

Mr. LOW: It is not a question of insisting; it is a question simply of allowing it to remain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the minister allow it to remain? The minister knows that all he has to do is to recommend an alteration and it goes into effect; he does not need to initial any qualification at all. This is his qualification. Now, if he has changed his mind and finds the commission right, is he not prepared to apologize for what he said a year ago?

Mr. LOW: I have no apology to make to the commission. I am of the same opinion as I was last year, and I shall use practically the same words to express it again: I am of the opinion that many good men who are not university graduates would make splendid trade commissioners. But that regulation was there when I took over the department, and to date, I have not changed it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister cannot put it that way. It is not a matter of simply not changing it; the minister has ratified it himself. The minister has ratified it in his department; so has his deputy. This matter was drawn to my attention by a man who came to my office and complained that because of the war he had not been able to finish his university course, and he wanted to know if this was an ironclad regulation which would prevent his trying the examination. I made inquiry because I had heard the minister say he had no use for this regulation at all—for this qualification. It is not a regulation; it is a qualification.

Mr. LOW: The right hon. gentleman says I have no use for the regulation. I quite agree that a man with some business experience, although he is forty years of age would perhaps make a much better representative than the younger man with the university training.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the point. The qualifications demand a university education, and that is demanded at the instance of the minister. I had occasion to inquire because this man called upon me, and here is the minister himself insisting upon this qualification that last year he ridiculed in order to strike at the commission. That is the position the minister is in now. And not only this qualification but another one, where it was insisted the man should be thirty-five years of age. This was also held up to scorn, and now I see the minister insists upon it himself. What I cannot understand is why the minister does not stand up and say, these are proper

[Mr. Meighen.]

qualifications, because these qualifications are his own. What is here in this advertisement is with his own authority, for I had occasion to find out.

Mr. LOW: I suppose my hon. friend knows that the age limit of thirty-five is laid down in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like to dispute a thing too positively until I know, but I do not think it is. Certainly the other qualification is not; that is the minister's own.

Mr. LOW: That is right.

Mr. LOGAN: I am not going to make any extended remarks on this vote to-night, because there will be a vote in the supplementaries, I presume, which we can discuss at greater length. I desire to urge upon the minister that if he has the power to change that regulation in reference to a man being a university graduate and being under the age of thirty-two, I think it is, not thirty-five as the right hon. leader of the opposition stated—

Mr. MEIGHEN: My own impression is the act does not say anything about the age. It is thirty-five in the advertisement.

Mr. LOW: I think it was thirty-two prior to this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was the act changed?

Mr. LOW: The act was not changed at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister said it was in the act; I thought he was wrong.

Mr. LOGAN: I am glad three years have been added on in the last year. I look upon the regulation that a man shall be a university graduate and not over thirty-five years of age to be a trade commissioner as the height of nonsense. I would rather have a man with experience in business whether he was fifty-five years of age—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member said he was glad the three years had been added. That makes it worse according to his view. He must be thirty-five now.

Mr. GRAHAM: He cannot be over thirty-five now.

Mr. LOGAN: I think that is the age limit. He cannot be over thirty-five. That is better than thirty-two. I think we had better have this matter cleared up before we take up the supplementary estimates, because the right hon. leader of the opposition says one thing