

David McGrane, "Social Democracy and Western Alienation in Saskatchewan Politics from 1900 to 2000", Presented at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association in London, Ontario on June 2nd, 2005

The current popular perception in Canada links western alienation with right-wing politics such as those of the Reform and Conservative parties. However, this perception ignores the role that western alienation played in the emergence of social democracy in Saskatchewan. In this paper, I adopt an intellectual history approach which creates genealogies of ideas and demonstrates that forms of consciousness are central to understanding the nature and origins of social change. Through adopting this approach, I argue that western alienation, particularly discontent caused by the National Policy, was a primary stimulus to the creation of Saskatchewan agrarian protest movements in 1900 to 1932. The ideas of these early Saskatchewan agrarian movements displayed a convergence of social democratic ideas and sentiments of western alienation. These agrarian movements transferred their idea of combining social democracy and western alienation to the Saskatchewan CCF who used the threat of Eastern mortgage companies' foreclosure on farmland as an effective electoral weapon leading to their electoral victory in 1944. Paradoxically, the western alienation of the CCF governments in 1944 to 1964 was confined to criticizing the federal government in the field of agriculture while promoting enlarged federal jurisdiction in the fields of income taxes and social policy in return for federal financial assistance to build the province's welfare state. The Blakeney NDP government from 1971 to 1982 renewed the tradition of western alienation within Saskatchewan social democratic thought by strongly condemned the Liberals in Ottawa for abandoning rural Saskatchewan and struggling with the federal government over control of natural resource rents. However, the Romanow NDP government from 1991 to 2000 was less strident with the federal government than Blakeney had been. The Romanow government still attacked Ottawa for its lack of funding for agriculture, abandoning the Crow rate and not funding highway construction but it decided to follow a conciliatory federalism which sought to work with the federal government for the achievement of common policy objectives such as the National Child Tax Benefit, Social Union Framework Agreement and the Charlottetown Accord. The paper ends with an assessment of the current relationship between western alienation and social democracy within the Saskatchewan NDP.

Defining Western Alienation and Social Democracy

The terms 'social democracy' and 'western alienation' are exceeding difficult to define. Both terms mean different things to different people in different time periods. However, I believe that we can discern some enduring characteristics of these two concepts. First, for the purposes of this paper, I will define social democracy as consisting of four main elements: 1.) collectivism, 2.) use of the state to promote economic and social equality, 3.) state intervention in the economy and 4.) public ownership of key sectors of the economy. First, social democrats believe in collectivism over individualism. They believe that society works best when people cooperate and pool their resources together instead of always competing against each other as individuals. Second, social democrats want to use the state to promote economic and social equality.

State action to reduce economic inequalities generally involves the development of a welfare state with universal, public and free education and health care as well as unemployment and old age insurance. Modern social democracy also includes state action to reduce social inequalities relating to gender and race such as legislation protecting the rights of these groups and programs to improve their economic status. The focus on rights of minority groups and women requires that social democracy adhere to basic liberal values such as constitutionalism, separation of church and state and religious tolerance. It also assumes that social democracy's goals are to be achieved within an electoral, democratic and parliamentary framework. Third, social democrats advocate state intervention within the economy to create a more even distribution of wealth and full employment. This government intervention in the economy can take various forms such as limiting the power of monopolies, encouraging cooperatives and ensuring a strong labour code. Fourth, social democrats believe in public ownership of certain key sectors of the economy like electricity, water, automobile insurance, telephone or railways. Nationalization of these key sectors ensures that essential services can be provided to the population at an affordable price.

The definition of western alienation that I will be using in this paper was largely inspired by the work of Roger Gibbins and W.L. Morton's classic essay "The Bias of Prairie Politics".¹ I define western alienation as having three over-arching and inter-related characteristics. First, beginning with the National Policy, western Canadian political actors have had the idea that the west has been placed in an economically exploitative and even colonial relationship to central Canada. Second, this feeling of being exploited has led western Canadians to feel that had a feeling of lack of control over the west's destiny and a sentiment that the federal government uses its powers to benefit eastern provinces at the expense of western provinces. Westerners generally feel their interests are not adequately represented or taken into account in Ottawa. Finally, in order to gain more control over their own destinies, western Canadians have demanded greater provincial autonomy from the federal government.

Western Alienation and the Advent of Saskatchewan Social Democracy (1884 to 1933)

Just before the North-West Rebellion, the Métis, English mixed-bloods and white settlers of the Prince Albert area compiled in a petition that was sent to the federal government on December 16th, 1884. While the petition was not expression of social democracy, it can be identified as the first expression of western alienation in Saskatchewan and evidence of early discontentment with MacDonal'd's National Policy. The petition argued that high tariffs operated to the detriment of western economic interests and there was asymmetry in the treatment of the prairie west compared to British Columbia and the eastern provinces.² It demanded responsible government, a railway to Hudson's Bay to gain access to European markets and the entry of Saskatchewan into Confederation as "free province" with control over its own resources and more representation in Ottawa. As we will see, these sentiments of western alienation were taken on by agrarian protest movements in Saskatchewan in the early 20th century.

The Patrons of Industry, an agrarian protest organization originating in the United States, spread from Manitoba into Saskatchewan during the 1896 federal election when Reverend James Moffat Douglas successfully ran as a Farmer-Liberal Candidate jointly

supported by the Patrons and the Liberal Party. J.M. Douglas combined the ideas of the agrarian protest movement external to Saskatchewan with the sentiments and grievances expressed by the petition of settlers to Ottawa eleven years earlier. Moffat's speech given at Saltcoats during his election campaign in 1895 is the earliest example of the types of ideas which would eventually form the bedrock of Saskatchewan agrarian protest.³ He began his speech by contending that the "we cannot see that either Grit or Tory has done anything for us in the Northwest" and that the "National Policy, which no doubt has done great things for Ontario and Quebec, but only has produced evil for us".⁴ He argued against monopolies by stating that "the root of things is that the whole principle of monopoly is wrong...Competition will cheapen prices of commodities as it has cheapened wheat and the power of combines will be broken".⁵ He proposed lower tariffs, regulation of freight rates and free trade with Great Britain and possibly the United States.⁶ However, he realized the power dynamics within the federal Conservative government: "With regard to reform of the tariff much has been promised, little performed, more, perhaps, from want of power than of will, for the manufacturers seem all powerful in Ottawa- the manufacturers and the CPR".⁷ Finally, he ends with an appeal to western alienation as he asks in relation to freight rates: "why are we punished for living west of Winnipeg?".⁸ Douglas' concerns were somewhat met by the Crow's Nest Pass agreement of 1897 between the federal government and the CPR which established the 'crow rate' which was paid by the federal government to reduce freight rates on eastbound wheat and westbound manufactured goods. Further, Douglas' agitation as a Member of Parliament caused the federal government to pass the Manitoba Grain Act in 1900 which imposed a system of regulation on railways and grain elevators reflecting at least some of Douglas' concerns.⁹

While the Manitoba Grain Act and the crow rate was a step forward, it by no means met all of Saskatchewan farmers' grievances. In 1901, Saskatchewan experienced a very good crop but the CPR did not have the capacity to ship it and over half of the wheat spoiled.¹⁰ In response, a group of farmers at Indian Head founded the Territorial Grain Growers' Association (TGGA) in December 1901 for the purpose of lobbying governments and educating farmers. The proceedings of the TGGA's second convention in 1903 can be used to provide a brief outline of its ideas. Like other western North American agrarian protest movements, the TGGA was strongly against monopoly control of the railways and grain trade. In his presidential address to the 1903 convention, William Richard Motherwell claimed that the "elevator monopoly reigned supreme" and a delegate stated farmers must work together to "show the railway companies and the combines that we would have our rights".¹¹ The TGGA's anti-monopoly sentiment was galvanized by feelings of western alienation. As one delegate stated "The officials in Montreal do not appreciate our position. They think that the people in the west are asking too much and therefore they do not intend to give what we ask".¹² The TGGA also passed a resolution calling the immediate granting of provincehood to the Northwest Territories with "full provincial powers" which presumably meant control over natural resources and Crown lands like British Columbia and the Eastern province had.¹³ The TGGA's main suggestion for reducing monopoly control of Saskatchewan's wheat economy was regulation of the railways and elevator companies by the federal government to ensure free competition. The bulk of the resolutions at the convention urged the federal government to force the CPR and elevator companies to build more

elevators, expand their rail network, reduce freight rates and allot half the cars to grain dealers and half the cars to farmers “to create competition”.¹⁴ However, there was sneaking suspicion that government regulation would be insufficient to curb the power of railway and elevator companies’ monopolies over farmers’ lives. Therefore, the TGGA passed resolution to explore feasibility of the construction of co-operative elevators owned by farmers and government-owned railways.

The TGGA was re-named the Saskatchewan Grain Growers Association upon the creation of Saskatchewan as a province in 1905. Throughout its existence, the SGGA had both liberal reformist (what David Laycock calls crypto-liberal¹⁵) and social democratic tendencies within it. The liberal reformist tendencies were dominant in the SGGA, especially in the early part of its existence, and were represented by men like J.M. Douglas and Motherwell. These men were eventually co-opted into the federal and Saskatchewan Liberal parties and under their leadership the SGGA was very close to the Saskatchewan Liberal party. These liberal reformers started from the premise that the National Policy with its high tariffs discriminated against the west. The basic problem of the Saskatchewan farmer was that the monopoly of grain companies and the CPR, owned by Easterners, did not allow true competition. The solution was free trade with the United States and Great Britain and government regulation of railway and elevator companies to reduce the power of their monopolies and ensure free competition. However, considering that government regulation may not be enough, competition from government-owned railways and co-operatively owned elevator and grain handling companies could induce the monopolies to pay farmers a higher price for their grain and lower freight rates. The mechanism for achieving these solutions was co-operation with and lobbying of the Saskatchewan and federal Liberal parties by the SGGA. The liberal reformist leadership did not believe in a farmer-labour alliance as their disapproval of the Winnipeg General Strike proved.

