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Research in the R. B. Bennett Papers several years ago uncovered the very serious controversy which had surrounded the appointment of Saskatchewan Senator Arthur Marcotte and led to the publication of an article entitled, "Religious and Racial Influences on a Senate Appointment, 1931." The question arose as to whether that case was an isolated one or whether there were other Senate appointments equally troublesome to Bennett during his tenure as Prime Minister of Canada from 1930 to 1935.

This thesis proposes to answer that question by exploring in detail the circumstances surrounding all thirty-three of Bennett's appointments. Consideration is given to the successful, as well as many of the unsuccessful, candidates. In a perusal, this time on microfilm, of all the pertinent information on the Senate to be found in the Bennett Papers as well as a reading of the major newspapers of that day, it was found that while none of the other Senate selections generated anything like the turmoil which characterized the Marcotte appointment, each, in its own way, did cause Bennett considerable concern.

The Prime Minister had some very definite guidelines in making his selections, including consideration of religion, race, geography, age and political service. Through the years he sought to adhere to them, but extenuating circumstances frequently made it impossible for him to give equal weight to them all. Whatever the criteria for each choice made, undoubtedly Bennett was deeply involved in every one of the thirty-three appointments.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Richard Bedford Bennett was deeply involved with the Senate throughout his five-year tenure as Prime Minister of Canada. He made thirty-three appointments to the upper chamber which Sir John A. Macdonald once described as the provision for a "sober second thought in legislation."

When Bennett and his Conservative party came to power in July 1930, the Senate was made up of ninety-six members—twenty-four from Quebec, twenty-four from Ontario, twenty-four from the three Maritime provinces, and twenty-four from the four western provinces. Between 1930 and 1935, however, vacancies occurred in every region—nine in Quebec, seven in Ontario, six in Nova Scotia, three in New Brunswick, three in Saskatchewan, two in Manitoba, one in British Columbia, one in Alberta and one in Prince Edward Island. Then, as now, it was the prerogative of the Prime Minister to make Senate appointments. No doubt he was influenced to a certain extent by cabinet colleagues and party supporters, but in each of the thirty-three appointments, the final decision appears to have been his.

Competition for the Senate appointments was very keen. Astonishingly, more than eleven thousand pages of correspondence relative to this subject passed through Bennett's office during the five-year period. From all across the country, aspirants and supporters of aspirants sought to put in writing their views on the appointments. Quebec led the way with the amassing of 3,031 pages; Saskatchewan followed with 2,215, Ontario with 2,078 and New Brunswick with 1,975. Alberta accumulated
761 pages on behalf of its one seat, Manitoba 745 for its two seats, Nova Scotia a mere 672 for its six. Prince Edward Island accounted for the fewest number, only 17 in all, while British Columbia mustered 54. The large volume of correspondence from Quebec reflected the propensity of individual French Canadians to petition in support of their favorite candidates. Often such petitions filled hundreds of pages, frequently they were repetitive. The Acadian seats in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia evoked a similar response as did Alberta's sole seat and Saskatchewan's first vacancy.

It is probable that Bennett put very little stock in such petitions. Once he remarked that they were "so easily signed." For the selection of new senators, the Prime Minister established his own astute guidelines.

The factor of religion was of paramount importance. Precedent had established the number of Roman Catholic seats in each province. Except for unusual circumstances, it must be followed without question. Bennett was Protestant, but he welcomed suggestions from senior members of the Roman Catholic clergy and frequently carried on very frank exchanges of views with them. He believed it was essential to have the approval of the hierarchy before a Catholic appointment was made. The racial factor was important too, particularly in eastern Canada. For example, in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia an Acadian senator must succeed an Acadian; in Ontario the proportion of Franco-Ontarian representation must be maintained; in Quebec there could be no alteration in the traditional number of French/English Catholic/Protestant seats. In the selection process geography too must play a role. The various regions within the provinces were entitled to their share of representation. Consideration
must be given to the age of the candidate. The Prime Minister expressed the opinion that, barring exceptional circumstances, the appointee should not be over sixty-five. It was also desirable that the would-be senator have the support of his local party leaders. Finally, as might be expected, a primary prerequisite to a Senate appointment was long-time service to the Conservative party.

The records indicate that the last-mentioned guideline was duly respected. Of the thirty-three Bennett appointees, all but nine had sat in the House of Commons or in one of the provincial legislatures; only five had never run for public office. Of course, there was a degree of adherence to the other guidelines. However, in the following pages, an attempt will be made to show that frequently extenuating circumstances forced the Prime Minister to abandon one or more of his guidelines and to make choices which he would not otherwise have made.

The complexion of the appointments made on seven different occasions throughout the five years shows a significant change between the earlier appointments and those made in the dying days of the administration. The first sixteen selections made between July 1931 and December 1933 included no sitting members of the House of Commons and but one member of a legislature; the seventeen selected in 1935 included eleven members of the House, one member of the Manitoba legislature, and three cabinet ministers.

The thirty-three appointments will be discussed in chronological order beginning with the three made in 1931 and concluding with the seventeen made in the last months of the Conservative administration. In addition, the cases of a number of unsuccessful candidates will be considered in an attempt to show the dilemma which Bennett had to face when several equally qualified people vied for a single Senate seat.
NOTES

1University of New Brunswick, R. B. Bennett Papers, (unless otherwise specified, all subsequent quotations are from the Bennett papers. These papers were read on microfilms borrowed from the University of New Brunswick Library and at the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa. In addition, the papers pertaining to the Senate appointments in Saskatchewan were read in the originals at the Public Archives of Canada in 1971) R. B. Bennett to C. C. Pearson, 16 May 1934, p. 425509.

Although R. B. Bennett assumed the mantle of Prime Minister of Canada on 7 August 1930, it was not until 6 July 1931 that he made his first two Senate appointments, Arthur Marcotte from Saskatchewan and Pat Burns from Alberta, with the nomination of General A. D. McRae from British Columbia following two months later.

The appointments of Burns and McRae met with almost universal approval from the western press, most of which was Liberal, while the appointment of Marcotte received very little press coverage even in his own province of Saskatchewan. It is probably safe to say that no Senate appointment gave Bennett more pleasure than that of Pat Burns and that none was made more reluctantly than that of Arthur Marcotte. Pat Burns had never applied for a senatorship nor had he been a politically-active Conservative. In his case, the appointment was truly a gift of the Prime Minister to an old friend who was an outstanding citizen of Alberta and western Canada. Arthur Marcotte, on the other hand, made his first application just a few weeks after the Conservatives came to power and kept up a steady barrage of letters until he became a senator some ten months later.

When the Prime Minister announced in Regina in late December 1930 that the Saskatchewan vacancy would be filled by a Catholic, the objections which he received from many Conservatives throughout the province and from members of the Co-operative government of Premier J. T. M. Anderson could
hardly have been unexpected, given the political climate there at that time. Many Conservatives harbored anti-Catholic feelings, some of these traceable to the late 1920's and the appearance in Saskatchewan of the Ku Klux Klan. Frustrated by their inability to defeat the Liberals at the polls and believing that a good deal of the Liberal success was due to its virtual stranglehold on the Catholic vote, many Conservatives had been a receptive audience when Klansmen vehemently attacked growing sectarianism in the public school system. Unfortunately for the Conservative party, some of this resentment against the "expanding influence" of the Roman Catholic church spilled over into party ranks. It was not long before Catholics who had been life-long Conservatives were made to feel unwelcome in the governing ranks of the party. Bennett, then leader of the Opposition, deplored this turn of events and did everything in his power to ease the situation, but with only partial success. Before the Saskatchewan election in June 1929, Conservative leader J. T. M. Anderson had assured Bennett that "our Roman Catholic friends are beginning to see we are not the monsters of intolerance our opposition paint us" to which the national party leader replied with obvious relief, "Few things have pleased me more than hearing that our Roman Catholic friends no longer regard you as a bigot." The election of 6 June brought great jubilation in Conservative party ranks. Although they had not achieved an over-all majority, the Conservatives were able to form a Co-operative government with the help of four Progressives and six Independents--most of whom had been financed by the Conservatives--thus unseating the Liberal government which had been in power for twenty-four years. There is little doubt that Anderson had garnered a sizeable anti-Catholic vote as had a number of the Independents elected.
One of the main planks in the Conservative platform had been the abolition of sectarianism in the public schools. When the new Co-operative government introduced amendments to the Public Schools Act which prohibited the presence of religious emblems and the wearing of religious garb in the schools, not unexpectedly the Catholics objected strenuously, particularly when it affected a few public schools which only Catholic children attended. In early 1931, after a study of elementary pupils in French Canadian communities had shown that the latter were scholastically inferior to their English-speaking counterparts, Premier Anderson as Minister of Education introduced a further amendment which abolished the use of French in the first year of school and another which specified that all school trustees must be able to speak and write English and be able to conduct meetings in English. These language restrictions, on top of the religious legislation, aroused the anger of French Canadians all across the country and made them unyielding in their demand that their chosen representative, Arthur Marcotte, be appointed to the Senate to succeed the late Senator J. G. Turriff.

Bennet's decision to appoint a Catholic had nothing to do with this school legislation, however. In 1921 the province's only Catholic senator, the late Ben Prince, had been succeeded by James Calder, a Protestant. The Prime Minister was convinced that Catholic representation should be restored in spite of opposition from many local Conservatives. He was just as certain that the appointment should go to the north inasmuch as the other five senators came from the south, "on or south of the Canadian Pacific Railway line." What he did not concede was that the Catholic selected should necessarily be a French Canadian. He frequently pointed out that the French in Saskatchewan were only five percent of the province's total population and only twenty-five percent of the province's Catholic population. Surely the English-speaking
Catholics had as strong, if not a stronger, claim to the appointment than did the French. In Bennett's eyes, fifty-eight year old Arthur Marcotte was just one of many Catholic candidates being considered, and the fact that he lived in Ponteix in the south-western part of the province all but eliminated him as far as the Prime Minister was concerned.

Marcotte, a native of Quebec, was a long-time Conservative worker who had run unsuccessfully for the Saskatchewan legislature in 1912 and 1917 and for the House of Commons in 1926. He had been President of the Bar Association for the Judicial District of Gravelbourg since 1925 and was Vice-President of the French Canadian Catholic Association from 1925 until 1929. Marcotte and his supporters stressed in letters and petitions that only by appointing a French Canadian could Bennett show that he did not condone the actions of the Anderson government. A Catholic was not enough; the choice had to be a French Catholic. They contended that as long as the French Canadian appointee was a true representative of his people, it did not matter where he lived. He would be representing all of his people throughout the province, not a particular geographic area.

There is no doubt that Marcotte had the support of most of the church hierarchy in the province as well as that of Bennett's cabinet colleagues from Quebec, Arthur Sauvé, Maurice Dupré and Alfred Duranleau. The attitude of his French-speaking supporters from across the country was perhaps best summed up by Manitoba Senator Aime Bénard when he wrote:

I support Marcotte not because he is Marcotte, but because he is a Frenchman and a Conservative, because he is acceptable to both the French people and to the Catholic authorities and to our own Party. If you can name me another man from Northern Saskatchewan who has all these qualifications I am ready to meet you and, all things being equal, to support him.

However, Bennett continued to see it as a religious rather than a racial
question, and in answer to yet another letter from Marcotte, he said:

Neither you nor anyone else has met the argument that the next senator should come from the northern part of the province and be a Catholic. You reside in the southern part of the province and, therefore, do not qualify for this vacancy.

It was Premier Anderson who helped put an end to the impasse when he introduced the above-mentioned language amendments. After reading an account of the introduction of the bill, A. W. Merriam, Bennett's private secretary, wired Attorney General M. A. MacPherson:

HOPE YOU REALIZE THIS MAKES CONDITIONS VERY DIFFICULT FOR CHIEF AND WILL PROBABLY RESULT IN DOWNFALL OF FEDERAL CONSERVATIVE ADMINISTRATION. IT WILL DIVIDE COUNTRY AND DO MORE TO WRECK CANADIAN UNITY AT THIS TIME THAN ANY OTHER SINGLE THING THAT HAS HAPPENED FOR MANY YEARS. AM VERY MUCH AFRAID IT WILL RESULT IN IMMEDIATE APPOINTMENT OF FRENCH CATHOLIC TO SENATE.

Although the appointment was not made for another four months, there is no doubt that the actions of the Anderson government led to the selection of Arthur Marcotte. Bennett, who had said he "positively will not become a party to all the senators living in the south," eventually bowed to the political pressure being exerted on him by French Canadians right across the country and appointed a sixth senator from the south.

It is certainly possible, however, that the Prime Minister could have withstood this pressure and followed the dictates of his own beliefs had there been one outstanding English-speaking Catholic who had the support of both the church and the party, but such was not the case. J. J. Leddy and Joseph Foley, the two leading candidates, were both from the north and were long-time Conservative stalwarts, but in the turbulent days of the late 1920's, one had antagonized the Conservative politicians by his outspoken condemnation of Anderson's proposed school legislation, while the other had lost the backing of the church hierarchy by siding
with his party rather than with his church.

J. J. Leddy from Saskatoon had been a Supreme Director of the Knights of Columbus in Canada and was considered to be its outstanding member in northern Saskatchewan. He had been a victim of the anti-Catholic feeling at the 1928 Conservative convention when, despite his long years of service to the party, he had been frozen out of a position on the executive. His beliefs later forced him to condemn the Co-operative government's school legislation, and he thereby gained the animosity of the Conservative-led government at the same time as he reinforced his position as an outstanding Catholic layman. Thus, when asked to comment on Leddy's claims, the church hierarchy gave him full and enthusiastic endorsement, while members of the Anderson government condemned him wholeheartedly.9

Joseph Foley, on the other hand, had maintained a discreet silence over the legislation and thus became the most acceptable Catholic in the province insofar as the Anderson government was concerned. Foley also had the support of Saskatchewan Senators H. W. Laird and A. B. Gillis, and former Prime Minister Arthur Meighen confirmed that he would have appointed Foley in 1921 to replace the French Canadian Ben Prince had it not been for the last-minute intrusion of James Calder. Meighen went on to say that he recalled the "manly way he accepted the situation" and that he wished there was something he could do to help him. With the church hierarchy, however, it was a different story. As Bishop Joseph Prud'homme of Prince Albert and Saskatoon said, "I strongly oppose the appointment of Mr. Foley of North Battleford if you intend to appoint a Catholic as Mr. Foley can not in any way represent worthily the Catholics." Unfortunately for Foley, the Prime Minister could no more see his way clear to appointing him over the objections of his own church than he could to choosing Leddy over the objections of almost all of
the Conservative politicians in Saskatchewan. He had little choice, therefore, but to accede to the demands of the French Canadians and elevate Arthur Marcotte to the Senate.

Ironically, in appointing Marcotte as he did, Bennett lost a good political worker in Saskatchewan. Once he had obtained the position he coveted, Marcotte seldom appeared in Saskatchewan, choosing instead to spend his free time in Quebec. In 1934 he aroused the ire of his fellow Conservatives when he refused to appear in Gravelbourg on behalf of the local Conservative candidate. In a long and bitter letter to M. A. MacPherson, a copy of which he sent to the Prime Minister, Marcotte indicated he was not willing to "forgive and forget" the abuses of the Anderson government against members of his religion and race. The fact that he had received his appointment because the Prime Minister wanted it to be known that he, too, deplored the excesses of the Saskatchewan government was either forgotten or ignored. Marcotte complained to MacPherson of incidents dating back to 1928 and also about the fact that Anderson had not included a Catholic in his cabinet and had abolished the judicial district of Gravelbourg as an "economy" measure. Furthermore, he claimed that in its redistribution bill, the government had made it virtually impossible for a French Canadian Conservative to get elected in the Gravelbourg district. But perhaps the chief reason for Marcotte's animosity towards the Anderson government surfaced when he reminded MacPherson that "outside of yourself, the members of your government have bitterly fought against my appointment."

For Bennett, Marcotte's attitude was like a slap in the face. "I had not the slightest idea that any such condition as that to which you refer existed between you and the Anderson government," he wrote. "In the light of your letter, I realize how great a strain your appointment was upon many of
our Party friends." The following day he remarked to a friend, "There is no such thing as gratitude in politics." Perhaps Bennett should have realized that Marcotte saw no reason whatever to be grateful for an appointment that he felt had been rightfully his.

* * * *

The vacancy in Alberta occurred four months after the one in Saskatchewan, on 11 April 1931 upon the death of Senator Prosper E. Lessard. Once again Bennett announced that the new appointee would be a Catholic but, as had been the case in Saskatchewan, at no time did he intimate that it should necessarily be a French Catholic. He had also made up his mind that the appointment would go to the south although Senator Lessard was from Edmonton. He again received many petitions from French Canadian organizations across the country urging the elevation of one of their race, but the situation in Alberta was different in that no single candidate had their backing.

It is probable that the Prime Minister would have given more serious consideration to one of the French Canadian candidates had he not realized that the events of the previous few months would likely force him to appoint Marcotte. Although the French Canadians felt they were entitled to both appointments, the one in Saskatchewan was much more meaningful to them because of the political climate there. The newspapers in Quebec had treated the Marcotte bid in Saskatchewan as a "cause célèbre", but they were not inclined to muster such support for the Alberta hopefuls.

