

**Narrator:** Ted Turner (TT)

**Company Affiliations:** Saskatchewan Wheat Board, Prairie Pools Ltd., Chamber of Maritime Commerce

**Interview Date:** 24 June 2013

**Interviewer:** Nancy Perozzo (NP)

**Recorder:** Nancy Perozzo (NP)

**Transcriber:** Sarah Lorenowich

**Summary:** Former president of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Ted Turner discusses his long career in Canada's grain industry within the cooperative movement. In the first audio part, Turner provides an overview of his career. In the second audio part, he begins by sharing his father's history in farming and the early Pool movement, and he explains the historical context of the Pool's formation. Turner describes taking over and updating the farm operation after his schooling, getting involved in his rural community, and being elected delegate for the Pool. He discusses the Pool's commercial stability, and its focus on policy issues like farmer net returns, international wheat agreements, and the Crow Rate. As he became vice president and president, Turner shares some changes in the industry, like the shift in grain movement from the Great Lakes to the West Coast, the consolidation of country elevators, and the building of terminal capacity in Prince Rupert. Other topics discussed include his memories of Thunder Bay's terminals, the joint Pool takeover of Federal Grain, the Pools' positive relationship with the Canadian Grain Commission and Canadian Wheat Board, his involvement with the Chamber of Maritime Commerce, American subsidies that affected international trade, sitting in on NAFTA and GATT negotiations, and the demise of farmer-owned organizations.

**Keywords:** Saskatchewan Wheat Pool; Prairie Pools Ltd.; Chamber of Maritime Commerce; Farmer cooperatives; Prince Rupert Grain; Grain farmers/producers; Agricultural policy; Grain trade—laws and legislation; Farming—equipment and supplies; Farmer delegates; International trade; International Wheat Council; Grain transportation—rail; Grain transportation—ships; Crows Nest Pass freight rate; Grain export destinations; Canadian Wheat Board (CWB); Canadian Grain Commission (CGC); St. Lawrence Seaway; Great Lakes trade; Country grain elevators; Terminal grain elevators—Thunder Bay; Terminal grain elevators—British Columbia; Consolidation; Amalgamation; Government subsidies; North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT); SWP Pool 4A and B; SWP Pool 7; Federal Grain

### Audio Part One

Time, Speaker, Narrative
--------------------------

NP: So I can start that part of it. It is June 24, 2013, and I have made my way to Regina. I would like to have our interviewee for the day introduce himself.

TT: My name is--. You tell me if I'm speaking loud enough or not.

NP: Looks good.

TT: Yeah. My name is Ted Turner, more formally known as Edward K. Turner. On the subject of grain elevators, I've had a lifetime of experience first as a farmer patronizing the elevator at my local hometown of Maymont, Saskatchewan, somewhere between Saskatoon and North Battleford. Later on in my career, I became a director with Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and that increased my involvement with grain elevators. I became a director in 1960 of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, vice president in 1966, president in 1969, and was in that position for almost 18 years. In addition to that, I was the executive director of Prairie Pools for two years, which even enlarged my scope of contact with grain elevators.

I was on the founding board of Prince Rupert Grain Limited, and of course, that was a huge undertaking and brought home the reality of the importance of grain elevators and also the reality of the high cost of building them, as well as the president of the Great Lakes Waterways Association for three years. During my tenure there, the name was changed to the Chamber of Maritime Commerce, and that brought in a new reality in that of dealing with grain elevators that were further down the chain from Thunder Bay and dealing with the transfer elevators on the St. Lawrence and the various elevators that were adjacent to the Great Lakes themselves. So I have had a lifetime of experience up until my retirement in 1989 of hands-on with elevators.

NP: I'm going to stop--.

**End of audio part one.**

## Audio Part Two

Time, Speaker, Narrative
NP: Okay. You started out as a farm boy.

TT: Right.

NP: Were you a first generation farmer?

TT: No. No, my father developed the land and farmed it ahead of me. Yeah. My father came to Canada from England in 1903.

NP: Ah.

TT: As part of the Barr Colonist movement. Most of the people ended up settling at Lloydminster. Just a bit of history on that. Excuse me, I want to introduce my wife.

**[Audio pauses]**

NP: I'm not being forward, I'm just being--. [Laughs] Yes, so you were talking about the Barr Colonists.

TT: My father to Canada with the Barr Colonists, which was a settlement group from England that were headed for Lloydminster. During the trip, Mr. Barr disappeared, and the second in command was a Revered Lloyd. So he took over the leadership of the group, and hence the name of the town Lloydminster, which described Reverend Lloyd. However, my father never got to Lloydminster. He stopped off in Saskatoon and settled on a homestead at Maymont, Saskatchewan.

NP: How's Maymont spelled?

TT: M-A-Y-M-O-N-T.

NP: Okay.

TT: That's where he started out as a 21-year-old farmer.

NP: Was he involved in the initial Pool movement then?

TT: Oh, yes. Very much so. He upgraded the farm to a very productive unit and also provided leadership in the community. So when the farmers became dissatisfied with the grain system, the way it was at that time, he was an easy convert to the movement of doing something for farmers by themselves and was one of the provisional leaders at the local level of the Saskatchewan Wheat

Pool. So it was only natural when I came along and took over the farm that I too would be involved in the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

NP: So when did you start to take a major role in the farm?

TT: Well, in 1946, I guess. My brother and I, he was just freshly returned from overseas in the army, and we undertook to farm together, but he did not like farming, so he moved on. I went to university, took agriculture, and then returned to the farm, got married in 1950, and together we took over the farm operations and stayed there until 1966 when we moved to Regina to assume office responsibilities with the Pool.

NP: Did your dad ever talk about why he felt a commitment to the co-op movement?

TT: Well, he saw this as a way of farmers getting a square deal from elevator companies. There's many horror stories about how farmers were treated in the early days. There was no end of elevator companies—up to 200 or something different elevator companies. I don't know the number now. They simply exploited farmers. So farmers got sick of it and said, "Okay. Well, we'll organize ourselves and do it." And they did. So I know a lot of the major grain companies were resentful about the Pools, but they brought it on themselves. Had they treated farmers with respect and fairly, there never would have been a Wheat Pool. But that is all history now.

NP: Mmhmm. We'll talk a bit more about that later on.

TT: Okay. Fine.

NP: But I'm interested in your own history. So did you take over an interest in the Wheat Pool as well? Like were you a delegate or--?

