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Abstract
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For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2009

In 1947 the federal government of Canada began a program to move European Displaced Persons (DP) out of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) camps in Germany and Austria. This program, designed to fill chronic labour shortages in Canada’s resource industries and contribute to a solution for Europe’s refugee crisis, occurred in a transitional moment in Canadian society. Canadians emerged from World War Two with a new sense of Canada’s role in the world, but despite a changed international climate, a new discourse of human rights and a potentially robust economy, old perceptions of race, immigration and economic management lingered in the postwar years complicating the work of a new generation of civil servants, politicians and industry operators.

This is a history of the transition. It demonstrates the ways that old and new ideas of the nation, citizenship, race and immigration co-existed. It highlights the significance of the beginnings of a debate on the elimination of discrimination based on race in Canada’s immigration policy; shows the link between economic prosperity and popular support for immigration; and demonstrates the importance of individuals within industry, the civil service and in government in national decision-making.

This is an international history, spanning the Atlantic and bringing a global perspective to local experience in Canadian industries. Chapters on the federal decision making process are supplemented by evidence from the United Nations Relief and
Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), the IRO, the Ontario Ministry of Education and forestry, mining and hydro industries. It uses a variety of methodologies including policy history, oral history, public opinion polling, gender, ethnicity and labour studies to investigate the implications of these decisions for Canadian society.

It demonstrates that the 1947-1951 movement of DPs was initiated primarily under dual pressure from Canadians who had served abroad and industry leaders who had previously used POW labour to solve on going shortages in the bush. These decisions were strongly informed by both the crisis in Europe and Canadian assumptions about race, labour and citizenship. By examining the expectations Canadians had for the behaviour of its newest arrivals and future citizens this study highlights the foundations of Canadian citizenship in 1947: community participation, contribution to the development of the economy, and political loyalty to the nation.
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Preface

On September 13, 1947 the *General Stewart* docked in Halifax carrying 831 men, former Displaced Persons (DPs). Each had been selected by Canadian teams in Europe, screened, and offered contracts to work as pulpwood cutters in Canada for a period of ten months. Although many had family remaining in Europe and no real work experience in the pulp and paper industry, they were grateful for the work, the chance to settle in Canada and build a life for themselves and for those waiting for their turn to cross the Atlantic.

While most Canadians today could name someone in their acquaintance whose family was part of this postwar movement, few are aware of the conditions under which these agreements were considered, signed and implemented. While most Canadians understand that after the Second World War there was a huge expansion in immigration to the country, few are aware of the reasons why this was so. Why then? Why *these* immigrants?

This is a history of the details behind these decisions and most significantly, of the process of change that Canada and Canadians underwent in the years after the war. This is a history of Canada’s changing sense of itself, its citizens, and its role in the world between 1943 when postwar reconstruction planning began and 1953 two years after the programme to move DPs had been completed. It aims to approach these events from multiple perspectives: Canadian foreign policy; federal politics;

---

1 The term “DP” originally had a specific bureaucratic meaning discussed in some detail in Chapter One. In the years after their arrival in Canada, within Canadian society the term took on a pejorative meaning. Throughout this work I use the term with no intention of repeating the negative associations, but only to describe a particular class of refugee managed first by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) and after July 1, 1947 by the International Refugee Organization (IRO).
industrial management; provincial education policy; volunteerism, and ideally, from the perspective of some of the 160,367 individuals who arrived in Canada under this program.\(^2\)

In addition to approaching this programme from the vantage points of a variety of participants, this project also examines events within both a short and long term narrative of Canadian history. Chapter one, “And who is my neighbour?” looks at the importance of immigration and refugee policy for Canadians over the last one hundred years, and places postwar events firmly at the centre. This transitional period demonstrates the ways that old and new ideas of the nation, citizenship, race and immigration co-exist and complicate events. It highlights the significance of the beginnings of a debate on the elimination of discrimination based on race in Canada’s immigration policy; shows the link between economic prosperity and popular support for immigration; and demonstrates the importance of individuals within industry, the civil service and in government in national decision-making.

Once the long term significance of the discussions begun in this period have been laid out, Chapter Two will return to the wartime roots of the immigration-labour scheme. “Kanada” demonstrates that managers in Canada’s pulp and paper industry chose to solve acute wartime labour shortages through cooperation with the Department of Labour. In this case, the solution lay in the use of volunteer German Prisoner of War (POW) workers in the bush. Ongoing industry consultation with

Arthur MacNamara, the Deputy Minister of Labour, and officials from the National Employment Service (NES) made it possible for managers to keep production going despite the loss of Canadian men to the armed forces. These wartime managerial channels and experience with European labourers (the Germans) were critical to the postwar decision to bring DPs to Canada under labour contracts.