The way was paved, therefore, for the appointment of an English Catholic in Alberta, and Pat Burns was the Prime Minister's choice. Burns was born in 1856 and moved west in 1878 to engage in the cattle trade. He was a boyhood friend of William MacKenzie of MacKenzie and Mann and this contact no doubt
helped him to obtain the contract to supply meat to the railroad construction crews in Saskatchewan in 1888-89 and later in Alberta. This experience led him into the wholesale distribution of livestock in British Columbia and into the meat packing business in Calgary. He was the first man to ship western livestock by railroad to eastern markets. Despite many setbacks, including being burned out twice, Pat Burns and Company grew to such an extent that he was able to sell it to Dominion Securities in 1928 for fifteen million dollars. Burns remained as Chairman of the Board of this company and was a director of the Bank of Montreal, of Imperial Life and of Calgary and Edmonton Corporation, Limited. Burns was also a philanthropist, although the widespread assistance he gave to the needy was little publicized. In recognition of such deeds, however, the Pope conferred on him the Knight Commander of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great.

Burns's seventy-fifth birthday celebration marked the opening of the Calgary Stampede festivities of 1931 with seven hundred attending his birthday dinner and an additional fifteen thousand sharing in his huge birthday cake later in the evening. The high point of the evening was the reading of a telegram from Prime Minister Bennett announcing his appointment to the Senate along with the comment, "You have given generously to every good cause and your life has been an inspiration to the younger generation." Premier Brownlee of the United Farmers of Alberta welcomed his elevation saying, "No choice could possibly be more popular or better deserved and could meet with more general approval from the citizens of Alberta." Burns also received congratulations from the Lieutenant-Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the Premier of British Columbia, all of whom were present to help him celebrate his birthday.

There were a number of other applicants vying for the Alberta seat
including Judge Emily Murphy, Adéodot Boileau, Dr. Luc LeBel and J. Romeo Miquelon, but none, with the possible exception of Mrs. Murphy, was as well known or as well loved as Burns.

Judge Emily Murphy of Edmonton was hopeful that the Prime Minister would appoint her in recognition of the thirteen-year struggle she and the other members of the "Famous Five" had carried on to have women declared eligible for the Senate. She pointed out that no western Canadian woman had served in the Senate and that the vacancy existed in Edmonton where she lived. Furthermore, her ancestors, the Fergusons and the Gowans, had been members of the Senate, the House of Commons or one of the provincial legislatures for over a century; it was her desire to follow in their footsteps. She felt she could do "right excellent work for your Government" and that "generally speaking, the people of Canada are expecting my appointment." Bennett repeatedly told Mrs. Murphy and her supporters that she was not eligible because the seat "belonged" to the Catholics, but she claimed that she would be representing women from all across the country and religion did not matter. Finally Bennett wrote "with some reluctance" to tell her he thought it "well there should be no misunderstanding, no false hopes of an appointment which cannot be made." Bennett had made up his mind that the appointment would go to a Catholic and nobody could change his mind about that, not even the persuasive Emily Murphy.

Adéodot Boileau had considerable support for the appointment from French Canadian groups, particularly those in the north. He also gained the backing of various Catholic ethnic groups and of D. M. Duggan, the Alberta Conservative leader. In his mid-forties, Boileau was a good platform speaker who had supported the Conservative party for twenty five years. He did not make a strong bid on his own behalf; merely he stated that if, in view of
the political situation in the various provinces as well as the different parts of Alberta, the Prime Minister decided to favor him with the appointment, he would be "deeply appreciative."\(^{17}\)

Dr. Luc LeBel had strong support also from various French Canadian groups as well as from many English Catholics. LeBel had come to Alberta from Rivière du Loup, Quebec, after the 1917 election. He had run provincially in 1905, federally in 1908 and 1911 and, like so many long-suffering Conservatives in Quebec, he was defeated each time. In 1917 he chose to run as a Unionist candidate; he lost not only the election but his practice as well. It was then he decided to move west and make a new start. He settled in Lac Labiche where he very quickly established himself as one of the town's leading citizens. LeBel sought the support of several cabinet ministers asking them to approach the Prime Minister on his behalf. But it was to no avail; he, too, was doomed to disappointment.\(^{18}\)

Romeo Miquelon had been a resident of Calgary since 1886 and had the support of Bishop Kidd, Armand Lavergne who was deputy speaker of the House of Commons, the French Canadian Association of Calgary and several members of parliament. He did not write to the Prime Minister to seek an appointment, but he did have his nephew, a member of the Quebec Legislative Assembly, approach the French Canadian members of parliament on his behalf. Bennett does not seem to have given serious consideration to Miquelon; even though they were old friends.\(^{19}\)

Of all the Albertans who applied for a senatorship, it is likely that Emily Murphy would have received the most serious consideration had another vacancy occurred. She had widespread support and was beneficiary of mounting pressure on the Conservatives to appoint a woman to counter-balance the favorable impression being made by Liberal Cairine Wilson.
The third senator to be named in 1931 was General A. D. McRae of Vancouver. He was elevated to the Senate on 4 September, a short time after the death of Senator S. J. Crowe. After the competition he had encountered in his appointments to the two prairie seats, Bennett must have found it a pleasant task to make his British Columbia appointment with little or no opposition. Only two men, H. S. Clements and C. H. Dickie, made bids to succeed Senator Crowe. But these were but token bids and both said they would withdraw their applications in favor of General McRae. Dickie made the suggestion that if the Prime Minister thought McRae would be more valuable in the cabinet, he would be glad to resign his Vancouver Island seat so that McRae could seek election to the House of Commons. However, this suggestion was never seriously considered.

There is no question that in General McRae, Bennett had appointed a man of outstanding ability. He had arrived in Vancouver in 1907 after a successful colonization venture on the prairies and took an active part immediately in the sale of railway townsite lands. Already a wealthy man, he became involved in both lumbering and fishing but, when the war broke out, he severed all his corporation ties to become a Lieutenant-Colonel in charge of remount purchasing west of Winnipeg. In 1917 he was honored with the Order of Commander of the Bath for meritorious service; in 1918 he was seconded to the Imperials with the rank of Major General to organize the Ministry of Information. After an abortive attempt to gain power in British Columbia in the early 1920's with his Provincial Party, he was elected to the House of Commons in 1926 subsequently to help organize R. B. Bennett's campaign to gain the leadership of the Conservative party in 1927. He was Conservative campaign organizer in the 1930 election and, although much of the success of that campaign was attributed to him, he lost his own seat in Vancouver North
and temporarily retired from public life. Most of the press reaction to McRae's appointment was positive, the only somewhat negative note appearing in the Vancouver Sun. In an editorial headed "End of a Promising Career", the Sun said the appointment recalled the saying, "Another good man gone wrong" and stated that "a man with his energy, imagination and administrative capacity belongs in the front line of public life or nowhere." The editorial writer conceded that McRae might have been eligible for the "elder statesman's paradise" after twenty more years of service, but not yet; his talents should have been enlisted to handle the unemployment situation where more than a half million people were jobless. The Vancouver Province wondered aloud whether or not it should congratulate McRae, but it had no doubt that the Senate deserved congratulations. The Province hoped that McRae would act as a "tonic" in the upper chamber and "jar it out of its habitual calm." However, McRae himself did not share this pessimistic view of the Senate and he wired the Prime Minister that he would be "delighted" to accept. A few days later he reported that his appointment had gone over "100%" with the active members of the party although some of his friends thought he should "clean up the dog drivel in Victoria." He admitted that public regard for the Senate was at a very low ebb and expressed hope that the Prime Minister would succeed in his efforts "to restore it to something like its old usefulness and respect."

It is interesting to note that although British Columbia, like Saskatchewan before the appointment of Marcotte, had no Catholic senator, at no time did Bennett suggest that a Catholic be appointed on the west coast. Presumably the Catholic population in the province was not large enough or perhaps sufficiently vocal to influence the Prime Minister to
consider the filling of the vacancy by a member of the minority. There is no evidence that either the French or the English-speaking Catholics expected such an appointment, but perhaps the speed with which Bennett named General McRae headed off a spate of petitions from Catholic organizations the like of which flooded the Prime Minister's office before the vacancies in Alberta and Saskatchewan were filled.
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1932: FEBRUARY, OCTOBER

The year 1932 was marked by six new Senate appointments--four in February and two in October. Undoubtedly the best known appointee was former Prime Minister Arthur Meighen who was elevated on 3 February, subsequently to be named government leader in the Senate and a Minister without Portfolio in the Bennett cabinet. Also named on that date were two men from Nova Scotia, W. H. Dennis and Dr. John A. MacDonald, and from Montreal, C. C. Ballantyne. In October two more Quebec vacancies were filled by J. H. Rainville and A. J. Brown.

The appointment of Meighen was hailed by most observers as an excellent move by Bennett. Meighen did not seek the position himself, but Robert A. Reid, a Toronto lawyer who was well known to Bennett, suggested that Meighen would make an outstanding replacement for the late Sir George Foster and for Senate leader W. B. Willoughby who was expected to resign due to ill health. It was Reid's opinion that such a move would be very beneficial as far as public opinion was concerned; these sentiments were echoed by Senator Edward Michener of Calgary. Bennett promised both men he would give serious consideration to their suggestions. Within a few weeks the appointment was made.¹

The Toronto Globe reported that for a time there was some doubt as to what the attitude of some Quebec senators would be. However, an unofficial canvass of the Conservative senators eventually confirmed that Meighen would be acceptable to them; his choice as leader of the Senatorial
caucus would be unanimous. The *Halifax Herald* in an editorial entitled "Able Leadership," said that Meighen's appointment "recalls to parliament perhaps the most consummate debator of our times, and will give the Senate such leadership as it has not enjoyed for generations." It added that Meighen would help restore public confidence in the Senate which should be much more than a "political hunting ground."²

Meighen, of course, had had an illustrious career. First elected to the House of Commons in 1908, he became leader of the Conservative party and Prime Minister of Canada in July 1920. His government was defeated by the Liberals in December 1921 and he suffered personal defeat in his home riding of Portage la Prairie. In January 1922 he was elected in a by-election in Grenville, Ontario; in 1925 he was elected once again, this time successful in Portage la Prairie. He served briefly as Prime Minister in 1926 but in the election of that year the Liberals were re-elected and Meighen himself rejected by the voters of Portage la Prairie. The following year R. B. Bennett succeeded Meighen as leader of the Conservative party and Leader of the Opposition. At this point Meighen took up residence in Toronto where he remained until summoned to the Senate.³

Unquestionably Meighen was a very effective senator and Bennett had little reason to regret the appointment of his former colleague. Three years later, however, events occurred which left both men very bitter. In January 1935 Bennett refused to proceed with a Royal Commission to investigate allegations concerning Meighen's conduct as an Ontario Hydro Commissioner. Meighen believed that only in an impartial hearing by a federal judge could his name be cleared, particularly since he considered the Ontario Latchford-Smith inquiry to have been "a political inquisition of the most unscrupulous and un-British character." Bennett
stressed that he did not agree with the Latchford-Smith report and that it was "obvious your view was honestly held and it doesn't reflect on your honor as a public servant." Therefore he could "see no reason for a further commission." Meighen had no choice but to accept the Prime Minister's decision.  

In late September Bennett requested Meighen to speak to a Conservative rally in Winnipeg and the latter refused. Meighen stated that as leader of the Senate he felt he should not take part in the election campaign although he admitted such a decision was "difficult in light of your request." After the election Bennett wrote Meighen that his refusal to speak had hurt him "more than I can say" and added that "your colleagues feel much as I do." It is probable that Meighen's refusal to go to Winnipeg was a result of the Prime Minister's decision not to proceed with the Royal Commission, but this would be little consolation to the beleaguered Bennett.

* * * *

The February 3, 1932 Nova Scotia appointments went to two men of very different backgrounds. Dr. John Alexander MacDonald was a physician from St. Peter's, Cape Breton Island, who had first been elected to the Nova Scotia legislature in 1916. He was re-elected in 1920 and 1925, but he resigned shortly after the latter election to successfully contest a seat in the federal election. In 1926 he met the only defeat of his political career, but he was elected again in 1930 to the House of Commons. Subsequently he gave up his seat so that former Nova Scotia Premier E. N. Rhodes could join the Bennett cabinet. This action no doubt paved the way for his appointment to the Senate some seventeen months later. And so, at the relatively young age of forty-nine, MacDonald withdrew from the
active political scene to take his seat in the Senate as a Catholic representative from Nova Scotia.6

W. H. Dennis was also in his forties, but his career had been vastly different. Although a Conservative, he had never run for public office. He was widely known and respected for his outspoken defence of any cause which was good for the Maritimes. A journalist, Dennis had first joined the Halifax Herald in 1900 and became vice-president and business manager in 1911. At the time of his appointment to the Senate, he was managing director and publisher of the Herald. Dennis's appointment was very well received particularly by coalmen and railwaymen who claimed he was "a long time tried and true friend of ours." Bennett must have been heartened by the large number of telegrams congratulating him on this appointment because he commented ten days later than Dennis was "perhaps as useful a Canadian as there is in the Maritimes."7

There were no other serious contenders for these two seats although one member of parliament, W. A. Black, did inform Bennett that he would like one of the appointments. Black claimed that it would be safe to open up his Halifax seat and suggested that perhaps W. H. Dennis could run, but the Prime Minister rejected the idea of an unnecessary by-election. Bennett promised he would "explain things when I see you." Black thus received the same answer as a dozen or so other Conservative members of parliament across the country who craved the serenity and security of a Senate seat. Bennett had no intention of making appointments to the Senate from within his parliamentary caucus; contenders for the Senate seats would have to wait until the end of the term.8

* * * *

Of the three Quebec men appointed in 1932, one was named in
February, the other two in October. Charles C. Ballantyne, the first appointee, was a Montreal manufacturer who had been associated with the Militia for many years. In 1916 he had raised a service battalion for overseas. In 1917 he joined the newly-formed Union government as Minister of Public Works, eventually to become Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of Naval Services. Ballantyne was one of three Unionist candidates elected in Quebec in the wartime election, but he was defeated as a Conservative candidate in 1921.

Apparently Sir Robert Borden thought very highly of Ballantyne's abilities. He did not hesitate to write to the Prime Minister on his behalf when his former colleague asked him to do so. Ballantyne declined to take the usual path of having friends send letters and telegrams in support of his application. Instead he told Borden that he felt his length of service entitled him to the appointment, "but if the Prime Minister has someone else in mind, that is all right." Borden assured Bennett that he felt there was no more deserving man than Ballantyne and that, in fact, "he deserves even higher office than that which he seeks." The Prime Minister received another high recommendation of Ballantyne from J. W. McConnell, the influential Montreal newspaper publisher, who called him "an outstanding character" and "a staunch and loyal supporter of yours." Apparently Bennett had hoped that McConnell himself would consider the Senatorship, but since he would not accept the offer, the Prime Minister felt the Party "should have gratitude enough to give serious consideration, and if possible, effect to any wish you may have in a matter of this kind." The Prime Minister meant what he said; within two weeks the sixty-five year old Ballantyne was named to the Senate.

The other two Quebec appointments followed eight months later--Albert
J. Brown, a Montrealer who had been born in the Eastern townships, and J. H. Rainville, also a Montrealer, were named to the Senate.

Brown, seventy years old, was one of five Bennett appointees who had never run for political office. He was graduated in Law from McGill University in 1886, a gold medalist, and had been appointed a Queen's Council in 1899. He formed his own law firm in 1907 and it had become widely known throughout the country. He had been a governor of McGill for some years and in 1923 he was presented with an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from that institution. He had also been active in hospital work, serving as a governor of the Montreal General, the Children's Memorial Hospital, Alexandra Hospital and the Verdun Protestant Hospital. In addition he was a leading figure in the Montreal business community, serving as a vice-president of the Royal Bank, the Montreal Trust Company, the Dominion Engineering Works Limited and the Canada Steamship Lines. He was a director of a number of other well-known companies, such as the Steel Company of Canada. Brown was appointed to replace Dr. W. L. McDougald who had resigned after being censured by his fellow senators for his part in the Beauharnois scandal. He succeeded McDougald as the representative for Wellington district in the Eastern townships, although both men lived in Montreal.

Bennett had been warned by a correspondent some months earlier that the Eastern townships residents felt very strongly that they did not want another outsider appointed for their district. This feeling was apparently encouraged by Arthur Wood, editor of the Sherbrooke Daily Record, who had frequently expressed his strong feelings in print. Such was the stature of Brown, however, that when he was actually named to the Senate, Wood wrote that he was "a native of the townships and will worthily
represent his old home and reflect upon us some share of his considerable achievement."

There were a number of townships residents who would have made worthy senators. These included Dr. George Hume, Dr. Warren W. Lynch and Dr. C. W. Colby. In each case, their names were given some consideration. Dr. Hume had the strong backing of Senator R. H. Pope who felt that Hume would have the support of the community at large. Hume himself did not contact the Prime Minister until just a few days before the appointment was made, but his supporters had been active throughout the summer of 1932, writing letters and participating in delegations on his behalf. When Brown was appointed, Hume wrote to the Prime Minister thanking him for receiving yet another delegation "at such a busy time" and pledging his continued support for the Conservative party. He promised that he would try to overcome the dissatisfaction of his supporters over the naming of a non-resident.

