

Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen,
Toronto, Ontario.

Feb. 22, 1946.

this man in the Privy Council Office there is now emerging there an intermediate group of Ministers, not in the Cabinet, but described as "of Cabinet rank". I have not verified this, but must remember to do so next time I am up at the Parliamentary Library. As to Canada, my impression is that down to the appointment of the first Solicitor General and Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue, the terms "Cabinet", "Ministry", "Government" and "Administration" were used interchangeably here, but that when there was a Solicitor General outside the Cabinet, or when there were Controllers outside the Cabinet, or when there were Parliamentary Secretaries and Under Secretaries during and immediately after the last war, the Ministry included these people, but the Cabinet of course did not. I should be interested to know your opinion. Whether the present Parliamentary Assistants should be called members of the Ministry, though not, of course, of the Cabinet, is apparently a rather difficult point. Common sense and British precedent, I think, say yes. But when the offices were created, King delivered himself of a characteristically muddled and ambiguous statement on the subject, which, as usual, is open to several interpretations. I must look this up again, but I should be much interested to have your opinion on this point also.

I expect to be in Toronto a week from tomorrow, March 2nd, but am to be tied up all morning and all afternoon, so I fear I shall not see you. Gilbert Jackson is inviting a group of economists of the University and, "it is hoped", two officials of the trade union movement, to meet him and his associates to discuss the work he has been doing on economic reconstruction. I am apparently one of the union officials; who the other is, I do not know.

I am hoping to finish tomorrow an article on the appointment of extra Senators under Section 26 of the British North America Act. I have dug up some confidential memoranda by Alexander Mackenzie on his attempt to use Section 26 in 1873, and I propose to consider this attempt and the question of possible future use of the Section. If the Liberals hold office much longer, by the time the next change of Government occurs, there will be nothing but Liberals in the Senate, and the new Government will simply have to invoke Section 26. So at least it seems to me. I shall probably send you a draft of the article for your criticism before I submit it to the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science. I enclose a copy of the note I have sent to the Canadian Historical Review on Mackenzie's memoranda, which you need not bother to return.

Yours sincerely,

Eugene Forsey
Eugene Forsey.