By 1910, the SGGA also had a growing social democratic tendency within it. In particular, E.A. Partridge, an important activist within the SGGA, went past the limits of the liberal reformism of the SGGA leadership to become the first social democratic thinker of significance in Saskatchewan. Unlike the liberal reformers of the SGGA, Partridge was concerned about the unequal distribution of wealth within society. As early as 1905, he stated that “unless the present opportunities of those who are already wealthy be in some way restricted, a quarter of a century will see ninety-nine per cent of the wealth of North America the private property of one per cent of the population”.¹⁶ In 1907, he wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Grain Growers’ Grain Company Ltd.- A Farmers’ Trade Union*, which argued that the “whole group of capitalistic classes moreover unite to control the educational system, the press and the legislative machinery to their mutual advantage”.¹⁷ Partridge clearly identified that the farmer’s exploitation was not due to a lack of competition but to the private ownership of a certain part of the means of production. In 1908 and 1909, Partridge argued for the establishment of government-owned elevators in Saskatchewan which he saw as “part of the worldwide struggle against vicious commercialism and industrialism”.¹⁸ What sets Partridge apart from the SGGA liberal reformist tendency was his insistence that the state be used to create economic equality for the whole society not just to secure higher prices for farmers. Ultimately, Partridge realized that farmers could only prosper under a mixed economy with co-operative and government owned enterprises existing along private

business and farms. This conception of a mixed economy was to become the hallmark of later Saskatchewan social democratic ideas including the CCF and T.C. Douglas. The resolutions passed at the 1907 and 1909 SGGGA conventions calling for state ownership of telephones and certain natural resource industries attest that Partridge was not alone in his social democratic beliefs. A strong social democratic group was forming within the SGGGA in the early part of the 1910s that was discontent with both the provincial Liberal government and the liberal reformist leadership of the SGGGA. This group would soon begin to challenge the liberal reformist leadership of the SGGGA over the issue of the entry of a farmers' party in elections.

The idea of a farmer party in Saskatchewan had been around at least since J.M. Douglas ran with the support of the Patrons of Industry in 1895. Starting in 1910, resolutions were presented at every SGGGA convention calling for the SGGGA to form a farmers' political party. However, the SGGGA executive was able to convince a sufficient number of delegates that co-operation with the Liberal party was a better avenue to take. The defeat of the Laurier government over reciprocity and the refusal of the Saskatchewan Liberal party to establish government owned elevators increased the desire of farmers for their own political party and sharpened their critique of traditional political parties in general. In 1913, after the narrow defeat of a resolution on the entry of the SGGGA into politics, Partridge invited those delegates interested in forming a new political party to meet at a local church. The outcome of this meeting was the formation of the No-Party League under a manifesto written by Partridge. If Partridge was the first social democratic thinker in Saskatchewan, the No-Party League was the first social democratic party in Saskatchewan.

While the No-Party League lasted less than a year, its manifesto does give us a good indication of the social democratic sentiments of a growing minority within the SGGGA. The manifesto begins by decrying that "violent inequality and unbrotherliness lead to pain and misery among all but the selfish- even among those who 'have' while, among those who 'have not'".¹⁹ It condemns that "Westerners, though a young people, are already mortgaged to the hilt" by federal and provincial government debt as well as their personal farm debt.²⁰ The manifesto also recognized the need to form an alliance between farmers and the urban working class and create a democratic party that did not replicate the discipline or centralization of traditional parties. Following the example of the New Zealand Labour Party, the manifesto proposes that Saskatchewan institute graduated taxation and embark on a program of substantial state ownership including banks, insurance, railways, coal mines, forestry, cement, lime and stone. Further, Saskatchewan should "establish manufactories for the making of all things the price of which are unduly enhanced by a combine, a protective tariff or a costly freight haul".²¹ The last passage especially foreshadows the social democratic ideas concerning the welfare state that were to come in Saskatchewan:

"By its [Saskatchewan's] heavy taxation of the owners of great wealth it should provide the means for having every child taught some useful trade, and, possessing the necessary natural gifts, equipped with a sound education as well. Education in youth, opportunity in manhood to make and enjoy a decent living, and security against want in sickness and old age, should be the irreducible minimum in every country laying claim to be counted civilized."²²

The No-Party League Manifesto represents the first systematic attempt at social democratic platform for a political party in Saskatchewan. It links the social democratic goal of economic equality with western alienation by arguing that the concentration of wealth and capital within a small group of Eastern companies, created by tariffs, is responsible for the excessive freight rates and inflated prices that impoverish Western farmers. The solution to this situation is a farmer-labour party that is more democratic than traditional parties and promotes public ownership of a certain parts of the means of production, graduated taxation and the institution of an advanced welfare state.

The Non-Partisan League (NPL) was organized in North Dakota in 1915 where it eventually formed state government and established itself in Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1916. Following other agrarian organizations, the Saskatchewan NPL argued that the Eastern corporate elite controlled provincial and federal politics in the interests of grain companies and railway monopolies.²³ Their solution was for labour and farmers to form an alliance to gain control of the state and institute public ownership of railways, banks, natural resources and grain companies and institute inheritance taxes, graduated income taxes and government old age and health insurance.²⁴ As a social democratic party, the NPL was the first in Saskatchewan to couple party politics with corporate control. Under the NPL's analysis, mock battles between old parties disguised the control of government by the corporate elite.²⁵ The NPL also was the first party to thoroughly infuse social democracy with anti-partyism advocating what it called "business government" which would abolish the cabinet structure and use direct legislation and referenda and recall of elected officials to govern.²⁶ Finally, the NPL was the first in Saskatchewan to connect a social democratic party to social gospel principles believing in prohibition and that it was God's work to pursue a more equal and prosperous community for farmers to live in.²⁷ As we will see, many of these characteristics were later adopted by the early Saskatchewan CCF.

The national Progressive movement, which rose in western Canada in 1920, was an uneasy coalition of populist, social democratic and liberal ideologies that had differing factions in each province. The Manitoba Progressives, like Crerar, were disenchanted Liberals who were angry over the federal Liberals' stance on tariffs and went back to the Liberal party when the Progressive disintegrated after 1923. The Alberta Progressives, lead by Henry Wise Wood, believed in the concept of "group government" which held that there should no parties and legislation should be the result of the coming together of representatives of the major economic groups within society. The Saskatchewan Progressives can be broken into three groups: liberals, social democrats and provincial rightists.²⁸ These groups were able to unite in common coalition under a loose agreement over the themes of the desirability of free trade, co-operative marketing of wheat and public ownership of utilities. The liberals within the Saskatchewan Progressive coalition saw the Progressive party as an agrarian counter-balance to the high tariff eastern business interests that prevailed within the federal Liberal Party at the time. These Saskatchewan liberal progressives mostly returned to the provincial or federal Liberal party after 1923. The Provincial Rightists in the Saskatchewan Progressives were holdovers from Haultain's Provincial Rights Party, which had since become the Saskatchewan Conservative party, whose focus was regional inequality within Canadian federalism. They argued that control over natural resources should be given to the prairie provinces, were strongly opposed to the Catholic schools that had been guaranteed by the

federal government upon Saskatchewan's entry into Confederation and were opposed to the teaching of any language other than English in schools. The most interesting part of the Progressives' Saskatchewan coalition, for our purposes, was the social democrats who saw both the Liberal and Conservative parties as equally disdainful instruments of an undemocratic system. They saw the Progressives as moving towards a British Labour type of party containing a farmer-labour alliance and inspired by British co-operative and social gospel ideas. Most of these social democrats, such as M.J. Coldwell, eventually found their way into the CCF. Thus, for our analysis, the importance of the Progressives is that they alienated Saskatchewan farmers from the federal Liberal party, proved that a farmer third party could succeed and provided a political training ground for future CCF activists.²⁹

The 1920s saw the rise of a rival farmer organization to the SGGGA in Saskatchewan. Disappointed with the conservatism of SGGGA leadership, a group of farmers in Ituna came together to form the Farmers' Union of Canada (FUC) in December of 1921. The FUC argued that it was useless to lobby governments or form farmer political parties in order to reduce the exploitation of farmers by Eastern business interests.³⁰ Rather, the solution was for farmers to assume control of their own affairs through the national and international organization of themselves into an economic interest association like business and labour had done. Its main proposal was the co-operative marketing of Canadian wheat and eventually the world's wheat so that farmers, not Eastern grain companies, would set prices.³¹ The FUC grew quickly and reached over 10,000 members by 1924 both through siphoning off members from the SGGGA and bringing in Ukrainian farmers which had not been organized by the SGGGA.³² In 1923, the FUC started to organize a 'Wheat Pool' under which farmers would sign contracts agreeing to turn all their wheat over to the Wheat Pool for five years. The Wheat Pool would then sell the wheat directly to various world markets thereby sidestepping the middlemen and Eastern grain companies altogether. The returns for the sales of wheat would be pooled together and divided annually among the membership with each farmer receiving the same price per bushel for the same grade. By 1925 an astounding 45,000 farmers, which was about 60% of the wheat growers in Saskatchewan, had signed contracts despite the fact that it meant an immediate financial sacrifice for many of them since private grain companies raised their price above that of the Pool's in an attempt to push it out of business.³³ Further, through the drive for a Wheat Pool, most of the SGGGA's membership had migrated to the FUC and the FUC had become a much larger organization than the SGGGA. Seeing its decline, the SGGGA merged with the FUC in 1926 to create the United Farmers' of Canada (Saskatchewan Section) or UFC (SS).

There is virtually no information on Partridge's life from 1914 to 1920.³⁴ It seems that a series of personal tragedies left him politically inactive but he did spend the early 1920s writing a book entitled *A War on Poverty* which was published in 1925. *A War on Poverty* introduced several important new ideas into Saskatchewan social democratic analysis. Partridge was the first in Saskatchewan to use the concept of a "Co-operative Commonwealth". He begins *A War on Poverty* by arguing that "The fullest, most effective co-operation would seem to need to be State-wide in its application, - to involve the turning of the State into a co-operative society -making it a Co-operative Commonwealth".³⁵ The guiding principle of this Co-operative Commonwealth would be "production and distribution for use, not for profit".³⁶ Partridge's vision of a Co-

operative Commonwealth was inspired by his adherence to the teachings of the social gospel. He argued that the “the Kingdom of Heaven suggests a Co-operative Commonwealth” and it is a Christian’s duty and God’s will to work towards it.³⁷ Following the themes of *A War on Poverty*, the UFC (SS) saw its role as a catalyst to the creation of a Co-operative Commonwealth. The first pamphlet issued by the UFC (SS) explained that “This organization will supplement the efforts of the Wheat Pool and inspire it with courage and determination to win. But this is not the end, it is the beginning...The next task will then be to work for the breakdown of all conflicting forces by advocating the Cooperative Commonwealth”.³⁸ The pamphlet goes on to claim that the “private ownership of the machinery of production and the private control of currency and credit are the two great forces which prevent a cooperative society”.³⁹