From these early discussions on the use of European labour we get a strong sense of the kinds of assumptions managers, civil servants and the Canadian public were making about race, ethnicity, and religion. Chapter Three, “The kind of people Canada wants” addresses these directly. This examination of the debates on Canada’s participation in immigration solutions to the postwar European refugee crisis reveals the boundaries assumed by members of the Department of Labour, the Immigration Branch, the Cabinet and members of the public of Canadian-ness. What groups were good “potential new Canadians”? What groups were “undesirable”? How were these categories and hierarchies of desirability changing in a new international framework of human rights?

The importance of the international context is reinforced in Chapter Four, “Full of the miseries of life in Europe.” To understand the decision of DPs to come to Canada and the pressures on government to allow the entry of refugees fully we must see the way life was lived in Germany in the immediate postwar years. This chapter will therefore address both general living conditions in the postwar DP camps and the

---

3 MacNamara was born in Toronto in 1884. He joined the Manitoba civil service in 1914, served in the Royal Flying Corps, later the RAF, between 1916-1919 and returned to Manitoba after the war. There he was instrumental in organizing relief for workers during the Great Depression. He moved to the federal civil service in 1940 and was appointed Acting Unemployment Insurance Commissioner in 1940. He received his law degree in 1944, from the University of Manitoba. From 1943-1953 he was the Deputy Minister of Labour.
experience of moving through the selection and boarding process. Along the way DPs had their first Canadian experiences and began to learn what Canadians expected of them in their new lives.

Chapter five “Operation DP” and Chapter six “The great privilege of the Canadian way of life” demonstrate the two elements that were central to Canadian understandings of the DPs’ potential for good citizenship: labour and knowledge. Fulfillment of the labour contract was explicitly used as a measure of a former DPs’ worth as a potential Canadian citizen and was presented to them as such. The legal and social contracts are discussed in these chapters in the context of the Canadian Citizenship Act (1946) and the debates that surrounded it. Examining the praise heaped on “successful” new Canadians and the scorn for others who failed in some way to live up to expectations is an excellent way to assess Canadian conceptions of citizenship during this time. In addition, local sources on work and study provide us with a sense of the day to day struggles and priorities of the former DP in Canada.
I – Introduction: “And who is my neighbour?”

If we compare Canadian policy responses to refugees before and after the Second World War we can see at least two significant shifts. The first is the use of humanitarian criteria in consideration for entry to Canada. Prior to the war, while allowing for the settlement of individuals and groups facing persecution in their homelands, applicants were required to meet the standards set by Canada's general immigration policy. There was no separate category of refugees based on humanitarian need. Groups like the Mennonites and Doukhobors negotiated with the government on the specifics of entry, bloc settlement, and wartime exemptions; however, they first had to convince officials that they would be “desirable” as settlers under the accepted immigration legislation.

The second shift occurring during this time was the opening of debate on the benefits of and the means to find an end to discriminatory policies based on race and religion. Existing assumptions and prejudices held by Canadian society in general, and government officers specifically about the talents, skills and potential of particular groups were significant factors in immigration decisions before the war. This was most obvious in policies such as the Chinese head tax and the government's refusal to allow for the entry of Jewish refugees in the 1930s. However, these assumptions about who Canada’s settlers should be were under growing pressure.

---

1 Thanks to the members of the Trinity College SCR, particularly to Stephen Waddams and Bruce Bowden, for the discussion which led to the choice of this title. This quotation comes from The Bible, King James Version, Luke 10:25-30. It precedes the story of the Good Samaritan and demonstrates the difficulty people sometimes have accepting responsibility for giving aid to those who are different or distant. Thanks also to Robert Bothwell, Jean Daudelin, Jeff Kilpatrick, Janine Rivière, Carla Hustak, Cara Spittal and the other authors who attended the writers’ workshop for their comments on early versions of the draft.

2 One might even characterize the post-war changes as a movement away from ministerial and bureaucratic discretion towards standardized immigration criteria and review processes.
Individuals working in new arenas of international politics; anti-Nazi and anti-communist ideology; and domestic calls for humanitarian aid and economic development combined to force an expansion in the pool of potential “new Canadians.” These changes are linked directly to both events in the period such as the growing importance of multilateralism in international affairs; a discourse of humanitarian rights coming out of the experience of the war; growing cold war fears; and long term trends in Canadian immigration policy.

In 1977, Gerald Dirks convincingly argued in *Canada’s Refugee Policy* that we have been open to refugees only when it suited us.\(^3\) Gallup poll data between 1949 and 2001 show that Canadians have rarely ranked immigration, or indeed refugee acceptance, as a national priority over the last sixty years. Not surprisingly, this has been particularly true in times of economic downturn.\(^4\) That this was the case during the Great Depression of the 1930s – admittedly before polls but with plenty of evidence – is especially unsurprising. Canadian historians have frequently remarked over the past thirty or forty years on the fact that mixed with economic fear was racial or ethnic prejudice. Even the prosperous Canada that came into existence after 1945 shows that there remains a correlation between prosperity, or the lack of it, and the nation’s receptivity to strangers. And yet the second half of the twentieth century was marked by significant waves of immigration begun by a movement of refugees in the years after World War II.