Dr. Warren W. Lynch was highly recommended by Arthur Reid of the Sherbrooke Weekly Telegram who said that he could mount a "tremendous" delegation on Dr. Lynch's behalf but that he would not allow it. Lynch, an outstanding surgeon, was the son of Judge W. Lynch, a long-time Conservative. Dr. C. W. Colby was suggested by R. S. White, M.P. According to White, Colby was a man of great learning who had filled the chair of English Literature at Harvard and at McGill. He was a "townships man through and through" whereas Albert J. Brown was not regarded as a townships man even though he had been born there. Bennett apparently gave serious consideration to Colby for he wrote to White:

That I should have in mind the one of whom you were thinking at the same time makes me feel that possibly I may be a wiser man than I thought.
Mere thoughts, however, were not sufficient apparently to obtain the appointment for Colby who quite possibly was not even aware that he was under consideration for such an honor.

J. H. Rainville, the final Quebec appointment in 1932, was also a lawyer, having been graduated from Laval University in 1900. In 1908 he had been narrowly defeated in the provincial election, but in 1911 he wrested the Chambly-Vercheres federal seat away from the Liberals for the first time since Confederation. He acted briefly as deputy speaker of the House of Commons in the tumultuous days before the formation of the Union government, but he subsequently resigned that position during the conscription debate. Rainville was one of five French Canadians who voted in favor of the Military Services Act and this all but guaranteed his defeat in the ensuing election. Thereafter, Rainville had little choice but to work behind the political scenes; in 1928 he was Conservative organizer in Quebec. In 1930 he was appointed Chairman of the Montreal Harbors Board, a position he filled with apparent distinction. The Gazette reported that his departure from that board to take up his new position in the Senate would be "regretted in many quarters....He spent much time at the Harbors Board office and attended many banquets on its behalf."

P. E. Blondin, speaker of the Senate, felt that Rainville deserved the appointment particularly since he "was left aside ever since he voted in the War Measures whilst Sevigny and I received wonderful gratification." Senator R. H. Pope was not enthusiastic, however, and later claimed that Rainville's abilities as an organizer were "very questionable." Bennett did not agree apparently. He had sufficient confidence in Rainville to make him the recipient of two major political appointments, something
which was unusual when there were so many lined up awaiting the largesse of the government.

As it turned out, Bennett's 1932 appointments were the least controversial of all those he made. The selection of Arthur Meighen was readily accepted, even by the man who had been promised the appointment. In Nova Scotia both MacDonald and Dennis were well-known, popular figures. Two of his Quebec appointees were over sixty, but this fact roused little or no comment. Both Armand Lavergne, deputy speaker of the House of Commons, and C. N. Dorion, M.P., were very disappointed that they had been unable to secure one of the seats for a long-time supporter, Ludger Bastien, but they realized there would be other vacancies. It was fourteen months before Bennett was ready to make any further appointments and by that time he was deluged with requests from all sides.
NOTES
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CHAPTER IV

1933: DECEMBER

As the year 1933 drew to a close, Prime Minister Bennett was faced with mounting pressure from his supporters to fill the Senate vacancies which by then numbered thirteen—two in Saskatchewan, four in Ontario, three in Quebec, three in New Brunswick, and one in Nova Scotia. On 30 December he made seven appointments, two in Saskatchewan, three in Ontario, two in Quebec, leaving one seat in each of the latter two provinces vacant. The seats in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were also left vacant.

The two Saskatchewan vacancies were filled by R. B. Horner and Walter M. Aseltine, both of whom were farmers from the northern part of the province. Ralph Byron Horner was born in 1884 at North Clarendon, Quebec. He received his early education there and at business college in Ottawa. He moved west in 1906 to homestead at Blaine Lake, sixty miles north of Saskatoon, where he eventually became one of the most successful farmers in the district. He ran twice for the Saskatchewan legislature—in 1917 and 1929—but was defeated both times. In 1931 he was named a director of the Canadian National Railways; the following year he was appointed a director of the Dominion Agriculture and Credit Corporation. 1

When Senator Turriff died in 1930, Horner wrote to the Prime Minister suggesting that the appointment should go to the north and to a farmer; he would like to be considered for the post. S. N. Horner,
a Progressive member of the Co-operative government, wrote recommending his brother, as did Premier Anderson and Attorney General M. A. MacPherson. In fact, when Bennett announced that the seat would be filled by a Catholic, both Anderson and MacPherson sent wires of protest, stating emphatically that the first appointment should not go to a Catholic. It should be given to Horner. The latter had widespread support, particularly in the north, with many wires and petitions being sent to the Prime Minister on his behalf. That appointment went to Marcotte, of course, but with the death of Senator W. B. Willoughby followed by that of Senator J. H. Ross in 1932, Horner's supporters renewed their efforts, this time with the assurance that both appointments would go to the north and likely to the country. The fact that Horner was a long-time Conservative worker, a defeated candidate, who had the support of the Anderson government, was important, but the decisive factor was that he was a farmer living in the north. It was primarily a case of being the right man in the right place at the right time.  

Much the same could be said for forty-seven year old Aseltine, the second Saskatchewan appointee. Aseltine was born in Ontario where he received his high school education. He then attended the University of Manitoba, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1909. After the study of Law for four years, he was called to the bar in Saskatchewan, subsequently to settle in Rosetown where he very soon became active with the local Conservatives.

In 1916, Aseltine helped William Badger, the first Conservative ever to be elected from that part of the province, to win a provincial seat. That year he became Secretary-Treasurer of the Rosetown provincial constituency association, a post which he held until 1925 when he assumed
the presidency. He was also Secretary-Treasurer of the Kindersley Federal Conservative Association and helped elect the local candidate to the Union government in 1917. In 1926 he contested Rosetown constituency, but he was defeated; in 1930 he narrowly lost the nomination to W. J. Loucks who shortly thereafter was elected to the House of Commons. In the same year, Aseltine was elected Mayor of Rosetown by an overwhelming majority, a position he held until 1934. As a Senate hopeful, Aseltine was strongly recommended by Loucks who reported, "When I defeated him for the nomination he went to work just as if he were the candidate, and I think much credit is due him for my victory." Also he had the support of many of the Conservative associations in the north.

Besides being a lawyer, Aseltine was a large-scale farmer who operated six sections in the Rosetown district, the first man to introduce strip farming. He was a shareholder in the Rosetown Hiway Refineries and Rosetown Hiway Sales. He served as vice-president of the Saskatchewan Fish and Games Association, as Chairman of the Rosetown School Board from 1920-1927, as member of the councils of both the Dominion and Provincial Bar Associations. Thus Aseltine had been a leading citizen in the Rosetown district for many years, and he looked on his appointment as a tribute to the people of Rosetown as well as to himself. He assured the Prime Minister it would be his aim to represent agriculture to the best of his ability, and certainly he had the qualifications to do so.

As might be expected, there were many other aspirants for two senate seats. These included J. J. Leddy, Joseph Foley, Charles Hollinrake, James Hagerman, Phillip Walters, George Braden and A. E. Whitmore. Leddy and Foley made what amounted to token bids for they realized there was no possibility of another Catholic being appointed in Saskatchewan at that
time. Several Saskatoon men also applied, including Hollinrake and Hagerman.

Charles Hollinrake was a highly respected lawyer who had lived in Saskatoon for twenty years. He had taken part in all the provincial and federal elections in Saskatoon and district for many years, was a past president of the Saskatchewan Conservative Association and had also been generous in his financial support. James Hagerman was a well-to-do farmer who also lived in Saskatoon. A good organizer, he had run federally in South Battleford in 1925 and 1926. He was recommended by several members of the provincial legislature and also by Dr. Walter Murray, President of the University of Saskatchewan. However, the feeling in Saskatchewan Conservative circles was that Saskatoon had received enough appointments and benefits from the government; the senatorships should go elsewhere.

One man with a thick file of recommendations was Phillip Walters, the mayor of Melville, who made a determined effort to secure the nomination in the interest of the Saskatchewan ethnic community. A German Lutheran and an Orangeman, Walters managed to secure the support of the German Catholics and other ethnic groups. It is quite possible that the large-scale campaign of letters and petitions was not spontaneous; it may have been carefully orchestrated by Walters himself. In any case, it does not seem that Bennett gave him any serious consideration. George Braden, an articulate farmer from Rosthern, was another candidate. He too had considerable support but not enough to edge out either Horner or Aseltine.

One of the more interesting campaigns for appointment was waged by the many friends of A. E. (Bert) Whitmore, a well-known Regina businessman. A persistent correspondent on his behalf was Father Athol Murray, founder of Notre Dame College at Wilcox, thirty miles south-west of Regina. So
determined was Father Murray to arrange the appointment for Whitmore that he suggested—and he must surely have been the only Catholic in the province to do so—that the first Senate appointment should go not to a Catholic as Bennett had proclaimed it would but to his friend and the benefactor of Notre Dame, the Protestant Bert Whitmore. Premier Anderson also spoke very highly of Whitmore. So did Senator A. D. McRae who rated him "the most outstanding citizen in Saskatchewan" at the same time acknowledging that the Prime Minister himself knew him so well that it was unnecessary to press his claims.]

But geography was against Whitmore in 1933, just as religion had been in 1931. Already there were two senators from Regina and Bennett firmly believed it would be unwise to appoint a third. Also, the situation was complicated by the promotion of another leading citizen of Regina. Henry Black, who had "gratuitously carried on relief work for two years" was highly recommended too. It would have been difficult for Bennett to choose one man over the other.

In his final choices, the Prime Minister did not waver from his plan to give both appointments to the north. In keeping with his guidelines, he chose the two men who without question had made great contributions to the Conservative cause over the years. No doubt the unsuccessful candidates and their supporters were disappointed, but on the whole, the appointments of Horner and Aseltine met with general approval.

* * * *

In Ontario the Prime Minister had four vacancies to fill, the fourth having arisen only a few weeks before the appointments with the death of Senator J. H. Fisher from Paris. The longest standing vacancy was that left by the death 8 August 1932 of Senator N. A. Belcourt, the Franco-Ontarian
from Ottawa. Senator Andrew Haydon, also from the Ottawa area, had died 10 November 1932; Senator Gideon Robertson, acknowledged as the representative of labor in the senate, died 25 August 1933.

Bennett's hands were somewhat tied. The Belcourt vacancy had to go to a French Canadian acceptable to the Franco-Ontarian community; Robertson should be succeeded by a labor man. In addition, Horatio Hocken, a former member of parliament and one-time mayor of Toronto, had been promised the first Senate vacancy at the time of the 1930 election. Although he had deferred his claim at the time of Meighen's appointment, Bennett was determined not to ask him to do so again. However, the Prime Minister realized that it would cause political difficulties should he appoint a Torontonian to what had been an eastern Ontario seat. No doubt this is one reason he delayed Hocken's appointment as long as he did. In the end, the death of Senator Fisher relieved him of that problem. That event allowed him to appoint Alfred Fripp, in dire financial straits, to the Ottawa vacancy; Hocken was appointed to replace Senator Fisher. The Franco-Ontarian vacancy went to Louis Côté, a lawyer from Ottawa who had been a member of the Ontario legislature since 1929. The labor seat Bennett left unfilled and, in fact, he never did find a suitable replacement for Robertson.

Horatio C. Hocken was a retired publisher who had served in the House of Commons for four consecutive parliaments between 1917 and 1930. He had been a controller in the Municipal Council of Toronto for five years and mayor for two. In 1930 when he had considered retiring because of age and ill health, he was prevailed upon to run again. Then, at the last minute, he was asked to stand aside so that T. L. Church could run in his place. At this time, he went to the rescue of the Orange Sentinel and proceeded to keep it afloat for two years at great personal financial loss.
When he agreed to defer to Church, Conservative party officials promised Hocken the first available Senate seat and that seemed a satisfactory arrangement for a man of seventy-three. Although R. B. Bennett was not a party to this agreement, he felt that he and the Conservative party were morally obligated to follow it through even though Hocken was considerably older than he believed the new senators should be.\(^\text{13}\)

At the time of Sir George Foster's death in late 1931, Hocken had had every reason to believe that the appointment would be his, but the Prime Minister asked him to stand aside in favor of Arthur Meighen. When Senator Belcourt died, Hocken realized that his seat had to go to a French Canadian. However, when Senator Hayden died the following November, he was justified in feeling that his long-awaited appointment was imminent. He went so far as to hope that he would be in the Senate before the session ended so that he could take advantage of the railway pass on adjournment!\(^\text{14}\) However, this was not to be. The Prime Minister gave Hocken his word that the next appointment would be his, but, because of complications arising from the French Canadian vacancy, he would not move immediately. Bennett did not wish to make one appointment without the other and he had not been able to come up with the name of a French Canadian satisfactory to the party and to the Franco-Ontarian community. The Prime Minister had hoped to resolve this problem in the first quarter of 1933, but by May he decided to postpone the whole matter. He claimed it undesirable to make the Ontario appointments when there were vacancies still in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Saskatchewan. He settled the matter by deciding it "was not thought desirable to incur the extra expense of making appointments at the moment." Thus poor Hocken had to bide his time; he must wait until Bennett was prepared to make his move.
As difficult as this must have been for him, Hocken had always been a loyal party man; he was prepared to accept the judgment of his old friend. When the appointment finally did come, he was overjoyed. Probably no man was happier to return to the hallowed halls of the parliament buildings than Horatio C. Hocken.  

The second English-speaking Ontario senator named on 30 December 1933 was sixty-seven year old Alfred Ernest Fripp, K.C., of Ottawa. Fripp and the Prime Minister were old friends, their friendship dating back to 1911 when they were deskmates in the House of Commons. Fripp had been a member of the Ontario Legislature from 1908 to 1911 and had sat in the House of Commons from 1911 until 1921. Fripp later claimed that, during that period, he had been compelled to see an average of sixty persons a day all looking for government positions, a time-consuming activity detrimental to his law practice. In 1931 he was confronted with extremely heavy medical expenses because his wife took ill. He had first applied for a senatorship in January 1932 just before the appointment of Meighen, admitting to the Prime Minister, for whom he had done considerable legal work over the years, that he was in "bad financial shape." It was Fripp's belief that with a senatorship, his creditors would not push him. Therefore, when Senator Belcourt died in August, he applied once again. Reasoning that in a mixed English-French community such as Ottawa, an Englishman should be alternated with a Frenchman, he claimed he should be appointed to succeed Belcourt. Of course, this was out of the question from the Prime Minister's point of view, although he was very concerned about Fripp whose financial position was worsening with every passing day. After the death of Haydon, Bennett told him frankly that there was no possibility of an appointment because of the prior commitment to Hocken. But Fripp, whose bank was by then pressing
him for payment, argued that he did not see how Hocken could expect an Ottawa vacancy. However, Bennett was adamant that the promises made to Hocken in 1930 were to be honored even if it meant appointing a Toronto man to an Ottawa vacancy. He suggested to Fripp that he look around for another suitable position. Fripp, who was approaching his sixty-seventh birthday, suggested he could qualify for the Railway Board although he still preferred the Senate partly because he believed he could still be of service as an organizer. 17

In the final analysis, it was the death of Senator Fisher which made it possible for the Prime Minister to appoint Fripp to the Haydon vacancy and still fulfill his obligation to Hocken. Bennett had been deeply troubled by Fripp's problems and there is no doubt that the opportunity to name him to the Senate greatly relieved his mind. Nevertheless, Fripp was a worthy recipient. His financial problems had risen in part because of his generous contribution of time to long political service, but it was the combination of a loss of income during the depression and the extraordinary expense of around-the-clock nursing care for his wife which placed him in the position of having to beg his friend "R. B." for help. 18 In only one other instance—that of Dr. Emile Fortin in Quebec—did the Prime Minister make a Senate appointment based primarily on financial need. However, in both cases the appointments could be justified on the basis of long-time service to the Conservative party.

The third appointment in Ontario, that of Louis Côté, was also a difficult one to make, but for quite different reasons. Bennett struggled with the problem of whom to name to replace Senator Belcourt for more than a year and, as 1933 drew to a close, he seemed no closer to a decision. There were a number of aspirants for the position, but no one man seemed
to stand out. The Prime Minister did not feel free to make the Franco-Ontarian appointment without taking into consideration the wishes of the French community and those of the French Canadian cabinet ministers. Unfortunately, the only man for whom there had been any degree of unanimity was Judge Albert Constantineau who did not want the position.

Constantineau had been a county court judge in Prescott and Russell for thirty-two years; as such he was a-political. He realized that as a judge he could not aspire to a senatorship, nor did he desire it. But it seemed that those in the province who hoped to see him assume the mantle of Senator Belcourt as leader of the Franco-Ontarians gave this no consideration. They inundated the Prime Minister with letters and petitions on his behalf even though Constantineau told them on more than one occasion that he could not and would not assume an active political role.19

Louis Côté, whom Bennett eventually appointed, was from a very old and distinguished Canadian family. His ancestor, Jean Côté, had married the daughter of Abraham Martin—for whom the Plains of Abraham was named—in 1635. Louis himself was married to a granddaughter of Sir Hector Langevin, a Father of Confederation. He was a highly respected corporation lawyer who had been Crown Attorney and Clerk of the Peace for the united counties of Prescott and Russell from 1919 to 1922. In 1925 the Ontario government had selected him as one of the commissioners to report on French-English schools in the province; his work on that commission brought him widespread recognition in the French community. He held an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from the University of Ottawa and was a member of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. He was associated with numerous French Canadian societies, the Knights of Columbus, and the Alliance Française, and was "an ardent supporter of the Bonne Entente movement for closer relations between the
English and French throughout the Dominion." According to the Ottawa Evening Journal, Côté was regarded "as one of the outstanding French Canadian citizens of Ontario."  

