

well, assume that the hon. gentleman is right, although I do not think the facts are with him, what about the other one-tenth, is there to be no punishment for them? The maximum invariably applies to the other one-tenth, or less. What about the fellow who takes this means of getting out of the country with a small fortune?

Mr. McMASTER: It would be a very small fortune.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that man to escape, because some other fellow is less guilty?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

#### BRONZE COINS—CURRENCY ACT. 1910, AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White Bill No. 25 to amend The Currency Act, 1910, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—New bronze cent:

Mr. BUREAU: In what respect does this Bill differ from the old Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend was absent when the resolution, on which this Bill is founded, was under consideration. I then gave a full explanation with respect to its provisions, but I am quite ready to repeat that information now.

Mr. BUREAU: Never mind, I will look up the record.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I may say that eighty of the present one cent pieces make an avoirdupois pound. Of the new pieces one hundred and forty will make an avoirdupois pound.

The weight of the present piece, the large bronze cent, is  $87\frac{1}{2}$  grains, and it is proposed to make the weight of the new piece 50 grains. It will be slightly larger than the American one-cent piece and thicker than our ten cent piece so as to be readily distinguishable by touch.

Mr. BUREAU: It is smaller than the cent we have?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

[Mr. Meighen.]

#### SUPPLY.

#### IMPERIAL WAR CABINET AND IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE—STATEMENT BY HON. MR. ROWELL.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of External Affairs—Salaries, including Deputy Minister at \$6,000, \$50,075.00. Contingencies, \$15,500.00.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Chairman, this item of the Estimates would appear to afford a suitable opportunity for a brief statement to the House in reference to the work last year of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference. Some members of the House have made inquiries as to what took place at the meetings of these bodies last year, and it is only fitting that the House should be placed in possession of the information which the Government has and which it is at liberty to communicate to the House.

Shortly after the House opened I placed on the Table the report of the Imperial War Conference as published for distribution. The meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference in 1918 were summoned by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in order that matters relating to the prosecution of the war and problems of reconstruction that affected all the Dominions of the Empire as well as Great Britain should be taken into consideration in common council in London. The two bodies exercised different functions. The Imperial War Cabinet dealt with all matters relating to the war and the terms of peace. The Imperial War Conference dealt with problems that might be described as those of reconstruction, and matters of common Imperial concern that were not related to the war or to the terms of peace. That was the broad, general division of work between the

5 p.m. two bodies. They met on alternate days and there were committees of both bodies in session more or less constantly all the time during the whole period that both bodies were meeting. The Imperial War Conference of 1918 was unique in this respect, that it was the first occasion on which India was represented as of right. The hon. members of the House will remember that by the Constitution of the Imperial War Conference, as laid down at the Conference in 1907, it was composed of the representatives of the Mother Country and of the self-governing dominions; India was not entitled under the Constitution then laid down to be represented at the