TT: Yeah. So when Mel and I got married in 1950, we simply put all of our energy into developing the farm and upgrading it and that sort of thing. It was pretty good to start with, but we were making it better. When I was at university, there was a professor there that absolutely extolled us to get back into our home communities and offer service, that we had a responsibility for leadership in our community, that we had the privilege of attending university at taxpayers' expense, largely at taxpayers' expense. Of course, we paid tuition as well. Therefore, because we'd had that privilege not everybody had, therefore we had the responsibility for leadership.

[0:05:45]

That rang a bell with me. I found that wasn't challenging at all because both of my parents had been leaders in the community. My mother in the homemaker's association and every community event, and dad in the municipality and in the Wheat Pool and so on. So I--.

NP: Do you remember the name of that professor? I think he deserves mention if you do.

TT: Yeah. Bill Baker was his name. He was very forthright about this. I know some people resented it, but I didn't. I took it as stimulation to do exactly what he said.

NP: What did they resent about it, do you think?

TT: Well, I suppose nobody likes being told what they need to do. Like, my university class, I was extremely fortunate in going to university in that at least a third of our class were veterans. They had served in the Second World War, and they have come back, and because of their service, their way to university was paid and that sort of thing, and we had this one third of our class very mature people, some of them even into their forties. Then there was a whole bunch of us young whippersnappers that knew about our home communities, but we didn't know much about anything else. [Laughs] So that was a tremendous education just being around people like that. So I was very fortunate in that aspect of it.

NP: Did you specialize in university? Was there something--.

TT: No, no.

NP: Just a generalist agriculture?

TT: I just took the School of Agriculture, and then my only intent was to go back to the farm, which I did in 1948, and started to upgrade the farm.

NP: So what changes were taking place on the farm at that time? You would have grown up on a farm when, I guess, horses were still--.

TT: Right. I remember driving horses in the field. I was pretty young, but I remember doing it. Then the mechanization for us started. Well, we had a tractor for as long as I can remember because my father and his brother had bought a huge steam engine and threshing machine, and they threshed half the country up there. But chemicals were just coming in for weed control, fertilizer were not commonly used. Technology was starting to descend on agriculture at that time, and mechanization was just going by leaps and bounds.

So when I took over the farm, really, in 1948, I was still in partnership with my brother, and then he decided to go off to other things. Then when I got married in 1950, well, I took over the management of the farm even though my parents lived in the village close by and were partners with us. So we were faced with a whole lot of challenges. We were living out on a snowbound farm in the winter without electricity, so one of the first things I did when I came back from university was to organize the neighbours into applying for power, electrical power. In those days, you had to do it in groups, and so Mel and I were the youngest in our community, in our little farm community, by a long way, and so--. And the others seemed quite content for me to take leadership on this sort of thing. So along with another young man in our community, I was able to organize to get power brought to our farm on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July 1952. I'll never forget that day because flicking a switch changed our whole lifestyle dramatically.

**[0:10:15]**

But at the same time, we were sick of driving horses in the winter, so I organized a snowplough club and bought a snowplough that I ran for eight years. [Laughs] As I say, the neighbours, they didn't seem to resent me taking over leadership. In fact, they welcomed it.

NP: A lot of people like to have leaders. They're willing to--.

TT: Well, they had grown up with this, and they had never known different and that. There I was keeping Bill Baker in the back of my mind about doing in the community. So I got involved in the community: the secretary of the Board of Trade, and president of the curling club, and so on and so forth. Baseball. Avid baseball player.

NP: Wow. And Pool work? Like were you--?

TT: Yeah, it was about this time I--. There was no doubt about my allegiance to the Pool, but it wasn't because of firsthand experience. It was because of my respect for my father and what he had done in the leadership in the Pool many years earlier. So of course, the Wheat Pool always held a local annual meeting every year, generally in the fall of the year, and I hadn't gone to it because we had to go to Saskatoon for a medical appointment of some kind. When I came back, they said I'd been elected to the

Wheat Pool committee. Well, if you're going to be on something, you better either do it or not bother being on it, so we got involved there, and my interest started to grow. Suddenly, baseball and hockey and curling weren't as important to me as providing for the family, being a better farmer, and participation in community events.

So it was kind of a remarkable change I felt inside. When I came back from university, I just wanted to be the best baseball player between Saskatoon and North Battleford. [Laughing] And I played a lot of baseball and really enjoyed it. Great fellowship and community in that. So then I got interested in the Wheat Pool, and suddenly somebody—the district field man Don Sinclair—showed up on a bright September day and said, “The Wheat Pool committee in Maymont want you to put your name forward for delegate.” I said, “Oh, I can't do that. I haven't got time. *Duh, duh, duh, duh, duh.* I've got a small family.” It just so happened that the neighbour from down the road was out in the field because we were baling, and we owned a baler together. I found out that by working together you could do a lot of things, like I owned different machines with my neighbours and that reduced the overall cost of them. So this was all fitting into who I was and where I was.

So he said, “Oh, don't worry. We'll make sure the work gets done.” So I talked to Mel, and she said, “Well, I can see you're interested.” “Yes.” “Go for it.” My father said, “Sure.” He was anxious, actually, for me to be a delegate. So I said, “Okay, I'll take it on for three years.” Well, three years stretched to 29.

NP: So that was about 1955 or so?

TT: 1957.

NP: 1957. And you retired--?

TT: I retired from the Wheat Pool in '87, 1987. So.

NP: Going in that early and having the background that your father had with it, how did issues change over the years related to the Wheat Pool?

TT: Oh, well, of course, they were just determined that they were going to get a fair price for their grain. That was fine. That was the major objective. In order to do that, they had to get an elevator system because they had no elevators to start with, and once they achieved that, then of course, it was a matter of developing markets and putting up--.

**[Audio pauses]**

**[0:15:04]**

NP: Now, where were we? Oh--.

TT: Oh, the difference in the Pool from the early days.

NP: Right, and you were talking about they didn't have elevators.

TT: Yeah. Then the Pools went bankrupt with the stock market crash in 1929. The whole economy, of course, of the country was turned upside down. The Pools weren't exempt from that. They went bankrupt, but the provincial government along with the major banks agreed to keep the Pools in business. It was, hm, almost 20 years, I guess, before the debt was finally paid off. So that was the big challenges in the early Pool. Then as the--.

NP: When you first started as a delegate and becoming involved, what--? Were they moving on?

TT: Yeah. We were pretty comfortable in the commercial operations. We were developing livestock marketing as more of a complete entity than what it was before, and I was very interested in that because I had livestock on the farm, particularly cattle. But the shift had taken place. At that time, we had 164 delegates, and they would come together for a two-week annual meeting in November, and there was countless committee meetings. When you have a committee at every point in the province--. I think at one time we had 1,200 country elevators, and we must have had 1,250 Wheat Pool committees because some points had more than one committee. When you get people meeting like that, they were passing resolutions in the country, and you'd get 160+ farmers together, they're going to start putting forth policy demands.