\(^4\) I surveyed the CIPO Gallup materials between 1949 and 2001 available online at Carleton University, paying particular attention to data on immigration and refugee programs. See below for more detail. [http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/pop_gallup.html](http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/pop_gallup.html)
So why is the idea that we are by nature a haven for the persecuted so strongly rooted? What experiences as a nation have convinced us that this is so? Despite moments when public fears of high costs, social disruption, and economic strain might have stalled refugee assistance, the influence of key individuals has kept the issue of refugee need on the table. More bluntly, officials, civil servants and politicians, backed by Canada’s foreign policy public, and sustained by a disciplined and centralized political system in some cases succeeded in opening Canada’s doors to large numbers of people seeking a new start. These moments of refugee acceptance have made a huge impact on Canadian society and how we view ourselves.

While there have been many waves of migration to these shores, none were officially “refugees” by immigration status until Canada ratified the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees in 1969. If we adopt a general rather than legal definition of “refugees,” persons seeking political as well as economic security have been coming to these shores since the United Empire Loyalists in 1783. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, there were Doukhobors and Mennonites from tsarist Russia and the new Soviet Union, seeking a life farther from political turmoil. There were some unofficial refugees, especially Jews, from Europe in the 1930s. However, the first mass refugee wave to Canada in the twentieth century was arguably the movement of DPs after World War Two.

Immigration histories point to the arrival of the DPs as crucial to two changes in Canadian society. First, it contributed to the further development of a multi-ethnic Canada through sheer numbers. Relatively quick shifts in the religious and ethnic make up of Canada’s cities were considerable. Further, the arrival of this wave and
the ones that followed created a growing awareness of ethnic difference. Few historians, with the exception of Gerald Dirks and Milda Danys, have looked in depth at the decision to allow for their entry and the conditions under which the Canadian government made this commitment. An examination of the documents related to this decision reveals that although domestic economic issues were critical to making this movement of DPs possible, the role of individuals working within a larger international community of interests is critical to understanding the tidal change under way. For this reason, a study of the creation of refugee policy in Canada in the emerging postwar international context receives a fair amount of emphasis in this story of the arrival of the DPs.

Michael Marrus' work, *The Unwanted*, convincingly argues that although people had been displaced by war or persecution for centuries, the European refugee crisis of the 1930s and 1940s was a largely new phenomenon, as great numbers of refugees were unable to return to their place of origin and found themselves permanent outsiders in the receiving societies. As a result, for the first time, argues Marrus, there was a need for an internationally coordinated response to a refugee crisis. In the case of Canada, we have in this crisis a pivotal moment when national and international interests came together and transformative policy making was the result. The case of the decision to accept DPs from Europe after the war will

---

7 I am grateful to Greg Donaghy for his comments during the Authors' Meeting on the importance of these intersections of national and international policy.
demonstrate how Canada's approach to refugees was shifting and provided a basis for developments in policy in the years after 1950.

Put simply, between 1906 and 1943 Canada’s response to immigration, including the entry of those displaced by politics, war, or disasters, was increasingly restricted. The years after World War Two saw the rise of a new generation of officials and an immense growth in Canadian willingness to consider the entry of refugees in a process independent of existing immigration requirements. This culminated in Canada’s recognition of the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees in 1969. Subsequently, in the late 1970s and 1980s Canada was widely considered an exemplary international citizen, allowing for the entry of more than 60,000 refugees from Indochina. Most recently, while Canadians generally consider refugee relief to be an important part of our national culture, the post-11 September world of economic crisis, increased security, and scrutiny, has created a context in which some groups have ceased to be considered worthy ‘neighbours’ and the process of inclusion seems to face resistance.  

This thesis will argue that an important policy transition occurred in the years between 1937 and 1951 that continues to shape the Canadian sense of nation today. During the wartime and post-war years Canada struggled with the issue of European refugees and began to devise a strategy for non-discriminatory immigrant selection process for the movement of DPs after the war. Canada began to consider the implementation of a refugee strategy based on humanitarian need outside of the standard immigration regulations, and it began to consider selection criteria based on

---

factors other than race. The following chapters will explore this time of transition and the role that officers of the external affairs department played in bringing their international perspective to the issue.

Over the last one hundred years we have seen considerable changes in Canadian assumptions about the nation's role in the international community; the "preferred" immigrant; and how the government should maximize any benefits accruing to Canada from immigration. What has remained, however, is the underlying assumption that immigration is only positive when it does not reduce the standard of living of established Canadians.

