

Mr. LAPOINTE: Everybody would be equal, if it is equality my hon. friend seeks.

Mr. HOEY: I seek information.

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): I believe it is the desire, Mr. Speaker, of everyone in this House that the home should be preserved. I believe the preservation of the home as an institution in the future lies almost entirely in the hands of the men. If they are willing to give to women economic freedom within that home; if they are willing to live by the standard that they wish the women to live by, the home will be preserved. If the preservation of the home means the enslavement of women, economically or morally, then we had better break it, and for that reason I will support the bill and I will vote against the amendment. I would ask men to think of that and think of it seriously. I do believe that the economic freedom of women is one of the things that is causing increasing divorces, because women will not tolerate what they once had to tolerate. You can smile about it if you like, but I know a lot of men who talk very learnedly on a subject like this and who want women to be very pure and very chaste when they themselves are not fit to associate with a chaste and pure woman. So, when we have a single standard for men and women, both morally and economically, we shall have a home that is well worth preserving, and I think we can be quite sure it will be preserved.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to inform hon. members on both sides that when the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) speaks, he closes the debate, and if any other hon. member wishes to express his views he should do so now.

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): As I have followed the debate, Mr. Speaker, I judge that the battle has been fought around the sanctity of the home. That is a point, I think, on which we are all agreed, at least verbally. But a question is arising in my mind as to the meaning we are putting into the words, "the sanctity of the home." I believe there is a fundamental difference of opinion here, and we ought to be frank and confess to it. I believe the mover of the amendment (Mr. Vien) has a somewhat different view of what constitutes the sanctity of the home from the view that I hold. However much I disagree with the mover of the amendment I greatly admire the manner in which he has approached this subject. His view of the sanctity of the home, however, is not one that I could entertain, biblical teaching, especially the teach-  
[Mr. Lapointe.]

ing of Jesus, was centred on the preservation of the sanctity of the home; there was no other consideration in the mind of any biblical teacher. It was not the view of Christ or of the New Testament that the sanctity of the home could be brought about by any legal or ecclesiastical enactment. The sanctity of the home consists in the purity of the home, and the only thing that dissolves the home tie is not the divorce bill, but the act of infidelity. The only logical position for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) to take, believing what he does, that the sanctity of the home must be kept inviolate, is to attach a penalty to the act of infidelity. If infidelity is a crime against the home and against the state, why does the Minister of Justice not make it a penal offence? That is the test that I would apply to the reasoning of the Minister of Justice.

Now, I for one do not deprecate the introduction of theological points of view into this debate; I think it is a good sign that such allusions can be made in this House. But this debate has established once again that you can prove almost anything by Scripture. If I were a polygamist I could substantiate my position quite easily from Scripture, and if I believed in celibacy I could do exactly the same thing. There is no point in referring to Scripture as the hon. member did in moving the amendment. The one thing that he did prove, but which he did not mean to prove, was that the teachers of Scripture were very human and that they recognized the relativity of all human laws and enactments. I think the reference in the New Testament to the Mosaic legislation is very significant. Moses would not have been a wise legislator if he had legislated in any other way than he did. He took into consideration, when he made his laws, the weaknesses of human nature. When we come to the New Testament, the same law of relativity must be confessed. The position of equality as between man and woman is taught in the New Testament, and I judge that that is the point in dispute at the present time. The Apostle Paul was quoted—another case of a biblical teacher whose teaching must be taken very relatively. I think the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) proved that the Sermon on the Mount must be taken relatively if it is to be taken at all. But the teaching of Paul was quoted by the hon. member who moved the amendment, the teaching of Paul with, not its Hebrew background, but its pagan background, because he was dealing solely with pagan customs in regard to marriage and