its expenditures, and apparently no attempt is made even now to economize. Here are the figures of expenditure for the month of June:

Expenditure on Consolidated Revenue Account. \$ 9,042,209
Expenditure on Capital Account 54,632,871

Mr. EDWARDS: How much of this expenditure was voted last session for the hon. gentleman's constituency?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: None at all.

Mr. EDWARDS: In public works?

Mr. BUREAU: What about the expenditure on national schools?

Mr. EDWARDS: You might have something a good deal worse than that.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: What about Kingston penitentiary?

Mr. EDWARDS: When the hon, gentleman mentions Kingston penitentiary it shows that he recognizes the necessity for that institution. Does my hon, friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) allege that no money was voted last session for public works in his constituency?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Not that I remember.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will take occasion to refresh my hon. friend's memory.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend has not posted himself in regard to the way in which my constituency has been used by the present Government. Practically no money has been voted for my constituency since the change of Government, and public works started prior to the change of Government are still unfinished. Small improvements of various kinds were very much required. In one case there was a breakwater on which \$10,000 was expended prior to 1911, and which was a very important work, because it gave shelter to the fishermen's boats. A little village had grown up at this breakwater and the result of that expendi-

[Mr. Sinclair.]

ture was a large increase in the production of fish. The number of fishermen increased so that they could not shelter their boats behind the breakwater. In 1912 they asked for \$10,000 additional to complete the work. I have pressed that matter on the attention of the Government at every session of Parliament since then and have asked for that breakwater to be completed, but I have not yet been able to get one dollar for that purpose. That is the way in which my constituency has been treated by the present Administration. That is a matter aside.

Mr. EDWARDS: Two-thirds of the money voted last session for public works was voted for constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: My recollection is that a very small amount was voted for public works in Nova Scotia.

Mr. EDWARDS: Small or large, hon. gentlemen opposite got the big end of it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I should explain to my hon. friend-I have just thought of it now-that in the county of Antigonish there were some small expenditures. When the hon. member asked me the question, I thought he referred to expenditures in the county of Guysborough, but I have the honour to represent two counties which are now one constituency, and if the public accounts were examined it would be found that there were some trifling expenditures in the county of Antigonish, but practically none for Guysborough. However, I was referring to general expenditure. A large part of this expenditure is, I admit, inevitable, but there is also much that could be controlled and reduced. The departments are admitted to be overcrowded with officials—is that not true? The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Carvell) admitted that to be true in his department, but nothing has been done to rectify that condition of affairs. Millions have been spent in Royal Commissions, most of which have been of no use whatever so far as the public is concerned. Here is a question asked by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) last session:

Mr. Casgrain: What has been the cost to the Government to date of the paper inquiry conducted by Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C.?
Sir Thomas White: Total amount paid to March 12, \$75,945,26.

Over \$75,000 for one inquiry which was not then finished. I suppose that the amount will have reached \$100,000 by this time. With these Royal Commissions "as