In 1909, Methodist minister and future leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) party in Canada, J.S. Woodsworth, published an eclectic collection of materials under the title *Strangers Within Our Gates, or, Coming Canadians*. He was writing at a time when Canadians were reacting to the perceived difficulties arising from the relatively open immigration policies of Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Clifford Sifton (Minister of the Interior, 1896-1905). The rising numbers of southern and eastern European immigrants were shocking to a society that defined itself largely as Anglo and Protestant (with the obvious exception of Quebec). Winnipeg, where Woodsworth worked, had become the epicentre of the movement of these migrating people. He was therefore at the centre of debate about how best to reduce the negative impact of the arrival of so many struggling settlers.
While sympathetic to the plight of the poor immigrants starting a new life in Canada, the tone of this work is largely fearful. The author feared a wave of immigrants who were unable to integrate into Canadian society. From his perspective those who would preserve different habits of behaviour and thought were not only "non-ideal" but should be excluded entirely if possible. "We, in Canada, have certain more or less clearly defined ideals of national well-being. These ideals must never be lost sight of. Non-ideal elements there must be, but they should be capable of assimilation. Essentially non-assimilable elements are clearly detrimental to our highest national development, and hence should be vigorously excluded."9

His fears of difference, disease, poverty, and political disruption reflect those of a significant portion of Anglo-Canadian society in general at this time towards those fleeing European unrest. Not only did the Canadian government not recognize these people as refugees with a just humanitarian claim for entry into the country, but after 1906 when Canada gained a new immigration minister, Frank Oliver, they were faced with an increasingly restrictive immigration policy altogether.10 The 1906 Immigration Act began what became known as a "White Canada Immigration Policy"11 and a process of exclusion by legislation culminating in March 1931 with an Order-in-Council, P.C. 695. This cabinet order restricted immigration to individuals in four categories. "1. British subjects from the United Kingdom, Ireland, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia or the Union of South Africa, who possessed

---

10 For more on Frank Oliver and immigration policy, see Knowles, Strangers at Our Gates, 79-89.
11 For more on the White Canada Immigration Policy and the comparable policy in Australia, see Freda Hawkins, Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989), 3-41.
sufficient means to maintain themselves until employment was secured. 2. United
States citizens, similarly possessed of means and maintenance. 3. Wives, unmarried
children under 18, or fiancees (sic) of men resident in Canada. 4. Agriculturists with
sufficient means to farm in Canada. 12

This isolationist approach reached its nadir in 1938-39 when, despite vigorous
lobbying efforts, the Government of Canada disallowed the entry of Jewish
refugees. 13 In 1938-39 Canada turned down request after request for the entry of
Jewish refugees from Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia. These refusals were
justified under the existing immigration regulations and strongly influenced by
Canadian assumptions about Jewish immigrants. In addition, attempts to liberalize the
regulations were further constrained by fears of economic hardship and
unemployment. Canada was still in the throes of the Great Depression; these refugees
were not agriculturists and they had no means to support themselves because of the
confiscation of their property by the German government. It was therefore an
unfortunately simple thing for the Immigration Branch to deny these refugees entry.

During 1942, at the height of World War II, only 7,576 immigrants of any
type were admitted to the country. 14 Many emigrants found themselves without
proper documentation and even those who had transit visas and passports found that it
had become virtually impossible for civilians to find passage on trans-Atlantic
crossings. This exclusionary approach to immigration continued until the pressures of
wartime dislocation in the 1940s became acute, Canada re-examined its commitment

---

12 Cited by Prime Minister King in his 1947 immigration policy statement to the House of Commons
13 Irving Abella and Harold Troper, “‘The Line Must be Drawn Somewhere’: Canada and Jewish
Refugees, 1933-1939,” in Canadian Historical Review 60, no. 2 (June 1979): 178-209.
14 Dirks, Canada’s Refugee Policy, Appendix A, 260.
to international action, and a growing discourse on human rights made refugee claims on humanitarian grounds an increasingly important category for consideration.

Under domestic pressure to find homes for Jews escaping from Europe, the American government invited a large group of nations to convene at Evian, France in July, 1938 in order to discuss refugee resettlement. While concrete solutions were few, the conference did establish the London based Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR) which was intended to assist

…persons who [had] not already left their country of origin…but who must emigrate because of their political opinions, religious beliefs, or racial origins, and, persons so defined who [had] already left their country of origin but who [had] not yet established themselves elsewhere.  

Despite its endorsement of the aims of Evian, Canada failed to open its doors to refugees in 1938. A continuing sense that Canadians were unwilling to accept changes in the country’s demographic profile, such as would occur with mass Jewish immigration, made Mackenzie King wary of an open door policy. Nevertheless, international efforts to allow the emigration of European Jews were beginning to change the attitudes of at least some policy makers towards a humanitarian category for immigration; Ottawa reluctantly but steadily followed this trend. Participation on international committees gave Canadian bureaucrats like Humphrey Hume Wrong, Canada’s permanent delegate to the League of Nations and its representative at Evian, an international perspective on the crisis and made it more difficult to ignore in Ottawa.

