

**Senator Carter:** No, the suggestion of tracing through the social security number?

**Mrs. Matthews:** We did not check it in complete and utter detail, because as an organization of volunteers we do not feel competent to do this. However, we did check the fact that there is a social security number and that people could be traced through it. If your question is did we research it all the way back, we did not.

**Senator Carter:** On that same point you make a statement which perhaps I am not interpreting correctly. In paragraph 51 you say:

It is further recommended that the law be amended to make it mandatory that irresponsible fathers who desert their families be forced to contribute to the support of this family until all children are of age to support themselves,...

That is all right, but now you come down to where I am somewhat puzzled. You go on to say:

and, as a deterrent to establishing a second family, legally or illegally, the first family should supersede any other families.

If the father establishes a second family and has children, they are also human. How do you draw the distinction between the responsibility for one child born in one family and another child born in a different family? How can you say that these are two separate human beings and that one should supersede the other?

**Mrs. Matthews:** First of all, we did not say that he did not have a responsibility to his second family.

**Senator Carter:** You are asking us to pass a law making it mandatory—you want something which would say that the first family would supersede the other families?

**Mrs. Matthews:** Yes, because we feel the first family is his primary responsibility. We are not saying that he is not responsible for the second family.

**Senator Carter:** Just how do you separate the two responsibilities? You say primary and secondary. Does he pay more to the first family than he would to the second?

**Rev. Dr. Mahoney:** Actually, I think we are trying to scare them off, senator. We want

him to think about that good and early. You have raised a good question; there is no doubt about that. Actually, we are not suggesting this on the basis of the children so much as on the basis of the man stopping to think of what is going to happen to him if he takes on more responsibilities.

**Senator Carter:** I know what you are driving at, but we are talking about a law. The law is not to protect the father, but the children. It is the responsibility of the father to the children which is embodied in the law; it is not to frighten the father away or keep him from straying from the narrow path. That is the point about which I am puzzled.

**Mrs. Matthews:** I think our basic point is the primary responsibility to his children. We did not say that he had no responsibility to the others nor did we try to say that he must give "X" dollars to this one or that one.

**Senator Carter:** That is what I want you to define, what "primary" responsibility means as opposed to "secondary."

**Mrs. Matthews:** His primary responsibility is to his first family.

**Senator Carter:** What does that mean?

**Mrs. Matthews:** I do not quite understand your question.

**Rev. Dr. Mahoney:** I think it means that the top of his pay cheque goes to the first family.

**Senator Carter:** And is that is the end of it?

**Rev. Dr. Mahoney:** How irresponsible are we going to allow this man to be under the law? If we do not have any law he can establish families all over the place, as some men do, and not support any of them. He cannot support them all. The Government is going to have to step in and support his families wherever they are, and I am sure they will. Where does his money go? Let his money go to the first family, which is the first obligation he took on. This is cruel, but he does not have enough money, only a lot of vigour. His problem is that he cannot keep his income up to his responsibilities. We are simply saying that his first obligation is to his original wife and family whom he undertook to raise. Beyond that he is going to have to get help anyhow because there is not enough money to go around. I think that is when the welfare comes in. He may simply say, "I have established three families and I will decide to give my money to this family or to that one." I do