After the stock market crash, the price of wheat in Saskatchewan plummeted from \$1.50 a bushel in 1929 to 38 cents a bushel in 1932.⁴⁰ To make matters worse, Saskatchewan entered one its worst droughts in recorded history. In all, Saskatchewan’s per capita income fell by 72% between 1929 and 1933 which was greatest drop in Canada.⁴¹ The Wheat Pool went bankrupt due to overpayments to farmers and had to abandon selling grain on world markets and return to being an elevator company which sold its grain on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. With the depression and demise of the Wheat Pool, which had been the farmers’ movement proudest achievement, the resistance to more radical and left-wing solutions within Saskatchewan’s farmers’ movement evaporated. The 1930 UFC (SS) convention established the Farmers Political Association at arm’s length from the UFC (SS) which hastily ran candidates in the 1930 federal election gaining 40,000 votes and two seats. Just months before his death, Partridge sent a letter from Victoria to be read February UFC (SS) 1931 convention which argued that the time had come for farmers to unite with labourers to “secure the election of a workers’ government to replace the owners’ government we now have”.⁴² Subsequently, a resolution passed with little opposition stating that the UFC (SS) would enter into provincial and federal politics as a political party. It also adopted a political platform noted the economic exploitation of Western Canada by the federal government and Eastern Canadian business interests and stated that: “in the opinion of this convention the present economic crisis is due to the inherent unsoundness of the capitalistic control of production and distribution and involves the payment of rent, interest and profit, we recognize that social ownership and cooperative production for use is the only sound economic system”.⁴³ The rest of the program relied on familiar ideas of the agrarian movement such as nationalization of railways, fixed price for grain, lower freight rates, compulsory Wheat Pool, state medicine and health insurance and the abolition of the Grain Exchange. Other parts of the program reflected the immediate circumstance of the depression such a moratorium on foreclosures, seizures and evictions of farmers from their land, crop insurance and adjustment of farm debt. The most radical proposal came from the floor of the convention as amendment to the platform that had been proposed by the executive. It proposed that a “use-lease” system of land tenure, based on the agricultural program of the British Labour Party, be adopted whereby, upon the request of the land-owner, the government could hold the title to the land and lease it farmers who could pass their leases on to their children.⁴⁴ Such a plan would avoid mortgage companies’ foreclosure on farmers’ land since the government would hold the title while maintaining private ownership of the family farm.

In 1929, the Regina Trades and Labour Council and a group of teachers, from mostly British origins, formed the Independent Labour Party of Saskatchewan (ILPS) which had been modeled on J.S. Woodsworth's Manitoba Independent Labour Party. Its leader was a Regina Alderman and former Progressive candidate M.J. Coldwell, who was a British immigrant and former member of the Fabian society and British Labour Party.⁴⁵ The ILPS formed branches in most of Saskatchewan's cities and towns though it never had more than 500 members.⁴⁶ The ILPS platform was inspired by British socialism and advocated government health insurance, unemployment insurance, improved labour legislation, nationalization of banking and increased relief to the poor.⁴⁷ Combining western alienation and social democracy, the ILPS argued that natural resources should be put under provincial control so that they may be nationalized.⁴⁸ ILPS is important because it provided a counter-balance to anti-party sentiment and the FUC's idea of social transformation could be based solely on education and organization of co-operatives. The ILPS saw gradual reform being induced by a labour party working within British parliamentary system instead of an agrarian protest party re-defining democracy through direct legislation or farmers re-organizing the economic system through the creation of co-operatives.

However, the ILPS knew that it could not be a major political party in Saskatchewan without the support of farmers. In 1931, the UFC (SS), with its 27,000 members, and the ILPS joined together to form a "cooperative commonwealth" named the Farmer-Labour Group (FLG) to run in federal, provincial and municipal elections under the leadership of Coldwell.⁴⁹ A platform was adopted by the FLG in 1932 containing many ideas that had already been put forth by Partridge, the ILPS and the UFC(SS) in the years from 1925 to 1931. The FLG program began by contending that Western Canada was being treated as a colony of the East and that "the present economic crisis is due to the inherent unsoundness of the capitalist system, which is based on private ownership of resources and the capitalistic control of production and distribution".⁵⁰ The rest of the program dealt with familiar themes of the ILPS and UFC(SS) such as nationalization of the banking system, encouragement of co-operative enterprises, free trade, use-lease land policy, socialization of health services and government ownership of utilities and natural resources and "insurance against illness, accident, old age and unemployment".⁵¹ The program also contained immediate actions such as the retention and extension of existing social legislation, a moratorium on foreclosures, seizures and evictions of farmers from their land and adjustment of farm debt.⁵² The platform did not critique the existing party system or call for the anti-party proposal of direct legislation. The only change that it proposed to Saskatchewan's democracy was that "election deposits for candidates for all public offices be abolished".⁵³ Despite calls for electoral and senate reform within the early Saskatchewan agrarian movement, the abolition of the senate or proportional representation was never advocated by the Saskatchewan FLG/CCF during its entire history. An important idea that was put forth by the FLG which had not been a part of Saskatchewan social democratic thinking was the planned economy. The 1932 FLG program stated as its first objective "the establishment of a planned system of social economy for the production, distribution and exchange of all goods".⁵⁴ However, the program did not specify what these planning mechanisms would be or what their operation would entail.⁵⁵

By 1932, we are able to refer to a Saskatchewan social democracy that had clearly distinguished itself both organizationally and intellectually from the liberal reformism of the SGG or Progressives. As we have seen, this social democracy began with Partridge's ideas in 1905 to 1908 and went through the No Party League, NPL, FUC, Wheat Pool, the ILPS and the UFC(SS) until its fullest expression in the formation of FLG in 1932. Within this social democracy, there was convergence of western alienation and social democratic goals. The foundation of Saskatchewan social democracy was the recognition of the exploitation of the prairie farmer by Eastern Canadian business interests represented by the CPR, grain company monopolies and tariff-protected manufacturers. This monopolistic exploitation created not only economic hardship for farmers but an unequal distribution of wealth within society and a division between 'those who produce and do not possess and those who possess and do not produce'. Thus, the problem was not a lack of competition, as some liberal reformists had supposed, but the private ownership of *certain parts of the means of production* (railways, banks, grain elevators, public utilities and natural resources) under a competitive economic system. Moreover, this unjust economic system was propped up by traditional parties and daily newspapers which were financed and controlled by the very Eastern companies who benefited from the exploitation of farmers.

The solution to this situation was the creation of a co-operative economic system or a Co-operative Commonwealth consisting of a mix of public, co-operative and private ownership. The exact mixture of ownership within the economy was not precisely defined. However, it was apparent that important parts of the means of production such as railways, banks, public utilities and natural resources should be owned and operated by the state. There were almost no suggestions in Saskatchewan social democratic thinking that the manufacturing or retail sector should be brought under public ownership. Along side state ownership, there should also be a vibrant co-operative sector which operated grain elevators, marketed grain under a wheat pool and distributed farming products at reasonable prices. Finally, if farmers requested, farms could be owned by the government and leased back to farmers as private property to be passed to future generations. However, for the most part, farms would remain privately owned and the farmers' ownership of land would be protected through debt adjustment and a moratorium on foreclosures thereby guaranteeing farmers their entrepreneurial freedom, control of their land and the continuation of wheat production for sale on world markets at a profit. Even at their most radical, Saskatchewan social democrats were always in favour of the continuance of a market economy and private property alongside co-operative and state-owned sectors. In terms of social policy, the state was to socialize health services and provide old age, unemployment and accident insurance to all of its citizens. The new activities of the state would be paid for by a graduated income tax system so that the government would not be plunged into debt.

The vehicle for the attainment of this social transformation was a farmer-labour party that was not financed by Eastern companies, was more democratic than traditional parties and was dedicated to educating and organizing citizens towards to achieving a Co-operative Commonwealth. Many early Saskatchewan social democrats also believed in critiques of partyism and supported reforms such as direct legislation, the abolition of the senate and proportional representation. For many, the Co-operative Commonwealth also represented was the achievement of the Kingdom of God on earth, was the embodiment

of the will of God and represented the Christian value of 'love thy neighbour'. Finally, alongside this sublime vision of a Co-operative commonwealth, Saskatchewan social democracy consistently put forth proposals for immediate action such as the retention of existing social legislation and a moratorium foreclosures, seizures and evictions of farmers from their land, crop insurance, adjustment of farm debt, the regulation of freight rates and tariff reduction for agricultural implements.

The unique historical circumstances of Saskatchewan created a feature that was unique to Saskatchewan social democracy: the identification of an external enemy of the 'people' which was the Eastern business class and Eastern federal government. The battle that early Saskatchewan social democrats were waging was not one against an indigenous bourgeoisie such as happened in Great Britain and other European countries. Rather, early Saskatchewan social democrats were building a movement against the powerful alliance of Eastern business and political parties who oppressed the whole of the 'people' of Saskatchewan and the prevented the emergence of a more just and equal society. Thus, in many ways, it was western alienation that justified and nurtured the emerging social democracy within Saskatchewan in the early part of the 20th century.

The FLG/CCF and the Use of Western Alienation to get Elected (1933-1944)

The FLG joined the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) when it was created in 1932 in Calgary. The CCF met in Regina in 1933 to consider a manifesto prepared by the Research Committee of the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) and written largely by their Chairman, Frank Underhill. After the manifesto was debated and some minor changes made, the historic "Regina Manifesto" was approved. The Regina Manifesto has been analyzed at length in other works.⁵⁶ For our purposes it will suffice to note that Manifesto's ideas were similar in many respects to themes that already appeared in Saskatchewan social democracy thought. The Manifesto's calls for the socialization of banking, public ownership of transportation and utilities, crop insurance, encouragement of co-operative enterprises, tariff reduction for agricultural implements, improvements to the labour code, socialized health services, abolition of the senate, lowering of public debt and equitable tax system are all consistent with Saskatchewan social democratic thinking up to 1933.⁵⁷ However, the Manifesto also contained ideas that were not prominent in Saskatchewan social democratic circles in 1933. The Manifesto proposed the amendment of the BNA Act to create a greater centralization of powers in the federal government. The Manifesto also called for a foreign policy designed to "promote disarmament and world peace", "ending of the deportation of immigrants, and a commission to revise the criminal law and the prison system based on "the understanding of human behaviour".⁵⁸ The manifesto elaborated on the idea of a planned economy which had only recently surfaced in Saskatchewan social democracy in the program of the FLG. The Manifesto desired "The establishment of a planned, socialized economic order, in order to make possible the most efficient development of the national resources and the most equitable distribution of the national income".⁵⁹ The manifesto then proposed a quite technocratic solution: "The first step in this will be the setting up of a National Planning Commission consisting of a small body of economists, engineers and statisticians...The Commission will be responsible to the Cabinet and will work in co-operation with the Managing Boards of the Socialized Industries".⁶⁰ While the FLG was

impressed by the LSR's elaboration of the concept of a planned economy, the centralizing bias of the LSR and their suggestion for changes to the BNA act did not fit well with Saskatchewan social democracy's sentiment of western alienation.⁶¹

