



C·I·H·S BULLETIN

Issue 51

ISSN 1485 - 8460

July 2007

The Canadian Immigration Historical Society • P O Box 9502, Station T • Ottawa ON K1G 3W2 • cihs@ncf.ca • <http://cihs.ncf.ca/index.htm>

20th Anniversary Annual General Meeting Canadian Immigration Historical Society

23 November 2006

President's Remarks

Good evening Ladies and Gentlemen

Twenty years ago last February a group of 17 men and women from the Immigration Department met with the idea of setting up a society to support, encourage and promote research into the history of Canadian immigration and to foster the collection and dissemination of that history.

The rest is, as they say, history.

In the 20 years since our little organization has prospered in its quiet way. We have a short but interesting list of publications we can take pride in, we have published 49 editions of the *CIHS Bulletin* and have stimulated and participated in a number of events celebrating various events in Canadian immigration history.

I would like to ask you to raise your glasses in a toast to our far sighted founders.

The founding of the Society was marked in our last *Bulletin* with an article by Gerry van Kessel. Gerry is in the Netherlands at the moment on a family matter but send regards.

The 50th edition of the *Bulletin* will be marked by a special version called, oddly enough, *The Best of the Bulletin* and will feature a number of articles from past issues selected by a distinguished panel this summer.

The executive decided that this year we would mark this event with a little more pizzazz than the usual drink and snack and we are very glad to be here at the Italia Soccer Club, a very appropriate venue, given the role that Italian immigration has played in the development of our country and in the careers of so many of our members. I remember well from my cross-Canada tour in 1968 that the great perk of being a settlement officer in those days was that you often got invited home for an Italian meal.

We have had a pretty good year in 2006. The quality of the articles in *Bulletin* continues to improve and I was particularly pleased with the item in *Bulletin #48* on the Kosovo refugee program, an interesting and original piece based on a talk by Rick Herring. The articles on the Hungarian movement by Greg Chubak and Peter Duschiński in the last bulletin were really outstanding.

With the assistance of the CIC Library, an index of the bulletins, to supplement that created by Roger St. Vincent, is being developed as part of the project to put the *Bulletin* onto the internet. David Bullock, Raph Girard and I did some work on it with CIC's Librarian, Charlene Elgee, this summer and one of the things we discovered is that we had never published a single item on the massive Indochinese refugee movement that occupied so much of the department's and indeed the country's attention in the late 1970s and early 1980s. So over the next year at least we will start to fill in the story of that mighty undertaking with a series of original articles on the operational, policy, program and organizational aspects of that program. If we do our work well, and we will, I expect we will eventually be able to publish a book on the subject. It has been some time since the Society published anything and there is no reason we can't put out a collection of essays on that largest of refugee movements.

We will also be running items on the *Longitudinal Study*, the adventures of one of our colleagues in the Persian Gulf area and will begin planning for another set of features on the

This Issue...

With the completion of the *Bulletin #50* the editorial team turned to getting out to you a regular bulletin before summer. In #51 we report on last fall's Annual General Meeting, provide more information on the introduction of the Visa counterfoil, launch a three part series on Garry Komar's experience in Abu Dhabi and a multipart series on Canada's response to the Indochinese refugee crisis. We also carry a couple of interesting letters to the editor which raise fundamental questions about the nature of history and the judging of past events by contemporary standards. Finally, and sadly, we publish tributes to Liz Boyce.

Czech movement for the 40th anniversary in 2008.

We have seen a modest growth in the Society's membership this year as a result of outreach activities involving active and retired members of the department and we will keep at it. We have promoted CIHS membership at a number of Immigration retirees' events and at the Foreign Service's annual pre-posting send-off party. In addition I had the pleasure of making a presentation on the CIHS to CIC's Departmental Management Committee, including the Regional DGs, just yesterday and received a very nice welcome.

By the way, I received a message today from Darrell Mesheau in New Brunswick who sends greetings.

It is once more my very pleasant duty to recognize the contribution of the Board and the Executive to the continued work of the Society. Our VP, Joe Bissett, Gerry van Kessel, Ian Rankin, Susan Gregson (who resigned from the board this summer to take up her duties as Canadian Consul General In Shanghai) and our treasurer Raph Girard (who is mining gold in Rumania according to last reports, and sends his regards) all deserve the Society's thanks.

This year again as in the past two years I must extend my special thanks to the twin pillars of the Society, David Bullock, our skilled and indefatigable Editor and our Secretary, Al Gunn, who in addition to keeping our records straight, is the one who sees to the printing and distribution of our *Bulletin*. Gentlemen it is a pleasure to work with you. FYI, I'm going to be out of the country from December to April and Joe Bissett our VP will manage our activities during that time.

Treasurer's Report

Nov 1, 2005 to Oct 31, 2006

Operating Funds:

Assets

Cash on hand, Nov 1, 2005	\$1,765.46
Revenue - memberships and bank interest	1,280.41
Total assets	3,045.87

Expenses

National Capital Freenet	100.00
Total expenses paid to Oct 31, 2006	100.00
Difference between revenue and expenses	1,180.41
Operating Fund as of Oct 31, 2006	2,945.87

Investment Account

Account value on Oct 1, 2005	6,204.39
Quarterly interest	155.61
Account value as of Sept 30, 2006	6,360.00

Total of Operating and Investment Accounts 9,305.87

Total Assets held by CIHS as of Oct 31, 2006
\$9,305.87

Submitted by Raph Girard, November 8, 2006

Introduction of the guest speaker

The president introduced Claudette Deschênes, Vice-President, Enforcement Branch, Canadian Border Services Agency.

Claudette Deschênes has more than twenty-four years of professional experience with the Public Service. In 1981, she began her career with the Department of External Affairs as a Visa Officer at Canadian missions overseas (Mexico, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago).

She returned to Ottawa in 1987 to serve for a two-year period as Cabinet Liaison Officer for the Ministers of Foreign Affairs. She then served twelve months as a Training Officer for Foreign Service Officers in the Social Affairs Stream, In August 1990 she was appointed Deputy Director, Latin America and the Caribbean Programs Division.

Following the transfer of the Immigration Program to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) in 1992, Claudette worked in the Personnel area of CIC's International Region, as an Assignment Officer and as the Deputy Director, Assignments. In 1994 she was appointed Immigration Program Manager in Sri Lanka. In 1996, Claudette was assigned to the position of Director General, Executive Services, to lead an organizational review of support provided to the Minister and Deputy Ministers. She became Director, Operational Coordination, with the International Region of CIC in 1998, Director General, Case Management, in 2000, and Director General, Intelligence Branch, in April 2002. With the creation of the Border Services Agency (CBSA) on December 12, 2003, she joined the transition team as Head, Immigration Intelligence Sector. As of June 15, 2004, Claudette assumed her duties as Vice-President, Enforcement Branch.