It was complicated for the Canadian government, as participants in the IGCR, to refuse to participate in efforts to solve the crisis by opening its doors to European

---

15 Quoted in Dirks, 48.
16 Dirks, 57.
refugees during and after the war. As early as 1943, after the Bermuda Conference on Refugees, Great Britain expressed concern about Canada's restrictive immigration policies. Britain claimed that since Canada had such a vast territory, it should agree to accommodate more refugees than the already heavily burdened nations of Europe.17

On 29 July 1943, the British Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, Clement Attlee, sent Mackenzie King a proposed draft from the United States government on the question of refugees. It praised those states that had accepted refugees whose "lives and liberty are in danger on account of their race, religion or their political beliefs." It also highlighted the urgency of the problem and significantly it noted that:

It cannot be expected that these [neutral] countries [of Europe], some of which are already overcrowded, should maintain these people for an indefinite period. The above mentioned Governments [Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, USSR, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia] hereby declare that they will, at the termination of this war, admit to their territories all their nationals who may have been displaced by the war into other countries.18

Canada's allies recognized both the immediate crisis and the necessity for countries like the United States and Canada, which had space and resources, to become receiving countries after the war in light of the burden already carried by European powers.

There was no doubt in the minds of any observers that this was a crisis on an unprecedented scale. Reports from the "Allied agencies" and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in September 1945 put the number of

17 Dirks, 93. Dirks quotes the British Foreign Office on the issue; "The absorptive capacity accessible to neutral countries in Europe seems to be approaching its limit. Allied countries cannot very well go on exhorting these countries not to turn back any refugees without offering cooperation in accommodating a portion of them."
18 Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Mackenzie King Correspondence, mfm C-7044, 303523-4, 29 July 1943, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs to Secretary of State for External Affairs, Canada.
refugees and displaced persons under their care at more than 6,795,000 people.\textsuperscript{19} When added to the number of refugees in the Soviet zone of Germany and the millions of displaced Germans – systematically expelled from east-central Europe in 1945-6 -- the number is staggering. It was an international priority, and, as good citizens in the post-war international community, Canadians were expected to take part in creating solutions.

R.G. Riddell, a member of external affairs since 1942 and the head of UN affairs from 1946, concluded publicly in August 1946 that it was an "international responsibility, not only to find new homes for them but to provide at least some of the rights granted ordinary citizens."\textsuperscript{20} Riddell, later represented Canada as his nation’s permanent ambassador to the UN in 1950-1. As Canada was one of the twenty-member UN committee investigating a possible international refugee organization which met in London from April to June 1946\textsuperscript{21}, it would be embarrassing for the nation, and especially for Canadian diplomats like Riddell, if Canada continued to support the UN’s efforts without providing immigration opportunities.

Although difficult to measure, one cannot help but conclude that this generation of officials, having spent more time abroad than their predecessors and having worked extensively with their foreign counterparts during the war and immediately after might have brought a new, more international, perspective to decision making in Canada. Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray’s work on the role of Canadians in UNRRA has shown clearly that returning UNRRAIDs, as the

\textsuperscript{21} Dirks, 108.
UNRRA staff were called, worked actively and directly to encourage the federal government to act on behalf of DPs waiting in Europe.  

In addition to their roles in UNRRA, Canadians abroad represented a variety of other bodies; External Affairs, the Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organization (PCIRO) and the Canadian Military Mission in Berlin. All of these organizations faced the increasingly obvious need for a solution to the crisis. 1.4 million European refugees, who had refused repatriation, sat in DP camps administered by UNRRA and the allied occupation forces. Each required housing, feeding and permanent homes.

John Holmes, the first secretary at Canada House in London between 1944 and 1947 and Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow in 1947-8, was a vocal witness to events in Europe. In the summer before he was stationed in Moscow he travelled with C.D. Howe, who among his other responsibilities was Acting Minister of Mines and Resources (and therefore immigration), to inspect several DP camps in Germany. Holmes remarked on both the difficult conditions in Germany and his impressions of the DPs. He seemed both concerned for their continued well-being and impressed by the quality of the lives DPs had managed to build up until this point under trying circumstances. "It was astonishing how the D.P.'s (sic), many of them obviously persons of distinction, managed to preserve their dignity, even when their handiwork

---

was being shown off by our American guide as if it were the surprising product of a kindergarten.”

He later set out his retrospective concerns about the refugee crisis in *The Shaping of Peace*. This account from his viewpoint in external affairs is unambiguously critical of the resistance from the Immigration Branch to opening Canada's doors to refugees immediately after the war.

Within the civil service the facts of life, including the conservatism of the cabinet on population policies, were recognized as setting limits to policy proposals, even though External Affairs officials in particular were aware of the handicap placed on their vision of the country by Canada's insensitivity to the plight of refugees, its archaic immigration regulations, and the racism clearly evident in practice. External Affairs battered vigorously against what they regarded as the defensive mentality entrenched in the Immigration Branch, sought to warn the cabinet of the desperate realities they saw in Europe, and to encourage an imaginative approach to a population policy for Canada.

