

divorce, and with the pagan view of the relative positions of man and woman; and are we in this House, in the twentieth century, going to stand behind pagan conceptions of the relative positions of man and woman in the social order? Paul distinctly in his teaching to the Corinthians recognizes the situation which existed at that time, in which it was an unlawful thing for a woman to cut her hair. I wonder where we should be at the present time if the Pauline teaching was carried out literally. It is a glory for man to crop his hair, but it was a scandal for a woman to do the same thing. In many other things Paul's teaching is marred in that way, by conforming itself to the pagan surroundings in which he was called upon to preach the gospel in which there is no difference as between man and woman. Yes, and Paul was a celibate, and not only a celibate, but he was opposed to marriage on any ground. Talk about race suicide—Paul was a race suicidist with a vengeance! He believed that marriage was undesirable in that age, and if there is one way of committing race suicide, that is the way.

Mr. VIEN: I think the hon. member is a bit mistaken. Paul said that those who married did well, but that those who did not marry did better. I do not believe my hon. friend is correct in saying that Paul was opposed to marriage as an institution.

Mr. McMASTER: Better to marry than to burn, he said.

Mr. BIRD: He was speaking relatively. He knew that anything he said would not prevent people from getting married, but he gave it as his judgment, the end of the world being imminent, that it was better for them to remain as they were because to marry would only bring them unnecessary trouble.

As I said, here is a fundamental difference of opinion. You cannot legislate the home into sanctity. You cannot impose sanctity upon family relationships. I believe that here is a point of view which my hon. friend would do well to consider—if we can make this a little clearing house for ideas: I think there is a good deal in what he contends, that we ought to surround the home with certain artificial restrictions, with as many restrictions as it can bear, being the human institution it is. But on the other hand, having regard to what constitutes the real sanctity of the home, we must by all means in our power, whether social or economic, make it possible for that sanctity to be a real thing.

That is the point of view which I am afraid my hon. friend does not grasp. We are living in an age when our women are going out day by day into our offices and factories to make their living. We are not living in the first century A.D., we are living in the twentieth century, when the position of women in society has been entirely transformed; and when you bring man and woman together to form a home, you must make it possible for them to keep that home intact. Why, when you read the divorce cases that come before this House, I will guarantee that drink is at the bottom of ninety per cent of them.

Mr. McMASTER: Can we legislate the home into sobriety?

Mr. BIRD: If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is interested in the sanctity of the home, let him make it impossible for drink to enter our homes. And also, on the economic side: I want to point out to the Minister of Justice that economically considered it is almost impossible for the home nowadays to maintain its sanctity. It takes a lot to make a home. A home is not merely a spiritual thing, it is not a rarefied thing; it takes a house, it takes furniture, it takes a weekly wage; it takes many things to make a home in which both the man and the woman and the children may be contented and happy; and I would throw out the suggestion to my hon. friends that if they are interested in the sanctity of the home, which I believe they are, they should not be so much interested in imposing upon it artificial restrictions, either ecclesiastical or civil, but they should see to it that the very foundations which make a home possible are secure, make it possible for man and woman to live together and rear their children in decency and refinement. If sanctity was encouraged in that direction, the time would come when we could do without restrictions of any kind, because it is in the very nature of human beings to live together; it is in their very soul to do it, and it is only our conditions which drive them into the follies in which they ultimately land in many cases.

That is my point of view. I do not put it forth as against that of my hon. friend, but rather as in complement to it. I think that a discussion of this kind is capable of achieving very much in thus giving us an opportunity of frankly exposing what our attitude is. I am sorry that we should sometimes seem to come at these questions from diametrically opposite angles; but our training, our environment, has decided that for us, we are not to blame for that. But we are to blame if