Just over a year after the adoption of the Regina Manifesto, the Saskatchewan CCF faced their first electoral challenge in the form of a provincial election that they contested under the FLG name and the leadership of M.J. Coldwell. Under the slogan "Humanity First", the FLG ran candidates in nearly every seat in the 1934 provincial election and used the platform they had passed in 1932. FLG party leaders stressed debt adjustment, a planned economy, nationalization of banks, higher corporate taxes and the socialization of health services.⁶² Further, using the example of Sweden, the FLG argued that it would develop Saskatchewan natural resources such as forests, clay and coal under government ownership in order to finance debt adjustment for farmers and create a more advanced welfare state.⁶³ The Liberals, the Conservatives and the press heavily attacked the FLG's use-lease land policy as the nationalization of land, the Sovietization of the province and the condemnation of farmers to serfdom.⁶⁴ The FLG responded that its use-lease land policy "does not envision any system of Government farming or collectivization, nor does it propose to take away from the Farmer any right that he possesses now".⁶⁵ The FLG insisted that without the use-lease policy that the independent farmer would turn into a tenant farmer for mortgage companies. The FLG attempted to portray itself as defending the farmer's private property against Eastern mortgage companies and financial interests. It declared "What do you need at this time? First, to retain your home and land for your use, and prevent its confiscation by the financial interests...The Farmer Labour Group (C.C.F.) pledges itself to enact immediately when returned to power, all the legislation necessary to secure to you the use and possession of your home and land. As long as you wish to use it, it will be yours to possess and enjoy".⁶⁶ The call for the protection of the family farm from foreclosure was wrapped in a cloak of western alienation as the FLG claimed "Strike a blow against the financial and industrial exploiters of Western Canada by voting Farmer-Labour".⁶⁷ After the 1934 provincial election, the FLG official changed its name to the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Saskatchewan Section) and George Williams became its leader.

In 1936, a new political force entered into Saskatchewan provincial politics when the Alberta Social Credit party indicated that they would be running candidates in the next Saskatchewan provincial election. Unlike their later right-wing incarnation under Ernest Manning, early Social Credit was a somewhat progressive party that sought to end the depression by limiting the power of Eastern banks and mortgage companies through increasing the money supply.⁶⁸ The 1938 provincial election was a four-way fight between the Conservatives, Social Credit, the CCF and the Liberals. Social Credit presented itself as a protest party that would end the depression using a monetary reform scheme that would give farmers the money they need to claw their way out of debt. The CCF attacked the Liberals as unable to relieve the depression or deal effectively with farmers' growing debt. Further, with an alternative protest party in the province, the CCF dubbed the Social Credit scheme as "the last illusion of capitalism" which would only create inflation and pointed out that Social Credit's reforms had not worked in Alberta.⁶⁹ The CCF ran almost no urban candidates in 1938 and concentrated on portraying itself as the party which would force Eastern mortgage and land companies to adjust farm debt

and not foreclose on farmers' land. It claimed that its policy would put "Humanity First" and "protect the people against the imposition of usury, until the powers of entrenched finance give a square deal to the Farmers and Home Owners of this province".⁷⁰ The Liberals won the election with 38 seats reflecting their continued dominance among urban, immigrant and Catholic voters while the Conservatives' popular vote collapsed and it won no seats. After running a disorganized campaign with a large amount of interference from the Alberta leadership of the party, Social Credit received 15% of the vote but won only two seats. Through portraying themselves as the party which would protect farmers' private property from Eastern finance capital, the CCF was able to withstand the challenge of Social Credit and win 10 seats in the election. With the poor results of the Social Credit and Conservative parties, the CCF emerged from the 1938 election as the only possible alternative to the Liberal Party.

When Williams went overseas to fight in World War II, the Saskatchewan CCF party united behind Tommy Douglas' leadership and began organizing and raising money for the next provincial election. A number of committees were created to develop policy on areas such as education, social services, labour, education, natural resources, government machinery and budgeting.⁷¹ From the policies of these committees a new platform was compiled and passed by the 1943 provincial convention.⁷² The platform was simply entitled *The C.C.F. Program for Saskatchewan* and contained a mix of old and new ideas. It would become the platform on which the CCF won the 1944 provincial election and intellectual foundation on which the CCF would govern Saskatchewan for 20 years.

The first part of the platform, entitled "Provision of Security" was divided between "Farm Security" and "Urban Security". The farm security portion re-iterated the familiar proposals of a moratorium on farm foreclosure and evictions, debt adjustment, crop insurance, encouragement and support for co-operatives and the abolition of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in favour of marketing boards for agricultural produce. The urban security plank was much more detailed than previous FLG/CCF platforms. It proposed the creation of a Department of Labour, an increased minimum wage, a reformed labour code to protect the workers' rights to form a union and to collective bargaining, improved workers' compensation and worker representation on all boards and commissions dealing with labour matters. The platform placed a much heavier emphasis on social programs than past articulations of social democracy in Saskatchewan. The second part of the platform was entitled "Provision of Social Services" and pledged that the first priority of a CCF government would be "to set up a complete system of socialized health services with special emphasis preventative medicine, so that everybody in the province will receive adequate medical, surgical, dental, nursing, and hospital care without charge".⁷³ The call for socialized medicine had been part of Saskatchewan social democracy since the No-Party League in 1913 and the NPL in 1916. However, this platform added the new caveat that "The establishment of a complete network of health services covering all parts of the province will undoubtedly take considerable time".⁷⁴ The platform dropped the Regina Manifesto's insistence on giving more powers to the federal government. Instead, the platform ends with the caution that "The C.C.F. has always recognized that it is not constitutionally possible to set up a complete co-operative commonwealth within the boundaries of a single province. There are, however, certain very definite powers vested in a Provincial Government by

the Constitution of Canada”.⁷⁵ Therefore, the platform pledges that the CCF “intends to use these powers to carry the province as far as possible forward to the realization of the aim set out in the Regina Manifesto”.⁷⁶ This aim, of course, was the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth. Here we see the suggestion, for the first time in Saskatchewan social democratic thought, that the assertion of provincial autonomy is necessary for the accomplishment of social democratic goals.

During the election campaign, the CCF focused on its proposals for an immediate moratorium on farm debt and government provided health care. Farm security was probably the CCF’s biggest issue, a 1944 election pamphlet stressed that “the CCF believes in the family farm as the basis of rural life” and promised to protect the family farm through debt adjustment, encouraging co-operatives, crop insurance and pressing for the abolition of the Winnipeg grain exchange.⁷⁷ The CCF also tried to frame the voters’ decision in broader terms, Douglas stated that voters had to choose between “conditions as they were before the war: a period of free enterprise and all the poverty it caused, or a change to a commonwealth of social justice”.⁷⁸ Douglas also used political fables such as “Mouseland” and “The Cream Separator” to explain old themes in Saskatchewan social democratic thought like the critique of traditional parties and the exploitation of the producer by the capitalist in an engaging and humorous manner.⁷⁹ The CCF won a massive victory taking 47 out of 52 seats with the Liberals winning the remaining 5 ridings.

Undoubtedly, the CCF’s victory was aided by the educational and organizational work done by agrarian movements and co-operatives in the first half of the 20th century. Three decades of agrarian protest and exploitation by the federal government and Eastern Canadian business interests had created the conditions for the emergence of a social democratic political culture in Saskatchewan. This social democratic political culture continued to operate from 1930 to 1944 and was even further entrenched by the advent of the depression. The depression confirmed suspicions concerning the exploitation of Saskatchewan by big Eastern business and created a questioning of the free market economy. Private companies, most with head offices in Eastern Canada, harshly treated cash-strapped customers by refusing them credit, raising prices, canceling their insurance policies and foreclosing on farms. Within the agricultural economy, wheat prices dropped while farm debts rose to staggering proportions. The depression also increased support for government intervention in the economy and World War II had illustrated the effectiveness of a government-planned economy. The hardships of the depression firmly established the need for a welfare state to protect citizens from abject poverty and provide adequate health and education services. Finally, the depression stimulated the growth of even more co-operatives as private companies fled Saskatchewan. Co-operative insurance providers, wholesalers, an oil refinery and credit unions all emerged in the 1930s signaling the popularity of a ‘co-operative philosophy’ in Saskatchewan. Lipset estimated that, by 1950, the average Saskatchewan farmer was a member in four to five cooperatives.⁸⁰

Though more understated, western alienation was still part of the Saskatchewan CCF’s ideology and electoral appeal in late 1930s and early 1940s. In 1938, George Williams urged voters to elect “a western party, such as the CCF, who are not continually looking for a cabinet position in Ottawa and not willing to sell out their western principles in order to get it”.⁸¹ In 1942, as the official opposition in the Saskatchewan

Legislature, the CCF put forth motions for supporting free trade and a railway to Hudson's Bay.⁸² In 1944, Douglas declared that banks should be nationalized because Eastern banks operating in the Western Canada "generally loan money when we least need it, and call it in when we most need it".⁸³ Further, the 1944 platform dropped the Regina Manifesto's insistence on giving more powers to the federal government. Instead, it was steadfast in its promise to use the powers of the provincial government to the fullest in order to achieve a Co-operative Commonwealth. The CCF also would press the federal government for more money to develop its welfare state because "if Confederation is to continue and Canadian unity is to be realized, there will have to be a redistribution of income between the Federal and Provincial Governments to enable the Provinces to maintain and expand essential services".⁸⁴ It also promised to press the federal government on the continuation of the Canadian Wheat Board, abolition of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the nationalization of railways and banks. Therefore, the emphasis of western alienation in the CCF had moved away from an exclusive focus on tariff issues to strongly pressuring the federal government on social and agricultural issues while exercising full provincial constitutional powers. This provincialist outlook did clash with centralist orientation of the national CCF. This clash of viewpoints concerning federalism may be one of the reasons that the Saskatchewan CCF operated in complete independence from the national CCF office during the 1930s and 1940s. Even though the national office was financially dependent on the Saskatchewan section, there was little contact between the two organizations and the Saskatchewan CCF always changed National CCF policy to suit what it saw as Saskatchewan's conditions and needs.⁸⁵

The Douglas Government's Support of Centralization (1944-1964)

Before 1944, the Saskatchewan CCF had a very undeveloped vision of federalism. It had signed on to the Regina Manifesto with its centralist vision but had maintained in its 1944 election platform that it would use the powers of province to their fullest in order to achieve a Co-operative Commonwealth and frequently expressed sentiments of western alienation that it had inherited from early Saskatchewan agrarian movements. However, once in power, the federal-provincial relations inherent in governing a Canadian province forced the CCF to quickly develop a more comprehensive approach to federalism. The CCF government had a number of disputes with the federal government during its first term of office. First, the federal government demanded payment from the CCF government for a seed-grain debt that the Liberal provincial government had incurred in 1937. The federal government had not forced their provincial counterparts to pay the debt but now that the CCF was in power it demanded immediate and full payment and withheld part of Saskatchewan's transfer payments. The CCF responded that the debt was incurred in a time of duress and that it should be cut in half. A compromise was finally reached where Saskatchewan was given 11 years to pay off the debt but the controversy proved to the CCF the type of fiscal power that hostile federal government could have over its treasury. The second dispute was the threat of the federal government to disallow the Farm Security Act and the Mineral Taxation Act which had imposed a levy on hitherto tax-free subsurface mineral rights. The federal threat was prompted by a request by the Dominion Loan and Mortgage Association and

the CPR. The CCF responded by urging Saskatchewan citizens to write letters to the federal government and by holding massive rallies around the province to denounce the federal government's action.⁸⁶ The federal government backed away from its threat but the clause of the Farm Security Act dealing with the suspension of interest on a farmer's mortgage in the event of crop failure was eventually found *ultra vires* by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1948.