In the provincial election of 1929, Côté successfully contested the Ottawa East constituency and served as a member of the Ontario legislature until he was named to the Senate. It is quite possible that for some months the Prime Minister had Côté in mind, but held up his appointment because of the wishes of Premier George Henry who had no desire to face a by-election. By the end of 1933, with his government's term drawing to a close and with a by-election no longer possible, Henry was prepared to release his supporter, thus leaving Bennett free to make the appointment. The news of Côté's elevation became public on 30 December, when upon shaking hands with him after a Canadian Club luncheon, the Prime Minister said, "Hello, Senator." He then confirmed to a somewhat startled Ottawa Citizen reporter standing by, "He's a Senator now!" At the age of forty-three, Louis Côté had just become the youngest member of Canada's upper house. It would not seem that Côté had pursued the senatorship but, living in Ottawa as he did, he may very well have made approaches on a personal basis. In any case he did not apply in writing himself and there was only one recommendation on his behalf, that of the Rector of the University of Ottawa.  

Among the other applicants for this senatorship was Harry Morel, a former long-time member of the Ontario legislature from Mattawa. Morel had the backing of Senator George Gordon from Sudbury; of Hon. Charles McCrea and Hon. William Finlayson, both members of the Ontario cabinet; and of Bishop D. J. Scollard from Sault Ste. Marie. The Prime Minister looked on his application with considerable sympathy although he recognized he could not appoint him without "canvassing every avenue." Morel was in
the advanced stages of diabetes and he had gained considerable sympathy on that account. Further, Senator Gordon had persuaded him to give up a safe provincial seat to run in the federal election of 1930. He was defeated in that election partly because of ill health during the campaign. In compensation, he had been given a job by the Ontario government as a superintendent in connection with northern development but, as Finlayson nervously admitted, Morel had done little work and his government feared an inquiry. The vacant senatorship might provide "a convenient way out of the dilemma." However, there was one major problem. Morel did not have the support of his fellow French Canadians. As A. Belanger, President of La Société de St. Jean Baptiste d'Ottawa put it, Morel had "nothing that may recommend him as a worthy or even a tolerable representative of his compatriots of Ontario." Belanger believed that the new senator should come from eastern Ontario as had the late Senator Belcourt, and he suggested Louis Côté or C. A. Seguin as worthy candidates.

C. A. Seguin, a member of the legislature from Russell, had quite widespread support including that of members of parliament Frank Shaver and Charles Belee and of M.L.A. Joseph St. Denis of Vankleek Hill, Ontario. Seguin was an excellent platform speaker; one supporter suggested that he could be of assistance politically because "he could speak to the French Canadian laborers in the north in language they could understand." Apparently, however, that was not enough to tip the scales in his favor.

One applicant whose only backing was himself was Alfred Limoges of Verner. He first wrote to the Prime Minister in January 1933 saying he would like to do something for the country by serving in the Senate. Already eighty-four years of age, he reasoned his appointment would be short-term; before long Mr. Bennett would be free to make another selection. A month
later he wrote again. He understood the appointments were to be put off for a year, but he hoped the Prime Minister would make an exception in his case. He "might be dead by next year." A year went by before he wrote again. Then he declared that, although he was eighty-five years of age, he did not feel the years. "A woman has the age she looks and a man the age he feels. I feel a good deal younger than eighty-five," he wrote. Limoges's long-time goal had been to find a cheaper process for the refining of nickel, and he had suggested that a prize of one million dollars be offered for the discovery of such a process. His interest in an appointment centered on his conviction that as a senator he could work in co-operation with the National Research Council to further this aim. However, Limoges never did get an opportunity to put his plan into effect. The vacant senatorship was not destined for him.

As Prime Minister, Bennett received thousands of letters from aspiring senators and their supporters. Even when there was no chance for an appointment, he or his staff placated each of them with the assurance that his or her application would be considered in due time. However in one instance, Bennett declared vehemently to his supporters that their man had no chance. That man was T. L. (Tommy) Church, the former mayor of Toronto who had run in Hocken's place in 1930, only to be defeated. In a very frank letter to J. G. Inkster, minister of Knox Church in Toronto, the Prime Minister said that Church had caused him a great deal of trouble as Leader of the Opposition. He added:

His selfishness was so apparent, our supporters urged me to take a course of action which I did not take....I know the services he has rendered, but it is difficult to reason with him or to induce him to believe that any opinion other than his own is sound....he was a great Chief Magistrate but has the unfortunate habit of embarrassing his friends and rendering their position at times intolerable.
With Bennett feeling as he did about Church, it is ironic that in the nine by-elections held from June 1933 to October 1934, only one Conservative was elected. The lone victor was Tommy Church, the successful candidate in Toronto East on 24 September 1934. The Prime Minister must have welcomed the new member with mixed emotions!

There were numerous other applicants for the vacancies in Ontario, but none seem to have been given anything more than cursory consideration. J. A. Bell, general chairman of the order of Railroad Telegraphers for the C.P.R., had wide support from labour to succeed Gideon Robertson; Charles R. Harrison, a senior conductor with the C.P.R., had the support of a number of politicians to fill the same post. Neither, apparently, was satisfactory to the Prime Minister. He was very conscious that the eyes of labor were upon him—not just in Ontario but right across the country—and he had no desire to make a wrong move in that regard. For that reason he was content to leave Robertson's seat vacant for the time being. In appointing Hocken and Fripp, he had once again chosen men who were older than he preferred, but he had been able to avoid the naming of Hocken to the Ottawa vacancy, an act which would have brought the wrath of at least the Ottawa papers on his head.

In Quebec, there were three vacancies, but Bennett filled only two of them, those seats going to G. A. Fauteux and Lucien Moraud. André Fauteux was a veteran of the political wars in Quebec, having run and been defeated in the four federal elections held between 1921 and 1930. Arthur Meighen held him in such high esteem that he named him Solicitor General in both 1921 and 1926 even though he did not hold a seat in the House of Commons. He had been an indefatigable worker on behalf of the Conservative party but, like so many of his compatriots in the party, he
suffered at the polls because of the conscription issue. He was an excellent orator and highly thought of in both the English and French communities. It was suggested by W. C. Pitfield that promises of a Senate seat had been made to Fauteux when he had agreed to run in 1930, although Fauteux himself never made such a claim. In fact, he made no written application for the position, at least not to the Prime Minister. Fauteux, fifty-nine, was a lawyer by profession and lived in Outremont.  

Lucien Moraud, the other Quebec appointee, was from Quebec City. He was the fourth of the senators named by Bennett who had never been candidates for public office. In 1918 he had been elected a member of the Board of Examiners of the Bar, subsequently to become a lecturer in the Law faculty and a member of the Board of Governors of Laval University. He was a director and a member of the executive of the Canadian National Railways from 1930 until 1933. He was a director as well of the Beauharnois Power Corporation, Sun Trust and Les Prevoyants du Canada. Like Fauteux, the forty-eight year old Moraud had not applied directly for a senatorship but, when he received notice of his appointment, he wired the Prime Minister to thank him "from the bottom of my heart." 

It could well be that both Fauteux and Moraud had approached the Quebec cabinet ministers rather than Bennett. The Prime Minister frequently referred Quebec applicants to the Quebec ministers. When Maurice Dupré consulted him about one aspiring senator, Bennett had replied firmly, "This is a matter to be considered by the Ministers from Quebec." In any case, given the pressures exerted by Sauvé, Duranleau and Dupré at the time of Marcotte's campaign, it is inconceivable that Bennett would make French Canadian appointments in Quebec without consulting that province's cabinet ministers.
NOTES


5. Aseltine to Bennett, 30 Dec. 1933; p. 428630.


7. Unsigned memorandum containing information about a number of potential candidates, including Hagerman. This memo was probably submitted by Robert Weir, Minister of Agriculture, 15 Dec. 1933, p. 428529.

8. Walters solicited support from dozens of ethnic organizations, both Protestant and Catholic. D. S. Johnstone, President of the Saskatchewan Conservative Association from 1930-1932, reported to Bennett that Walters had offered him money for his support, pp. 428672-428840.

9. Braden's file contains many sincere letters of support and a number of articulate letters which he wrote to Bennett, p. 428937-429010.

10. Anderson to Bennett, 9 Dec. 1930, p. 428572; Father Athol Murray to Bennett, 6 Aug. 1932, p. 430548; Bennett to Murray, 5 Jan. 1933, p. 430553; McRae to Bennett, 27 Dec. 1932, p. 430554; Murray to Bennett, 24 Oct. 1933, pp. 430573-5.


17. Fripp to Bennett, 14 Jan. 1933, p. 426507; Fripp to Bennett, 25 Jan. 1933, p. 426508; Bennett to Fripp, 26 Jan. 1933, p. 426509; Fripp to Bennett, 16 May 1933, p. 426518.

18. P. D. Ross to Bennett, 27 March 1933, p. 426515; Bennett to Fripp, 31 Oct. 1933, p. 426521.


23. Chas. Belee, M.P., to Bennett, 1 Sept. 1932, p. 427227; Dr. A. A. Allen to Bennett, 20 Dec. 1933, p. 427258.


29 Bennett to Maurice Dupré, 9 May 1933, p. 423135.
Prime Minister Bennett did not make any further Senate appointments until 1935. On 20 July he rewarded ten of his followers, on 14 August six additional vacancies were filled, and the final one was made 15 August. Eleven of the seventeen appointments made in the dying days of the administration went to members of parliament who had remained faithful to the end. The Liberal-oriented Winnipeg Free Press suggested that Bennett had let the vacancies pile up because he wanted to strengthen his control of parliament by retaining the patronage in his hands. There is probably a good deal of truth in that statement. Further, after the disastrous results of the by-elections in 1933 and 1934 when the Conservatives lost all but one of nine contests, the Prime Minister had no intention of creating unnecessary vacancies in the House of Commons by appointing sitting members to the Senate. However, he realized that many of them had legitimate claims to the vacancies. Thus he held them all up until he could reward the faithful without jeopardizing his government!

The 20 July list saw four selections made in Nova Scotia, three in Ontario, and one each in the provinces of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec. Of these ten, seven were members of the House of Commons and three were cabinet ministers.

In Nova Scotia, three of the four appointments went to members of the about-to-be dissolved parliament—E. N. Rhodes, Thomas Cantley and Felix Patrick Quinn—while the fourth went to J. P. L. Robicheau who filled
the long-vacant seat of the deceased Senator E. L. Girroir.

The best known of the four recipients was Edgar Nelson Rhodes, Minister of Finance in the Conservative government and former Premier of Nova Scotia. Rhodes had had a long and illustrious political career and may have been the most respected of Bennett's cabinet colleagues. First elected to the House of Commons in 1908, Rhodes was re-elected in 1911 and 1917. He was appointed Speaker of the House in 1917 and 1918, and then retired from politics in 1921. However, in 1925 he answered the call of his party to run successfully for a seat in the Nova Scotia Legislature. He was named Premier and Provincial Secretary on 16 July. On 11 August in 1930 he resigned the Premiership to accept the portfolio of Minister of Fisheries in the newly-elected Conservative government; three weeks later he was elected by acclamation to the seat vacated for him by John Alexander MacDonald. In a cabinet shuffle in February 1932, Rhodes became Minister of Finance, the post he held until his appointment to the Senate.

Several months before being named to the Senate, Rhodes had announced that he would be retiring from active politics at the end of the session because of ill health. In an editorial entitled "Senators," the Globe and Mail greeted his appointment with these words:

For every one appointment, a hundred are outraged in their deepest political feelings....but from time to time a political chance does enable a Prime Minister to make a Senate appointment that promises as well as rewards, and this was grasped in the case of E. N. Rhodes. Ill health that forced his resignation is a misfortune to the country as well as to the Conservative party....He is one of the few members of the Bennett cabinet who has not been overshadowed by his leader.... His abilities are recognized on both sides of the House.

The Ottawa Citizen said that the appointment "rounds off the long and distinguished career of one of Nova Scotia's most distinguished sons."² As was the case in a number of instances in 1935, there had been no
correspondence between the two men concerning the Senate seat. But because
the Prime Minister had worked alongside him for five years, he could be sure
that Rhodes would be a genuine asset to the Conservative party in the upper
house.

Thomas Cantley, the second appointee from Nova Scotia, was a veteran
parliamentarian from Pictou, having been elected in 1925, 1926 and again in
1930. Cantley first approached the Prime Minister about a Senate appointment
shortly after the 1930 election. On 2 November 1931 he reminded Bennett of
their conversation, pointing out that his four election contests—he ran
in 1921 and was defeated—constituted perhaps his "smallest contribution
to the Party and to the country." He assured the Prime Minister that Pictou
County was in good shape and that he had an excellent candidate in mind to
replace him should he be elevated to the Senate.

Cantley's friends worried about the state of his health and finances; they saw a Senate appointment as the ideal solution to these problems.
As early as January 1932 (before the elevation of W. H. Dennis and John A.
MacDonald), it had been pointed out to Bennett that Cantley's health would
make another campaign extremely difficult. To this the Prime Minister was
non-committal, saying only that he had "the highest regard" for Cantley.\(^3\)
By early 1935, not only had his financial position worsened, but he suffered
from an ossified hip condition. News of this led the Prime Minister to
admit that he was "very worried about our mutual friend Thomas Cantley."
However, Bennett indicated that, as Cantley was well over seventy, he
believed he was too old for the appointment even though he was "a personal
friend and a warm admirer of him." Up until 16 July, the Prime Minister
still insisted that the seat should go to a younger man. But that evening
the press reported that Cantley's fifty-one year old son Charles, one of
Canada's best-known metallurgists, had drowned in Maine following a heart attack. It is quite possible that this tragedy, coupled with Bennett's natural compassion for his old friend, influenced him to change his mind. To give Cantley the appointment he desired would save him the necessity of contesting still another election which, he admitted, "would have been a nightmare." Cantley's daughter Dorothy indicated the depth of her father's appreciation when she wrote, "You have relieved him of worry, honoured him and made him as happy as is humanly possible."^{4}

Like Cantley, Felix Patrick Quinn had been a member of the House of Commons since 1925. He had also run for the Nova Scotia legislature—in 1916—when he was defeated in a close contest. Quinn's campaign for elevation to the Senate was a short one, started just one month before his appointment when he made application to replace Senator P. F. Martin, the Catholic representative who died 2 May 1935. Quinn had the support of Senator W. H. Dennis and the Rev. C. J. Martin who recommended that he be appointed to replace his late father. Support came for him from a number of other members of the clergy. The Ottawa Citizen noted that the Quinn family "for many years has been prominent in Halifax mercantile life" and concluded that, with the appointment of the sixty-year old member of parliament, the "House of Commons loses an accomplished tenor. When the Commoners sang songs during the interval preceding a roll-call vote, he was invariably leader of the choruses."^{5}

The fourth appointment in Nova Scotia, that of J. P. L. Robicheau, brought to an end the long wait for a successor to the Acadian representative, Senator E. L. Girroir who had died in May 1932. Robicheau had dropped out of college when his mother died leaving five younger children to care for.
He had taken up telegraphy and eventually went to Saskatchewan where he spent ten years as a station agent in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon. In 1918 he returned home to purchase a farm and a lumber business. In the provincial election of 1925, he wrested Clare county away from the Liberals, a seat they had held for forty-nine years, but he was defeated in 1928. In three federal elections he was an organizer for his local member of parliament, H. B. Short, who showed his appreciation by making every effort to secure a senate seat for him. Short approached the Prime Minister on Robicheau's behalf shortly after the death of Girroir pointing out that there were more Acadians in Digby County than anywhere else in the province and, of all the Acadians, Robicheau had the stronger claim. He emphasized that Robicheau had made no personal application, but he was very worthy. It was evident that the residents of the county were expecting Short to obtain the appointment for Robicheau because he received dozens of wires urging him to "get the Senate appointment for John." Robicheau had the support as well of Thomas L. Deveau, secretary of the Conservative Association for Clare municipality, and of a large segment of the English-speaking population of Clare. According to one correspondent, Robicheau was fluent in both languages and his name was "held in the highest regard for integrity and ability. Nothing would please us English people more than to have him receive the appointment."