She directs the collection, analysis, and distribution of intelligence regarding threats to the security of Canada's borders and the integrity of the Agency's programs, and provides functional direction and support to field staff at posts abroad, ports of entry, and inland offices. She provides intelligence support with respect to immigration and refugee cases, as well as functional direction and support for the detention and removal programs.

As Vice-President, Enforcement Branch, Claudette is the focal point for the CBSA's relations with the security, law enforcement, and intelligence community,

Report of the Nominating Committee

Our President, Mike Molloy, was elected to a two year term at the last AGM, and no election is necessary this year.

Nominations for Director

The nominating committee recommends the following slate for election or re-election. All present Directors have agreed to serve another term. Ms Anne Arnott has agreed to accept a nomination. The slate follows in alphabetical order:

Ms Anne Arnott, Joe Bissett, David Bullock, Jim Cross (British Columbia), Raph Girard, Al Gunn, Gary Komar (Prairies), Ian Rankin, Bill Sinclair (Maritimes), Gerry Van Kessel.

There were no nominations from the floor, and the nominees were declared elected by acclamation.

Al Gunn, Secretary

Email from: Rob.Vineberg@cic.gc.ca

Subject: The First Counterfoil Visa

I read with interest the article on the first counterfoil visa in the October 2006 issue of the CIHS *Bulletin*. While Bud Muise had the lead on the administrative side, it was my initiative on the program side.

In 1979, I returned to NHQ from two years in Port-au-Prince where I was, at once, dismayed by the ease with which our rubber visa stamp was counterfeited and the challenges to counterfeiters posed by the US visa that then consisted of a steel visa stamp placed over a small (approx 1 1/2" x 2 1/2") counterfoil. The counterfoil was made of self-adhesive paper that destructed if removal were attempted. Shortly after I accepted a two-year assignment in the Intelligence Division, then located within Enforcement Branch, and I made it my goal to persuade the department that we needed a more secure visitor visa. I began with the idea that we should emulate the US approach but the more I thought of it, the idea of expanding the small US counterfoil to be the entire visa became more and more attractive.

I began to do some research, starting with my US contacts, to find the source of the paper. From the US manufacturer, Fasson, I found out the sole Canadian licensee for the special self-adhesive/self-destructive paper was the Canadian Banknote Company. I approached them and they were willing to work on the development of a prototype.

At this point I drafted a joint proposal from John Hucker, DG Enforcement and Joe Bissett, DG Foreign Branch to then ADM Immigration, Cal Best. Joe and John both endorsed it strongly and quickly obtained the go-ahead from Cal. As I knew nothing about the logistics of procurement, this was when Bud was drawn in. We made countless trips to Canadian Banknote to review various design proposals and the one portrayed in the photo was the design we finally accepted. The Canadian Banknote Company produced several prototype pages, each with 4 visas, so the pages of visas would be big enough to go through an IBM Selectric typewriter. We were moving to high tech from hand-writing on rubber stamps! Each prototype page had visas numbered 0000001 through 0000004. This did not pose a security risk as on the real visas the first "0" would be replaced by a letter.

At this stage, I arranged for framed copies of the sheets with the 4 prototype visas to be presented to the people most involved in the project. The file I still have lists the recipients as: myself, Bud, Joe Bissett, Bob Wales, David Hall, Cal Best, Bob

Hudon, Evan Gill (VP of Canadian Banknote), George O'Leary, and Paul Harris.

You will notice that the prototype has no form number on it. This is because Bud and I had cut several corners in moving the project along. By the time we got around to getting a form number and signing a contract, the Banknote Company was ready to run the presses. Well, the CEIC "Forms Committee" was not impressed. (Yes there really was one!) We were informed that we would have to make a submission and they and only they would determine whether this project warranted a form number. At this point, I produced Cal Best's signed approval of the project and informed them that Cal would not be pleased when I advised him of this roadblock. We got our form number! I then appeased the forms police by promising I would never ever try to elude their scrutiny in the future.

As for the contract, obviously it had to be sole source as no other supplier than Canadian Banknote had the paper stock, so we were quite surprised when the procurement people told us we had no right to deal with a supplier prior to tendering. Again, we advised them that it was too late and if they wanted to hold up the project they would have to explain why to Cal. And again, I promised never to avoid the tendering system for getting a form printed!

The first order, for some 300,000 visas, numbered A100001 to A 400000 I believe, was delivered to CEIC in late 1981.

Rob Vineberg

Director General, Prairies and Northern Territories
Region , CIC



Letters to the Editor

Sir:

Anti-semitism and Canadian immigration policy during and before World War II

In contrast with Al Gunn, I fully agree with Charles Godfrey in his article Refugees before and during World War II (*Bulletin*, October 2006), that Canada's immigration policy towards Jews was downright discriminatory in the 1930's and during World War II when thousands of Jews sought refuge from Nazi persecution. Prominent historians like professors Abella and Potter have condemned this policy. I wrote a report on Immigration and Refugee Policy for Canada's *Demographic Review* in 1988 and came to the same conclusions. It is, therefore, a surprise to read Al Gunn's reply to Charles Godfrey.

The statement by Mr. Blair that "None is too many" clearly reflects an anti-Semitic attitude. Similarly, Charlotte Whitton stated during World War II, when asked about her view of admitting several hundred Jewish children from France via Switzerland into Canada, that these children would never adjust to life in Canada. The children were later shipped from France to concentration camps and perished.

On a related note, quite recently it was revealed in the *Ottawa Citizen* that Ms. Whitton, some years later, as the mayor of Ottawa, rejected a substantial financial gift from Mr. Loeb to the Civic Hospital because she did not want the name of a Jew on the building. Mr. Loeb gave the gift instead to Carleton University.

My report to the *Demographic Review* was criticised by some of the staff of the Department of Manpower and Immigration because it did not take into account the 'spirit of the time' in Canada that was more or less anti-Semitic. However, the criticism is not acceptable to historians who judge the past on today's point of view. The view is confirmed by recent actions of the Canadian government, paying compensation to Japanese internees and to surviving Chinese who had been forced to pay a head tax to enter Canada.