There is a great deal of correspondence between the Department of Labour, External Affairs and the Immigration Branch that backs up Holmes’ observations. Officers of the Department of Labour were frequently equally critical of the limited approach of the Immigration Branch. Holmes, officers of the Department of Labour in Germany, and other Canadians stationed abroad after the war were perhaps more aware of the humanitarian issues at stake than those manning the offices of the Immigration Branch in Ottawa. It is possible that discussions with other international diplomats and trips through Germany such as Holmes made with C.D. Howe in 1947

---

24 Trinity College Archives, John Holmes – Memoirs (General), Box 74 E/II/7, 21 August 1947. Thanks must go to Adam Chapnick for providing me with this reference.
brought a special urgency to the crisis and a certain embarrassment about Canada’s old-fashioned parochialism. It is clear that the trip made a lasting impression on Holmes and that he and other officers of the Department of External Affairs brought this perspective to discussions of policy.\textsuperscript{27}

Responding to what must have been becoming a more common accusation of discrimination in the Immigration Branch's policy, a confidential memo to the Department of Labour candidly defends the Immigration Branch's approach.

The claim is sometimes made that Canada's immigration laws reflect class and race discrimination: they do, and necessarily so. Some form of discrimination cannot be avoided if immigration is to be effectively controlled. In order to prevent the creation in Canada of expanding non-assimilable (sic) racial groups, the prohibiting of entry to immigrants of non-assimilable races is necessary. Many organizations have passed resolutions urging "selective immigration." The term is so general that it can be applied to mean almost anything from near exclusion to an extremely wide range of immigrant classes. Certainly it is not possible to have selective immigration on the one hand and no discrimination on the other. The very act of selection results in discrimination.\textsuperscript{28}

This tension between branches of the Canadian government seems to be, in part, a function of a changing sense of what the term "discrimination" meant. There was a growing sense (especially among Canadians in External Affairs like Riddell and Holmes, and in ethnic and religious organizations) that a rejection based solely on race or, in the case of Jewish applicants, religion, was not acceptable in a world that

\textsuperscript{27} See also LAC, RG2, v. 83, Privy Council Office – Immigration, I-50-2, 5 December 1946, Norman Robertson forwards correspondence from a Latvian logger interested in employment in Canadian industry to the Canadian Government. Robertson endorses his request based on the “favourable impressions of the Balts formed by Canadian officials who have had the opportunity of visiting Displaced Persons camps…”

\textsuperscript{28} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy - Confidential Memorandum re Immigration – Department of Mines and Resources, 5 September 1945. The Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy included representatives from the departments of Mines and Resources, Agriculture, Labour and the Secretary of State. A.L. Jolliffe was the Director of Immigration and functioned under the Department of Mines and Resources.
had just defeated Nazism.\textsuperscript{29} And yet the maintenance of deeply rooted ethnic and religious stereotypes in Canada (and elsewhere) provided rationalizations for either rejecting applications for immigration outright, or restricting members of particular groups to specific occupations. The Immigration Branch official who penned this memo was unable (or unwilling) to consider the more difficult question of how to formulate a policy that would both benefit Canadians and would evaluate potential immigrants according to a set of criteria that, as much as possible, could be said to avoid arbitrary decisions based on ethnic origin.

He was not alone. In this transitional period race and ethnic origins remained a critical element in discussions of suitability despite attempts to move away from “discrimination.” In May 1947, H.L. Keenleyside, the Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, wrote to Laurent Beaudry, the Acting Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, with some recommendations for the treatment of DPs. This memo, more than any other document, shows the convergence in 1947 of Canada's domestic needs and an opening for action abroad. Delays in the establishment of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) and in Congress in the passing of legislation required to allow for the passage of DPs to the United States opened up the possibility for Canada to appear as a leader on this issue and gain an opportunity to

\textsuperscript{29} For an extended discussion of the impact of UNRRA service abroad on individuals’ desire for change in Canada’s immigration laws and the lengths they went to communicate these ideas to policy makers, see Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray, \textit{Armies of Peace: Canada and the UNRRA Years} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 331-50. For Hume Wrong’s concerns about discrimination see LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy – 8 August 1946 – Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy (Chair-J.A. Glen) "Policy with respect to Refugees". For Mackenzie King’s fear on the UN reaction to “discrimination” in Canadian immigration policy see LAC, \textit{William Lyon Mackenzie King Diaries, 1893-1950}, MJ26-J13, 13 February 1947.
"select the D.P.'s (sic) in accordance with our own ideas as to who would be likely to make the best Canadian citizens."³⁰

This expression of Canadian intentions included a concern for the refugees "who continue to suffer" and the hope that Canada's actions would encourage "other countries to make an early contribution to the problem." There was also the very opportunistic hope to "have the satisfaction of being able to say that Canada was the first country to make any serious effort to contribute to a solution to this problem…" and that it "would enhance the reputation of Canadians as a humanitarian and practical people." In addition, Keenleyside expressed the hope that it would improve the optics domestically for Canadian immigration policy showing that "the Government is seriously interested in immigration and is acting effectively to obtain a good type of immigrant."³¹ While the former Allies sought solutions to the unprecedented refugee crisis, Canadians were considering ways to maintain and increase the nation’s new international stature. The assumption that wealthy, under-populated nations like Canada should contribute and Canada’s desire to lead on this issue came together in the DP scheme of 1947-1951.