At the suggestion of Short, Robicheau wrote to the Prime Minister admitting that Clare County had "strong hopes" for the appointment, but emphasizing that he did not want to convey the idea that he was "the best and only person qualified. My competitors are all worthy men and I have the kindest feelings towards them. Honor can fall on but one of us." In this instance, however, the honor did fall on John Robicheau, much to the satisfaction of the people of Clare county.
There were a number of other Acadians in Nova Scotia who made strong bids for the honor, including Hubert Aucoin, Dr. B. A. LeBlanc and Raymond d'Entremont. Aucoin was a former member of the Nova Scotia legislature for Inverness County and was junior whip from 1925 to 1928. He had been an assistant organizer for his party in the province and helped at the polls in 1925, 1926 and 1930. An outstanding orator, he gave excellent speeches in both languages at E. N. Rhodes's nomination meeting in Richmond. He was largely responsible for swinging the support of the Acadian people behind Rhodes when they opposed him because he was not a Catholic as was his predecessor, John A. MacDonald. At the time of Girroir's death, he was living in Halifax and had considerable support in that area from both the English and French. For example, Edward Whelan, Secretary of Ward Two of the Halifax City and County Conservative Association, strongly supported his candidature, assuring the Prime Minister that Aucoin had the endorsement of the English and the Irish in his ward. There were numerous petitions sent to Bennett on Aucoin's behalf, mainly from the Acadian groups in the Halifax area. Apparently Aucoin was unaware that such endorsements were reaching the Prime Minister. In October 1933, he wrote saying that he felt he would be a good representative of the Acadian people. He believed he had Acadian support in Inverness as well as in other French settlements in Cape Breton, in the Halifax area and in the west counties. He discounted the press rumors that the appointment might go to one other than an Acadian saying that such a move would be "both unfair and unsound politically." Of course, Bennett had no intention of appointing a non-Acadian. But the fact that Aucoin was still thought of as a representative of Inverness worked against him. There were already two senators from Cape Breton and the Prime Minister did not in any way seem disposed to appoint a third. 8
The same situation affected Dr. B. A. LeBlanc, a former M.L.A. from Richmond county. He had strong support from the clergy; a number of priests sent letters and resolutions on his behalf. It was pointed out by one, Father P. Robitaille, that the Acadians wanted someone with more than a French name, referring to the fact that Senator Girroir, although an Acadian, could not speak French. Another priest, Father A. Boudreau, emphasized that Dr. LeBlanc was "pure Acadian, a member of the Knights of Columbus, and a practical Catholic" who had fought for the Conservative party since 1906. Father A. Briand was concerned about the rumor that the Girroir vacancy might go to a non-Catholic. Not only would that be a great disappointment to the Acadians who numbered between fifty-five and sixty thousand, but it would destroy the recognized Catholic proportion of Maritime representatives in the upper house. While assuring him that this was not his intention, Bennett pointed out that the feeling was that the appointment should go to a western Acadian; Cape Breton already had its fair share of senators.9

Raymond d'Entremont was from Yarmouth and his supporters in that area firmly believed that the appointment should come to their county. George Killam, President of the Yarmouth County Conservative Association, felt that d'Entremont should receive consideration. He was a life-long worker for the party and was a "fine representative of one of the oldest Acadian families." Killam believed that d'Entremont, who was fluent in both languages, would be a real help to the Conservatives in the county should he be in Ottawa. D'Entremont himself believed that direct contact with Ottawa would strengthen the party and pointed out that he had been active since 1904 when he had made the first of three attempts to win the county for his party. W. H. Surette and a number of other district leaders also supported d'Entremont, promoting their claim that the clergy supported.
him because of his character and standing and because it was the turn of Yarmouth county to receive the Acadian appointment. They added, "We of the laity demand it as our inalienable right. It is a matter of justice due to the French and the Conservatives of this county by a Conservative administration at Ottawa." They added that d'Entremont had been active longer than Robicheau and thus deserved the recognition.

Not all the Conservatives in the area agreed, however. M. C. Denton, President of the Digby Liberal-Conservative Association, claimed later that a delegation had been to see him charging that the petition submitted to the Prime Minister favoring d'Entremont had been written by a Liberal priest and that eighty percent of the priests who had signed the petition were Liberals. He added that rumor was that many of those signing the petition had been told that LeBlanc and Robicheau were out of the running. Consequently, they had supported d'Entremont only to bring the appointment to the west. Of course, Denton may have been prejudiced because he was a strong supporter of Robicheau, but charges such as these could hardly have helped d'Entremont's case. In any event, the appointment went to Robicheau. Thus the western Acadians obtained their representative in the Senate in Ottawa.

* * * *

Unquestionably the least controversial of the Prime Minister's 1935 appointments was that of John Alexander Macdonald of Prince Edward Island. Macdonald, a Minister without Portfolio in the Bennett administration, was in the unique position of having a senator resign purposely so that he might be appointed. In the fall of 1934, Senator John McLean had discussed with the Prime Minister the possibility of his resignation in favor of Macdonald and had received tentative approval for the move. In November, Macdonald surprised everyone, including the Premier of the province, W. J. P. MacMillan,
with the announcement of his retirement at the annual meeting of the King's County Conservative Association. MacMillan, who was present at that meeting, told the Prime Minister that he felt Macdonald should have first advised the executive, but he surmised that he "may be counting on the Senatorship now held by John McLean." Bennett admitted that Macdonald had not told him of his intention to resign. However he added that he did not think this oversight was "attributable to lack of thought because he has always been so considerate....I hope that things will work out so that I can appoint him to the position you mention." In February 1935 Macdonald informed his leader that he had no intention of asking for written commitment as "verbal assurance is good enough for Senator McLean and myself," but he did suggest that the Senator "would very much appreciate having a letter from you." Although there is no record of Bennett having written such a letter, he did as he had promised and appointed Macdonald to succeed McLean.

There is no doubt that Macdonald was a worthy recipient. He had been elected to the Prince Edward Island legislature in 1908, 1911 and 1923 and during the war served as Director of National Service and Honorary Fuel and Food Control administrator for his province. He was elected to the House of Commons in 1925, 1926 and 1930 where he served as Minister without Portfolio in the brief Meighen administration in 1926 and under that of Bennett. After elevating him to the Senate, the Prime Minister showed what high regard he had for Macdonald by writing:

I congratulate you upon possessing those qualities which warranted a friend such as Senator McLean making way for your appointment at this time. I am bound to say that my experience supports the view taken by Senator McLean.12

One surprising thing about the McLean-Macdonald succession is that
McLean was a Presbyterian and Macdonald a Catholic, yet at no time was this even mentioned by any of those involved nor did it evoke any letters of protest. It meant that of the four Prince Edward Island senate seats, two were held by Catholics and two by Protestants, apparently a situation satisfactory to the people of that province.

There were only two other applications for appointment to the Senate from Prince Edward Island. One came from W. Frederick Prowse who felt that because his father and grandfather had served in Conservative governments, he deserved a reward. The other came from John H. Myers, the member of parliament from Queens County. Myers argued that Queens County deserved a second representative because it was "by far more thickly populated" than Kings county; it had only one Senator while Kings had two. Should there be an appointment he deserved it more than anyone because of his twenty-five years in active politics. He stressed that he did not want to embarrass the Prime Minister, but he would like to be considered an applicant. Under the circumstances, of course, neither man stood a chance. After receiving the usual formal acknowledgment from the Prime Minister, nothing further was heard from them.¹³

* * * *

The three vacancies in Ontario were filled by Lt. Col. James Arthurs, Donald Sutherland and Mrs. Iva Fallis. For Arthurs, it was the culmination of a political career dating back to 1908 when he was first elected to the House of Commons for Parry Sound. He contested the next six federal elections and succeeded each time. During the war he raised and commanded the 162nd battalion and served in France until May 1917.

Early in 1932 he informed the Prime Minister that he would like to be elevated to the Senate and that he felt his riding could safely be
opened up. Bennett, who was no more disposed to appointing Arthurs than any other sitting member of parliament, told him it was doubtful that his wishes could be met. There the matter lay until 1935 when his selection was announced. Although there was no correspondence in the intervening three years, it is probable that Arthurs took advantage of their informal meetings in the House of Commons to remind the Prime Minister of his desire. In any case, after twenty-seven years in the House of Commons, James Arthurs became a senator. At the age of sixty-eight, he was certainly older than Bennett's fast-disappearing age guideline, but, obviously, his record as a successful politician and a loyal follower of his party overcame the age handicap.  

The second Ontario recipient also hurdled this block. Donald Sutherland was a seventy-two-year-old farmer from Ingersoll. He was also a veteran of the political wars, although he had known his share of electoral defeats. First elected to the Ontario legislature in 1902, he ran successfully again in 1905. In 1908 he was defeated in both the provincial and federal election contests. However in 1911 he ran successfully in South Oxford to become the first Conservative since confederation to be elected from that riding for either the Legislature or the House of Commons. Three electoral successes followed in 1917, 1921 and 1925, but in 1926 after being named a Minister without Portfolio in the short-lived Meighen cabinet, he met defeat at the polls for the first time in eighteen years. In 1930 he was defeated again, this time by only twenty votes.  

Early in 1932 Sutherland expressed the desire to be named to the Senate. Obviously he felt that his ten election contests, six of which were successful, entitled him to consideration. He also stressed the fact that South Oxford had never been so honored and the farmers in
Ontario were almost without representation in the upper house. The vacancy which he originally sought went to Meighen, but when Senator Belcourt died later in the year, he renewed his request only to be told that the seat was not available. Sutherland could gain some solace, however, from the very warm reply he received from the Prime Minister. On writing to his "dear old friend" Bennett said:

Whenever I think of you I do so with a feeling of profound esteem and regard, for it is one of the pleasant memories of my life to recall my acquaintance and association with you.

He went on to explain that it was impossible to grant Sutherland's wish because the seat in question "belonged" to the French Canadians. His difficulty was to make a decision between the Ottawa district and northern Ontario.

In April 1934, Sutherland was persuaded to once again contest the South Oxford riding in a by-election. As had been the case in 1930, he lost to his Liberal opponent. However, his efforts on behalf of his party did not go unnoticed. His namesake, Dr. Donald Sutherland, Minister of National Defence and the member for North Oxford, mentioned to the Prime Minister that the matter of Sutherland's appointment was brought up every time he visited the county. He stressed that his elevation to the Senate was "exceedingly important from my standpoint." Bennett made no commitments but, when the time came to fill the final Ontario vacancies, he did not forget his old friend. Quite obviously he was influenced by the recommendations of Sutherland and that of Ontario's Attorney General, W. H. Price, one among several who backed this candidate. Still, probably it was the fact that he had high personal regard for the farmer-politician that tipped the scales in Sutherland's favor.16

The third and final Ontario recipient of a Senate seat was
Iva Campbell Fallis, a farmer's wife from Peterborough and a long-time worker for the Conservative party. Mrs. Fallis, an outstanding orator, had first achieved prominence at Winnipeg in 1927 when, together with Madame Fremont of Quebec, she was asked to speak to the delegates. This marked the first time that women had been placed on the agenda to address a national convention. Later she admitted that it was at Winnipeg that the idea of her becoming a senator was first mentioned to her. However, it was not until December 1933 that she herself suggested to the Prime Minister that the time was right for the naming of a second woman to the upper house.

At that time Bennett gave her no encouragement, saying that it was unlikely that he could appoint a second woman from Ontario when the other provinces had none. Mrs. Fallis was content to accept him at his word, but she did ask him to let her know if he changed his mind so that she could "muster support." Bennett did change his mind apparently but this took place without any further urging from Mrs. Fallis. She did as she had promised and let her "case rest." Probably she was as surprised as anyone, therefore, when the Prime Minister telephoned her the news that she would be joining Cairine Wilson in the Senate.

The main reason for Bennett's about-face in the filling of this Ontario vacancy was that he and his advisors felt that if a woman were to be named, she should "come from the country." Mrs. Fallis more than satisfied this requirement; she and her husband had farmed on the Soo Line south of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan for eight years prior to locating in North Monaghan Township where they farmed for another fifteen years. Although there were many strong women applicants from across the country, few of them were from predominantly rural areas. In 1933, Bennett claimed
he searched for a candidate from among his supporters in rural Saskatchewan but to no avail, while in Manitoba where a vacancy arose the following year, the only woman to be given serious consideration was Mrs. Robert Rogers of Winnipeg who died before any decision was reached. The leading candidates in Quebec were from Montreal while Mrs. Fallis's chief rivals in Ontario lived in Toronto. At one point Bennett did give some thought to naming a Quebec woman to the Senate, but apparently he did not receive encouragement for such a move from his cabinet colleagues from that province; he dropped the idea. Presumably his Ontario colleagues were not against the idea of appointing a woman although Mrs. Fallis believed that it was Bennett himself who influenced the cabinet in her favor. In this regard, she may have given the Prime Minister more credit than he deserved. In fact, Bennett was not convinced that women deserved much recognition. To a correspondent in Manitoba where women had first achieved the franchise in provincial elections, and to one in Quebec where they did not yet have it, his answer was the same. Women had not been in the political arena as long as men and therefore they did not deserve equal consideration:

We must remember that the men have sustained the struggle for many years and not until the next generation has come into the field will there be equality between men and women in that regard.]

Whoever was responsible for it, the fact remains that the choice of Mrs. Fallis was a popular one and it overshadowed the other two Ontario appointments. Whether or not it had beneficial political results is open to question. The Globe and Mail doubted it would, saying that it might get the hoped-for votes in rural Ontario, but chances were it would not. As the paper noted wryly, "There are many things that neither Mr. Bennett nor his prophets know about women." The Winnipeg Free Press noted that Mrs. Fallis "combines the ability of performing most of the heavy duties
of farm life with that of an eloquent platform speaker" and added that although she was a "daughter of Ontario", she had also lived on a Saskatchewan farm, a point in her favor as far as that western Liberal paper was concerned.\(^{19}\)

There were two other women in Ontario who received at least some consideration for the Senate, Mrs. W. Plumptre and Mrs. Gertrude Van Koughnet, both from Toronto. Bennett admitted to a correspondent, Bessie Gowan Ferguson of the *Mail and Empire*, that he had the "highest regard" for Mrs. Plumptre, that she would "undoubtedly have had my support, but when only one appointment was being made, it had to be from the country." Mrs. Plumptre made no application herself but, according to Ferguson, she was eager to "lay her hand to the plow" in the Conservative cause although the Liberals were "wooing her."\(^{20}\)

Mrs. Van Koughnet had the backing of a number of political figures including Premier George Henry; Hon. Charles McCrea; Hon. William H. Price; Earl Lawson, M.P.; H. C. Scholfield, M.L.A.; and Sir Thomas White. She was the subject of a long article in *Saturday Night* on 25 March 1933 in which her activities as a Supervising Commissioner of Soldiers Aid Committee of Ontario were detailed, along with her work on dozens of other committees. In spite of the high recommendations she received, Mrs. Van Koughnet does not seem to have been seriously considered, at first because it was felt the appointment of a woman should go to another province, in the end because she was not "from the country."\(^{21}\)

There were a number of Ontario men vying for the Senate seats including Sam Charters, William F. Garland and W. G. Weichel.

The political career of Sam Charters dated back to 1902 when he first ran for the Ontario legislature. He was defeated that year and again
in 1905 before being elected to the House of Commons in 1908 and in 1911. He resigned his seat in 1913 but was again a successful candidate in 1917 as he was in the next four federal elections. From 1921 to 1926 he was assistant whip; from 1926 to 1930 he was chief whip. Charter's request for a Senate seat was one the Prime Minister felt he could not satisfy although he turned him down with regret stating that "I have a very special affection for you, and in purely personal matters I do not think you could make any appeal to me in vain. But," he added, "there are many other facts to consider." 22

William F. Garland was from Carleton county and had been a member of the House of Commons for twenty years. He reported that he was in a "precarious" financial position. He would like any position if the Senate were not possible. Bennett suggested to Garland that he should "look around and see if you can find some position in the public service which is the gift of the Government, which you could fill satisfactorily to yourself and the public service." Garland replied, listing several possible appointments, but there the matter ended. He did not receive his position. 23

W. G. Weichel, President of the Waterloo Mutual Fire Insurance Co., was another man who had given yeoman service to the Conservative party. He too was doomed to disappointment. Weichel had represented Waterloo North in both the House of Commons and the Ontario Legislature, having first been elected in 1911 when he defeated W. L. Mackenzie King. He fought six election campaigns, winning in three of them. His final campaign was in the provincial election of 1934 when he was soundly defeated by his Liberal opponent primarily, he felt, because of the Separate School question. Weichel had the backing of a number of German-Lutheran groups in Waterloo as well as the support of many friends and acquaintances. But this was
not sufficient to influence the Prime Minister who stated quite definitely
that he could make no promises concerning the Senate. Obviously Weichel
was not as close to Bennett as either Arthurs or Sutherland. With so many
vying for so few positions, he stood almost no chance of being selected.

Thus, with his final three Ontario appointments, Bennett selected
two faithful party stalwarts who had run in a total of seventeen elections
and a woman who had never contested an election but who had been a tireless
worker in Conservative organizations over the years. It is difficult to
determine what role, if any, Bennett's cabinet colleagues played in these
selections. With the exception of Sutherland, there was virtually no
 correspondence between the Prime Minister and his cabinet ministers from
Ontario concerning potential senators. It is quite possible, of course,
that the subject was discussed in caucus or informally in the House of
Commons but, from the nature of the appointments, it would appear that
Arthurs and Sutherland were Bennett's personal choices and that, although
he may have been advised to appoint a woman from the country, it was he
who chose Mrs. Fallis.

* * * *

The situation in New Brunswick was quite different with R. B. Hanson
taking a very active interest in the Senate selections. The man who became
the first Bennett appointee in New Brunswick, George B. Jones, had first
been recommended by Hanson in January 1933 shortly after the death of
Senator Irving Todd. Hanson said that the member of parliament from Royal
had been the "brains" of the party in New Brunswick since 1908 when he won
the first of nine successive provincial and federal elections. He entered
the House of Commons in 1921 and was named Minister of Labor in the Meighen
cabinet in 1926.
Jones appears to have been highly regarded by all who knew him. Justice J. B. M. Baxter, the former Premier of New Brunswick, spoke very highly of him. A. D. Ganong, a fellow member of parliament, said that Jones was his first choice for the Senate and, if all the other applicants were to be asked for their second choice, each would name Jones.

A descendant of United Empire Loyalists, Jones was a merchant who had been President of Jones Brothers Ltd. for thirty-nine years. While he never applied in writing for the appointment, it seems to have been almost a foregone conclusion that he would fill one of the three New Brunswick vacancies.