Al Gunn's reply contains serious errors. While I agree that the difficult economic times of the 1930s were contributing factors to restrictive immigration policy, Jewish organizations, intervening with Mr. Blair in Ottawa, offered to provide assistance to the refugees. The granting of asylum to Jews by other countries is an important point noted by Charles Godfrey. Apart from Britain and the USA, poor Central American countries like Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras accepted Jewish refugees. Furthermore, the restrictive Canadian policy was already in place before World War II when there were limited shipments of war supplies to Britain. It should also be noted that convoys of ships returned more or less empty to Canada. Al Gunn exaggerates when stating that Jewish refugees accounted for the majority of hundreds of thousands of refugees after the war. Nevertheless, the preferential treatment of Jews was a positive act.

Al Gunn refers to revisionism and a lack of objective analysis regarding Charles Godfrey's article. His own view is revisionist in an attempt to cover this "black eye" in Canada's immigration policy. I have always admired the hard work that Al Gunn has done on behalf of the Society but the view

taken is akin to those offered by right wing circles in Europe and some Moslem countries.

Edgar Ziegler, Ottawa

21/10/06

Sir:

Charges of anti-Semitism—a rebuttal

It's relatively easy for all of us to look back 70 years and with prejudicial hindsight rationalize historical events, including Canadian immigration policy. Al Gunn's reply in *Bulletin* #49 to 'Charges of Anti-Semitism' falls within this rationalization, as no doubt, will mine. Taking a position and supporting it with rational arguments happens all the time. It's called selected history.

I have no doubt Al Gunn's facts are correct. And he has articulated very well the reasons why the Canadian government did not and should not have taken Jewish refugees from Europe. At the time, the reasons for refusal seemed reasonable. As Mr. Gunn validly points out Canada was just coming out of a depression with high unemployment. And the 1927 Immigration Act placed persons in the prohibited class who were a 'public charge' or liable to become a public charge. Our marine resources were strained to the limit shipping food, weapons and troops to war-torn Britain.

Adding to these reasons one might even put forward the argument the term 'Holocaust' did not exist during the early war years. Not until January 1942 when Nazi Germany began its 'Final Solution'—the liquidation of the Jews of Europe rather than their forced migration—should countries such as Canada have considered changing its policies. However Al Gunn's reasons for denying the Jews entry to Canada are partly technical (the wonderful catchall prohibition phrase 'public charge') and partially convenient justification. I was amused to read that the United States also used 'likely to become a public' charge as a reason to refuse Jewish refugees in 1939.

In 1939 the passenger ship *St Louis* was allowed to leave Germany. Carrying 937 Jewish men, women and children, the ship attempted without success to discharge its passengers somewhere in the Western Hemisphere, Canada included. (In this incident, Mr. Gunn cannot claim our "marine resources were strained"). Certainly Canada and the United States had been aware of the persecution of the Jews in Germany. The German campaign of terror against the Jews on November 9, 1938 ('Crystal Night' or Night of Broken Glass) was well known. The book, *Voyage of the Damned*, notes that President Roosevelt had appealed to the world for a suitable area "to which refugees could be admitted in almost unlimited numbers." Hitler suggested Madagascar. Roosevelt wrote to Rome about Ethiopia. Mussolini proposed Russia and the Soviet Union replied that Alaska was more appropriate.

Given the persecution the Jews faced in Germany in 1939, it's hardly appropriate to use the immigration prohibition 'public charge' as a reason to deny the Jewish refugees entry to Canada. More likely is that Canada was only following the lead of the United States and United Kingdom. As *Voyage of the Damned* points out, by 1939 "Britain already had 25,000 refugees, was preparing for all-out war, and there was no great enthusiasm for accepting more refugees from the

country Britain was about to fight.”

Can it really be said that Fred Blair’s comment “None is too many” was taken out of context and “open to interpretation” as Mr. Gunn contends. I think not. David Matas in his *Justice Delayed* (referring to the book *None is Too Many*) points out that the diaries of Mackenzie King shows anti-Semitic views. In one entry King wrote: “I must say that the evidence is very strong, not against all Jews, which is quite wrong, as one cannot indict a race any more than one can a nation, but that in a large percentage of the race there are tendencies and trends which are dangerous indeed.” Fred Blair and the Canadian immigration service were, in all probability, mirroring Mackenzie King’s sentiments.

I could go on with counter arguments to debate Al Gunn’s comments. Canada was ‘racist’ until 1967 when regulations provided for a point system to allow anyone in the world to apply to immigration to Canada. But the Canadian government knew that certain people in Asian countries could not meet the point system and further enhanced a restrictive selection system by placing only one visa office in New Delhi while scores of visa offices dotted the western European landscape. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister of Labor in a 1908 report put it best: “That Canada should desire to restrict immigration from the Orient is regarded as

natural, that Canada should remain a white man’s country is believed to be not only desirable for economic and social reasons but highly necessary on political and national grounds.” (Quoted from *A White Man’s Country - An Exercise in Canadian Prejudice* by Ted Ferguson - an account of the refusal in 1914 to allow 376 East Indians to disembark in Vancouver).

George and Mrs. Vanier, including Eleanor Roosevelt, were ahead of their time. This is not to lay blame or shame on the western governments for their immigration policies before or during the World War II years. Historians have more than adequately covered this ground. Al Gunn correctly reflects an attitude and behavior that was the norm during the first half of the 20th century. And as he concluded, changes in attitude developed slowly. Over the next fifty years there emerged more progressive definitions of ‘humanitarian’ and ‘refugee’ considering the international events taking place. Although it is easy to judge Canada’s past immigration behavior with hindsight, there is also a need to present as much information as possible in order that young Canadians can share many points of view.

Gary Komar, Winnipeg, Manitoba

The Indochinese Refugee Movement

Editor’s Introduction;

We have been developing indices for 50 CIHS Bulletins issued over the past 20 years and in reviewing the latest draft discovered that we have not published a single article on the Indochinese refugee movement. The refugees generated by the fall of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in 1975 captured the attention of the world and engaged the efforts of Canadian governments, officials, NGOs and ordinary Canadians for nearly two decades. They constitute the largest single group of refugees resettled by Canada to date.

With the present Bulletin we begin to remedy this lack of attention and we hope to stimulate a series of articles dealing with everything from the aftermath of the fall of Saigon to the measures adopted by the international community to manage the movement in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

We begin with a paper written back in 1981 by our current president, Mike Molloy. Under the watchful eyes of ADM Cal Best and the late Kirk Bell, Mike led the Task Force that managed the movement of 60,000 refugees from South East Asia in 1979 and 1980. Mike tells us the paper was written to boost his chances for a promotion after the FS3 promotion board passed him over in 1980. Apparently it worked because he was promoted the next year. He apologizes for the number of times the word ‘major’ appears in the article.

The document that follows tells the story of the 1979-80 Indochina Program from a National Headquarters perspective. We hope that subsequent articles will focus

on the operations abroad, the CFB Longue Point and Griesbach Barracks Staging Areas, the Matching System, and the wide range of programs and projects developed to receive and settle refugees throughout Canada, with due attention to the remarkable efforts of private Canadian sponsors who settled 34,000 of these refugees.