The new CCF government was able to articulate its complete vision of Canadian federalism at the Dominion-Provincial Conferences on Reconstruction in 1945 and 1946. In spite of the recognition of the limits that centralization could place on the financial ability to achieve social democratic goals in the 1944 CCF program, the Douglas government nonetheless argued for a quite centralist system of federalism. For the most part, the Saskatchewan position at the reconstruction conferences supported the federal vision of social security contained in the *White Paper on Unemployment and Income* and the *Green Book on Reconstruction*.⁸⁷ In fact, Douglas was the only premier to support the *Green Book* which other provinces, particularly Quebec and Ontario, saw as an unjustified intrusion on their provincial jurisdiction.⁸⁸ The vision contained in the *Green Book* and *White Paper* was one of a centralized welfare state where the federal government would provide unemployment assistance and health insurance to all Canadians in co-operation with the provinces. Further, the position papers of the CCF government frequently re-iterated its support for the principles of the Rowell-Sirois Report, especially the Report's suggestion of equalization payments.⁸⁹

The Douglas government orientated its federal-provincial relations from the premise that provinces did not have the financial resources to effectively discharge their constitutional responsibilities. The solution to this asymmetry was for provinces to surrender their jurisdiction over personal and corporate income taxes to the federal government. The federal government could then redistribute personal and corporate income tax revenue in such a way as to help poorer provinces like Saskatchewan plus give federal grants to assist all provinces in providing improved health and social services which would meet "a minimum standard across Canada".⁹⁰ The Douglas government strongly felt that a comprehensive Canada-wide social security system could only come into being with the participation of the federal government. The CCF was even willing to accept minimum standards in the field of education in exchange for federal grants. At the Dominion-Provincial Conference, Douglas stated that "We believe that the Dominion Government should give grants to the provinces for the purpose of maintaining minimum standards of education across Canada. In our opinion, education should be classified with the other social services".⁹¹ The CCF government also called for joint federal-provincial investment on highways, natural resources development, municipal projects, occupational rehabilitation, air transportation and radio communications.⁹² Finally, Douglas stated that the Saskatchewan government wanted the federal government to assume all provincial debts and the Bank of Canada to loan money to municipalities to assist in financing local projects.

There were two reasons why the Douglas government pushed for these sorts of centralized fiscal arrangements. First, it was a way to get equalization 'through the back door' since under the Wartime Tax Collection Agreements Saskatchewan received more in grants from the federal government than it contributed in the form of personal and corporate taxes. Second, the Saskatchewan CCF desperately wanted the federal

government to take the lead in instituting a Canada-wide welfare state. Cost-shared federal programs in health and social assistance would give the CCF government money to institute a modernized and generous social aid plan as well as fulfill its commitment to implement Medicare. Further, with the federal government leading the construction of the welfare state, every Canadian would come to enjoy comprehensive services regardless of whether they lived in a rich or poor province. At the Dominion-Provincial Conference, Douglas made Saskatchewan's logic clear when he stated "Only by pooling the proceeds of these taxes can each province receive its fair share and every person in Canada enjoy a minimum standard of social services, irrespective of where they happen to reside".⁹³ The CCF government also presented a number of proposals to the federal-provincial conference that were found in the national CCF's 1945 federal election platform.⁹⁴ For instance, the Saskatchewan CCF government advocated the institution of a National Labour Code because "at present every province which passes advanced labour legislation is thereby penalized" and such legislation would "eliminate inter-provincial legislation competition for industry at the expense of labour".⁹⁵ The CCF government was willing to surrender jurisdiction over a substantial part of the labour field to the federal government provided a sufficient guarantee could be made that Saskatchewan's labour standards would not be lowered or impaired. The CCF government also suggested a number of amendments to the BNA Act which were also called for in the national CCF's 1945 federal election platform. First, the CCF government wanted to add a Bill of Rights to the BNA act which would protect "fundamental religious, racial and civil liberties" and be amendable only by the unanimous consent of the provincial legislatures and the dominion parliament.⁹⁶ Second, the CCF suggested that amendment of the BNA Act by the Parliament of Great Britain be abolished, a formula for joint federal-provincial amendment be devised and that appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council be discontinued. Finally, constitutional protection was sought to secure effective control over marketing by government agencies and the CCF government declared that only the Parliament of Canada should have the power to implement international treaty obligations. Unlike the 1945 federal CCF platform, the Saskatchewan CCF government did not advocate the abolition of the senate or the nationalization of banks.⁹⁷ There was also one amendment to the BNA act suggested by the Saskatchewan CCF government that was not found in the national CCF's 1945 platform. It was the suggestion that the BNA Act be amended to allow for provinces to delegate legislative jurisdiction to the federal government and for the federal government to give jurisdiction to the provinces if it so desired. Despite the support of the Saskatchewan government for the majority of the federal government's proposals, Ontario and Quebec firmly rejected the federal government's plan as an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction and the reconstruction conferences adjourned without agreement.

As we saw, under Williams' leadership, the Saskatchewan CCF had been much more apt to make appeals to western alienation and was deeply suspicious of the national CCF's and the LSR's centralist vision of federalism. In 1937, Williams wrote to David Lewis that "I can well see the argument in favour of centralization of power under a socialist government, but the centralization of power under the present set up may easily mean 'secession' later on, because I have absolutely no faith in a government controlled by Eastern financiers and industrialists".⁹⁸ Though there is evidence that Douglas shared Williams' views in the late 1930s, he clearly overcame his suspicion of centralization

during his time as premier and moved the Saskatchewan CCF intellectually closer to the national CCF's centralist view of federalism.⁹⁹ Throughout his time as premier, Douglas was much more of a Canadian nationalist than Williams had been and he was less prone to make appeals to western alienation.¹⁰⁰ However, Douglas did not wholeheartedly endorse the national CCF's view of federalism. Frank Scott later commented that the Douglas succeeded in moderating the extreme centralist tendencies of the National CCF and "show how important the role of the provinces was".¹⁰¹ In many ways, Douglas' attempted to balance to the extreme centralist National CCF version of Canadian federalism with Saskatchewan social democracy's tradition of western alienation. Douglas stated that "I've have never been a provincial rightist; I've never believed that provinces are sovereign powers, and I completely repudiate the compact theory of Confederation" but he maintained that provinces must be able to freely exercise "certain sovereign rights within their own field of jurisdiction".¹⁰²

The Douglas government's proposals to the reconstruction conferences illustrated that the Saskatchewan CCF government definitely did not hold a provincial rights position concerned with maintaining and expanding provincial jurisdiction. Yet, the CCF's view of federalism was not devoid of traditional concerns emanating from the tradition of western alienation within Saskatchewan social democracy. While willing to accept centralization in terms of social policy, the Saskatchewan CCF harshly criticized the federal government's inactivity on agricultural issues. In its brief to the reconstruction conferences the Saskatchewan government demanded that federal government institute programs to provide price stability, crop insurance, farm rehabilitation, irrigation, agricultural research and entrench the Canadian Wheat Board.¹⁰³ Further, at the reconstruction conference itself, Douglas called for a reduction of tariffs to facilitate increased trade, reduced freight rates, the fullest possible use of the Hudson's Bay Railway and a "determined war against monopolies and cartels".¹⁰⁴ The Douglas government also took a conflictual stance towards the federal government in terms of the seed grain and disallowance disputes where it appealed to Saskatchewan people's sense of western alienation. Thus, the Saskatchewan CCF's approach to federalism under Douglas could be best described as support for centralization in exchange for financial resources to build a Canada-wide welfare state coupled with a sentiment of western alienation that was critical of federal agricultural policy. It should be noted that the tradition of western alienation within Saskatchewan social democracy was based on the recognition of the exploitation of the prairie farmer by eastern Canadian business interests and distrust of the traditional eastern-based political parties who propped up this unjust economic situation. As the previous section illustrated, there was very little concern for provincial rights or the expansion of provincial jurisdiction among early Saskatchewan social democrats. Thus, Douglas' modifications to the Saskatchewan CCF's view of federalism did not fall significantly outside of the tradition of social democratic thinking in Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan CCF's vision of federalism in the 1950s remained very similar to the model that it argued for at the 1945 and 1946 reconstruction conferences. The CCF government consistently expressed their satisfaction with federal government collection of corporate and personal income tax while urging the federal government to set up a national welfare state compromising of health insurance, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions and federal grants for education.¹⁰⁵ Douglas viciously attacked the giving of

corporate and personal income taxing powers to Quebec in 1955 because he thought that it undermined the ability of the federal government to direct the economy through fiscal policy and to build a Canada-wide welfare state.¹⁰⁶ While the CCF government was willing to co-operate with the federal government in terms of social policy, agriculture would continue to be an area of major friction between the CCF and federal government during the 1950s. After a certain part of the Farm Security Act had been found *ultra vires* by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1948, the CCF government introduced another piece of legislation intended to protect the insolvent farmer. However, the Canadian Bankers Association, the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Associations and the federal government brought the legislation before the Supreme Court of Canada where it was found to *ultra vires* as well.¹⁰⁷ The largest issue in agriculture in Saskatchewan in the 1950s was the negotiations between the federal and the provincial government for the building of a dam along the South Saskatchewan River to provide irrigation. Discussions had actually begun as early as 1946 but the new federal Liberal government in 1948, under St. Laurent, refused to move on the issue even though the Saskatchewan government agreed to pay over half of the costs. The CCF argued that St. Laurent's position was unfair since the federal government was constructing the St. Lawrence Seaway at no cost to Quebec or Ontario. It was not until Diefenbaker became Prime Minister in 1958 that an agreement for a dam was concluded. Finally, throughout the 1950s, the CCF demanded a "a fair share of the national income for farmers" through federal government action on cash advances on farm stored grain, price guarantees to reduce the cost-price squeeze for farmers and the orderly marketing of grain.¹⁰⁸

The end of fourth term of the Douglas government bought about two important innovations in Saskatchewan welfare state which had been precipitated by two newfound sources of revenue: increased grants from the federal government for social programs and rising resource royalties. First, increased federal financial support lead the CCF government to pass the Social Aid Act in 1959 which modernized social assistance in Saskatchewan. The new act still left the administration of social aid to municipalities but it introduced a comprehensive and integrated social assistance structure whereby the provincial government set social aid rates and eligibility requirements and created a standardized application and appeals process for all municipalities to follow.¹⁰⁹ The second, and more significant, innovation at the end of the fourth term of CCF government was the beginning of the process to expand the hospitalization program into Medicare. In 1957, the federal government under Diefenbaker committed to sharing the costs of any provincial hospitalization plan that offered universal coverage. The CCF had stated in its 1944 election platform that socialized medicine would take "considerable time" to implement and this increased federal support had finally freed up the necessary fiscal resources for the CCF government to proceed with Medicare. Therefore, on December 16th, 1959, Douglas announced in a province-wide radio broadcast that the Saskatchewan government intended to introduce a comprehensive and universal Medicare program which it did after the provincial election in 1960.