Filling the remaining two vacancies posed a greater problem for the Prime Minister. That is quite likely why he delayed those decisions until mid-August at which time he chose A. J. Léger and B. F. Smith.

In Quebec, there were four vacancies and here again Bennett delayed all but one appointment until August. The man honored on 20 July was Arthur Sauvé, a member of the cabinet and former Conservative leader in Quebec. Sauvé had had a long and eventful political career. He served as Mayor of St. Benôit from 1906 until 1923. In 1908 he entered the Legislative Assembly upon winning the first of six provincial elections. In 1916 he was appointed the leader of the Conservatives in the Assembly, and in 1922 he was unanimously confirmed in that position by five hundred convention delegates. After the election of 1927, he announced his resignation as party leader and, at the convention in July 1929 when he again refused to continue, Sauvé was replaced by Camilien Houde. In 1930 he resigned his seat in Two Mountains to run for the House of Commons, was elected and subsequently named Postmaster General, a post he held until his appointment...
to the Senate. A journalist by profession, Sauvé was President of L'Union des Journalistes of Montreal, the well-known author of pamphlets on topics such as "St. John Baptist Celebration" and "The Foundation of the Liberal-Conservative Party succeeding to the Tory Party." His appointment met with a generally favorable reaction from his journalistic peers. La Patrie, La Presse and the Montreal Daily Star all welcomed his elevation. Each commented on his long and arduous career devoted to public service. The Star felt he would make a "wise, reserved, and valuable Senator." The Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph considered that Sauvé and Rhodes were perhaps the outstanding appointees.

As to the future outlook for the once Postmaster General, the newspaper commented that the "seclusion of the Upper House comes like the happy ending in the last act of a melodrama, after years of political misfortune and frustration." The Globe and Mail said that Sauvé who had been "badgered but always obedient...will rest in peace, safe at last from slings and arrows from Jean-Francis Pouliot's interrogatory wit..../He/ has suffered much and squirmed often." 26

However, one of Sauvé's former colleagues in the Quebec Legislative Assembly was very much against his appointment. On 11 July C. E. Gault, M.L.A., had written to "register my protest if Sauvé is to be appointed". He explained:

He has been a detriment to and lived on the party for the past twenty-five years. Both he and Duranleau have ruined the prospects for their party in their constituencies and if they are candidates they will be snowed under. Let them go down to oblivion.

It is obvious that by the time Bennett received Gault's letter, he had already made up his mind to appoint Sauvé to the Senate (and, incidentally, Duranleau to the Quebec Bench), but before the announcements were made, he wrote to assure him that he had read his letter "with great care."
added, "The situation is not without difficulty, but I hope when a decision is reached, it will commend itself to our friends." A month later, after his final selections had been made, he wrote Gault again:

You perhaps do not realize that if the wishes of members of the government with respect to their retirement are not met, they continue on but their services are half-hearted, and if they retire without recognition, they are then a source of worry to the party itself.²⁷

There is little doubt that Bennett was thinking of Sauvé when he wrote that letter, although perhaps it could apply equally to other M.P.'s whose "retirement" to the upper house had been arranged. That he wrote so frankly indicates Bennett's respect for Gault's opinion; he wanted it understood why he had made the appointment so opposed by the M.L.A.
NOTES
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CHAPTER VI

1935: AUGUST

With the release of his 20 July list, the Prime Minister had made ten political friends very happy and disappointed dozens more. For those candidates in Manitoba, New Brunswick and Quebec, hope still reigned, but they were to remain in suspense until mid-August. Manitoba, the only province which had not yet received an appointment from Bennett, awaited word on its two vacancies, New Brunswick anticipated two, Quebec three.

In Manitoba, one seat had been vacant since February 1934 when Senator Robert Forke died; the second became available in May 1935 on the death of Senator F. L. Schaffner. The two successful candidates were Col. Henry A. B. Mullins from the Marquette constituency in western Manitoba and John Thomas Haig of Winnipeg.

Henry Mullins, born in England, came to Lindsay, Ontario at the age of ten and was educated thereafter going west to Manitoba. During the war he served as Chief Inspector of Supply and Transport west of the Great Lakes, a position he filled with distinction. He was a director of the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Insurance Company and the Royal Canadian Security Company.

Mullins's political history dated back to 1899 when he was first elected to the Manitoba legislature. He retired from active politics in 1903 and did not seek election again until 1925 when he entered the House of Commons. He was defeated in 1926 to be re-elected in 1930 at the age sixty-nine. Mullins applied to succeed Senator Forke shortly after his
death, but the Prime Minister would not consider opening up his seat. His only other letter to Bennett was written 10 July 1935 to deny the rumor which was being circulated that he had taken up residence in Toronto. He explained that he had purchased a house in Toronto for his daughter, that his wife stayed there while he was in Ottawa, but that he himself had not changed his place of residence. "I have no apology to offer for having in any way neglected my duty or loyalty to you," Mullins added. When he was appointed, the Winnipeg Free Press welcomed the news. It predicted that Mullins, one of the best informed men in the cattle business in Canada, would continue to render useful public service in his new role of senator.1

John T. Haig, who was sixteen years younger than Mullins, was born in Colborne, Ontario, and moved to Manitoba at an early age. An Honor graduate of the University of Manitoba, he taught school for a time before pursuing the study of law. He was named a K.C. in 1927. He was President of Security Construction Company Ltd., vice president of Finance Corporation, Ltd., and Universal Life Assurance and Annuity Company, Ltd. An avid curler and lawn bowler, he had served as President of the Manitoba Curling Association, the Dominion Curling Association, and the Manitoba Lawn Bowling Association.

Haig's political life was spent in the Manitoba legislature with fourteen years' service as well on the Winnipeg School Board. He was first elected to the legislature in 1914, was defeated the following year, and re-elected four time between 1920 and 1932. Haig considered himself a "dark horse" candidate, but at the urging of many friends, he wrote to the Prime Minister on 20 July 1935. His participation in the National Organization Committee of the National Convention which had chosen Bennett leader highlighted his qualifications. He assured Bennett he would be "right on the job" when
an election came along whether or not he was appointed; nevertheless if the selection of a dark horse would smooth the way, "Barkus is willing." He emphasized that he was writing in the "strictest confidence," that he would not feel hurt if the Prime Minister took no action. Still he did characterize his services to his city and province over twenty-five years as "very energetic." As of 8 August, Bennett's reply was that there were "many difficulties in the way as there always are with senate positions" to which he added, "I may telephone you for I assume you have seen Mr. /T. G./ Murphy on his trip west."2

There is no indication that Murphy did contact Haig, the fifty-seven year old new appointee whom the Free Press hailed as a "leading and popular citizen of Winnipeg." The Manitoba cabinet minister had not included Haig's name on the list of candidates submitted a month earlier. That list of potential appointees included the names of a number of other candidates who had been in touch with Bennett--Mullins, Thomas Hay, Dr. H. C. Hodgson, Hugh R. Ross and Dr. R. M. Simpson among others.3

Thomas Hay seemed to be the man whom Murphy felt had the strongest claim. A member of a pioneer Manitoba family who had given long service to the Conservative party, he had been a candidate in five federal elections and two provincial between 1917 and 1930. He had been elected three times to the House of Commons for Springfield constituency, in 1917, in 1925 and in 1930. He first applied to replace Robert Forke in November 1934, telling the Prime Minister that he himself had discouraged his friends from sending petitions. Bennett replied that no petitions were necessary; in any event, his request would be difficult to fill. "If it were possible to do, I would be only too glad to do so, but the matter is by no means entirely in my hands," he cautioned. Murphy felt that Hay deserved consideration because of the number
of times he had offered himself as a candidate, particularly in two provincial elections when the situations were "more or less hopeless." In their letters of recommendation, Hay's many friends mentioned his long service and his Manitoba family background. There is no doubt that Hay's appointment would have been a popular one, but apparently with only two seats available, the Prime Minister decided that only one should go a senior politician. Harry Mullins had been that choice.

Dr. H. C. Hodgson of Winnipeg had given considerable service to the party as an organizer, never as a candidate. He had been President of the Manitoba Conservative Association in 1928, chief organizer in the province for the federal election of 1930. On recommending him, James Stitt, M.P., claimed that he had given great service with "very little recognition" for the "thankless job" of party organizer. Other friends supported him, including Archbishop Alfred A. Sinnett of Winnipeg, a point which Bennett said he considered significant because Hodgson was not a Catholic. The Prime Minister indicated to the Archbishop that Hodgson stood little chance, however. Many of the old timers who had given longer service would feel that the appointment should not go to a younger man whose service had been relatively short.5

Efforts to secure the position for Hugh R. Ross were unique; the only letter Ross ever wrote to the Prime Minister was on behalf of another man, not himself. However, Ross had the fervent backing of a large number of United Church adherents who seemed to have taken it as their personal mission to secure a Senate seat for him. Their letter campaign started in 1933 months before a vacancy existed and continued until mid-1935. Mention was made of his candidature in 1921, but for the most part, his supporters stressed his good citizenship and outstanding character. It is questionable whether Ross himself was even aware of these efforts, but few Senate applicants
for a seat were favored with so many sincere accolades.

Dr. R. M. Simpson was the man about whom Ross had written to the Prime Minister to suggest a candidacy for either the Senate or the Lieutenant-Governorship. Consideration of Simpson for either position had been recommended by a widely divergent group and he himself made no secret that he would welcome an appointment primarily because his financial position was shaky. The Prime Minister conceded that Simpson had never before asked for anything, that his request was not unreasonable, but he told him that if it could not be met, he hoped "you'll accept it as part of the fortunes of war." At a later date, Murphy advised that despite Simpson's "strong claims," his health was such that his appointment would be unwise. It is doubtful that Bennett had been giving him serious consideration, but Murphy's assessment would not have helped Simpson's cause.7

T. G. Murphy's list made it obvious that little or no consideration had been given to the women of the province in spite of the fact that they had held the franchise longer than in any of the other provinces. Of the fifteen names listed, only one was that of a woman, Mrs. H. G. Brown, and she merited mention only as one of four people who had "also submitted their claims for recognition." Little wonder, then, that Bennett wrote to Mrs. J. H. Cathcart on 17 August 1935 to say that, in discussing the possibility of appointing a woman to one of the two Manitoba vacancies, "our friends did not think it possible at the present time." He hoped she would agree that "it was more or less difficult, if not impossible, to appoint a woman with only two vacancies."8

In the final analysis, Bennett seems to have made up his own mind although he had discussed the appointments with Murphy and other leading party members of Manitoba. His choice was one man from a rural riding,
the second from the province's major metropolitan area. Although Mullins was older than he would have preferred, apparently because of his long service Bennett overlooked that fact.

* * * *

There were still two senators to be selected in New Brunswick. The Prime Minister faced difficulties for, although he had made a popular move in appointing George Jones on 20 July, the two remaining openings in his native province were not so easy to fill. Strong competition continued to flourish for the Acadian seat of the late Senator Pascal Poirier, and, following the defeat of the New Brunswick Conservative government in June, there were more aspirants than ever for the second seat. Bennett's final choice of A. J. Léger and B. F. Smith was quite acceptable to most Conservatives, but many candidates were disappointed, particularly the former Premier, L. P. D. Tilley.

The choice of Antoine J. Léger, a lawyer from Moncton, was of little surprise to most observers; it had long been rumored that he would be named to either the Senate or bench. Léger had taken an active part in every election since 1904, a candidate in the provincial elections of 1917, 1925 and 1930, a success in the last two. In 1925 he had been named Provincial Secretary-Treasurer and Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the cabinet of Premier J. B. M. Baxter, positions which he retained under Premier Tilley. A director and legal advisor of the National Society of Acadians, for over twenty years he had been as well the legal advisor and directing spirit of La Société l'Assomption, a mutual and fraternal society of over ten thousand members. A short time before, Léger had written a highly praised book about La Société.

The campaign for Léger's appointment began in October 1933 a few days after the death of Pascal Poirier and continued unabated. The chief hurdle
Léger faced was that Westmorland county, his territory, already had four senators while seven other counties in the province had none. Evidently Bennett was as concerned about this inequitable geographic distribution in New Brunswick as he had been about the situation in Saskatchewan at the time of Marcotte's appointment. When he asked Léger and his supporters if they could see any way round the problem of Westmorland's over-representation, they argued that Poirier, one of three Acadian senators, had come from the south; his successor should come from there too. As far as the Acadians were concerned, the fact that Westmorland had more than its share of English-speaking senators was really irrelevant. The seat was Acadian; Léger was their chosen leader. Dr. J. C. Webster echoed this view, but he did admit that if he could have his way, the position would go to the best man available, regardless of race. He readily recognized that such a thought was idealistic.

Indications are that by the end of November 1933 Bennett had already made a tentative decision to appoint Léger even though such had not had the support of his New Brunswick minister, R. B. Hanson. His concern was that, once Léger was appointed he would be lost as a political worker, that he would simply attend the session, draw his salary and "depart hence to attend to his law practice." Too, Hanson deplored the fact that Léger was conducting such a vigorous campaign, charging him with "allowing, if not fathering, petitions." However, his most effective argument was that it would be almost impossible to find a replacement for him should Léger leave the provincial government. Premier Tilley agreed with this assessment and the Prime Minister assured him in February 1934 that "there will be no need for making the appointments to the Senate at the moment."

There the matter lay until July 1935 when the campaign to secure the Senate seat for Léger gained new momentum. In June the Tilley government
suffered an overwhelming defeat and even Léger lost his seat. His supporters were more anxious than ever to secure the seat that had undoubtedly been promised to him. Needless to say, Bennett was pressured from other quarters to appoint the candidates they favored; for a time he contemplated naming Léger to the Supreme Court of New Brunswick instead of to the Senate. Although he had considerable support for such a move, Bennett was unable to carry it through: Léger refused to relinquish his claim to the Senate seat. Likely his supporters would have been satisfied with either appointment—they considered the Acadian representation in the Supreme Court inadequate—but Léger had his heart set on the Senate. Not even the usually persuasive Prime Minister could change his mind. Thus it was that on 14 August Antoine Léger joined Senators O. Turgeon and T. J. Bourque as the Acadian representatives in the Senate from New Brunswick. 

Probably the odd man out because of Léger's intractability was Ferdinand J. Robidoux from Shediac, Westmorland county. Born in Shediac, Robidoux had settled in Kent county in 1900 and it was there in 1908 that he ran unsuccessfully for the House of Commons, entering the contest again in 1911, that time to be elected. He had always been a loyal party man, supporting even the Military Service Act, a decision which led to his defeat in 1917. By his own admission, Robidoux lost many friends "whose esteem I prized." Subsequently he returned to Shediac to make a new start.

In applying for the appointment, Robidoux readily conceded that Léger was an "excellent man", but he suggested that he would make a worthy addition to the Supreme Court. He reminded the Prime Minister that, of the five French Canadians who had supported the Military Service Act, only he had not been rewarded with a federal government appointment. It was true that the Baxter government had put him on the Liquor Board and that he served on
the Hydro Electric Commission (for which he was paid only when attending sittings), but he was prepared to resign from both positions if he were named to the Senate. Ironically, many Acadians considered that, having been given these two positions, Robidoux had been "looked after" although neither was comparable to a Senate seat in stature or remuneration.13

Former Prime Minister Robert Borden felt strongly about Robidoux, stating "he was an especially loyal friend and supporter for whose welfare I feel great concern." J. D. Hazen, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, spoke highly of him, stressing that his appointment would be received with favor by friends of the party in the province, particularly the Acadians. T. Arsenault, M.P., echoed this viewpoint and recounted how, at great personal expense, Robidoux had organized and published *Moniteur Acadien* for the elections of 1925 and 1926 and the *Nation* for the election of 1930, thus giving the Conservative party a voice among the Acadians in New Brunswick. Bennett who had suffered similar financial losses keeping the *Regina Daily Star* afloat must have felt a pang of sympathy at this reminder of similar endeavours.14

Unfortunately for Robidoux, the influential R. B. Hanson was no longer one of his supporters. Initially, when the question of filling the Acadian vacancy had occurred, he had favored him over Léger. Then with the realization that Léger, not Robidoux, had the support of the majority of the clergy, he changed his mind. Hanson insisted that he himself continued to think very highly of him, but Robidoux would not have the full backing of his people--his father was Quebec-born; therefore he could not be considered a true Acadian. Besides, his wife was Protestant.15

Although probably the best known, Robidoux was by no means the only unsuccessful Acadian aspirant to the upper house. Among others who made a bit to succeed the late Senator Poirier were Aimé P. Bourque, Herméne
Boulay, Alexandre-J. Doucet, Dr. Albert Sormony and Edouard de Grace.
Aimé Bourque, a retired official of the Canadian National, does not appear to have been an active Conservative, but apparently that fact did not prevent him from making application. At seventy-five years of age, it would seem that his sole mission in life was to discover perpetual motion, a pursuit which had occupied him for forty-five years. Why he considered that this study entitled him to a Senate seat he did not say. However, when he went to Los Angeles a year after his first letter of application, the self-professed "well known candidate for the Senate" was careful to give the Prime Minister his change of address, to assure him that he continued to work on his project with faith that he was "likely to succeed any day soon." Bennett who had replied to his first letter by saying that he had read it "with interest" was forced to tell him what he had told so many others: there were already four senators from his county of Westmorland; it would be very difficult to name a fifth.16

Boulay may have provided the Prime Minister with a few light moments; Herméne Boulay certainly did not. Originally from the province of Quebec, Boulay lived in Kedgewick, New Brunswick. He made the claim that Restigouche-Madawaska should have a senator and that he would be a logical choice as appointee. Back in Rimouski he had been an unsuccessful candidate in 1908 but was elected in 1911 to sit in the House of Commons until 1917. Boulay said he would "accept" an appointment in Quebec if one were not available in New Brunswick. When he was not chosen for either, he wrote a scathing letter to the Prime Minister. Bennett replied to that letter, admitting that he did so because Boulay "was an old Conservative and Member of Parliament." He showed remarkable restraint explaining that, had he remained in Quebec, his "claims could not have been easily overlooked" but in New Brunswick the minister:
would not support him. It is highly unlikely that Boulay would have had much support in Quebec even if he were still living there, but by answering as he did, Bennett no doubt hoped to keep him on the Conservative side in the upcoming election.17

A candidate of quite a different type was Alexandre Doucet from Notre Dame in Kent County. Doucet had run in five elections—four federal and one provincial—and was successful in three of them. He was defeated federally in 1921 but was successful in a by-election in 1923 and the general election of 1925. Defeated again in 1926, he was influential in getting T. Arsenault elected in 1930. In 1931 he won a provincial by-election in Gloucester "against great odds". This record of political activity led him to believe that he had earned a promotion to the Senate. Doucet was recommended by Senator P. F. Martin, but he did not seem to have the backing of any other influential Conservative figure, perhaps because he did not solicit such backing as so many other candidates did.18

Dr. Albert Sormony of Edmundston was a rather controversial figure. He had considerable support from the local clergy and from Bishop Arthur Melanson of Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan. Bishop Melanson, who had earlier written to extol the virtues of Léger, suggested that if Bennett did not want to appoint another senator from Westmorland, the choice of Sormony, "a perfect gentleman of knowledge and action", would solve the problem. Many parish priests sent wires and petitions on his behalf. It is interesting that, in so doing, most of them asked as well that Antoine Léger be named to succeed Judge Byrne of the New Brunswick Supreme Court and that J. E. Léger be appointed as Administrator of Postal Services for Saint John. However, Sormony's campaign raised the ire of a number of party members who claimed he was not a true Conservative; perhaps for this reason he did not receive
very serious consideration.