The Indochinese Refugee Task Force 1979-80

To understand the significance of the role of the Coordinator of the Indochinese Refugee Program (IRP) it is essential to have an appreciation of the nature of the discrete and major elements that it was necessary to either develop or harness (and in each instance to shape and reshape) as the program evolved, in order to achieve the very successful results that occurred. In many cases, their elements had to be ‘invented’ since many had no precedent. All this had to be done against extremely tight timeframes and in the glare of intense political and public interest and pressure. The principle elements and their more important components are as follows.

Refugee Selection

With the announcement to select 50,000 Indochinese (IC) refugees, a strategy for selection had to be articulated to achieve both international and domestic goals. In the initial months, this called for Canadian teams to hit all the major camps in all the asylum countries and to select very large numbers of refugees. Strategically, this was designed to reassure the host governments that resettlement could solve the refugee problem thereby encouraging them to maintain acceptable asylum policies, reducing the loss of life.

Because of the overwhelming logistical problems, efforts were made to keep overseas processing as simple as possible. A unique combined processing record and visa (IMM1314) was

designed and printed and a team sent to SE Asia to train officers in its use. Statistical reporting systems were cut to the bone and officers were encouraged to operate with maximum flexibility.

At the same time, given the massive demonstration of domestic support, selection standards were redefined to relate to public expectations. The participation of thousands of sponsors meant that a broader cross section of the refugee population could be successfully established in Canada and the focus was adjusted to take this into account giving priority to families with children. Posts had to be shown that refugee previously considered unacceptable could now in fact be resettled in Canada. [Ed. note: 'posts' in this context refers to the visa sections of Canadian missions in Hong Kong, Singapore, Bangkok, and Manila]. Selection guidelines were continually updated throughout the movement to take advantage of new settlement potential as new 'speciality' groups in Canada emerged.



Source: Barbara Lee—Bangkok, 1983

Transportation

Given the size of the movement, a major charter airlift had to be organized involving all major Canadian airlines as well as DND (ed. Department of National Defence). Initially the Task Force negotiated contracts and arranged charter schedules, but as quickly as possible this function was contracted to DSS [Department of Supply and Services] leaving the Task Force free to concentrate on planning the schedules which DSS arranged in relation to policy objectives and operational requirements.

Considerable effort was expended in arranging landing rights, curfew exemptions, and fuel supplies with the countries concerned or enroute. In some cases a very tough stance had to be taken to ensure airline companies got the cooperation

and technical support required. Once the Task Force became satisfied that ICEM [The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, now the International Organization for Migration] was operating in an efficient manner, posts were encouraged to take full advantage of whatever services seemed appropriate.

The problem of obtaining sufficient aircraft on short notice resulted in very challenging scheduling in the fall of 1979 causing major difficulties for posts, staging areas, the Matching Centre and many of the sponsors which had to be dealt with by the Task Force as they emerged. However, by January 1980, though the volume of traffic remained heavy, better spacing of flights reduced pressure all around.

Medical Problems

The earliest controversies that developed in the movement related to health concerns which re-emerged in several forms over the first six months.

The strategy followed in coping with this results from the realization that the problem was basically one of lack of understanding rather than threats to health. Efforts were made to enlist the aid of provincial health departments and medical specialists and to mobilize health-care professionals and existing systems to cope with health problems. The Task Force recruited experts which were asked to write articles on various health problems relating to the refugees and these were given wide circulation through newsletters and other channels.

Provincial support was obtained by cooperating with HWC [Health and Welfare Canada] in its efforts to provide general information on medical procedures and the health situation in the camps. At the urging of the Task Force and the provinces, HWC organized a system of notifying provincial health departments of all refugee arrivals and including notification codes identifying conditions detected abroad along with the results of hepatitis B screenings at the staging areas.

A special edition of the Refugee News Letter drew together all the elements of the health protection system and stimulated sponsoring groups, CEIC [Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission] settlement workers and the provinces to ensure all refugees underwent further medical examinations after arrival. The staging areas played a key role and were required to develop a capacity to quarantine one flight while dealing with a second.

Eventually concerns about physical health diminished as it became apparent that with proper coordination at all levels, the Canadian health care system could respond to any problems that were detected. Once this happened the Task Force shifted its focus to the field of emotional and mental health, conducting a campaign to sensitize provincial medical authorities, private physicians, settlement workers and sponsors to the problem and distributing a steady stream of materials on the subject as they were developed in Canada, the USA and elsewhere.

Reception Services: The Staging Areas

In order to reduce the documentation burden on the posts abroad, and to provide a location for a final medical check, the issuance of clothing, and a means of carrying out of systematic and equitable distribution of refugees across Canada, two staging areas were established—one in Montreal (Longue Pointe) and one in Edmonton (Griesbach) with the cooperation of DND. Apart from the very real practical benefits this type of facility provided, it was also a useful

element in obtaining political and public support for the program from the public at large, the provinces and indeed the CEIC, as they quickly developed into show-place operations that never failed to impress visitors.

The Task Force worked with the staff of each unit to help them organize to suit their own environmental needs with Longue Point being staffed exclusively from Quebec region while Griesbach contained units from the four western provinces and Ontario. The Task Force's role was to set basic objectives and standards, develop consistent forms of intercommunications between the staging areas, the Matching Centre, and the Regions and, that being done, to encourage the Staging Areas management to use its initiative.

Further, the Task Force arbitrated disputes between the Staging Areas and other parts of the system and fostered an ongoing exchange of ideas and techniques between the two.

Relations with Sponsors and Sponsoring Groups.

The central element in the Indochinese Refugee program was the involvement for the first time in any refugee movement of private refugee sponsorship as a major force. In all, some 7000 groups participated, taking on responsibility for 34,000 refugees involving about 70,000 Canadians in a 'hands on' capacity and perhaps another 500,000 in support and coordinating roles. With this sort of committed constituency, the 'care and feeding' of the sponsors and the new organizations that came into existence became a major challenge. The key decision was to regard them as full partners in the process and to avoid policies, procedures and approaches that could not be frankly discussed with the leaders of the sponsorship movement. Concerted efforts were made to win the confidence and trust of the key actors and this trust quickly matured into a bond strong enough to withstand the negative effects of the decision to abandon the 1 for 1 matching concept. [Ed. note: See Special Programs below] In the long term, these new leaders were recognized as a pragmatic and beneficial counterweight to the groups that have traditionally championed refugees in Canada and efforts were made to instill a permanent interest in refugees on behalf of this group.