So we became a very important voice in public policy for agriculture. That became almost a focus for us as I went through my tenure at the Pool—three years as vice-president and 18 years as president. So I was involved as the chief spokesman of the organization for many of those years, for all the time as president.

NP: Now, there are lots of policy issues, but as you think back on the time that you spent with the Pool, what were the major--?

TT: The major issue always was—the one that stands out above all others—was net returns to farmers. You know, there was an interesting chat from a university in Chicago that showed that on a net basis, taking into account relative inflation and that sort of thing, that the price of grain had never been higher than it was in 1918 or something. Something of that nature. That isn't the exact



date. But it showed that any increase in the actual price of grain was not relatively largely than it had been years earlier. Of course, the '30s were desperate when wheat was 10, 20, 30 cents a bushel. So our major concern was to get the net return for farmers, and of course, that meant railway costs and that, and the famous Crow Rate situation, fighting to retain that Crow Rate, keeping elevator charges as low as we could. And of course, we were the largest grain company in Canada, so we had a huge impact on what could be charged at that level.

We took our--. One of the major issues—and even before I was there—was an international wheat agreement to bring stability to the world market, and we fought very hard for that. Never, ever achieved it, but at least it had an impact and influence on what did happen internationally. So years later, I was in Geneva on several occasions negotiating grains agreements or wheat agreements with the various countries around the world. But always our concern was the net return to farmers, and not--. We'd been accused—and I suppose rightfully so—that we were concerned with the small farmer more than we were with the big farmer. Some use that as a weapon against us, but I always felt, well, the big farmers can look after themselves, but the other ones need to have the support of other farmers and the organization. But we had lots of big farmers in our membership as well.

**[0:20:54]**

NP: A couple of questions come out of that information. The international wheat agreements seem to be if not annual negotiations certainly frequent. What do you think over that period that you were aware of--. Well, first of all, for those people who are listening who aren't aware, what difference does it make what other countries do?

TT: Well, it makes a big, big, big difference because if a country just goes in and drops their price just to get rid of their product, then your price automatically comes down too. What we sought when I was in Geneva was we wanted a floor price that was ruminative to farmers, and we were prepared to have a ceiling price that was fair to consumers, the purchasing nations. So when you go to negotiate an international wheat agreement, you have the two different factions there. You have the producing or exporting countries, and you have the importing countries. Not always was it complete agreement in the exporting countries because I used to get into lots of verbal battles with my American friends who felt that if big countries like Canada and the United States dropped our price, we could force a lot of the smaller producing countries out of business, and therefore we'd have the market to ourselves. But personally, I couldn't go along with that. I didn't think that was the way to go. Oh, it was a huge--. We could talk for hours on the philosophies in grains arrangements and that sort of thing.

NP: Were there natural allies with Canada's position?

TT: Generally, Australia was closely aligned with us most often. Argentina was in and out depending on how much grain they had in their bins. Sometimes they really wanted an agreement, and other times they didn't want any at all—but Canada and Australia for sure, and oftentimes with the Americans too.

NP: Because now you can look back on all of the years that you were aware of what was going on, and in many instances actively involved, do you think anything was accomplished?

TT: Oh, I think so. I think we--.

NP: How would you describe the accomplishments?

TT: I think we brought stability to the international market—not as formally structured as what we were seeking, but nevertheless, it increased an awareness of the things we were talking about. And even countries like Japan that said they didn't want an international wheat agreement, they didn't want to get stuck in a short market either where people were exploiting them. They were quite happy when there was a world surplus, and they could play one off against the other. As I described to the Japanese at an International Federation of Agriculture meeting one time, my wife had owned a succession of Toyota cars, and each one cost me--. I think the first one I had to spend 1,200 bushels of wheat to get that. The next one was 3,600, and the next one was 7,200 bushels of wheat to buy almost the equivalent car, with upgrades of course. The Japanese really didn't have an answer for that because they were talking about, we were exploiting them and all this sort of thing. So purchasing power isn't always dollars. Sometimes it's a commodity of one kind or another. Oh, these were huge, huge battles that we used to have.

**[0:25:34]**

NP: Coming out of the agreements, were they usually signed?

TT: Oh, yes. You would sign. We came home from Geneva on a couple of occasions without any signatures because we just couldn't--. I was confronted when we came back one time by the press and said, "Well, why didn't you get an agreement, a signed agreement?" I said, "Well, I don't need an international agreement to give me a lousy price. The market will do that any day."  
[Laughing]

NP: Having been signed, were they always followed?

TT: No. There was times--. But there was the International Wheat Council that oversaw this and was a disciplinary body there, but there was violations to the agreement from time to time, but they weren't--. Most people stuck with them or close to them anyway.

NP: If you were speaking to a group of farmers, how would you describe to them the impact of having and not having an international agreement?

TT: Well, just as I've tried to express here. I did this on countless platforms. Stability.

NP: Is important.

TT: They knew that they were going to get a minimum of, let's say, \$2.50 a bushel for their grain, and they could then--. The challenge was production. Of course, it always was production anyway. Then they could start to organize, manage their resources better. If they weren't sure when they went to the field in the spring if the price was going to be \$5 or \$1, that is a challenge then. "How much do I put into fertilizer or how much do I put into sprays? What do I grow?" And this sort of thing. I think that we were able to bring some stability into the market through all of this. No, I'm talking like I'm the only one. That's not the case.

NP: No, I understand it's part of the Canadian delegation.

TT: The president of Alberta Pool and Manitoba Pool were always there, and United Grain Growers [UGG], and so on. We were there as advisors to the Canadian Government on this. Some of us played a little stronger role maybe because of the size of our companies or whatever. I don't know.

NP: You mentioned railway costs. From my reading of the papers, that has ever been the situation. [Laughs]

TT: Oh, yes, it has. We had a very favourable grain rate because of the Crowsnest Pass Agreement that set the rate for grain moving from the Prairies to export position. And actually, it--. Oh, gee wiz. It was set for Canadian National moving grain, I think, from the Prairies to Thunder Bay, but then it was extended to Canadian Pacific, and also for both railways to the West Coast at the same half-a-cent per bushel per mile or something. I can't--. No, it wasn't that much. That's way too high. But anyway, it stabilized us at a very low level.

But interestingly enough, it only made us competitive with the United States and Australia and Argentina because the United States had at least as highly subsidized rate through their waterways system, which was completely funded and maintained by the federal government through different agencies. Australia, all of its wheat production is within 3 or 400 miles of tidewater. Argentina is the

same—very close to tidewater wherever. And so, they had a huge geographical advantage over Canada. So our Crow Rate gave us the ability to be competitive at the international level on grain shipments.