Another candidate from the north was J. Edouard de Grace, a school inspector from Campbellton. De Grace, who had been active since 1908, was a federal candidate in 1921 and had taken part in the elections of 1925, 1926 and 1930. When he applied shortly after the death of Senator Poirier, de Grace received a rather bitter reply from Bennett. The Prime Minister was still smarting from the defeat of the Conservative candidate in a recent by-election in Restigouche-Madawaska; the Liberals had taken the seat from the Conservatives with a six-thousand vote majority. He complained that it would be very difficult to select a senator to represent the Acadian interests in northern New Brunswick "when apparently all are of the opposing political faith." However, R. B. Hanson suggested that, if Bennett found it impossible to choose between Léger and Robidoux, the two Westmorland candidates, he should give some consideration to de Grace. He was a "respectable, educated Acadian" whom he had supported for school inspector. The New Brunswick Teachers Association reported that he had given excellent service and that it would be gratifying not only to them, but to the Canadian Teachers Federation, if one of their members received the appointment. Bennett promised to consider him, but it is obvious that de Grace had only an outside chance at best.20

The filling of the other New Brunswick seat posed quite a different problem for the Prime Minister. The man he finally named, albeit somewhat reluctantly, was seventy year old Benjamin Franklin Smith who had been an active Conservative since 1903. In that year he contested the first of seven provincial elections, defeated only once, in 1921. He also ran in four federal contests to be elected in 1925 and again in 1930 with the largest majority ever recorded by a candidate in East Florenceville. Smith, a wholesale produce merchant, was president of B. F. Smith, Ltd., the Saint John Valley
Produce Exchange and the Associated Shippers of New Brunswick.

When Senator Irving Todd died in December, 1932, Smith made an unusual move for a potential candidate. He wrote the Prime Minister to say that he felt nothing should be done about filling the vacancy until election time, a point with which Bennett concurred. However, Smith's friends were not of the same mind and they were quick to suggest that he be elevated to the upper house. He was recommended by G. H. Blakeny, the mayor of Moncton, and Hugh John Flemming. H. H. Hatfield reported that through his association with Smith in the potato business, he knew what financial sacrifices he had made for the party. In November 1934 it was rumored in the New Brunswick press that Thomas Bell, M.P., would be named to the Senate. This brought forth a strong protest from B. E. Cliff who advised Hanson that if Bell and not Smith got the appointment, they might as well "kiss Carleton-Victoria goodbye." Cliff added that Bell would be of no help in the upcoming election; they "might as well have old Senator Poirier, and he is dead." Hanson agreed with his sentiments. He contended that although Bennett seemed "not too well disposed to appointing Frank Smith," from a political standpoint Smith should get one English seat, George Jones the other.21

In July 1935, Smith was unable to see the Prime Minister in person before leaving for home; he had to be content with expressing his views by letter. He remarked that he understood Bennett's distress over the results of the recent election in the province and assured him that, if he were ten years younger, he would run again. However, he was past seventy, he had suffered business reverses in the past ten years; a younger man should take over. He suggested Hugh J. Flemming. Smith pointed out that his constituency had been Liberal when he began; now if any seat were safe in New Brunswick, it was Carleton-Victoria. He contended that he had made as many sacrifices as any
man and that his constituency, which had not had a senator since confederation, was expecting the honor. Further, the area from Saint John extending along the Saint John River to Quebec was without representation. His appointment would rectify that situation.

A few days after writing this letter, Smith suffered the loss of his family home by fire. This elicited an expression of sympathy from the Prime Minister who took the opportunity to inform him that the matter of the senate was "difficult, especially because of the recent loss by the Provincial Government." It is obvious that Bennett was still not willing to concede an appointment for Smith, but a letter arrived a few days later from R. B. Hanson to swing the pendulum in his favor. Hanson wrote:

I know your antipathy against the appointment of Frank Smith, but every dictate of wisdom prompts me to stand by this recommendation. His appointment will be more popular in Saint John than any other man, including Tilley and Bell. But most important, the executive of Carleton-Victoria tell me if he is not appointed, they cannot get a candidate, and I cannot be left in this position. Smith is not in on this, as he hasn't communicated with me since he left Ottawa.

It is not clear why Bennett was so reluctant to appoint Smith. The correspondence between the two men was very cordial and certainly Smith seemed unaware that the Prime Minister had any negative feelings towards him. It is unlikely that age was a factor. At seventy, Smith was older than Bennett would have preferred, but six of his other 1935 Senate appointees were past sixty-five. In any case, three weeks after receiving Hanson's frank letter and in spite of the pressures being exerted on behalf of former Premier L. P. D. Tilley, Bennett elevated Smith to the Senate.

For Tilley, the Prime Minister's failure to appoint him to the Senate must have been the greatest disappointment of his political career. When his government had been defeated in June, quite naturally he looked to his friends
in Ottawa to find him a meaningful position. For him, the Senate was a logical choice. Certainly Tilley's expectations were not unreasonable in light of the nature and length of his public service. He had "taken the stump for the party in every election, federal and provincial" since the age of nineteen. He was first elected to the legislature in 1912; he became a member of the newly-formed Baxter government in 1925; he was named Minister of Lands in 1931; two years later he succeeded Baxter as Premier and continued to hold the Lands portfolio. Throughout that whole period, he had carried on his Law practice but had given it very little time, especially since 1931; consequently he had had little to fall back on once he was defeated.

In early July, Tilley met with R. B. Hanson to discuss his prospects and he then wrote to his good friend, Sir George Perley:

The support for my application is strong. I was deeply hurt when when R. B. Hanson intimated a County Court Judgeship for Kings and Albert Counties was to be my reward. You can imagine my feelings. If I am forced to take it I suppose I will have to, but I feel hurt beyond words to think that the Government, composed in nearly every instance of warm personal friends, should hand me out a position of this kind, instead of a position of Senatorship, where I can still be of some public service to my Province and country.23

No doubt Perley discussed the situation with Bennett and forwarded him a copy of the letter. On 2 August the Prime Minister wired Tilley, "Am anxious to speak with you. Please telephone me immediately upon your arrival in Saint John."24

As a result of the ensuing conversation, the former Premier agreed to take the County Court appointment, probably realizing he had very little choice. This must have been a particularly difficult meeting for Bennett. It was Tilley who had nominated him at the leadership convention eight years earlier. At that Tilley fared better than the former premiers of other provinces. J. T. M. Anderson of Saskatchewan, S. F. Tolmie of British Columbia, George Henry of Ontario--each sought government appointments, each was rejected out of hand.
There were a number of other applicants for this remaining Senate seat, including Thomas Bell, R. W. Grimmer, C. P. Hickey, W. S. Montgomery and David A. Stewart.

Thomas Bell, member of parliament for Saint John-Albert counties, first applied in January 1933 to succeed Senator J. W. Daniel. Although he indicated that there were many others after that seat, Bennett did promise to discuss the matter with him. He must have given Bell no hope when they met because there was no further correspondence between them; still Bell's name came up several times in 1934 and 1935 as that of a potential candidate.  

R. W. Grimmer, a popular former member from Charlotte County, had been an M.L.A. for eight years and an M.P. for nine. He had retired in 1930 to make way for Arthur D. Ganong whose family had been staunch Conservative supporters for thirty years. In 1931 Grimmer had been appointed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but that position ended in 1933 when he turned sixty-five. He was strongly recommended by Charles Murchie, Chairman of the Election Committee for Charlotte County, who wrote several letters on his behalf. However, apparently former Premier Baxter did not favour his appointment. Grimmer was never really given serious consideration.

C. P. Hickey was a pharmacist from Chatham whose supporters attempted to persuade the Prime Minister that the vacancy should go to an Irish Catholic. Hickey was their choice. They argued that Senator John McDonald, the Irish representative who had been appointed by Arthur Meighen in 1921, was in actual fact from Nova Scotia. He had only a summer home in New Brunswick. Naturally this fact caused great resentment among the Catholics of New Brunswick. Bennett replied that there were already four Catholic senators; he could not change that balance "without creating a difficulty which will extend to many other parts of Canada." He agreed that the situation was
unfair but it was beyond his power to rectify it. As he commented to Hickey, "I am not the complete master in this situation....personal interests must be disregarded in the public interest." Still another applicant, W. S. Montgomery, was the manager of the Dalhousie Land Company in Dalhousie. He hoped to get the appointment for Restigouche which had never had a senator. He had considerable support from acquaintances, but no strong support from members of parliament and cabinet ministers--quite the opposite, in fact. R. B. Hanson, on hearing of the move to seat Montgomery, wrote to Bennett enclosing a letter from the President of the Conservative Association for Restigouche-Madawaska in which he said he was very much against the appointment. Hanson added that in his own opinion such an appointment "would be a disgraceful one. He is not the type who should go to the Senate. I never met him yet but what he was in a semi-intoxicated condition." Bennett agreed that he had heard much the same from Judge Baxter and assured Hanson that "I fancy I have much the same opinion myself." There was thought given to the suggestion that Restigouche should have a representative in the Senate. After all, it did contribute considerable revenue from its potato crops, pulp and paper industries and lumbering. Apparently the Prime Minister remained unconvinced of the necessity for such a move.

David A. Stewart, former Minister of Public Works in the Tilley government, was in complete agreement with those who were anxious that Restigouche be represented in the Senate. He hoped to be the one chosen to fill such a seat. As for the rumor that B. F. Smith was being considered, he reasoned that while Smith had the backing to get re-elected in Carleton-Victoria, it would be impossible to elect a Conservative in Restigouche. Therefore that area would have to be given representation in the Senate. Stewart, who
had been a member of the New Brunswick legislature for fifteen years prior to his defeat in June, admitted needing a position because of financial problems. He had spent all his means educating his three sons. Like so many defeated candidates from all across the country, he looked to the federal Conservative government for assistance. He too was doomed to disappointment.

The influence of R. B. Hanson was apparent in all three New Brunswick appointments. Unlike the majority of cabinet ministers, Hanson chose to become directly involved in the selections. Bennett appears to have placed stock in his advice. Although Calgary had been his home for many years, the Prime Minister maintained close ties with his native province. He was particularly anxious to make selections which would prove acceptable to the party stalwarts there. For this reason, he decided to appoint Frank Smith when his personal choice would have been Tilley who was less politically acceptable.

* * * *

In Quebec, three vacancies remained. These were filled by two medical doctors--Dr. Emile Fortin and Dr. Eugene Paquet--and a lawyer--Charles Bourgeois, K. C. Fortin and Bourgeois were current members of parliament, Paquet a former member and long-time Conservative worker in Quebec.

 Probably few of the Bennett Senate appointees wished more desperately for the position that did Dr. Fortin, a pharmacist and physician from Lévis. Fortin was a widower with ten children, seven of whom were still students; he himself was in poor health; his political activity had all but finished his medical practice. He had been an organizer in 1925, an unsuccessful candidate in 1926, an organizer again for the 1928 provincial election,
and a candidate—with success this time—in 1930. Fortin had applied for a Senate seat shortly after the death of Senator Jules Tessier in January 1934. A few months later he asked the Prime Minister to let him know if he had no chance; he would have to return to what was left of his practice. He stressed that things were "getting more serious all the time." Bennett wrote to his "dear old friend" immediately upon receiving the letter saying, "Do not become despondent. We all have troubles...when you return to the House, I will have a talk with you." Perhaps the Prime Minister informed Fortin in person that there were no plans to make appointments at that time. There was no further correspondence for a year. However, in June 1935 Bennett proved that he had not forgotten Fortin's problems when he wrote to Maurice Dupré:

I think something has to be done for poor old Dr. Fortin if it is at all possible. You know the nature and the character of the service he has rendered.30

Dupré assured the Prime Minister that he was "at his disposal" to do anything he suggested. The way had been paved for the appointment of the fifty-seven year old Fortin, but apparently no one told him of Bennett’s intention. "Please don't forget me," he wired on 17 July; "For God's sake don't forget me," he wired again on 13 August less than a month later. One more day and an order-in-council announced his appointment for the division of de la Durantaye. Fortin's ordeal was over.31 His story was reminiscent of that of Alfred Fripp whose appointment rescued him from dire financial straits. Both had many friends and acquaintances who wrote on their behalf. Stress was laid on length of service to the party, but their financial woes loomed large. Compassion played a major role in both decisions undoubtedly. Perhaps there was a side to Prime Minister Bennett not too well-known outside of Conservative circles.

Dr. Eugene Paquet, also a physician, was ten years older than Fortin.
He had been active politically for thirty-five years. He had run successfully in L'Islet in 1904, 1908 and 1911, a notable feat because it was very difficult for a Conservative to get elected in the Quebec district in Laurier's day. Dr. Paquet first applied for the Senate in January 1933, a petition bearing the signatures of scores of Bonaventure citizens arriving in Ottawa the same day. He reminded Bennett that, since arriving in Bonaventure in 1917, he had worked very hard, that he would likely have been successful at the polls in 1926 had his opponents not introduced the conscription issue. In 1930 he had campaigned actively for E. A. D. Morgan, a lawyer. Although Morgan was defeated, the Liberal majority was reduced to 36 votes. Paquet, who had agreed at that time to stand aside so that Morgan could run, had been assured by the provincial organizer, J. H. Rainville, that he would be appointed to the Senate at the first opportunity. Postmaster General Arthur Sauvé later confirmed that he would get "what was promised to him." Paquet himself did not raise this subject with the Prime Minister. He did state that as director of patronage he was "still devoting my time to the cause of the party"; a Senate appointment would "increase my prestige in Bonaventure and assure victory for the next election." In late July 1935, E. A. D. Morgan wrote to Sir George Perley to remind him of Paquet's service to the party. He said that although he did not wish to complain, he wanted to point out that "not one of the old Conservatives from the Quebec district has had a look-in on the plums."

This situation was rectified on 14 August when Paquet joined Fortin in the Senate, succeeding to the seat of H. S. Beland in the division of Lauzon. The final Senate appointment made by R. B. Bennett was that of Charles Bourgeois from Trois Rivières. Although the order-in-council naming Bourgeois was dated 15 August, it was not released immediately to the press. There had been mounting speculation as to who the appointee might be. The name of
Bourgeois was not given a high rating, perhaps because his stay in the House of Commons had been relatively short. He had been an unsuccessful candidate in 1926, but the successful contesting of a by-election in August 1931 brought him into the House of Commons. In his early years he had been active in local politics, serving as alderman of Trois Rivières in 1911 and as mayor in 1913. He had been Batonnier of the local bar in 1921, 1922, 1925 and 1926, and he served as Batonnier General for the province of Quebec in 1926. Pope Pius XI created him a Commander of the Order of St. Sylvester in 1932.

In December 1933 Bourgeois wrote to the Prime Minister disclaiming responsibility for the "premature" campaign which had been started on his behalf with reference to Senator Jacques Bureau's vacant seat; he admitted that he had told his supporters of his interest "when time matures for it." However, interest in Bourgeois was being expressed even though he may not have been taking an active part. There were recommendations from a number of church leaders; the mayor of Trois Rivières assured the Prime Minister that he was "President of many benevolent societies for helping the needy....a very respectful and respected citizen." There were dissenting voices, however. J. Verrette of the R. B. Bennett Club of Trois Rivières charged that the appointment of Bourgeois would be a disgrace; there were other members of parliament who deserved it more. "Bourgeois has been a thorough-paced curse to the Conservative Party in Trois Rivières," he stormed by letter to the Prime Minister, enclosing a condemnatory newspaper article to strengthen his claim. Even after the appointment was made, an anonymous writer continued to attack the appointment in venomous terms, returning to the Prime Minister several pictures he had of him. Aside from this outburst, there was very little reaction to the appointment of Bourgeois. Undoubtedly the people of Trois Rivières
were gratified to have the seat go to a long-time resident of their city. The numerous other aspirants for these final Quebec seats included J.-A. Barrette, Pierre Bertrand, Paul Lacoste and Ludger Bastien.