Keeping the above context in mind it is easy to understand how a directed labour immigration project such as the movement of DPs could be relatively easy to defend politically in the late 1940s. Canadians could respond in keeping with their perceived “Christian duty,” while at the same time receiving assurances that the privations of the 1930s could be avoided. Canada could bend to internal and external pressure without accusations that the economy would not "absorb" refugee labour.

³⁰ LAC, W.L. Mackenzie King Correspondence, mfm c-11038, 386210-1. H.L. Keenleyside to Laurent Beaudry, Acting Under-Secretary for External Affairs, May 15, 1947, Ottawa.
³¹ Ibid.
since employment was guaranteed. It was a win-win situation from the perspective of the Department of Labour, woods operators and most refugees;\textsuperscript{32} Canada's resource industries could be expanded, Canada could hold its head up in international circles, and those displaced persons seeking to get as far away as possible from the Soviet Union and communism found work in the Canadian bush.

Forest industry representatives had been actively working with the Department of Labour during the war in the movement of POWs to the bush, and the same organizations began to press the federal government to allow for the immigration of DPs in a scheme based on the model used for the settlement of Polish Veterans during 1946. If they could not have Germans because of the continued restriction on the immigration of "enemy aliens" (this restriction on Germans was removed in 1950), they would press for woods workers from among the Baltic DPs, who had been sending requests to the Ontario Forest Industries Association and others.

This plan was all the more attractive because of the surprisingly low level of general unemployment in 1945 and the high demand for woods labour. Department of Labour officials were pleasantly surprised to find that the anticipated level of unemployment did not occur. In their estimation this was because women were leaving the workplace to “return to their homes”; a significant number of retirees had

\textsuperscript{32} This is not to say that this scheme was seen to be universally positive by Canadians. The Department of Labour received a significant number of official complaints from a variety of unions about this practice and from individual Canadians who felt that the federal government was taking jobs away from "our boys" by assisting in the immigration of displaced persons. In addition, although most cases were declared "successful," reports of immigrants who faced significant social, physical or mental health challenges do exist in the administrative files of the Immigration Labour Committee of the Department of Mines and Resources, Immigration Branch. LAC, RG26, v. 72. More on the contemporary criticisms of the program will follow in future research.
left the workplace; and an unexpected number of plants were successfully converted to civilian production.  

International context coincided with perceived domestic needs: a humanitarian impulse; labour requirements; resource development; and a relatively sparse population over a large area. Railway and resource industry representatives, ethnic lobby groups, and religious organizations, were already pressing for changes in Canada's "non-immigration" policy in 1946.  

In April 1946 immigration was front and centre in the House of Commons. W. Ross Thatcher, the CCF MP for Moose Jaw (and future Liberal Premier of Saskatchewan), proposed a bill to the House on "Immigration Planned in Relation to Absorptive Capacity, Economic Need and Development Possibilities." Although Thatcher's bill naturally did not pass, immigration was on the table. Around the same time the previously dormant Senate standing committee on immigration and labour (May 1946-1953) was revived with a mandate to inquire into the possibility of amendments to the Immigration Act, its administration and "a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, b) the type of immigrant which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to..."

---


34 This idea of a “non-immigration Act” comes from the report of the Senate standing committee on immigration and labour. Canada, *Journals of the Senate of Canada*, Wednesday, 14th August 1946, 497. For discussions of the various groups putting pressure on the federal government in this period see Dirks, 60-71 and Howard Margolian, *Unauthorized Entry: The Truth about Nazi War Criminals in Canada, 1946-1956* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 70-82.

absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission.\textsuperscript{36}

Many groups were invited to present their opinions to the Senate Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour after it was reconvened in 1946. In the first year these included representatives of Ukrainian, Polish, Finnish and Jewish organizations as well as speakers from the Department of Mines and Resources, Canada’s railways, labour unions, Canadian National Committee on Refugees and the Cunard White Star Line.\textsuperscript{37}

Initially authorities could point to shipping shortages as the reason Canada could not open its doors wide to refugee immigrants, but once Canada’s armed forces had largely returned and shipping was freed up for civilian transport, the question could not be avoided any longer. The cabinet committee on immigration policy, chaired by J.A. Glen, the Minister of Mines and Resources and chair of the cabinet committee on immigration policy, saw "it was a matter of some urgency" to formulate a new immigration policy by March 1946.\textsuperscript{38}