**[0:30:32]**

NP: So it must have been interesting times at the Wheat Pool, delegates discussing the eventual elimination of it.

TT: It was. I was the president during those years and got beat up on pretty good, but we got to the point where the railways said they simply had no more money to put into rail services. There was a long history of intervention from provincial governments, the federal government, the Wheat Board all buying grain cars. This had run its course, and the railways said, “Well, we just can’t do it. We’re not getting enough revenue out of grain to make the investment.” So we had to come face the reality that what do we want? Do we want to maintain the grain rate and not have any movement, or do we want to pay some more and get our product to market? It was a long, spirited debate in our annual meeting, but we finally made the decision that we would negotiate under certain terms re: the change in the grain rate. We went on and did that.

NP: Do you recall approximately when that was and how many years--? Like was it done at a certain point in your career that you could see the fallout from it and whether it accomplished what you had hoped it would?

TT: Well, certainly, the railways responded good at the time with the upgrading. I think it was 1982 when we had the big negotiations on that. We got a pretty good deal, I thought, for farmers on it. [Laughs] Then the--. Oh, I can’t even think of all the details now. I’d have to go to my notes. But essentially, the government said, “If the farmers will pay an increased rate, we will commit \$650 million towards the overall costs, the railway costs.” And of course, as users of the system and representing farmers, we wanted to make sure the railways’ costs were legitimate, that they weren’t saying suddenly, “Okay, this is our cost. Government, give us \$650 million. Farmers, you give us the rest.”

Of course, farmers and even large companies like Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was at that time simply didn’t have access to or the resources to understand railway accounting. Only the federal government had the ability to do that. So that was one of our weaknesses in our plan was that the government gave us a finite amount, and then the railways could determine the difference. We would have been better off if they had charged us a definite amount, and then the government be responsible for the difference, but it didn’t work that way. But it was a good deal, and then the federal government—after my time—offered farmers a certain amount of money to buy them out, and then they’d be responsible for the full costs after that. I thought that was a shame because the government sure knew what they were doing, and they got off the hook pretty lightly and transferred it all to farmers.

NP: I'd like to talk to you—because we do have a limited time and because you're so knowledgeable—I'd like to spend a little bit of time talking about Saskatchewan Wheat Pool's terminal elevators.

TT: Sure.

NP: We might be able to come back to other things as well, but I don't want to miss this because we have a special focus on terminal elevators.

TT: Okay. Good for you.

NP: So the only thing I know about Saskatchewan terminal elevators pretty much has to do with the Saskatchewan Co-Operative elevators which were built, I think, before 1920.

**[0:35:15]**

TT: Yeah.

NP: There was one in Thunder Bay. Actually, they were two. They were Pool 4 and 5, initially, I think.

TT: Right, yes.

NP: So that's all I know, but I want to know what you know about Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminal elevators.

TT: My first impression of the terminal elevators is that they were horribly expensive. Sitting as a director of Sask Wheat Pool and never having been to Thunder Bay and seeing these huge amounts of money that we were authorizing to be spent on elevators, I thought, "Ugh! This is ridiculous!" And then authorizing wage increases as we had to do and so on, I thought, "Whew!" But then Saskatchewan Wheat Pool had a policy that our full board would go to Thunder Bay either in September of each year---. That was our policy. We would go there in September. When I got on, some of the other directors and I got it changed to October because we were still harvesting in September in the northern part of the province.

So it was just a huge eye opener to get down and see these terminals. Suddenly, when you saw how massive they were and the job they were doing and how they handled the boxcars and the grain and the separation and the grading and the preparation for

shipping and shipping, you realized that the costs were justified. So it was just such a treat to go to Thunder Bay every year.  
[Laughs]

NP: What did you like about that visit? You aren't the only one who's said that it was--.

TT: Well, of course, seeing the facilities functioning, but meeting the staff.

NP: Do you recall some of the managers' names when you were visiting?

TT: Tamblyn was one, Harold. Harold Tamblyn. Oh, gee. It's no fun getting old, Nancy.

NP: [Laughs] I can't remember names of people I worked with, and I'm not your age!

TT: But he was there, and Ron Sproule, of course, was our manager there, and then at one time then took over the whole terminal operations. He was fabulous. They all were. But the community, it's just such nice people, you know? And such a blend, ethnic blend, of people. We just enjoyed this, and we had good parties, and the community would--. The mayor of the city always came to these things. A guy by the name of the Andrews, and another guy by the name of Halter, and all of these people that I don't quite remember their titles now.

NP: Well, Syd Halter, he would have been with the engineering group that did engineering work.

TT: Yes. And we were a strong client of his. Johnny Andrews?

NP: That name sounds familiar, but I don't think he's around anymore.

TT: Yeah. He was--. Was he the mayor? He was associated with the city, and his wife was quite a socialite and played the piano. Oh! [Laughs] We had lots of fun. I'm trying to think. La Prade, have you ever heard that name there?

NP: Yes, yes.

TT: The La Prade girl was married to a fellow, and they would dance all night long. God, they could dance!

NP: Gee, I would have thought Saskatchewan people could keep up. [Laughs]

TT: Oh, we were doing that pretty good, I think. [Laughing] It was a good fit. Saskatchewan people and Thunder Bay people. There were a commonality of interests. It was an easy fit.

NP: Well, I--. Because my parents' generation and knowing their friends, I read the obituaries quite often. It was really amazing to me the number of people who came from Saskatchewan and Manitoba to Thunder Bay.

TT: Yes, yes.

NP: Would have come in the '30s, I guess, when life was really tough.

TT: I suppose so.

NP: What were some of the issues related to--? Once you realized that they did cost money to run, what were some of the issues you had to deal with related to terminal elevators?

TT: Well, we had to keep them operating and efficient. Like Pool 7, that was sort of our prize one. It was built in 1927 or something, wasn't it? It was, at that time, the largest grain elevator in the world, terminal elevator in the world, with all the latest bells and whistles. So many automatic car unloaders and all that sort of thing.

**[0:40:22]**

NP: That then became Pool 7A because another elevator beside it was bought out. Were you involved at all? It was either a Bawlf Elevator--.

TT: I don't think there was ever a 7A. There was a 5A.

NP: 7A and B.

TT: No, 4A and B.

NP: 4A and B.

TT: And then there was 5, and then No. 6 was originally owned by Canadian National Railways.

NP: Right.

TT: It was stuck out by itself. Great big tub of an elevator. Horribly inefficient, but huge storage capacity. Then there was 7. We had an 8 and a 9, 10, and 11.

