

will rise again. It is the breath of God which alone gives life to the bodies of men. Freedom, truth and justice, these will endure; for not only do they give life but they continue to give it more abundantly.

What is necessary then to win the present conflict? It is to put on the whole armour of God, not the outward material trappings only, the helmet, the sword and the shield, necessary as they may be for purposes of defence and of attack. Let it never be forgotten that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Let us make sure that the helmet is also one of salvation; the sword, one of the spirit; and the shield, one of faith; that our loins are girt about with truth and that our breastplate is one of righteousness, and that our feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. If these things are ours, and I believe they are the weapons with which Britain and the dominions seek to slay the dragon of nazi Germany to-day, we shall find little difficulty in reconciling our war aims and our peace aims. To slay the dragon which has been fascinating its victims by fear, poisoning the springs of their moral and intellectual being at the source, and which would prey upon their vitals for years to come is clearly the first task of a civilization which would save itself. In equal measure, however, we must strive throughout the struggle itself, and more than ever when the evil dragon of nazism is slain, to see that never again, in our own or in any other land, shall the gods of material power, of worldly possessions and of special privilege be permitted to exercise their sway. Never again must we allow any man or any group of men to subjugate by fear and to crush by the power of might the spirit and the lives of honest and humble men.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I do not propose to follow closely to-night the arguments or the statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I shall have some criticisms to make, but before I do so I should like to congratulate the Prime Minister upon an anniversary in his life which I understand is reached to-day. I am told that thirty-one years ago, on November 12, 1909, he first took his seat in this house as Minister of Labour. I should like on behalf of the group to which I belong—and I am sure I express the feelings of other hon. members as well—to wish him good health and strength to carry on the difficult task that is now his.

I should like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address, and to express to the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton) the appreciation we feel for his kindly reference to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). We feel that in that reference he placed before the people of Canada as well as hon. members of this house one of the reasons why many people who might otherwise oppose the use of force believe that the struggle now in progress is one for the very fundamentals of democracy; for in this parliament on more than one occasion the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rose in his place and freely expressed opinions which were in direct opposition to the views held by a vast majority of the members of this house. The very fact that that could be done in this chamber is in my opinion a demonstration of some democracy in the Dominion of Canada.

I would also congratulate the seconder of the address (Mr. Jutras), and to pass this remark, that his excellent use of the English language and the fact that I am told that he speaks French equally well, coming as he does from an English-speaking province of this dominion, constitute an example which I wish more of our young people throughout this broad dominion would follow. I want to congratulate him upon his ability to use both languages so proficiently.

The members of our group welcome this new session of parliament. We believed, and we believe, that this house should neither adjourn nor prorogue for a longer period than ninety days during the continuance of the present struggle. It is, I think, a sad commentary on the Prime Minister's professions of democracy that he has treated parliament with what I believe to be scant consideration since the outbreak of war. In the first eight crucial months of this great struggle parliament sat for only six business days, including January 25. When it was suggested that parliament should adjourn and not prorogue on August 7 we were careful to inquire if re-assembly on November 5 would be mandatory. The Prime Minister gave us his assurance that it would be. The question was prompted by a desire to prevent a repetition of the farce of January 25. It was with surprise, therefore, that we read in the press the announcement that the meeting on November 5 would be merely formal and that the house would adjourn without discussion until some time in January. The announcement went so far as to say that members who lived at a distance need not attend.

Without entering into the controversy between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie