted, SB847 - they just got up on the witness stand and voted FOR an increase in child support payments.

Like lawyers, these men said the bill would help their obligation level, even while they DIDN'T do the math. The math shows they will pay MORE . Only the destitute stand to pay less.

It is notable that the 2 speaking of financials do not have Maryland data to work from. The University. MD social worker got her data from MY former organization, BCOSE; the Colorado woman is not a Maryland resident.

As family law lawyer Milko testified, his concern is for consistency in pay for high earners. Not that they're not making pay; he just wishes lawyers to have easier math at highest levels and to keep high earners paying less (as a percentage of income) than do low and medium income NCPs.

The bill before you, SB847, does NOT achieve & absolutely will not, in practice, achieve the full intentions of the Obama E.O. In fact, SB847 INcreases child support obligations even as the financial future for men in Maryland is waning. And it has been waning for decades. Keep in mind that when men quit looking for work, they are removed from employment data statistics. Yet the child support obligations continue.

The bill came in 2 pieces and - to keep things brief - the piece mandated by the E.O. should be kept, to help low-, mid-income noncustodial parents.

The piece of voluntary impoverishment should be cut out. If you don't practice family law, listen to Masters in child support court and also review appellate cases, (I am telling you as someone who does) you will NOT like the impact that piece will have. It will be far-reaching and negative for fathers and their children, all for the sake of (literally) a few dollars. There is rarely a noteworthy sum of money in question on voluntary impoverishment cases.

Judges are punitive toward fathers and they realize that terms like deadbeat dads and toxic masculinity bring fathers few empathetic ears. So the imputing of income which the Obama E.O. aimed to reduce will not happen. (See HB386/2017 Session).

These facts are confirmed by my experience with National Parents Organization, my personal courtwatching efforts, my courtwatching efforts on behalf of BCOCSE, my role with Child Support being extensively involved with all aspects of child support enforcement in the largest child support enforcement office in the state of Maryland, my review of other states' efforts while working for BCOCSE and my interactions with judges/child support officials for the benefit of Maryland fathers, even to the case level.

These facts are also confirmed by today's Baltimore Sun piece on child support, involving low/mid-income fathers.

<https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/investigations/bs-md-baltimore-sun-child-support-project-20200305-cddqvji4m5dlvd3n27mng4e3by-htmlstory.html>

1) Please remove the piece of the bill which will make it HARDER to achieve effective child support operations -- don't put ANY increases in the Guidelines, when an adjustment DOWN is what the math/evidence/testimony dictates.

2) Please have NO statements about voluntary impoverishment in the bill. This is handled daily in child support offices, Masters' courtrooms and our reported appellate cases involving voluntary impoverishment are sufficient.

3) Please provide information for FATHERS at courthouses so good dads can make reasonable payment in a routine fashion through the course of their children's lives.

I am always available for giving you the plan which will permanently get these issues off your plate, from a sustainable, best practices stance.

Returning emails is all that is needed.

I have applied to 4 different taskforces in 7 years to freely give what was given to me.