NP: Now, the 8 was Ogilvie at one time.

TT: Yeah. Yeah, we bought the Ogilvie plant, and then when we bought Federal Grain, we got some more. We got the Searle plant that was up the river a bit. As I think I told you, it was just an excellent elevator.

NP: And some others on the river.

TT: Yeah. We closed some. We even tore some down.

NP: Take us through how that decision is made, when to tear it down, when to close?

TT: Well, when you look at the bill to bring it up to full technology was going to exceed the benefits, and we simply said, "No, we don't want to operate this." We had excess capacity there after we got the Federal purchase. That was 1972. We agonized over a lot of those things at the board level, but really it was management that really had to wrestle with the decisions and the justifications and that sort of thing.

We got two really good plants from Federal, and that allowed us to cut out some of those smaller inefficient ones. Some of those small ones, they couldn't load a full load, so then that ship had to go to two or three terminals to complete a load. They didn't like that. Of course, we didn't like that. We liked them to pull under a spout and get their full load and be gone. So we were trying to get the greatest efficiencies, not just for our system, but for the total grain system too.

NP: Do you recall where the other Federal elevator was? Like Searle was one.

TT: Searle was one. You know, I don't know Nancy.



NP: They kept moving around the waterfront. The names would change on them. The elevators would still be there, but you'd never know which was which.

TT: No, that's right. I don't know. I didn't give you a name in Winnipeg that you should talk to, and that's Jim MacDonald. Did I give you that?

NP: No, somebody else had, and I've had difficulty making contact with him. Are you in touch with him at all?

TT: Yeah.

NP: Would you put in a word for us?

TT: Oh, he'll--. Oh, have you tried to contact?

NP: I've tried to contact him and ask.

TT: Oh, I'll get a hold of him and tell him to smarten up.

NP: Because I'm heading to Winnipeg next, and I'll have an extra day, so it'll be great if I can pick him up because he was the manager of the terminals, right?

TT: Yeah. All of our terminals, yeah. He followed Ron Sproule who was there for years, so. Yeah, he would know that stuff because he was involved first hand with it.

NP: Right. Yeah. Were the negotiations with Federal difficult or--?

TT: They were protracted. [Laughing] Not difficult but protracted.

NP: Why do you think the lengthy nature of them?

TT: Well, we decided that if we were going to get efficiencies in the grain handling system in the country that we needed to eliminate some of the companies because nobody could afford to really do anything because of the competitive factor in it. We

knew that Federal Grain, and they had bought Searle Grain earlier on. They were a very competent company, but they had lots of other opportunities, and we knew that they weren't very happy on their rate of return that they were getting on their investment.

**[0:45:11]**

So we invited their president, George Sellers, to come meet with the three Pool presidents one day and told him quite frankly, "We're interested in buying Federal Grain." He said, "Oh, God!" [Laughs] He said, "I snuck into this Royal Bank building hoping nobody would see me," because that's where Manitoba's office was, Manitoba Pool. But anyway, he said, "Well, frankly, I'll take this back to the board because we aren't happy with what's happening in the grain trade. We don't know how the solution will come. We've got other opportunities."

So they wanted to pursue it, and so we pursued it for several months. We had to do it on the quiet because Federal Grain was publicly traded, and if this got to be known, then it would impact the price of shares. So anyway, we got to a point, and it looked like there was an impasse, and it would not go ahead. So we said, "Okay, well, at least we tried." I was in Winnipeg, and I was waiting to catch a flight for Regina, and I look up and there's George Sellers. He's got off a flight from Toronto. So we had a little chat, and I said, "Is negotiation still dead?" He said, "No, I think we should reopen them." So I said, "Okay."

So when I got home, I phoned Ira Mumford, our CEO at the time, and he contacted Wally Madill and Moffat in Winnipeg, and the next day we were back in business. We carried that right through until the ultimate purchase date on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March 1972. It was a huge, huge undertaking. They had tremendous inventory of grain and farm supplies. They had huge numbers of employees, and all of these had to be accommodated in the purchase price. And either continuing employment or pension or whatever. But Ira Mumford quarterbacked it, Wally Madill and Moffat—whatever his name was—they were in daily contact. Then added the three presidents into the negotiating committee.

NP: So did all three Pools buy them out then?

TT: Yeah. It was a joint venture.

NP: And the assets within each of the provinces--?

TT: Then we spilt them up as we wanted them.

NP: And what happened then? Saskatchewan Wheat Pool took on the terminals?

TT: We took on the terminals at Thunder Bay. Manitoba didn't need excess capacity. They might have taken on one, though. They might have taken one. Alberta Wheat Pool took the big Federal plant at Vancouver. They took one plant at Vancouver, then there was another in Pacific Elevators that we operated on a joint basis with Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta Pools.

NP: Is that the Victoria one?

TT: No, no. It was called Pacific Elevators at that time. It was on the north shore in Vancouver. No, it was on the south shore, and it was right beside the Alberta plant. Yeah, I guess was there one in Victoria? I guess there was.

NP: There was at one time. Wally was talking about it, but I think Ray was as well.

TT: I've forgotten about that.

NP: Did the buyout work as you had hoped? Were--?

TT: Oh, beyond our expectations, actually.

NP: What did it allow you to do?

TT: Well, it allowed us to carry out a sensible consolidation in the country and make profitable many of the points that weren't profitable before. But just before we leave the terminals, we set up two new companies as a result of this. One was called Pacific Elevators Ltd. that was operated by--. And then we had Western Pool Terminals also that operated largely—well, entirely—on the West Coast facilities. They were joint operations.

**[0:50:07]**

And actually, Cargill sat on a board of one of those companies, Pacific Elevators, because they had an agreement with Federal Grain that they wanted to keep alive with us because they had no outlet to the west. And it's out of that that led us to Prince Rupert. Cargill was desperate to get facilities on the West Coast and had talked with us privately about doing something together. But I simply said, "If we do anything, it's going to be as three Pools, not just Sask Pool." There was a small terminal in Prince Rupert, but quite inadequate. So then we brought United Grain Growers, Cargill, Pioneer, and the three Pools together into a consortium that organized and built Prince Rupert.

NP: Yes, I've seen some of the publicity material for the opening of it.

TT: Yes. But Prince Rupert was served only by Canadian National, so that meant quite a scrambling of grain shifting in the Prairies in order to get on the CN lines and there. So then that weakened CN's ability into Vancouver but gave CP a little bigger. I don't know how the railways sorted out among themselves. But it was interesting.

NP: So building a terminal must have been a fascinating undertaking because it wouldn't have been done for a long time.

TT: No, no. Well, there had been. Pioneer had built one in Vancouver. We had built one in Vancouver in the late '60s, both of those, I think. And we're talking here the '70s, '75, was it? We had planned this whole thing, and there was no way that we could really justify the expenditure. The economics just were not there. So we approached the federal Minister of Agriculture and asked for permission to put on a surcharge of--. What was the surcharge? It wasn't huge.

NP: That can be checked.

TT: \$2.50 a tonne or something like that, which would flip it over, and we would be economical. And he said, "Sure, go ahead." Because the governments, particularly the Alberta government, desperately wanted that Prince Rupert terminal, and they provided money and leadership and that sort of thing.

NP: Um--. Sorry?

TT: No, even Hugh Horner, who I think was deputy premier of Alberta at the time, came on the board of Prince Rupert to protect their government's interests in that. Then the federal Minister of Agriculture, because he got a half a dozen letters from the rural areas protesting this surcharge, he said, no, he won't go ahead with it. It was so easily justifiable because the shipping costs from Prince Rupert to Japan were \$2.50 a tonne cheaper than they were out of Vancouver, so the farmers were breaking even on this even with the additional charge. It allowed an efficient or viable operation.

NP: Yeah. Not as congested as I imagine when they talk about the port of Vancouver.

TT: Well, it would give us huge capacity, and we were fighting for capacity through the West Coast.

NP: So it would have been that time, and this would have been after the Russian grain deal, that things started to really shift from east--.

TT: Yeah. The shift was on, really, although we didn't recognize it, following the Second World War when Europe made the decision that they would never again be short of food because Europe almost starved to death during that war. So they instituted their Common Agricultural Policy that had huge subsidies for agricultural production, huge subsidies for storing of surplus production, and essentially Europe became close to self-sufficient in grain products. That had been one of our big markets. That's why Thunder Bay, that's why Churchill was important. That's why those transfer elevators in the St. Lawrence were so important to us.

**[0:55:41]**

Well, when Europe started falling off on their demand, thank goodness for Canadian farmers, the demand in China and Japan and all over the Far East rose. But it was not good news for Thunder Bay because it meant flip flop in grain. One time there was only a few bushels of grain went from Manitoba to the Pacific. Everything went to Thunder Bay. There was only a small portion of the Saskatchewan crop that would be east of Broadview that would go to the Pacific. But then with that change, they started reaching further and further east and cutting into Thunder Bay territory. So that was a tough one. There was lots of battles to increase understanding about that. [Laughs]

NP: Why was it difficult? It seems fairly straightforward.

TT: Well, it was so difficult for Thunder Bay and for companies with their big investments there too. The members of the Chamber of Maritime Commerce did not understand what was happening in this whole area. They were told that simply all you had to do was--. We had a huge political debate for years about what we called the method of payment of the Crow benefit. Some were advocating that it be paid to farmers. We were advocating it be paid to the railways directly by the government because only government could regulate the railways. Individual farmers could not. If it was a subsidy paid to farmers, then you get into international negotiations that get targeted right off the bat, and it's gone. We had this, but the people at Thunder Bay were convinced that if it were paid to farmers, suddenly, they'd start coming to Thunder Bay.

Well, I said, "You guys be careful what you wish for because it's not going to happen. That's not what determines whether they come to Thunder Bay or not, whether they have the freedom of where they're going to spend this newfound money." I had huge talks within the Chamber of Maritime Commerce about that, but they were convinced that if the farmers were paid directly the Crow subsidy, then Thunder Bay would--.

NP: And who were the “theys”? The shipowners?

TT: Yeah. The head of the Dominion Marine Association who was also the head of the Chamber of Maritime Commerce, a guy by the name of Norman Hall. He and I actually fell out over that particular item. He was representing shipping interests as well as the Great Lakes Development Association, but that’s a long and complicated story. But anyway, it wasn’t any internal factors in Canada. It was simply the external factors, largely the Common Agriculture Policy of the European economic community.

NP: I’m going to move on because we’re heading into our last 45 minutes, and I want to talk about your experience in Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and dealing with the Canadian Grain Commission [CGC].

**[1:00:10]**

TT: The Canadian Grain Commission?

NP: Mmhmm.

TT: Well. There was no problem at all. No, we had a positive relationship with the Grain Commission and supported very much the things they were doing.

NP: Anything get your goat? [Laughs]

TT: Well, I suppose there was. Yeah, we used to battle with them about--. They really controlled the grain rates that you could charge—how much you could charge for storage, how much you could charge for handling it—at both country and terminal elevators. We used to battle with them on that, but it was never a major issue.

NP: Just the usual cut and thrust of negotiating a price.

TT: Sure. They were doing their job protecting farmers, and we generally had our commercial hats on at that time wanting to get a few extra dollars in the commercial system. But no, we had no problem there.

NP: Now how did that work? Because the farmers owned the Wheat Pool.

TT: Right.

NP: And owned the elevators, and yet they were charging farmers. So sort of how does that work out? You have two--.

TT: We charged farmers the standard fee for handling their grain, for storing their grain, cleaning it, or whatever we did. Then at the end of the year, we totalled up everything, and if there was something left over, we returned it to the farmers.

NP: So how does higher rates for handling--. That doesn't just come out in the wash?

TT: Well--.

NP: Because they would be getting the profit from the higher rates or--?

TT: Well, they would within the cooperatives, but then there was that other sector that wasn't within the cooperative sector too. No, we didn't want to charge more than what was necessary to keep the system viable. So the other companies didn't like us very much because we generally proposed lower rates than what the other companies in the negotiation with the Canadian Grain Commission, so.

NP: Because of volume, essentially?

TT: Yeah. We had a volume advantage. No, I don't recall any great concerns with the Grain Commission.

NP: Canadian Wheat Board?

TT: Well, we had a long and very positive relationship with the Wheat Board. We had our usual battles with them about car allocation and things like that. But there's a certificate in the office there that showed I had 13 years as an advisor to the Canadian Wheat Board, so we were pretty well attuned with them. I went with them on occasion to overseas functions to promote Canadian grain and that. Never on negotiating sessions. No, we had a common philosophy about getting the best price for farmers out of all of this. Yeah. So no, I don't have much to add to that, Nancy.

NP: You mentioned that because of the work you did you were involved in the marine side of things too. So what kind of set up was there at Saskatchewan Wheat Pool for dealing with water shipment?

TT: Well, we had to negotiate with shippers on that.

NP: Did you have a division, like a shipper's division?

TT: No, it was handled through our terminal division.

NP: Ah, okay.

TT: I think they had people assigned to that.

NP: So Mr. Macdonald would know that?

TT: Macdonald would certainly know that, yeah. How I got to be involved with the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association was there were numerous, I don't know, hundreds of members of that association like towns and cities all along the Great Lakes and the waterways and that, the grain companies, and the railways, and so on. When it came to the grain industry, the fee that was paid related to the volume that was done. So as it turned out, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool paid the largest fee of anybody into the Great Lakes Waterways Association. We had huge volumes through Thunder Bay.

**[1:05:49]**

So after I had retired from the Wheat Pool, they asked me to take on the chairmanship of that, so I did. That's how I got involved there, and as I say, I don't know if the Chamber of Maritime Commerce still exists or not. I have no idea. I've been away from it. My last contact with that would be 1989, I guess.

NP: So what did you learn about maritime shipping as a result of being on that, chair of that group?

TT: Well, our big focus in that was working with the government agency that controlled the shipping, you know, the opening of the canals, the opening of the Seaway and the canals each year. That was very crucial to elevator companies not only the exact date, but to know the exact date ahead of time. So when are they going to close it down, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December or the 18<sup>th</sup> or whatever? And then when does it open, the 4<sup>th</sup> of April or sometime in March? Then we spent quite a bit of time talking about the locks and the need to upgrade the locks. I recall being down in the bottom of one of those locks in December one year, or January, I guess it was—December it was still operating—down near Thorold, Ontario. So we did an awful lot of work with that.



Really, it was a surprise to me when we got into this debate on how the Crow benefit would be distributed. I thought that was right off base with this Chamber of Maritime Commerce, but others insisted it was part of it. I had to take a contrary view because that's where I was coming from.

NP: Well, I guess they saw their responsibility keeping or improving shipments.

TT: Yeah. Well, there was an organization in Thunder Bay--.

NP: The Port Authority?

TT: The Port Authority, yeah. They were very, very vocal on this, and they were convinced of this. So anyway, that was in the public policy area.

NP: Yeah. I have my own conclusions relative to the shipments out of Thunder Bay, but I'd like yours. Was there anything that Thunder Bay could have done differently to stop the shift of grain shipments?

TT: Oh, I don't think so. You know, when you look at it, there's no way you're going to service Japan out of Thunder Bay. Just no way. It's absolutely marvellous having a sea-going port in the centre of a continent, but that road from the port to tidewater, you know, it had a lot of obstacles in it.

NP: And charges.

TT: Yeah. When you've got to use locks and locks and so on, you're limited to the size of ships. It was getting so, what was it, 35,000 tonnes, was that the limit? Maybe it was a little larger. Competing with 1 million tonnes or whatever they carry now. It was a marvel, actually, but the world passed it by, actually. And I don't know what you could have done in Thunder Bay unless you put in an all-new locks system, which were horrendous. And not only the length of the lock, but the width of the lock. Once you get to the St. Lawrence, then I think there wasn't any obstacles there that I understood to interfere much.

**[1:10:41]**

NP: I want to move on to talk about a couple of things, one being I've chatted with Wally and Ray and Doug Livingstone and so on about what happened in the Pool system over the years that led to the eventual demise of the Pools.

TT: Well, if you get that figured out, tell me.

NP: [Laughs]

TT: Because I don't know. They turned away somewhere from this objective of farmers first. I've been bewildered by how the organization disappeared.

NP: Were there indications of shifts in attitudes even among the farmers before 1989, was it, when you left?

TT: Oh, sure, and we were accommodating those. We were bringing the number of elevator points down dramatically, although, I suppose the interpretation of dramatically might vary. But I think we had at one time 1,200 country elevator points, and we had reduced that. I think when I left the Pool in 1987 was when I left in January—'89 was when I left the three Pools—we were down to around 700 elevator points. But we did this by reducing but then upgrading an adjacent point to give better service. Farmers hated losing their local elevator point. Some didn't even use it, and yet they were very upset about it because it was their community. They could see it as a weakening of community. But at the same time, their trucks were getting larger, and their ability to travel farther was greater and that. The system was built for horse and wagon when you realize it.

We had lots of anxious meetings out in the country, but for the most part, the changes, the consolidation, was being accepted. We had told the farmers through our delegates and that, that our objective was to go to 350 elevator points across the province, and that we expected to be at 400 by 1990 or something like that. We had set out a timeline for them. **[Audio pauses]** Because that's not much different than this.

NP: Right. We were talking about the changes that the Pool went through over time, and then the big almost like a--. I think there's some business term for the kind of shift that happened a few years back.

TT: Yeah.

NP: Were you involved at all in any of the negotiations for the Pools combining?

TT: No.

NP: So that started after?

TT: That was after I left, actually.

NP: Yeah.

TT: I thought I was going to be, but then it didn't materialize.

NP: And it wasn't successful. Well, it was successful for two.

TT: Yeah. It came almost to--. I had been told by one of the people in the negotiations that they'd actually reached agreement and Sask Wheat Pool bowed out at the next meeting. So that was the end of it. So Manitoba and Alberta actually went together.

**[1:15:04]**

NP: Do you think that would have been—and you were looking at it from the outside—would that have been the answer to it?

TT: It would have answered a lot of the questions or situations that have arisen since. No, I was very disappointed when they didn't bring about the amalgamation. There was great synergy in that.

NP: Do you think that story will ever be told?

TT: I don't know. I can't tell it because I don't know it.

NP: Yeah, you can't tell because you don't know it.

TT: No.

NP: The Canadian Wheat Board, you've mentioned because their stated goal was to get the best price for farmers. It was a real synergy between them and Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which had the same goals. We've talked about the railways, the handlers. If you think about Canada's history as a grain trader—and you mentioned yourself a couple of times just how far the wheat producing area is from the ports and markets—what do you think made Canada successful in spite of geography, climate?

TT: High quality. We produced wheat like few other areas in the world could produce as far as quality, strong gluten content, excellent baking qualities. And the Grain Commission assured absolutely cleanliness in the shipments that left the country. So the

importers weren't paying for weed seeds or anything like that. The ability of our farmers to produce this high quality in the quantities that were required. The system ensuring the weights, the cleanliness of it. Yeah. The system really supported it as well, our transportation system, which included ships on the Great Lakes and the occasional high-seas vessel.

And then we got established into the world markets on that basis, and we were by far the leading exporter of milling wheat until the United States decided to go into it in a big way following the First World War. They had, during their wartime, put on extra efforts to encourage production and that sort of thing. And then they ended, after the war, they had a huge surplus, much more than the American people could consume. So they decided to blast their way into world markets, and they did so with export subsidies. They ensured production by subsidizing producers. So that dropped Canada out of the number one spot of export for milling wheat.