The Matching System

If the sponsorship movement was the central element in the program, the key to harnessing it was the Matching System.

Given the immense political pressure that sponsors and their organizations were capable of generating, not only did the selection standards and the transportation timetable have to be constantly monitored to ensure the refugees were arriving as quickly as possible but new techniques for matching sponsor and refugee had to be invented as the volume of sponsors soared. Once the size of the movement was defined, the decision was taken to relieve the posts of all responsibility for matching and enable them to concentrate all their efforts on selection and processing.

A new system designed to match only refugees ready to travel was developed and implemented 'on the run.' Posts provided detailed manifests to all Regions and the Matching Centre which identified likely sponsors and, using the regional network, offered specific refugees to sponsoring groups. Once the Matching Centre and the Regions had learned to use this system, a computerized record system was installed to improve accuracy, effectiveness and prioritization of sponsoring requests. By November 1979 the matching

Centre with a total staff of seven could handle six flights worth of refugees at a time and find sponsors for over 90% of the refugees before the flights touched down.

As techniques were perfected, efforts were made to develop a set of rules and priorities aimed at enhancing fairness and equity in the Matching system and as the nature of the refugees and the sponsors varied in the course of the movement, matching priorities and techniques were altered accordingly.

Public Relations

The key decision this area was that in the initial phase of the operation CEIC would tell the story rather than relying on the press. To do this, a refugee news letter was established. Staffed and supported by CEIC Public Affairs, it came under the jurisdiction of the Task Force which controlled its content, thrust and direction. The newsletter carried features that explained the selection, transportation and matching systems, gave advice on organizations for sponsorship and carried technical and human interest features. As issues arose in the community, the newsletter tackled them head on. It became the most successful PR tool the CEIC ever developed with a circulation of 16,000 when it ceased publication.

At the same time, a wide range of other PR tools including speakers' kits for CIC and CEIC officers, training packages for Refugee Liaison Officers, slide shows for sponsors and for sponsored and government-assisted refugees were developed and distributed. Full use was made of materials developed by provinces and private groups and of materials originating in the USA. (The audio-visual package won a national award for the CEIC.)



Source: Barbara Lee—Bangkok, 1983

Early on, it became apparent that the academic community was eager to be involved and care was taken to tap their

expertise through provision of materials, statistics and attendance at academic conferences. One result has been the publication by the Canadian Asian Studies Association of a handbook on SE Asia designed for Canadian sponsors.

The Public relations campaign established the CEICs credibility insofar as the Indochinese movement was concerned and this credibility, aligned with the efforts of groups like Operation Lifeline was successful in containing the backlash that occasionally emerged.

New Settlement Initiatives

The Task Force played a catalytic and developmental role in setting up a number of new settlement programs designed to respond to the Indochinese refugees' influx.

The first of these was the Refugee Liaison Officers Program under which 55 officers were deployed across the country to act as coordinators of settlement services and to identify program gaps and overlaps. In order to get the program going, the Regions had to be convinced of its utility, formal goals and objectives were developed and training courses designed and delivered. Legitimate regional variations had to be accommodated while keeping the initiatives overall aims in mind. This special short-term program has proved itself to the extent that a permanent Settlement Liaison Program is about to be installed.

Because of the emergence of new types of voluntary organizations formed to assist sponsors which did not qualify and were not suited to ISAP funding an Indochinese Refugee Grants Program was developed to provide short-term funding. This was administered by the Settlement Division but the Task Force was involved in its design.

At the same time, shortcomings of the ISAP program were also identified and following the joint development by Settlement and the Task Force of a Comprehensive Settlement Strategy, the terms and conditions of the ISAP program were revised to ensure greater flexibility and responsiveness. The settlement strategy itself provided the theoretical underpinnings for a change in the direction of the settlement program away from pure interpretation and into the area of cultural and social adaptation.

Special Programs

Once the main stream of the Indochinese program was in train, a number of special sub-movements and programs were designed to cope with special needs and developments.

Because of the public perception of the plight of

unaccompanied minors in the camps, a model program was designed to serve as a basis for negotiations with the provinces. Subsequently, using the model to define federal requirements, five distinct programs taking into account the child welfare protection systems of five provinces were negotiated and implemented. This involved developing concepts, amending regulations, designing procedures and placement systems against a background of well-meant but often exceedingly shrill public concern. In the end, some 600 minors came to Canada and a number of alternative arrangements involving group homes was also initiated.

The incidence of tuberculosis [TB] among refugees was such that the pre-existing handicapped refugee procedures were found to be inadequate. Once again procedures had to be designed and provinces were induced to participate. The end result of this effort to date has been the participation of all provinces (including some that had never taken TB refugees before) and a movement of TB cases larger than Canada's total intake between 1945 and 1978.

At the same time, efforts were made to resettle other disadvantaged refugees using a Joint Assistance Program involving federal, provincial and private groups. The number brought in under this program is small but includes cases whose resettlement could not have been facilitated under any previous system.

Other special projects included the promotion of host-family projects for government assisted refugees, and special measures to provide support for young single males who were perhaps the most difficult-to-settle group. At the same time, while the Vietnamese Family Reunification Program was dormant during most of this period, efforts to contain and rechannel public concern and to get the movement of relatives going again required periodic attention.

One final special project arose from the government's decision to increase the intake in March 1988 by the admission of 10,000 additional government-assisted refugees. In order to cope with this in a creative way, regions were instructed to develop settlement plans to disperse these latecomers into secondary centres where the sponsorship program had already developed small clusters of refugees. The matching system was altered to make it possible to reinforce existing secondary communities with refugees of compatible ethnic and social background. This system has been successful in retarding the flow of refugees into major centres and will likely become a permanent feature of Canada's settlement strategy.

A YEAR IN THE EMIRATES

Blueprint for Change

**by Gary Komar, C.I.H.S. Director-at-large
Prairies (Winnipeg)**

One hundred kilometers from Iran across the Strait of Hormuz, due south of Kuwait and Iraq at the terminus of

the Persian Gulf, the 83,000 square kilometre United Arab Emirates (UAE)—about the size of New Brunswick—has a tentative hold on the northeast corner of the Arabian Peninsula. Formerly independent sheikdoms known as the Trucial States, the UAE is made up of seven different emirates. The UAE has one of the world's highest per capital incomes (about CA\$25,000) with oil contributing almost 28% to its gross domestic product. Of its total population of approximately four million, three-quarters are expatriates who are on contract to the government, or to the service and construction industries.

