

ister said that if there was any thought or hint of amalgamation he and his colleagues would resign. Well, in the remarks of the Secretary of State were both the hint and the thought, and I do not know that any member of this government has any right to speak other than as a minister.

Mr. MANION: Might I ask a question?

Mr. HEENAN: I would rather you did not.

Mr. MANION: I thought my hon. friend would not like it.

An hon. MEMBER: Talk insurance, not railways.

Mr. HEENAN: I would sooner talk sense than sit over there and talk nonsense. I do not know why, when we appeal to the government for unemployment insurance, they should loll in their seats and take no definite stand in the matter. Not one minister has spoken, though this same government has put sixty-five thousand railway men out of work since they came into office.

An hon. MEMBER: You put one out of work every summer.

Mr. HEENAN: I did that for a purpose; I did it to be unique. I wanted to be known as the only man that the Bennett government ever put into overalls.

An hon. MEMBER: You are unique all right.

Mr. HEENAN: What does my hon. friend do between sessions? Does he just loll in his seat as he is doing at the present time, and do nothing; does he go back into a law office or a doctor's office; does he go on the farm or into the factory; does he just clip coupons, or what does he do? That same suggestion has been made here once or twice before. It is a peculiar thing that our doctors, lawyers, merchants and coupon clippers who go back into their offices between sessions pick on the only man who goes back into overalls. It must be wrong for me to do that, but I am not a bit ashamed. I am proud, and I thank God I am able to do it. It is honest toil, and because of it I am more able to speak for the labouring men of this country than are my hon. friends who sit lolling in their seats and will not take part in these debates.

Mr. BROWN: I want to protest against the hon. member's statement, that he is the only member who goes back into overalls.

Mr. HEENAN: I said the only member who went back into overalls to make an honest living.

While I am discussing the question, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out the importance of this kind of legislation. At page 42 of the Labour Gazette I find the following:

The number of man-days worked on state-aided projects on a wage basis numbered 1,157,559 during the first eleven months of 1933, while to those employed on useful works in return for subsistence and a small cash allowance 8,494,212 man-days' work were given. This was a total of 9,651,771 man-days of employment afforded in 1933 up to November 30. During 1932, the man-days worked on a wage basis numbered 7,700,709.

There is something wrong here; these figures have not been completed, or if they are complete there is only one thing we can deduce from them. It is that the men who performed the 7,700,709 man-days of work on a wage basis in 1932 were put on a subsistence basis in 1933. I am sure the government must be proud of that record; in 1933 they gave 8,494,212 man-days of work for subsistence and a small cash payment. In the government returns these men are counted as employed; this government does not hesitate to include these men in the aggregate as employed persons, yet they give this note here, which is not sufficiently complete to assist in analyzing the situation from one year to another, in which they say the men are working for their subsistence and a small cash allowance. I am sorry they had the nerve to include in a government report the statement that this government provides for 8,000,000 days'-work in a year, on a subsistence basis. In the summer time in northern Ontario they pay \$5 a month, and their board. Of that \$5 this government contributes \$2.50. If one were to analyze these figures and direct them to the number of days worked, I do not know where he would come out. Hon. gentlemen across the way talk about the five cent speech. They throw remarks across the house about five cents which was mentioned one day in this House of Commons. But they are not giving even five cents; they are giving only one cent. I have in my pocket at the moment a cheque for one cent paid out to a man in the province of Ontario—and he is a white man at that. It appears to be the pay for a month's work, evidently after he had paid for small pieces of tobacco, and supplies of that type. When he had made these payments he had one cent left. The only redeeming feature about it, as I said before, is that the cheque was made out to a man called Caesar. Evidently the government have been reading the