We can now briefly summarize the ideas of the Saskatchewan CCF in 1944 to 1964 and explore their relation to western alienation. The CCF advocated a mixed economy with publicly owned utilities, strong co-operatives restricted mainly to the agricultural, financial and retail sector, privately owned small business and family farms and the private development of natural resources and manufacturing. The CCF desired to

gradually build a universal, comprehensive welfare state primarily administered by provinces (except for unemployment insurance and pensions) but paid for through federal-provincial cost-sharing arrangements where the federal government collected personal and corporate income taxes and provincial governments levied consumptions taxes and user fees. However, the building of such a welfare state would have to be done in a fiscally responsible framework in which the government did not run deficits, gradually paid down its public debt and had a high credit rating ensuring that interest charges on its debt would be kept to a minimum. While passing advanced labour legislation itself, the CCF also wanted the federal government to have jurisdiction over labour to ensure high labour standards across Canada and avoid provinces being punished by business for having advanced labour laws.

The western alienation of the CCF in 1944 to 1964 was confined mostly to criticizing the federal government in the field of agriculture instead of demanding for enlarged provincial jurisdiction. The CCF government recognized and accepted that Canadian federalism limited its ability to achieve social democratic goals by constraining its fiscal resources and denying it control over crucial policy areas such as transportation, banking and tariff policy and international trade which were needed to adequately support the prairie agricultural industry, limit the power of monopolies and plan the economy. Such acceptance of the limits that federalism placed on provincial social democracy and the push for a centralized national welfare state was consistent with Douglas' often-repeated quip that "No one can build an island of socialism in a sea of capitalism".¹¹⁰ As early as 1944, Douglas had stated that "We recognize the under the British North America Act there is a distinct limit to the powers of a provincial government; we do not have the power to create an entirely new society".¹¹¹ However, Douglas did not believe that Saskatchewan government was powerless. He also stated that "Within the limited jurisdiction of a provincial government we can lay the foundations of a Co-operative Commonwealth and begin to set public, co-operative and private ownership in our provincial society".¹¹² Thus, the Saskatchewan CCF argued that, as a provincial government, it could only begin the work of building a Co-operative Commonwealth and a CCF federal government would be needed to fully complete the task. In the meantime, the CCF Saskatchewan government would accept the limits of the BNA act and attempt to build its own welfare state with federal cash and resource royalties from private industry as well as build up the public and co-operative sector within its provincial economy.

The Blakeney Government and the Fight for Control of Resources and the Crow Rate

The NDP ran on a platform entitled *A New Deal for People* for the 1971 election campaign in which they received majority government. Following the same tact of Douglas governments, the platform strongly criticized the federal Liberal government on its agricultural policy and attempted to link the provincial Liberal government with the federal Liberal government. It stated that the federal government's policies will "lead to the take over of Saskatchewan by agribusiness. Instead of family farms, there will be huge corporate enterprises run by a few hired hands".¹¹³ The platform goes on to promise that a NDP government would urge the federal government to institute guaranteed prices, provide capital grants to farmers, pass legislation to allow the creation of producer-

controlled national marketing boards and convert a substantial part of the defence budget into food aid for Third World countries. Finally, the platform attacks the federal Liberal government for abandoning rural Saskatchewan through closing post offices, allowing the shutdown of railway stations and branch lines and reducing grain delivery points. In particular, the platform and 1971 NDP campaign literature rallied against a federal taskforce report on agriculture that it claimed planned to eliminate two thirds of Saskatchewan farms.

In the autumn of 1973, with the OPEC crisis emerging, the federal Liberal government introduced a national energy policy which included provisions for a freeze on the price of domestic oil and the division of proceeds from the export tax on oil in such a way that the oil producing province would receive only half of the royalties from windfall profits on exported oil. The federal government's proposal prompted Blakeney to become a defender of provincial rights and autonomy using western alienation rhetoric. Soon after the federal policy was announced, Blakeney had a provincially televised address to stress that oil and gas resources clearly belong to provinces and that his government would "capture for the people of Saskatchewan the full benefit of all future windfall profits".¹¹⁴ He wrote an article in the *Globe and Mail* arguing that Canada was facing a "crisis of regional inequality" in which the comfort of residents of Eastern provinces was being prioritized over the prosperity of Saskatchewan.¹¹⁵ In comparison of resident of Ontario and people in Saskatchewan he wrote "Some people may not be able to afford to buy as much gasoline as they need for their cars. But at least they have cars".¹¹⁶ A pamphlet distributed by the Saskatchewan government stated that "The rules of the game, as they have been applied to a whole range of commodities, have largely worked to the disadvantage of Saskatchewan. But with respect to one commodity which Saskatchewan wishes to utilize in furthering its development, the rules are to be changed".¹¹⁷ Aside from rhetoric, the Blakeney government responded to the federal government's proposal with legislation of their own which nationalized, with compensation, oil and gas freehold rights of 25 companies to gain more complete public control of the province's oil reserves and placed a royalty surcharge on oil in order to recoup the half of royalties that were currently going to the federal government. The legislation was challenged in courts by the federal government and oil companies and found unconstitutional in 1977. In late March 1974, the Blakeney government did reach an agreement for a 15 month price freeze on domestic crude oil at a higher price than was originally proposed by the federal government. Blakeney's Minister of Mineral Resources claimed that the agreement was a "a major victory for the West" and that "without hard bargaining by Allan Blakeney, many western grievances would have been ignored by the federal government".¹¹⁸

During its first term, the Blakeney government pushed its ideas in the area of agriculture with the federal government but to little avail. The one exception was that the federal government did pass legislation to allow for producer-controlled national marketing boards in 1972. As such, the NDP's 1975 election platform, entitled *New Deal '75*, merely repeated the NDP's attack on the federal government. The platform charged that, despite a two year federal freeze on branch line abandonment scheduled to end in 1975, railway services continued to deteriorate and grain delivery points continued to be reduced. In any case, the platform declares that the branch line abandonment freeze is "hollow and meaningless if the Crows Nest rates are scuttled and the railways are free to

charge whatever they can extract from Western farmers”.¹¹⁹ Thus, the platform promises that a NDP government would oppose any tampering with Crows Nest rates, fight for a fair re-organization of branch lines, strengthen the Wheat Board and urge the federal government to establish a Canadian Food Bank to provide food aid to poor countries (the NDP government would even contribute funds to this new agency). The platform also responded to the federal government national energy policy by stating that a NDP would defend “Defend and protect the right of Saskatchewan people to full benefits of their rightful heritage- the natural resources of this province”.¹²⁰ The 1975 program also promised to “speed up direct government participation in the exploration for and development of potash and hard rock minerals” and to “step up direct public participation in exploration for and development of oil, gas, coal and uranium”.¹²¹

After the 1975 election, the Blakeney NDP government made the boldest move of its time in power. Foreign and Canadian owned oil and potash companies challenged the increased royalties imposed by the Blakeney government arguing that it was a violation of Sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution.¹²² The federal Liberal government supported the resource companies and intervened on their side in the court case. The Blakeney government used a similar line of western alienation as it had with the national energy policy in 1973. It claimed that the federal government was intruding on provincial jurisdiction in order to reduce the amount of royalties that the people of Saskatchewan received from their natural resources. Moreover, resources royalties were to pay for the expansion of Saskatchewan’s welfare state and therefore federal government intrusion into provincial jurisdiction was standing in the way of creating a more equal society in Saskatchewan. After a variety of legal battles it became clear that the collection of resource royalties in the future was becoming increasingly uncertain. In response, the NDP government introduced a law allowing it acquire by purchase or expropriation any relevant potash assets in Saskatchewan. With both the provincial government and potash companies anxious to avoid expropriation, the companies voluntarily sold their holdings to the provincial government who paid generous prices.

The 1978 provincial election took place as court cases surrounding Saskatchewan’s resource taxation were still ongoing. The 1978 NDP platform entitled *A Solid Success* stresses a new theme in the Saskatchewan NDP’s thinking. The basic message was that increased government revenue from resource development provides for the expansion of social programs and lowering of taxes at time when the federal government refuses to control inflation or give control of natural resources to the provinces. The platform re-stated that “New Democrats believe these resources belong to the people of Saskatchewan. They’re entitled to their fair share of the resource dollar”.¹²³ The platform rallied against “big oil and potash companies” and the “Liberals in Ottawa” who fought in the press and the courts against fair taxation of Saskatchewan’s resource revenues.¹²⁴ Just before the day of the election, the Supreme Court of Canada handed down two decisions in favour of the federal government on the issue of resource taxation. The NDP campaign sent out a letter to many households in the province claiming that “Saskatchewan has become the target of an attempt by Ottawa to take over provincial resources. The federal government wants to be able to divide our resource revenues as it sees fit between itself, the resource companies and the provinces.”¹²⁵

