

will collapse, and that if you have good, healthy and solid families, society itself will be strong and prosperous. Therefore, if it is our duty as legislators to provide the nation with the necessary physical needs, our mandate will be fulfilled only if at the same time we enact the necessary legislation to prevent the moral decadence from which the people may suffer. Let us save the family and then we can face the future of our country with confidence.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from an article published in the last issue of the magazine *New World* and entitled "What makes people happy?":

A Harvard professor recently stated that if the basis of civilization, the family, is to survive, it must be sold like soap flakes on bill boards, four-coloured advertisements and the radio, by a firm to be called Hucksters (International) Inc. Another news report from Los Angeles which shows that there are five divorces for every six marriages in California, adds point to his suggestion, particularly when we realize that the Canadian divorce rate is rising every year.

In contrast with Britain we rate money above family life. A comparison between findings of the Canadian institute of public opinion and the British institute when the question was asked, "Will you tell me in your words what the word 'Happiness' means to you?" showed the following returns:

	Happiness First	
	Britain Per cent	Canada Per cent
Family life	33	19
Sufficient money, et cetera	13	38
Contentment	20	32
Health	13	18
Friends	3	7
Religion	1	2
Dont know	7	6

The article goes on to say:

While the above table makes comparison a little difficult, in that the total percentage exceeds 100 per cent because some people listed more than one reason for the meaning of happiness, the comparison does, however, show that our standard of values in Canada badly needs overhauling. If we teach our children that happiness consists in having sufficient money, they will be forever chasing a will-o'-the-wisp, because no one ever has sufficient money—we can always use another ten dollars. And our children, when they grow up, will feel that their marriages are unhappy because they do not have sufficient money, and that they are, therefore, entitled to a divorce.

The function of a woman after marriage is to be a good wife and good mother. This is one of the most difficult jobs in the world, and skill in this task is not an accident. It demands everything that she's got. Therefore, since 95 per cent of women get married, it would be as well to teach girls in the last grades, in addition to Romeo and Juliet and quadratic equations, something about child care, sex, budgeting, and household economics. It is true that a few women's ambition might be to work in a factory

or office, but they will always represent a small minority.

Why don't we teach boys and girls the meaning of marriage so that they will not, in increasing numbers, have an emotional let-down after marriage and seek the divorce courts?

Thus it goes without saying that divorce is the most direct menace to the family. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, when I speak of divorce, I have in mind not only the bills that are before us, but also the situation as it now exists throughout nine provinces; because, if our attention here in this house is especially drawn to the divorces from the province of Quebec, we must not forget that it is still the province in which there is the smallest average number of divorces. I have here some figures from the Canada Year Book 1945, page 151, showing that in 1943 there were 3,263 divorces in the whole dominion, of which ninety were in the province of Quebec.

When one speaks on questions like this we are often asked, and rightly so: Well, what do you suggest to correct the situation? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, first, our laws are such that it is much too easy for people to obtain a divorce. People get married without enough precautions, because they know that if they cannot get along with each other as smoothly as they wish, it will be very easy for them to quit and start anew with somebody else. Therefore the federal law relating to divorce, as well as the laws of the provinces where there is such legislation, should be modified so as to restrain as much as possible the granting of divorce.

But there is another means much more effective. This would be to direct those who are responsible for the education of our young people, to educate their pupils more fully on the gravity of marriage and the responsibilities that are attached to the union of man and wife, which must always be regarded as sacred.

I know, as an example, that in my home town, in the parish in which I live, our parish priests have organized once a week lectures for the young men and women on preparation for marriage. And nobody can deny that, in the province of Quebec, let alone the city of Montreal, there is not one divorce per 100,000 of population.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from a declaration of the Bishops of Canada dated January 18, 1945, the following passage:

Marriage and family. If it pleases us to realize that public attention is drawn towards the economic security of the family, we cannot but deplore the forever renewed attempts to loosen the sacred bonds of marriage. We condemn without hesitation all measures originating sometimes even in the midst of public organi-