

virtually what it means if what the minister states now is the case. The situation in Mexico is very much the same. Mexico was very much chagrined in connection with American traders and American trade, and was anxious to extend a good deal of that trade to Canada; it was so stated to our representatives who were sent down there by the government of Canada. Yet nothing has been done to foster that trade. I am sorry the minister has not been able to give us some encouragement in this direction. If, as he states, these are the facts, and nothing has been done, then it does not speak very well for the expansion of Canadian trade. The minister refers to the excess of exports over imports last year. That is all right, but it is not reaching out into those new markets which are close to Canada and which are likely to increase year by year if we foster them and take care of them. The excess of exports referred to by the minister was governed for the most part by the exceptionally large grain crop of 1923.

Mr. LOW: I did not speak of the imports; I referred only to exports.

Mr. STEVENS: It was the increase of exports, and that was largely attributable to the abnormally heavy grain crop of 1923; in fact, the export ran into the midsummer of 1924. All that is very true, but I do deplore the failure to take advantage of this new business which was offered to us. In addition to that, there is the Australian business. Has the minister any information to give us with regard to Australian trade?

Mr. LOW: As to the Australian agreement, that question has been answered almost every day of the last week by the Prime Minister. I have nothing further to add in that respect. With regard to trade with Fiji, it was the opinion of Sir Henry Thornton upon investigation that the business would not warrant the weekly service that was requested.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I remember correctly, last year the minister passed some strictures on the Civil Service Commission for having a regulation that only university graduates could be appointed trade commissioners. Is the minister of the same view still—that this regulation is wrong?

Mr. LOW: I am of exactly the same opinion as I was at that time—that many good men who are not university graduates would make splendid trade commissioners. But the regulation still stands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say he has not himself approved of that regulation since?

Mr. LOW: The regulation still remains.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a regulation at all. The minister himself submits to the Civil Service Commission the qualifications he requires in an applicant. The reason the matter came up was that one of the many civil service advertisements that go out calling for applications for new positions reached my office, and I read the following:

Wanted, four junior trade commissioners, male, Department of Trade and Commerce. Salary \$1,500 per annum if without business experience. Candidates who have had at least three years' business experience will receive a salary of \$1,800 per annum. Qualifications required, graduation from a university of recognized standing on or before the date of examination. . .

There are other qualifications, but this is one essential—and this advertisement is dated March 23 of this year. How does the minister explain having these qualifications insisted on by his own department this year when last year he censured the Civil Service Commission because it had insisted on them?

Mr. LOW: I am simply continuing the rule that was in force when I took over the department. I have not yet decided to change it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the minister condemned the rule, and if he condemns it now why does he stay with it? He condemned the rule and condemned the commission; indeed he held them up to ridicule in this House. When I saw this advertisement I made inquiries to find out what was the matter. I knew the minister had endeavoured to make capital against the commission in this parliament for putting up what he called an absurd rule—that nobody but a university graduate could be a trade commissioner; and the information I got was that the minister's own department and his own deputy and the minister himself, had insisted on it. The minister cannot deny that right now.

Mr. LOW: The Civil Service Commission drew that regulation in the first instance; I suppose my right hon. friend knows that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has nothing to do with it. I inquired because I recognized that this was wholly at variance with what the minister had said and my information was that it was submitted to the minister's department, and the minister's department themselves insisted on this qualification being inserted. Has the minister not an apology to make to the commission?