Blakeney’s final term in office was also characterized by considerable animosity between the federal government and the Saskatchewan government in three primary

areas: the monetary policy, grain transportation and the repatriation of the Constitution. First, the Blakeney government severely criticized the federal government's 'tight' monetary policy consisting of high interest rates by the Bank of Canada in order to keep inflation down.¹²⁶ The Blakeney government held that high interest rates choked economic growth leading to higher unemployment while not substantially lowering inflation and benefiting banks instead of 'average' Canadians. Moreover, the monetary policy of the federal government hurt the West and its dynamic and growing economy. Instead of monetarist economic policy, the Saskatchewan government proposed Keynesian solutions such as low interest rates and direct government investment in the economy. Second, the Blakeney government fought hard against the federal government's proposed changes to the Crow Rate which eliminated fixed freight rates and equal rates for equal distances. The Saskatchewan government declared that the Crow Rate must be maintained because it was part of the bargain for Confederation and argued for public investments by the federal and provincial governments to make improvements to rail system such as increasing main line capacity, branch line rehabilitation and equipment replacement. The Blakeney government even put these principles into practice by purchasing 1,000 hopper cars which were used by the railway companies free of charge to move grain within their western division. Such investment would give governments equity in the railway system and "should ultimately lead to a total public utility rail system, where the only goal would be to increase Canadian exports, not to fatten the pocketbooks of corporate shareholders".¹²⁷ In language which closely resembled that of early Saskatchewan social democrats, a widely distributed Saskatchewan pamphlet in February of 1982 stated:

The railways hold a powerful monopoly position over the movement of grain to port from Canada's land-locked prairies. What is needed is a national transportation policy which looks beyond the interests of the railway companies, to the national interest. What we need is a transportation policy which recognizes that the crucial question is not whether the CPR can afford the Crow Rate, but whether Canada can any longer afford the CPR.¹²⁸

Finally, the Blakeney government joined the 'Gang of Eight' and opposed Trudeau's initial package of constitutional changes and unilateral patriation of the constitution. The Blakeney pushed for a clear provision within the new constitution which would give provinces full control over their resources and ensure a very limited role for the senate in constitutional amendment since the Blakeney government was officially in favour of abolishing the senate.¹²⁹ The Blakeney government was also against an entrenched federal Charter of Rights because it would give courts too much power over public policy and did not support a constitutional veto for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In the end, Saskatchewan succeeded in getting an amendment securing provincial control over resources and an amending formula which did not contain a veto for any province in exchange for its support of an entrenched Charter.

We can see from the above discussion that, along with its commitment to the expansion of the welfare state and public enterprise, the Blakeney government displayed a consistent sentiment of western alienation as it argued against the federal government's agricultural and monetary policies and fought to establish complete provincial control over natural resources. It is clear that the Blakeney government relied much more on appeals to western alienation and was more protectionist of provincial jurisdiction than the Douglas government especially in the area of resource policy. A possible reason for

Blakeney's tougher stance with the federal government was that there was no threat of federal intrusion on provincial control of resources during the Douglas era. However, even in the area of social policy, the expansion that Blakeney made to provincial welfare state all took place without joint federal-provincial funding. Thus, Blakeney's innovations to the welfare state such as free dental care for all children between the ages of 4-16, provision of low-cost drugs and more generous social assistance rates took place just Saskatchewan and were not a part of a national programs. In many ways, Blakeney harkened back to the era of early Saskatchewan social democracy which used western alienation as motivating force for the accomplishment of the economic and social reform of society.

The Romanow Government's Conciliatory Approach to Canadian Federalism

The Romanow government was definitely less strident with the federal government than the Blakeney government had been. The referendum on the Charlottetown Accord was held almost exactly a year after the election of Romanow government in October 1991. Thus, the new NDP government had to quickly establish its position on Canadian federalism within its first year in office. The Romanow NDP government came out strongly in favour of the Charlottetown Accord which it argued struck the right balance between a strong central government and limiting the federal government's spending powers, created an effective and elected senate, protected existing provincial jurisdictions, recognized Aboriginal rights and strengthen the federal commitment to equalization.¹³⁰ The Romanow government maintained a conciliatory tone with the federal government throughout its time in office. Saskatchewan successfully lobbied the federal government to create the National Child Benefit in 1997 and played a critical role in creating a consensus among the provinces during the negotiations on the Benefit's implementation.¹³¹ The Saskatchewan government hailed the federal program as the first addition to the Canadian welfare state in 30 years and sought to take credit for its creation. Similarly, the Saskatchewan government supported the federal government's efforts to establish the Social Union Framework Agreement (SUFA) and acted as the provincial co-chair of the negotiations. Under most analyses, SUFA acted to limit the federal government's power by allowing the opting out of federal social programs with full compensation and requiring new federal government social policy initiatives to be approved by 7 out of 10 provinces.

The Romanow government did criticize the federal government in a number of areas during the 1990s. In its 1993 budget, the Romanow government claimed that cuts to transfer payments from the federal government created the situation where it had to cut social programs.¹³² In its 1995 and 1999 election platforms, the Romanow government attacked the federal government for lack of funding for agriculture, abandoning the Crow rate and not funding highway construction.¹³³ Moreover, the Romanow government urged the federal government to fight against the unfair agricultural subsidies of the European Union and the United States to ensure "fair market-driven prices."¹³⁴ However, besides these mild reproaches, the Romanow government never fundamentally challenged the federal government's power as the Blakeney government had done. Romanow never deployed the rhetoric of western alienation and his government was one of the strongest allies of the federal government in federal-provincial negotiations. It

seems that Romanow decided to follow a conciliatory federalism which sought to work with the federal government for the achievement of common policy objectives such as the National Child Tax Benefit, Social Union Framework Agreement and the Charlottetown Accord.

Is the Connection between Western Alienation and Social Democracy Dead?

As we have seen, there has historically been a connection between western alienation and social democracy in Saskatchewan which was strongest in the time period from 1900 to 1944 and during the Blakeney government but considerably weaker in the time periods of the Douglas and Romanow governments. Overall, there were a number of commonalities and differences among the visions of federalism within Saskatchewan CCF-NDP governments since 1944. Saskatchewan social democracy defended provincial control over resources throughout the Douglas, Blakeney and Romanow governments. There was never any question for Saskatchewan CCF-NDP governments that control over resources should be a provincial power. However, it was only during Blakeney's time period that the federal government challenged Saskatchewan's control over its natural resources which may partially account for Blakeney's heightened sense of western alienation. The federal government conceded control over resources to the provinces in the 1982 constitution. However, federal-provincial wrangling over resources did definitely not end there. With the new deals signed by Nova Scotia and Newfoundland exempting their equalization from clawbacks due to their offshore revenues, the question of resources rents is once again at the heart of Saskatchewan-federal government relations. What has been interesting is that, as Calvert has pushed for a new energy accord to give Saskatchewan the same deal as Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, he has not employed the language of western alienation in the least. Instead of trying to depict the NDP as the defender of western Canada, as Blakeney did, Calvert has employed a dull discourse emphasizing basic fairness and trying to build a common front with Conservative and Saskatchewan Party politicians to pressure the federal government.

In terms of social policy, CCF-NDP governments were consistently in favour of joint federal-provincial funding of social programs within national standards set by the federal government. Such an arrangement would provide money for Saskatchewan to build its own welfare state while ensuring that all Canadians had similar access to quality social programs. However, no one is currently defending idea of a universal, Canada-wide welfare with uniform national standards and significant involvement by the federal government in the area of social policy. Beginning with the Charottletown Accord, provinces have pushed for decentralization in social policy areas and as SUFA illustrates the federal government has generally acquiesced. It seems that the NDP under Romanow and Calvert have also been swept up in this movement towards decentralization. The willingness of the federal government to accept minimal national standards in health (or no standards at all in the case of Quebec) was illustrated through the recent health accord that it completed with provinces in September 2004. The health accord signaled that the federal government will not be attempting to go back to a postwar type cost-shared fiscal arrangement where the federal government exercised significant control over social policy within provincial jurisdiction. The health accord also made it clear that there is no

enthusiasm among the provinces for national standards in the area of health or any other policy area. While Quebec's and Alberta's stance in this regard was not surprising, the NDP governments in Saskatchewan and Manitoba also were resistant to the concept of national standards at the First Ministers' Meeting. Unlike Douglas who was the lone provincial voice calling out for a stronger national government at the reconstruction conferences in 1945 and 1946, the Romanow/Calvert government has reluctantly went along with the other provinces' insistence that national standards in social policy should be resisted at all costs. However, there is no indication that Romanow/Calvert government has done this out of western alienation. It appears more as if the Romanow/Calvert government has accepted that national standards are an obstacle to reaching federal-provincial agreements and the obtaining federal funding for Saskatchewan social programs. Thus, Saskatchewan has positioned itself as broker in federal-provincial negotiations where it is an ally of the federal government in trying to obtain minimal national objectives and forms common front with other provinces in order to pry as much cash as possible out of Ottawa.

In conclusion, my analysis leads to the question of if the connection between Saskatchewan social democracy and western alienation is dead? The answer appears to be that, if western alienation in Saskatchewan social democracy is not dead, it clearly appears to be on its deathbed. As David Laycock has shown, western alienation and western populism are now the possession of right-wing political parties like Reform, Canadian Alliance and the Alberta Conservatives.¹³⁵ The left-wing version of western alienation, and to some degree western populism, that was represented by Blakeney and the agrarian protest movement is no longer part to the intellectual apparatus of the Saskatchewan NDP. Calvert's reluctance to the play the part of defender of western Canada in Saskatchewan's latest dispute with Ottawa over equalization illustrates that the Saskatchewan NDP now views federalism a bureaucratic process instead of an emotionally and historically contested concept.

Endnotes

¹ Gibbins has published numerous articles and books on the subject of western alienation. See Roger Gibbins, "Western Alienation," in *The Prairie West: Historical readings*, eds. R. Douglas Francis and Howard Palmer (Edmonton: Pica Pica Press, 1985), 585-610 and Chapter 2, *Roger Gibbins and Loleen Berdahl, Western visions, western futures: Perspectives on the West in Canada*, Peterborough, Ont. : Broadview Press, 2003. W.L. Morton, "Bias of Prairie Politics" in *Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces*, Donald Swainson (ed.), (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1970), 289-300.

² The full text of the petition is reprinted in Lewis, Thomas, "Louis Riel's Petition of Rights, 1884," in *Saskatchewan History* 23, (Winter 1970): 21.

³ A report of Douglas' speech was published in the February 13th, 1895 issue of the *Patrons' Advocate*, the official organ of the Patrons in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. This report was reprinted in "The Agrarian Movement of the 1890s," in *Saskatchewan History*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 1954), 51-55.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁹ Gilbert Johnson, "James Moffat Douglas and the Agrarian Movement in the 1890s," in *Saskatchewan History* 7, no. 1 (Winter 1954), 49 & Wood, 195-168.

¹⁰ Wood, 171-172.