Less than 50 years ago, the emirate of Abu Dhabi was little more than an empty desert inhabited by nomadic Bedouin

tribes. Today it has 70% of the country's wealth and a population of over one million, 80% who are expatriates. Abu Dhabi, the city capital, with a population of about 650,000, is known as the Manhattan of the Middle East. Numerous high rise buildings, rich shopping malls, and international luxury hotels are squeezed on to a T-shaped island of 200 square kilometers.

From September, 2004 until August 2005, I was under contract as an immigration consultant to the Ministry of Interior's General Directorate of Abu Dhabi Police. Major General His Highness Sheikh Saif bin Zayed Al Nahyan, one of nineteen sons of the UAE's ruling founder, heads the Ministry. The Abu Dhabi Emirate sought a retired Canadian immigration officer to help bring its outdated immigration system into the 21st century.

This was an ultimate challenge for me. After retiring in 1994 with 30 years of Canadian immigration service, I returned to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) in November 1999. My contract as a Hearings Officer and War Crimes Investigator was due to expire in March 2004.

In May 2004, Lyle Moffat, a former Manager of CIC Winnipeg, traveled with me to the Emirates for a job interview. We spent a week with Interior Ministry officials who asked us to look at the immigration Head Office operation of the Residence and Nationality Department in Abu Dhabi. We were to ask no questions. A federal immigration office in Abu Dhabi represents all the emirates much like Immigration National Headquarters in Ottawa. The Abu Dhabi immigration Head Office functions similar to a Canadian immigration region. While national legislation dictates how the immigration rules and regulations are applied, the various emirates have considerable discretion. This autonomy depends on how closely connected a particular emirate's immigration administration is with the royal family.

Dubai immigration authorities, for example, operate quite independently. A member of the royal family who manages the immigration office in Al Ain, a city in eastern Abu Dhabi Emirate, also has considerable independence. In contrast, the manager of the Abu Dhabi immigration Head Office, is from the rank and file and is closely controlled by the federal office situated in the capital. As a result, the three million expatriate immigration clients working in the United Arab Emirates receive inconsistent quality of service. Whether service is prompt and efficient, or a fee for service is collected, depends not only in what emirate an immigration application is processed, but also in what city of a particular emirate.

What Lyle and I noticed immediately during our lightning tour of the immigration Head Office in Abu Dhabi, was the mass of client humanity that crowded the halls and offices of the five-story building. There seemed to be no logical organization or control. As the commercial and financial world in the Emirates prepared for the 21st century, Abu Dhabi Immigration exercised a management style appropriate for 1980, with no incentive to change. After a week in the Emirate, we made a cursory report on our observations and returned to Canada. A month later we were both offered a one-year contract as immigration consultants. Due to Lyle's personal situation at the time, he was unable to join me when I left for Abu Dhabi in August 2004.

August is one of the hottest months of the year. Temperatures can reach 50°C or more. Many businesses close during the afternoon hours. Most residents and

expatriates take holidays to cooler climates. Although my own recruiting officer was out of the country in August, I began the residence induction process immediately. This was to be an adventure in itself. The process included a medical examination, security clearance, house hunting, and filling out reams of forms. I received visitor status for two months when I arrived. But I did not obtain an employment authorization until October, my residence status until November or my first paycheck until December.

A rigid and uncoordinated system did not allow me to move into permanent accommodation until I had my Residence Permit. One unit pushed me to find a place immediately to reduce hotel expenses; another cared less about my housing dilemma. The list of requirements I had to meet was usually incomplete. One person would tell me one thing; another would say something else. No one was concerned with my pay situation or that I had to live off my own financial resources for four months. My frustration mounted but complaints only fell on deaf ears. The induction process was a microcosm of the way things worked in the Emirates, and an introduction to what was wrong with the immigration system.

In the meantime, I was required to start work by mid-September 2004, determine the immigration problems in the Abu Dhabi Emirate, examine options, and suggest possible solutions. The Police Directorate expected me to make a Power Point Presentation to Colonel Nasir (the Sheik's Chief of Staff) in October, and a final presentation to the Minister of Interior (Sheikh Saif) in November. His Highness was leaning toward a new VIP immigration office separate and apart from the current Head Office location. The VIP office was to provide a modern, streamlined and professional immigration service to the public. Visa and Resident Permit processing delays at Head Office impacted negatively on the Emirate's economic development. Oil company personnel and foreign investors, in particular, suffered most.

Captain Saeed Mubarak Hadi Al Yaaquobi, a 20-year veteran of the Abu Dhabi immigration system, became my one saving grace. Assigned to me on this project from the beginning, Saeed knew the language and the customs, and had valuable connections within the Emirate. He became a valued colleague and friend. We were so in tune and shared so many of the same ideas and visions that he could almost read my mind.

The project problems were daunting. My Canadian immigration experience was of limited value. It would assist me to identify the workflow processes, lines of authority, staff training and management skills, and the information technology in place. But the language, customs, and way of doing business were new to me. I asked Saeed to take me to every unit at Head Office (Visa, Residence, Passport, Investigation, Security, Information Technology (IT), Personnel, Finance and Equipment Purchasing sections). I had to ask a multitude of questions. I had to learn the immigration rules and determine what was being done and why it was being done in a certain way. Then we focused on the sub-offices at the industrial complex of Mussafah, the inland office of Al Rahiba, the seaport at Al Mina, the Abu Dhabi Labour Office, the Municipal office, the military office, as well as Abu Dhabi International Airport. We listened to experienced staff expound their ideas on how to improve service and questioned every aspect of office procedures.

Saeed and I visited the Al Ain immigration office, some 150 kilometers east of Abu Dhabi, where a royal family member managed immigration operations. Al Ain, with a population of

about 370,000, was the birthplace of the royal family. Finally, Said and I traveled to the Dubai immigration office, the most modern and progressive of all the Emirates to learn the secrets of its success. The further away an emirate or immigration office was located from the capital, the more independence it seemed to exercise.

The problems in the immigration system were considerable. Immigration Head Office in Abu Dhabi was overwhelmed by its current client workload. In no way could it handle the increased traffic anticipated as a result of new business and future development within the Emirate. Change was necessary in terms of workflow, workload distribution, signing authorities, building configuration, client control, and parking facilities. The IT system was woefully outdated and little used by management to track growing trends or to plan for change.

Inadequately trained staff at the front counters, pressed by people pushing for attention or unable to speak Arabic, frequently turned away clients without making decisions. Some staff simply did not know the immigration rules or procedures, lacked the skills or abilities to do the job, or were unable to communicate in English. Either they refused applicants outright, sent them elsewhere, or just told the clients to come back another day. Company representatives, carrying a multitude of applications for their workers, lined up like everyone else.