Bennett may well have become aware of J.-A. Barrette's possible candidacy through the receipt of a negative letter in March 1932. Written on Senate letterhead, it bore the signature, "A few members of the Senate," in effect no signature at all. It suggested there was "lots of nonsense" about the consideration of Barrette to succeed Senator Legris. They were sure the "Prime Minister "was too full of dignity to replace him by such a fool....we do not want any more disgrace in this room; we have already too much." Whether or not the letter was authentic, it was bound to rouse the curiosity of Bennett, especially as he was soon to receive information that was highly commendatory. To Barrette's supporters he eventually replied that he knew their candidate well--they had entered the House of Commons together in 1911. However, there would be a problem in opening up his seat. It was not until 18 July 1935 that Barrette undertook to make application himself. He wrote:

I claim justice and reward for long service. I have a large family and I am poor. The Trinity, Duranleau, Rainville, and Cartier are against me. I have confidence in you.

He wrote again on 1 August to request appointment to the district of Shawinigan "in the name of our old friendship and in consideration of my long service."

After the appointment had gone to Bourgeois, Bennett explained to a supporter of Barrette that it had been mandatory to name a resident of Trois Rivières. He hoped Barrette could be honored at a later date. Of course, that day never came. Barrette was left to face once again the voters of Berthier, to contest the constituency where he had worked so hard for thirty years.

Pierre Bertrand was a member of the Quebec Legislative Assembly from St. Sauveur who had begun his political career as an alderman, a position he
held for twelve years. In the federal election of 1921, he had been defeated as a Conservative candidate in Quebec West, but in 1923 he was elected to the provincial house in St. Sauveur. Defeated in 1927, he was successful in 1931. Bertrand had started his career as a laborer, and although he eventually became a successful shoe manufacturer, letters and petitions testified that he continued to have the support of the laboring class. Bennett seemed to have a high regard for Bertrand. He told him that the party leaders in Quebec felt it was "absolutely essential that you be in the next provincial election as a candidate....there is great work for you to do in the Provincial legislature. An appointment to the Senate might come at a later date." Evidently there had been some hope that Bertrand would be appointed for Shawinigan, but Bennett pointed out that the residents of Trois-Rivières had a stronger claim. They demanded that the third largest city "be secure in its representation in the Senate". Action was taken accordingly.  

Paul Lacoste, a lawyer from Montreal whose father and grandfather had been senators, felt he was entitled to the position too. He did have considerable support from English-speaking Conservatives such as R. L. Borden and C. H. Cahan, but he roused only antagonism in Bennett who remarked to Cahan, "I am familiar with Paul Lacoste's claims, but I cannot think that his persistence in urging these claims improves his chances."  

The unsuccessful candidate on whose behalf the strongest campaign was waged was Ludger Bastien from Quebec City. Bastien himself made no application, but the campaign for his appointment began in September 1932 with the submission of a petition containing fifteen hundred names. Deputy Speaker Armand Lavergne and, to a lesser extent, C. N. Dorion, M.P., made a determined bid to secure the Senate seat for him. A manufacturer, Bastien had been a member of the Quebec Assembly from 1922 to 1927 and an unsuccessful candidate in 1927 and 1931.
According to Dorion, he was from one of Quebec's most distinguished families and had "spent a small fortune" on behalf of the Conservative party. Of Huron extraction with "French blood in his veins," he was Great Chief of the Huron reserve of the Young Lorette, a fact which Lavergne maintained would have a beneficial influence on the Indian population all across the country. The campaign continued unabated until the Prime Minister made his final dispositions in August 1935.38

When Bastien had been passed over in favor of A. J. Brown and J. H. Rainville in October 1932, Lavergne had persisted in his campaign on his candidate's behalf. He attempted to put pressure on Solicitor General Maurice Dupre because he claimed he was "the only one against Bastien." He reminded his colleague that he had done him favours in the past including his help in securing his nomination; in return he wanted his support for Bastien's application. Dupre was not persuaded; he continued to oppose Bastien. Lavergne then renewed his request to Bennett only to receive the judgment that Bastien "is still an Indian under the Act and would not, therefore, be eligible for appointment." At that Lavergne "begged to differ" with the Prime Minister by stating:

/My/ opinion is corroborated by M. Plaxton of the Department of Justice, M. Charles Lanctot, Assistant Attorney-General for Quebec, M. Louis St.-Laurent, and many other prominent lawyers who unanimously hold the opinion that the fact of Mr. Bastien being an Indian would not in any way disqualify him as a Senator. The only qualifications requested are those of the B.N.A. Act, the Canadian Revised Statutes, and nothing in the Indian Act prevents an Indian not living in the Reserves, of exercising the rights of an ordinary citizen.39

Bennett re-affirmed that Bastien was ineligible. However, he informed Dupre that Lavergne was "pressing very hard" and asked him to discuss the matter with him. Then in December 1934, Bennett suggested that Lavergne himself get in touch with Dupre again. Two months later Dupre reported to the Prime that Lavergne was adamant; he had made Bastien's appointment the condition
"sine qua non" for his support of the party in the next election. Dupré was now ready to compromise. He observed that, although he did not believe the selection of Bastien would help the party, perhaps something could be done for him "in view of his past services." 40

Whatever chance Bastien might have had was probably erased by the sudden death of Armand Lavergne on 5 March 1935. The campaign of the former Nationalist leader was extraordinary. In no other appointment had any one fought so tenaciously to seat a long-time friend and supporter. It is hard to fathom his motives. Perhaps through the years, it had developed into nothing more than a battle of wills between Dupré and himself.

C. N. Dorion continued to press on Bastien's behalf and wired Bennett on 10 August that his appointment would secure his re-election. "Otherwise, the situation is very bad." 41 However, the Prime Minister was not prepared to overrule Dupré. He dug in his heels. Unlike his actions in the Marcotte affair, Bennett did not yield to the pressure that had continued unrelentingly for three long years.
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CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

R. B. Bennett was an experienced parliamentarian. He understood well that the Senate of Canada was designed to give equal representation to the sections or regions of the country and to safeguard the minority and sectional rights and interests of all Canadians. Certain major minorities had acquired a kind of prescriptive right to representation in the Senate: the Acadians in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; the French-speaking Canadians in Ontario; the English-speaking Catholics in the predominately English-speaking provinces; the English-speaking Catholics and Protestants in Quebec. In his choice of senators, the Prime Minister was prepared to honor that tradition.

In the weighing of decision-making factors—his guidelines—unquestionably Bennett considered the element of religion to be of paramount importance. Over and over again his papers reflect that attitude. But his interpretation of that particular element raised real problems for him in Saskatchewan in 1931 when he sought in fairness to restore to the Catholics a seat that had been traditionally theirs. The province's considerable Protestant Conservatives objected strenuously, but the Prime Minister successfully dismissed what he considered to be their unrealistic objections. It was the introduction of the racial factor by the very vocal French Canadian minority that troubled him. They insisted that the seat be assigned not only to a Catholic, but to the French Canadian Catholic, Arthur Marcotte. For a time he held out.
Religion was the issue, not race; the secondary factor was regional. On those grounds, southerner Marcotte was totally unacceptable. The correspondence shows that there were two northerners qualified to meet both the regional and religious needs. But J. J. Leddy proved unacceptable to the Conservative-led provincial government, Joseph Foley to the influential Catholic hierarchy. No other prospect emerged from among the English-speaking Catholics of the north to counterbalance the massive support for Marcotte mustered not only in Saskatchewan but in French Canadian Catholic conclaves across the nation. Much against his will, the Prime Minister was forced to appoint a man whose qualifications did not satisfy his own regional guideline.

A probe of the Bennett Papers indicates that Bennett's guidelines served him better in his other appointments. Never again did his designation of an issue as a religious one create the problems he confronted in the Marcotte case. In fact, often it made his choice clear-cut. In Alberta in 1931, for example, the Catholic Pat Burns had clear preference over Emily Murphy whose appeal as a representative of women could not counter-balance her Protestantism. In 1932 the Presbyterian C. C. Ballantyne succeeded logically to the traditionally Protestant seat in Quebec. With like ease, F. P. Quinn, an Irish Catholic, was appointed in Nova Scotia in 1935 to the seat once held by the Irish Catholic Senator Martin. Even in an unusual case in 1935 where a seat once designated Protestant was assigned to a Catholic, there was no controversy. In Prince Edward Island, Senator John McLean, a Protestant, resigned his seat expressly to make way for J. A. Macdonald, an extraordinary move in the history of Senate appointments. The fact that Macdonald was a Catholic and that therefore the ratio of Protestant/Catholic representation would stand at two to two instead of the existing three to one raised no
comment.

As for those appointments where he deemed race to be the major factor, Bennett encountered little difficulty with one troublesome exception. To be sure, he was subjected to considerable pressure from those who sought to influence his choice. For instance, in Ontario in 1933 Bennett found it necessary to remind a number of people that the Senator Belcourt vacancy "belonged" to the French Canadians. In his mind, the only question to be resolved was one of region: which was to be represented, northern Ontario or eastern? His eventual appointment of Louis Cote from Ottawa stirred no charge that the seat had been unfairly placed. Rumors abounded in Nova Scotia in 1933 and 1934 that the vacant Acadian seat might be filled by an English-speaking Catholic. Bennett himself had no such thought. J. P. L. Robicheau was his first choice among several Acadians, the only group he considered. The one troublesome aspect of that appointment was the need for some regional consideration, a minor problem easily resolved. In New Brunswick in 1935 he had to face again a blurring of guidelines somewhat reminiscent of the Marcotte case. Racial considerations brought about the appointment of A. J. Léger of Westmorland county, even though that meant that five out of the ten senators came from that county. Bennett feared that that situation could provoke regional dissatisfaction because so many other counties had none. But for the Acadians, at any rate, Léger was the proper choice; they were quite prepared to insist that Bennett overlook regional considerations. There were other situations where the Prime Minister could not be persuaded. He adhered strictly to his regional guideline in Saskatchewan in 1933, for instance, when he chose Aseltine and Horner, two northerners who met his regional requirements.

In his considerations of religion, race, and region, Bennett faced
decision-making problems similar to those of other Prime Ministers. In a like way, service to the party weighed heavily. However, there must be some significance in the fact that in his first sixteen selections made between 1931 and 1933, only fifty percent had legislative experience. Perhaps this could be read to mean that in the early days of his administration, Bennett had made a sincere effort to achieve a balance, seeking not exclusively those with legislative experience but perhaps reasoning that those with a diversity of experience would bring strength to the Senate. Businessman Burns, lawyers Brown, Marcotte, Fauteux and Moraud, publisher Dennis, farmers Horner and Aseltine—these represented the diversity of his choice in the early years. By contrast, of his seventeen appointments in 1935, all but one had legislative experience. Iva Fallis was the lone outsider. She had been a party organizer, but her appointment was probably made because of her support from the feminists.

Of course, Bennett's appointments of members of his caucus was not at all unusual and can be defended on the grounds that the Senate is a legislative body and it would therefore seem logical that its make-up include those with legislative experience. Russell Hopkins points out that during the years 1926-1966 more than two-thirds of the Senators had some kind of legislative apprenticeship, usually in the House of Commons, prior to their appointment. As will be seen in the chart, Bennett's percentage was not appreciably over that figure, in spite of his 1935 selections.

Undoubtedly Bennett's final appointments—those made in the disastrous days of his waning administration—represent a compromise. Nowhere was this more obvious than in his retreat from the age specification. Early on in his career, he had recognized that public confidence
in the Senate was at a low ebb. He had hoped to restore its status by naming younger men. To that principle, he adhered successfully in his early years. Six of the sixteen appointees of that era were under fifty. But quite a different situation prevailed at the last. Of the 1935 appointees, not one was under fifty, seven were in their sixties, four in their seventies. Obviously, as his mandate drew to a close, Bennett had to yield to the entreaties of senior members of caucus. He realized that many of them had accepted reduced financial earnings as a result of their political activities and that many were victims of the depression. Should this compromise on Bennett's part suggest that he did a disservice to the Senate, it might be pointed out that he could justify his actions—at least to himself—by claiming that, from a great number of petitioners, he selected only those men whose character was publicly recognized. In terms of service, few could quibble with the choice of such as seventy year old Smith of New Brunswick, of seventy-four year old Mullins of Manitoba, of seventy-two year old Sutherland and sixty-nine year old Arthurs of Ontario, or seventy-eight year old Cantley of Nova Scotia.

There is no doubt that Bennett was motivated in some of his appointments by his need to respect political obligations: the 1930 promise to Hocken who had stepped aside in favor of Church had to be fulfilled in 1933; Dr. J. A. MacDonald of Nova Scotia, who had resigned in favor of E. N. Rhodes, received an appointment in 1932; Dr. Eugene Paquet, who had stood aside for E. A. D. Morgan in 1930, was placed in 1935. Each, however, had given many years of service to the Conservative party, and no objections were voiced concerning their selections.

The question as to how large a part friendship played in Bennett's
appointments is bound to rise. Almost all, if not all, appointees were well known to him. Twenty had sat in the House of Commons with him; four had been members of a provincial legislature while he was national party leader. Certainly many of them would have to be categorized as personal friends but it would be inaccurate and unfair to say that friendship with the Prime Minister was a passport to the Senate. Nor can it be said that Bennett used the Senate to rid himself of political embarrassments, a charge often levelled at other Prime Ministers. In his eyes appointment to the Senate was a high honor. It is doubtful that he even contemplated the choice of someone whom he knew to be less than worthy.

It is obvious that all thirty-three appointments were favored with Bennett's personal attention. He gave very serious thought to the letters and other forms of written communication which inundated his office, particularly in the early years. By 1933 there was a slight shift in his approach and he was inclined to inform the aspirant that he should first seek the support of his cabinet minister. Of course all communications from cabinet ministers, members of parliament, and provincial legislators received his personal attention. Of the English-speaking cabinet ministers, R. B. Hanson of New Brunswick appears to be the only one who became personally involved in each of the Senate appointments from his province. His forthright advice was based on his instinct for the "grass roots" feeling and Bennett followed it with confidence. The French-speaking ministers from Quebec participated actively as well, but they observed little restriction as to area, involving themselves not merely regionally but offering advice on French Canadian vacancies regardless of where they occurred. Also, the name of Sir Robert Borden
appears on many pieces of correspondence, but it does not seem that
Bennett was unduly influenced by him.

It is safe to say that the mountain of correspondence which
comprises the "Senate" section of the Bennett papers does not tell
the whole story of the reasoning behind his choices. Potential
appointments were no doubt discussed in caucus and in the confines
of Bennett's office. However, it is equally safe to say that it is
unlikely that the preferences and opinions expressed there served as
anything more than a guide for the Prime Minister. The conclusion
is that it is in his correspondence that his philosophy and rationale
are to be found.

In his Senate appointments, perhaps it could be said that
R. B. Bennett lived up to his reputation of running a "one-man govern-
ment." The final decisions were truly his own. There is no denying,
however, that by his own lights he did honor his precepts as to the
calibre of Canadian who should sit in the Senate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Appointed</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Prov</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>M.P.</th>
<th>M.P.</th>
<th>M.L.A.</th>
<th>M.L.A.</th>
<th>Cand</th>
<th>Org.</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1931</td>
<td>Burns, Pat</td>
<td>Alta.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5,12-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcotte, A.</td>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6-12,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sept 1931</td>
<td>McRae, A.D.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 1932</td>
<td>Meighen, Arthur</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21-23,29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis, W.H.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>U.C.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21,24,29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macdonald, J.A.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballantyne, C.C.</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oct 1932</td>
<td>Brown, A.J.</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>21,28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainville, J.H.</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>32-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Dec 1933</td>
<td>Aseltine, W.M.</td>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>U.C.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>32-33,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morner, R.B.</td>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>U.C.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>32,33,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Côté, Louis</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>40-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fripp, A.E.</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>C.ofE.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>39,40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hocken, H.C.</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Method.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>37-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fauteux, G.A.</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>45-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morand, Lucien</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1935</td>
<td>Cantley, Thomas</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>50,52,53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quinn, F.F.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>50,53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodes, E.N.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>50,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robicheau, J.P.L.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>50,53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthurs, James</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>59,60,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fallis, Iva</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>U.C.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>59,62-64,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sutherland, D.</td>
<td>Ont.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>59-61,66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sauvé, Arthur</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>67-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, C.E.</td>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Presby.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>66-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macdonald, J.A.</td>
<td>P.E.I.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>23,57,58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aug 1935</td>
<td>Haig, J.T.</td>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>U.C.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>73,74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mullins, H.A.</td>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Method.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>73,74,78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Léger, A.J.</td>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>67,78-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, E.J.</td>
<td>N.B.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>84-86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortin, Emile</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>90,91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paquet, Eugene</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>90,92,92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Aug 1935</td>
<td>Bourgeois, Chas.</td>
<td>Que.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>92,93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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