-
- ¹¹ Territorial Grain Growers' Association, *Report of the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting of the Territorial Grain Growers' Association* (Indian Head: Territorial Grain Growers' Association, 1902), 3-4.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 11.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 17.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.
- ¹⁵ Laycock defines crypto-liberalism as "a western, rurally inclined, more socially progressive and politically experimental version of Ontario Grit Liberalism" which was adhered to by the SGGGA until 1926 as well as the Saskatchewan Liberal government, MGGGA and UFA. See Laycock, 21-68.
- ¹⁶ Partridge as quoted in Knuttila, 19.
- ¹⁷ Partridge as quoted in Knuttila, 27.
- ¹⁸ Partridge quoted in Knuttila, 32.
- ¹⁹ E.A., Partridge, *Manifesto of the No-Party League of Western Canada* (1913), 1.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 25.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ For a discussion of the Social Democratic populism of the Saskatchewan NPL see Laycock, 136-166.
- ²⁴ Laycock, 166.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 140-141.
- ²⁶ Sharp, 77-103.
- ²⁷ Allen, *Social Passion*, 205-206.
- ²⁸ L.D. Courville, "The Conservatism of the Saskatchewan Progressives," in *The Prairie West: Historical readings*, eds. R. Douglas Francis and Howard Palmer (Edmonton: Pica Pica Press, 1985), 511-533.
- ²⁹ Lipset, 82.
- ³⁰ D.S. Spafford, "The Origin of the Farmers' Union of Canada," in *Historical Essay's on the Prairie Provinces*, ed. Swainson, Donald (Toronto: Macmillan, 1978), 255.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² Spafford, "Origin", 259.
- ³³ Lipset, 86.
- ³⁴ Knuttila, 56.
- ³⁵ E.A. Partridge, *A War on Poverty: The War that Can End War* (Winnipeg: Wallingford Press, 1925), xi.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, xi.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*
- ³⁸ Quoted in Lipset, 89.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ Lipset, 104.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 122.
- ⁴² Knuttila, 71.
- ⁴³ Lipset, 109.
- ⁴⁴ Hoffman, "The Saskatchewan Farmer-Labor Party", 54-55.
- ⁴⁵ Walter, Stewart, *M.J.: The Life and Times of M.J. Coldwell* (Toronto: Stoddart, 2000), 36-40.
- ⁴⁶ Lipset, 111.
- ⁴⁷ Hoffman, "Farmer-Labor Party", 55.
- ⁴⁸ Young, "M.J. Coldwell", 59.
- ⁴⁹ Lipset, 112.
- ⁵⁰ Saskatchewan Farmer-Labor Group. *Handbook for Speakers*, Compiled from Conferences held in Saskatoon and Regina, January 7th and February 11th, 1933, National Library of Canada, 22.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵² *Ibid.*
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ See Young, *Anatomy of a Party*, Chapter 3 and Alan Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992), Chapter 3.
- ⁵⁷ The Regina Manifesto is reprinted in Young, *The Anatomy of a Party*, 304-313.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 310-312.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 305.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Laycock, 169 & Michiel Horn, "The League for Social Reconstruction in Western Canada," in *The Dirty Thirties in Prairie Canada*, D.C. Francis and H. Ganzevoort (eds.), (Vancouver, Tantalus Research, 1980), 65-75.

⁶² George Hoffman, "The 1934 Saskatchewan Election Campaign," in *Saskatchewan History* 36, no. 2 (Spring 1983) 51.

⁶³ Saskatchewan Farmer-Labor Group, *Is Your Home Safe?*, 1934, National Library of Canada.

⁶⁴ Hoffman, "The 1934 Saskatchewan Election Campaign,"

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Farmer-Labor Group, *Declaration of Policy*, 2.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶⁸ See Alvin Finkel, "Alberta Social Credit Reappraised: The Radical Character of the Early Social Credit Movement," in *The Prairie West: Historical Readings, Second Edition*, R. Douglas Francis and Howard Palmer (eds.) (Edmonton: Pica Pica Press, 1992), 661-680.

⁶⁹ John, Conway, *The West: The History of a Region in Confederation* (Toronto: James Lormier and Company, 1983), 141.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ A.W. Johnson, *Dream No Little Dreams: A Biography of the Douglas Government of Saskatchewan, 1944-1961* (Toronto: Institute of Public Administration of Canada and the University of Toronto Press, 2004), 39-41.

⁷² King stated that the only change made to the platform was to take out government ownership of breweries because it was disagreed to by those in the party who still supported prohibition. See "Carlyle King" in *Western Canadian Politics: The Radical Tradition*, ed. Donald Kerr (Edmonton: West Institute for Canadian Studies, 1981), 36.

⁷³ Saskatchewan CCF, *The C.C.F. Program for Saskatchewan*, 1943, National Library of Canada, 7.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Quoted in Peter Sinclair, "The Saskatchewan CCF: Ascent to Power and the Decline of Socialism" in *The Canadian Historical Review* 54, no. 4, (December 1973), 432.

⁷⁸ Douglas as quoted in Doris Shackleton, *Tommy Douglas* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975), 124.

⁷⁹ For the text of these fables see L.D. Lovick, (ed.) *Tommy Douglas Speaks*. (Lantzville, British Columbia: Oolichan Books. 1979). 78-81.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁸¹ Williams cited in Lipset, p. 163.

⁸² CCF (Saskatchewan Section), *The CCF in the Legislature- 1942*, 1942, National Library of Canada.

⁸³ T.C. Douglas, *Where is the Money Coming From?*, A Radio Broadcast on February 3, 7,8 & 9, 1944, National Library of Canada, 2.

⁸⁴ Saskatchewan CCF, *The C.C.F. Program for Saskatchewan*, 19.

⁸⁵ Young, 109.

⁸⁶ Margoshes, 110.

⁸⁷ A.W. Johnson, 312-314.

⁸⁸ Margoshes, 109.

⁸⁹ Government of Saskatchewan, *The Dominion –Provincial Conference on Reconstruction : The reply of the Saskatchewan Government to the proposals submitted to the conference by the Dominion on August 6th, 1945* (Regina: Bureau of Publications, 1946). 7.

⁹⁰ "Dominion and Provincial Submissions and Plenary Conference Discussions" in *Saskatchewan Speaks: A History of the Province in Documents*, ed. David E. Smith (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan Political Science Department, 1990), 504.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 506.

⁹² Government of Saskatchewan, *Dominion –Provincial Conference on Reconstruction*. 15-32.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 503.

⁹⁴ For a text of the CCF's 1945 federal election platform see *Michael, Cross, The Decline and Fall of a Good Idea: CCF-NDP Manifestos, 1932-1969* (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1974), 24-29.

- ⁹⁵ “Dominion and Provincial Submissions and Plenary Conference Discussions”, 503 and *The Dominion – Provincial Conference on Reconstruction : The reply of the Saskatchewan Government*, 77.
- ⁹⁶ “Dominion and Provincial Submissions and Plenary Conference Discussions”, 505.
- ⁹⁷ Douglas unsuccessfully attempted to have the National CCF eliminate its advocacy of the nationalization of banks at the 1948 CCF national convention. See Lipset, 336.
- ⁹⁸ Williams quoted in McLeod & McLeod, 133.
- ⁹⁹ A.W. Johnson, 42, McLeod & McLeod, 133.
- ¹⁰⁰ Alan Whitehorn and L.D. Lovick also argue that Douglas was a Canadian nationalist. See Lovick, 38 & Alan Whitehorn, *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992), 175.
- ¹⁰¹ Shackleton, 175.
- ¹⁰² Lewis, *Making of a Socialist*, 201.
- ¹⁰³ *The Dominion –Provincial Conference on Reconstruction : The reply of the Saskatchewan Government*, 60-74.
- ¹⁰⁴ “Dominion and Provincial Submissions and Plenary Conference Discussions”, 505.
- ¹⁰⁵ See Address by the Honourable T.C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, at the Meeting of the Federal-Provincial Conference, House of Commons Chamber, October 3rd, 1955. National Library of Canada.
- ¹⁰⁶ Shackleton, 222-223.
- ¹⁰⁷ Shackleton, 163.
- ¹⁰⁸ Address by the Honourable T.C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, at the Meeting of the Federal-Provincial Conference, House of Commons Chamber, October 3rd, 1955. 11-12.
- ¹⁰⁹ Pitsula, “Social Aid”, 212-216.
- ¹¹⁰ Margoshes, 95 & 119.
- ¹¹¹ Lewis, *Making of a Socialist*, 169.
- ¹¹² *Ibid.*
- ¹¹³ New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, *A New Deal for People*, 1971, 3.
- ¹¹⁴ Allan Blakeney, “Our Oil and our Future: Text of a province-wide Radio and Television Broadcast, December 11, 1973”, Blakeney Papers, Saskatchewan Archives, R565, III, 495a.
- ¹¹⁵ Allan Blakeney, “The Crisis of Inequality in Canada”, *Globe and Mail*, January 3, 1974, 6.
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁷ Government of Saskatchewan, *Why Just Oil?: The Case for Extending the Equalization Principle to Other Commodities*, 1974.
- ¹¹⁸ Government of Saskatchewan Press Release, “Cowley Comments on Oil Price Agreement”, Blakeney Papers, Saskatchewan Archives, R565, III, 495a.
- ¹¹⁹ New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, *New Deal '75*, 1975, 8.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.
- ¹²¹ p. 5-6- *ibid.*
- ¹²² For a description of the nationalization of potash in Saskatchewan see Chapter 10 of Richards, John and Larry Pratt. *Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. 1979.
- ¹²³ p. 2- New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. *A Solid Success*. 1978.
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.
- ¹²⁵ An open letter by Allan Blakeney to the citizens of Saskatchewan on October 6th, 1978. Saskatchewan Archives.
- ¹²⁶ Government of Saskatchewan, *The Road out of Recession: An Alternative Economic Policy for Canadians*, Prepared in Advance of the First Ministers’ Conference on the Economy, February 2nd and 3rd, 1982.
- ¹²⁷ Saskatchewan Agriculture, *Saskatchewan Challenges “The Pepin Plan”*, February 1982. Saskatchewan Archives, Blakeney Papers, R-1106.III.1.f.
- ¹²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁹ Government of Saskatchewan, *Canada’s Constitution: The Saskatchewan Position*, December 1981, 14-26.
- ¹³⁰ Saskatchewan Justice (Constitutional Unit), *The Charlottetown Agreement: A Saskatchewan Perspective*, September 1992.

¹³¹ See Government of Saskatchewan, *Annual Progress Report of Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children 2000/2001*.

¹³² Government of Saskatchewan. *1993 Budget*. Delivered by Janice MacKinnon, March 1993. 20-21.

¹³³ New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. *The Saskatchewan Way...It's Working*. 1995 & New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. *Building a Bright Future Together, The Saskatchewan Way*. 1999.

¹³⁴ New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. *Building a Bright Future Together, The Saskatchewan Way*. 1999, 15.

¹³⁵ David Laycock, *The new right and democracy in Canada: Understanding Reform and the Canadian Alliance* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2001).