Clients refused at the front counters searched without appointments on every floor of the five-storied antiquated building for someone in authority to overturn initial decisions or to grant special consideration. Each day clients lined up outside the offices of senior managers to seek exceptions. These managers for the most part were unaware why applicants were refused at the initial stages. The IT client database did not record this type of information. Time devoted to client cases detracted from management's ability to address these systemic problems, and many managers had little or no management training. Four senior officers in the Residence Section, for example, did nothing else but sign 1500 to 2000 permits each day. Sub offices and branch offices had limited capability to handle Head Office overflow. They were either unable to take some of the workload or not given the authority to do so. Authority had not been decentralized to allow sub offices to handle local cases. Immigration facilities ranged from the ultra-modern sub-office at Al Rahba, to the cramped trailers at the Al Mina seaport.

Questions arose whether the VIP office should serve only certain occupational professionals in a particular income bracket, and whether immigration service should be provided jointly or separately to the public and oil company personnel. For years ADNOC, the Abu Dhabi National Oil Company that controls the consortium of oil and gas enterprises extracting the mineral wealth from the sands, had advocated a separate immigration office to take care of their 250,000 employees, family members, and household staff. ADNOC employees represented approximately a third of the immigration business carried out on the Emirate.

Saeed and I held meetings with the ADNOC executives to determine their needs. Desperate for change and at no cost to the government, the ADNOC was prepared to donate building space, the furniture, IT systems, equipment and half the office staff, as well as undertake complete renovations for the new enterprise. The ADNOC employees were better trained in immigration procedures than many of the Emirate's immigration staff. We were asked to provide trained

immigration employees. The ADNOC location's only drawback was the lack of parking spaces.

In the meantime, Captain Saeed and I spent months scouring the Abu Dhabi area for a suitable building for the new VIP office. No leased space was available at the Abu Dhabi Mall while the Marina Mall offered limited facilities and was unsuitable for future expansion. The new buildings at the edge of the city were too far out and some villas under construction were already sold or too small. Other empty buildings were slated for demolition, the sites to be used for new shopping malls or hotel complexes. Almost all sites had insufficient parking.

We also attempted to obtain from the Head Office IT unit computer printouts of the professional occupations employed in the Emirate, to determine how many and which professions might be selected for VIP office processing. The IT unit lacked the sophisticated capability to extract such data. Eventually, from the thousands of data base entries, a manual list was produced of 6000 professions, many inappropriately or duplicitously categorized. In contrast, the Dubai IT system provided almost instantly the units of business for any occupational category we desired. Dubai could print out the daily workload of each employee.

In our November presentation to the Sheik Saif, the Minister of Interior, we enunciated the problem of identifying suitable professional occupations through the current immigration IT system. His Highness instructed that any person who was willing to pay the 'urgent' 200 Dirham application-processing fee we intended to levy could access the VIP office. The regular fee is 100 Dirhams (approximately CA\$33).

Saeed and I pointed out our findings at Head Office. We recommended a number of options: upgrade Head Office operations; decentralize work to sub offices; open a new VIP office as a 'one stop shop' with extended hours, separate and apart from Head Office, providing a complete and full ranges of services and configured to be user-friendly. We also suggested that the Abu Dhabi Emirate introduce a fee system similar to the one used in the Dubai Emirate. Specially selected staff had to be trained in all phases of immigration work and in customer service, and their English and computer capabilities upgraded. We also suggested updating the IT system and providing for on-line applications and fee payments. And finally, we strongly recommended that the new VIP office hire more women who were currently unemployed or underemployed in the Emirate. All this was necessary, we pointed out, to meet the growing demand for immigration services as the Abu Dhabi Emirate's industrial and population base expanded.

Sheikh Saif asked us to focus on a VIP office, and gave us approval in principle to proceed with our plans. He emphasized that expenses for the new operation could not exceed income (in effect, a balanced budget), and to design the new system at government expense to accommodate both the public and ADNOC either at one location or at separate locations. In addition, I was to personally select the management team and to explore the possibility of setting up visa offices overseas in the majority of the problem-source countries from which most of the expatriates originated (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines). The Emirate did not issue visitor, employment, or residence visas overseas. All immigration processing took place within the country.

Parts 2 and 3 of Gary's report are to appear in CIHS Bulletins later in the year.

Elizabeth (Liz) Boyce

Ed. note: A number of contributions have been received paying tribute to Liz Boyce who died in March this year.

—from Fran Psutka

Liz Boyce was born, I believe, in Sarnia, Ontario in 1932. Liz joined the Foreign Service in 1961 and served in the Foreign Service as a Visa Officer in London, San Francisco and Athens. In the 1970's Liz left the Foreign Service and transferred to Employment and Immigration Canada. Having also worked in the Dept. of External Affairs and in Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Liz served her entire career in the immigration program. She was what we call a 'lifer'.

Liz trained new FS recruits and others going on single assignments abroad, as part of a two-person team, specializing in the 'Act and Regs.' In the latter part of the 1970's computers and technology started playing a dramatically increasing role in the administration of the immigration program. Liz was one of the original players in this automation—she worked on the development of overseas forms to be processed by computers. All the computers were still located in Canada in those days. However, Liz travelled abroad to various missions and countries and trained staff in the use of the new forms. In the 1980's Liz worked on the IRIS project with John Reynolds and Jim Humphries. IRIS (Immigration Records Indexing System) was the first automated client index in an immigration mission overseas. The first IRIS installation was in London, England. Later, Liz served on the CAIPS (Computer Assisted Immigration Processing System) team as a project officer/trainer. John Reynolds and Al Bezanson were the technical leads. Liz travelled to missions abroad where she worked to install CAIPS, trained FS officers and local staff and assisted staff abroad with the humongous task of moving from a basically manual system to a computer system. Both forms and visas were converted from manual to automated documents during the 80s and 90s. CAIPS was successfully installed at all immigration missions world-wide. Liz retired in 1998

Travelling around the world and hosting parties at her high-rise condo with great views of the Ottawa River and downtown Ottawa were among Liz's great pleasures. Liz maintained her friendships with many friends and former colleagues around the world. A memorial service for Liz was held on March 19 in Ottawa.

—from Carol Turner

After a four day weekend in Budapest, I opened my computer this morning to see the news of Liz's passing late last week.

While absorbing this, and knowing that Liz is now at peace in that other place, whatever each of us believes that place to be, I was equally struck by the long, long list of addressees to whom the message had been sent: The Immigration Foreign Service Family.

I imagine many of you are there today, behaving much as other 'families' do—as we transition from the gatherings for weddings to the gatherings for funerals. Today is an occasion to greet and to remember times past, with laughter—combined with tears—as the inevitable tales get told, or retold.