It was tough to take, to hear countries like the United States complain about our Crow Rate subsidy when they had massive subsidies not only in their waterways, but also in production subsidies that they were trying to hide from the rest of the world. They had Public Law 480 that ensured producers got subsidies. It ensured export subsidies when required. It allowed the United States to go into countries and exchange wheat for strategic military sites. There was another clause in there. I can't remember what it was. I use the word "blasted" and that's what they did: Blasted their way into the world markets.

**[1:20:00]**

NP: When I hear you talk about that—and I've heard others involved speak of that as well—how can you have successful negotiations when a pretty major player is not playing fair?

TT: Well, that was always there, and it was tough to negotiate [Laughs] virtually impossible on occasions to negotiate under those circumstances right up to the time of the Canada-North America Free Trade Agreement, which I sat in on that, a good chunk of it.

NP: Did you feel that was going to be a good deal for farmers?

TT: We did a good job of laying out the agriculture objectives of what we had to achieve there. So no, I never saw that as a good deal for farmers. It was more for our manufacturing sector, which was a good deal for farmers because it allowed a stronger economy in other parts of the country, which benefits agriculture too.

NP: But not directly.

TT: No. You can't take a narrow view on these things because if you do, you miss out on opportunities. So no, I--.

NP: That's a good philosophy.

TT: Beg your pardon?

NP: I said that's a good philosophy.

TT: Well. [Laughing] So I had no problem sitting in as an advisor to the development of our Free Trade Agreement.

NP: Do you have any thoughts on the almost the co-demise of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Wheat Pools and what the farmers might gain or lose from that?

TT: Yeah. Well, of course, I'm completely biased, and I don't mind admitting so in regard to both the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board. I saw those as tremendously valuable assets for farmers. But I don't know why farmers seem to lose some interest—although, I wasn't around at the time—in maintaining these entities, but at the time of the debate, the political debate, about the Wheat Board, there was no lack of farmer interest in that. They were very, very strongly in favour of retaining the Wheat Board. Otherwise, if it had been the other way, we would have had a vote on it to prove that the government was right.

The government was terrified of a vote to keep the Wheat Board because they knew it would fail dramatically to change the Wheat Board. So no, I don't think the whole story has been told in regard to the Wheat Board yet. The change was made at a very fortunate time for farmers in that the United States had a huge crop failure. They weren't really strong competitors in the international market. We had a very good crop, and because of the shortages in other places, the prices were strong. There was no conflict or competition in marketing. But if those things happen to reverse, then I think people will be looking to see, "Well, what went wrong here?" But as I say, I'm completely biased in that. A bit of an old dinosaur, no doubt.

NP: [Laughs] The size of farms now is quite different too.

TT: It's dramatically different. Yeah.

NP: So has not the whole farming scene just completely changed?

TT: The whole farming scene. Well, as these comfort organizations disappear, then a lot of farmers are just willing to say, "I don't want to do this anymore."

NP: What do you mean “comfort organizations”?

TT: Well, Sask Wheat Pool or the Wheat Pools, rather, and the Canadian Wheat Board. A lot of farmers didn’t want to get into that game of, “Should I sell today or tomorrow? Should I sell ahead? What should I hedge and what shouldn’t I?” They didn’t want to get into that, and yet, they knew they were going to have to. They knew the Wheat Pools were there for their benefit. They could trust us. So I think there’s going to be some interesting revelations come to farmers before all of this is over.

**[1:25:15]**

NP: Yeah. Interesting you use the term “interesting” because that’s what most people, whether what side you come down on, they say, “It will be interesting.”

TT: Yeah, for sure.

NP: Yeah. When you look back on your career—and I’d like to mention that lots of people on tape have spoken very highly of your time in the grain business—what brings you the most satisfaction? What are you most proud of?

TT: Well, I think right up til the time I left Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and left the three Pools, I feel good about my service to farmers, in protecting their interests to the best of my ability. That was my sole goal in life in my career to do that. And of course, lots of people argue I didn’t do a very good job, so I guess that’s up to their decision. [Laughs] I never--. I think I feel good about my complete honesty with farmers. I never misled them. I told them their elevator system had to get smaller when it had to get smaller. I told them the grain rate had to change whether we liked it or not if we were going to continue to have a transportation system. Some will still argue that I was wrong on that, but I guess I feel like I come through all of this with a great deal of integrity. I’ve never deliberately misled people, except on the Federal purchase when we couldn’t say anything. [Laughing]

NP: That’s hard to do, isn’t it, when you tend to be the kind of person who wants to give them the stories.

TT: Yeah, yeah. One of our directors said I had to lie for the first time in my life when somebody asked me if we were in talks with Federal Grain. [Laughs] And we couldn’t dare say anything because of the public trading of Federal Grain.

NP: Anything you would have done differently?

TT: Oh, I'm sure there's 1,000 things probably.

NP: But nothing you lose sleep over? [Laughs]

TT: No, no.

NP: I mean, there's always good of the hindsight, right?

TT: Yeah. No, I don't really know, and that maybe sounds conceited to say that. I followed the tasks that I was given to do in the various roles in the Wheat Pool, and I looked at it always as bigger than the Wheat Pool. I looked at it as roles in agriculture, and then later on in roles in Canada as I consulted in the trade talks, and I was at the kick-off at GATT [General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade] in Uruguay, the last GATT negotiating session. So I felt I had a bit of service to the country beyond even agriculture because we talked about a lot of things in the GATT discussions. I was there for agriculture, but there was a lot of other consideration. So I followed the tasks I agreed to undertake, and I followed my own personal philosophy. I don't think I compromised my ethics or integrity along the way, not intentionally I didn't, anyway.

NP: Anything questions I should have asked you that I haven't?

TT: You didn't ask my age. [Laughing]

NP: I thought I would be sort of sneaky about that and say, "So you went into farming--." So when were you born? It will be good for our records.

TT: 1927.

NP: 1927.

TT: So that might be a clue. [Laughing]

NP: Any other people you feel--. We're winding down the project, so you know, besides Mr. Macdonald, who you'll try to--.

TT: Yeah. Jim, I don't have his number, I don't think. I would phone him right now if I did have.

NP: I might be able to send you what I've got anyway.

TT: Have you got his number?

NP: I think I have it somewhere. I'll have to check. There's my information if you track him down before I get back to you.

**[1:30:09]**

TT: There it is.

NP: Oh, good. Thank you. I have another question to ask you, but I will ask that once I shut us off here. So thank you very much for fitting me in at late notice into your very busy schedule.

TT: Yeah.

NP: Would you like to say goodbye to your listeners?

TT: Well, certainly. This has been a delight talking about myself! [Laughing]

NP: Good.

TT: But with such a delightful interviewer.

NP: Thank you. Bye-bye.

**End of interview.**