And how is it that I, one of the younger generation (also known as the 1982 intake), know of this family? Well, it's very simple. As Liz took us (her last group) through the Act and Regs in early 1983 before she moved on to her new career as CAIPS guru, not only did she impart her knowledge of the legal niceties to us, but also instilled in us this sense of family cohesion, "all for one and one for all", to borrow from Dumas. Not to mention a few tales of escapades past that only served to whet our appetites for this new career we were then embarking upon. That sense of family endures to this day.

Those of us still working continue to benefit from what is one of Liz's lasting contributions—CAIPS. While she was not a programmer, she became the invaluable resource in its initial development and later roll-out and training abroad, where our local staff also have fond recollections of Liz's visits to their missions. My own introduction to CAIPS came one afternoon in the Fall of 1995 just before heading out to Vienna on TD: a true test of multi-tasking as Liz endeavoured to teach me something about it while we talked the afternoon away. More time was spent talking than teaching, of course—all credit is due to Liz that she could teach CAIPS survival skills while still networking. CAIPS' longevity gives new meaning to the expression "they don't make 'em like they used to"...

Liz kept track of a good many of us over the years, even while abroad for decades on end, to welcome us back whenever we showed up in HQ. I am one of the very lucky ones who continued to have a friendship with Liz over time and distance and beyond her retirement after only 37 years' of service.

I've known Liz for a few months short of 25 years and consider myself privileged to have had her friendship for this time. Rest in peace, Liz - you'll be missed.

—from Claudette Deschênes:

I remember Liz on that first morning in September 81, the first day of what would be a friendship that would last more than 25 years. Her best advice offered in the very first days of Act and Regs training had nothing to do about being a good officer but more about being a good person. She advised all of us to remember the most important people in the missions were the 'facilitators' not the 'bosses', for example the Head of Mission's secretary, the drivers, the administration support at the mission. Another sage piece of advice centered around remember to be nice to people as you never know who you might meet on your way down the "ladder". These are pieces of wisdom that have served many of us "young trainees" well.

My other reminiscence about Liz is that in those early 80s you could still smoke in the work environment and Liz used to start talking about the Act and Regs with a cigarette in her lips going up and down more quickly as she related this wonderful anecdote to help us learn our new jobs. I had a pet peeve about people who talked with a cigarette in their mouth and though for sure I would not be able to make it through the training and would soon be on the unemployment line. What to my surprise that Liz was always so entertaining and committed to our learning the ins and outs of the Act that most days I completely forgot her habit.

—from Tony DeKir

Liz was one of the first CIC officers that I came into contact

with as a new trainee in the summer of 1977 (can't believe it's that long ago!). Her dedication, her professionalism, and her extensive knowledge of the job were among the things that first stood out for me. She was always ready to help you and to offer sound advice.

But, over the years, and although I did not work extensively with Liz, nor can I claim to know her very well, it was something else that came to personify Liz for me above all: her wry sense of humour. This intuitive knowledge of people and therefore ability to apply fine humour to any situation is what I will remember about Liz.

—from Michael MacKenzie

Being assigned to the CAIPS team as a newby FS-1D was beneficial to me in many respects but none more so than gaining Liz's friendship and being able to learn so much from her. During our time in Ottawa and on many CAIPS installations abroad I never ceased to marvel at her knowledge of immigration and the FS community's history. She could tell you not only what the appropriate section of the Act or Regs was, but how it came to be that way. Her personal anecdotes were always interesting and she had countless amusing stories to relate. From Liz I gained an appreciation of the people of IR and their many accomplishments.

Her dedication to immigration was second-to-none. I shall miss her but always be grateful for having her as a friend and mentor.

—from Susan Burrows

Liz was a mentor to me and so many other foreign service immigration officers at a time when we did not have many women in that field. Her sense of humour, healthy dose of skepticism and kind advice was of great value to me in my career. I missed her very much when she retired but I knew that she was pursuing life to the fullest.

—from Bill Farrell

Liz was a friend, indeed a mentor, to many of my generation. Eager young pups who benefited enormously from Liz's insights, humour and uncanny ability to ensure we never lost sight of the human faces, the human side of our business.

She moulded, folded and despatched a great many of us, as we were prepared to be shipped off and to do the 'right thing', in so many far-flung corners of the globe. As such, I suggest part of Liz lives on through us, as were we her own progeny. After all, she did think of us as 'her' kids!

—from Joyce Cavanagh Wood

I met Liz in the fall of 1967 when she had the dubious pleasure of training that year's batch of recruits. We were a rowdy lot, very young (mostly), and just raring to get on with life.

Liz, in her calm way, drilled into us everything we needed to know about the Act and Regs, and coached us through those awful days when we doubted we would ever remember it all. She always had an example, a smile, a story to tell.

Then she had me for a repeat lesson in 1982, and still she remained unshakeable in her knowledge, and imaginative in the way she made us learn.

Over many years we would cross paths, as one does in our game, and she would always have a new story to tell, a funny tale of something that had happened in a far off place to one of her trainees/colleagues. I think she remembered us all fondly, but probably not as fondly as we remember her. Her smile and gentle voice will be with me always.

Anne Arnott wins APEX Career Contribution Award

CIHS board member Anne Arnott has been awarded the Association of Profession Executives' (APEX) prestigious Career Contribution Award for 2007. The citation of the award states:

Throughout her 32 year Public Service career, Anne Arnott has continuously demonstrated all the attributes of leadership. Currently Director General, International Region with Citizenship and Immigration, Anne is a role model in her commitment to promoting management excellence and professionalism. A team player, Anne leads employees by demonstrating respect, care and fairness at all times.

Supporting staff dealing with sensitive and challenging cases is just one area in which Anne shines. By coaching and nudging her staff, she is able to help them navigate the complex landscape and find solutions that uphold legal requirements, the integrity of Canada's visa program and account for the best interest of the individuals involved. She is well known by her colleagues for her empathy, tact and good humor, and as someone who is able to bring out the best in everyone. And she always manages these high-stress situations while maintaining her poise, confidence and wit.

Anne's commitment to client service and her ability to find workable solutions quickly, even in times of great stress, are yet other aspects of her exceptional leadership skills.

(www.apex.cg.ca)

Congratulations Anne!

It is interesting to note that in the Award's 12 year history this is the third time it has been awarded to someone from Immigration. Previous CIC winners include Joan Atkinson (2002) and Mike Molloy (2003). And, still within the broad immigration family, Jean-Guy Fleury of the Immigration and Refugee Board won in 2005.

Early 'Heads-up'

Please take note of the date proposed for the 2007 CIHS Annual General Meeting: Thursday, 22 November 2007. The usual notice and other details will be sent out in due time.