Although R.G. Riddell was aware of the humanitarian need for assisted immigration to Canada, he presented the cabinet committee on immigration with a limited proposal. He started small, asking only that the alien husbands of Canadian women and European orphans be considered since they "would make good immigrants."\textsuperscript{39} The Committee agreed to this. A subsequent memo to Arthur

\textsuperscript{36} Canada, \textit{Journals of the Senate of Canada}, Wednesday, 14 August 1946, 492.
\textsuperscript{37} Canada, \textit{Journals of the Senate of Canada}, Wednesday, 14 August 1946, 492-3.
\textsuperscript{38} Also present were other members of the cabinet committee on immigration policy; J.G. Gardiner, the minister of agriculture, H. Mitchell the minister of labour, P. Martin the secretary of state and A.L. Jolliffe, who ran the immigration branch of the ministry of mines and resources.
\textsuperscript{39} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy – 26 March 1946, 4.
MacNamara\textsuperscript{40} acknowledged that the committee's decision to begin with relatives was a way of avoiding the increasingly thorny issue of race.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite awareness of the problems in Europe, immigration and ethnicity were long standing, significant, and often potentially volatile issues for Canadians at home. Mackenzie King had seen the potentially divisive, sometimes violent effects of racism and immigration policy during his time as deputy minister of labour between 1900 and 1909\textsuperscript{42} and as prime minister, he was even less inclined to open pandora’s box without great consideration. While British and American immigrants were welcome neighbours, being “our own,” there was more antagonism towards other groups.\textsuperscript{43} In April 1946 the \textit{Ottawa Evening Citizen} published data from a Gallup poll. In response to the question "Would you like to see a large number of people from the European continent migrate to Canada or not?" 61% chose "no". Only 21% were in favour of increased European immigration and 10% gave a "qualified" yes. Furthermore, the article reported that among the qualifications presented by responders was "that the immigration should be carefully selected" and that no immigration should occur until "unemployment is overcome and our veterans are settled."\textsuperscript{44} In answer to the question "From what countries would you particularly like to see these people come?" the \textit{Ottawa Evening Citizen} reported that

\textsuperscript{40} For more on the life of Arthur MacNamara see the Preface, 1.
\textsuperscript{41} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy– 27 March 1946, Harry Hereford forwards the minutes of the March 26, 1946 meeting to A. MacNamara with a memo stating that "This method of handling the matter keeps away from dealing with racial groups and also will not necessarily increase the shelter problem."
\textsuperscript{42} W.L. Mackenzie King was sent to Vancouver in the wake of the 1907 riots to investigate compensation for those Chinese merchants whose property had been damaged by the angry mob.
\textsuperscript{44} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy– clipping from the Ottawa Evening Citizen, 24 April 1946, "Plurality Vote Against British Immigration."
"Scandinavian countries headed the list by quite a margin. Holland and France were second and third respectively, with Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, 'the Balkans', Russia and Ukraine finishing in that order."\(^{45}\)

Canadian opinions about immigration and ethnic "preferences" were taken into consideration by the Department of Labour and the cabinet committee on immigration policy in their deliberations about a DP labour scheme. Industry representatives were consulted specifically as to their preferences and reports from Europe included extensive discussions about the relative merits of various groups.

There was ongoing debate in the cabinet and in the House about the means of maintaining selectivity without resorting to discrimination. J.A. Glen, told the House that "When it is suggested in an editorial that there should be selective immigration, and in the next breath that there should be no discrimination, then I venture to say to those who are making the suggestions that I do not see how we can have selective immigration without discrimination."\(^{46}\)

Eventually the international context intervened in the domestic debate and Canada's participation in the UN General Assembly and Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) forced the cabinet committee on immigration policy to take action to ensure the formulation of a clear, defensible position. It could not be put off any longer since, as H. Hume Wrong, now Canada’s new ambassador to the United States, reminded the committee, in a matter of weeks "Canadian delegations…would

\(^{45}\) Ibid. It should be noted that at the time it was a relatively common error to mistake 'the Balkans' for the Baltics. There are even cases of government officials in the Department of Labour making this mistake. Therefore we might assume that when some Canadians reported they supported immigration from 'the Balkans' they may in fact have supported immigration from the Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

be called upon to discuss the question of Canada's attitude to the refugee problem" and the UN organization was not going to look kindly on policies based on racial or other discriminatory categories.\(^{47}\)

On 14 August 1946, after months of investigation, the Senate standing committee on immigration and labour submitted its report and recommendations. In addition to general agreement that “as a humane and Christian nation” it was important for Canada to “do her share towards the relief of refugees and displaced persons,” the situation was also considered “urgent” in order for Canada “to hold [its] place abroad and maintain and improve [its] standard of living at home.”\(^{48}\) The Committee concluded that it was generally agreed "that immigrants should be admitted, subject to the qualification that immigrants should be carefully selected and that admissions should not exceed the number which [could] be absorbed from time to time without creating conditions of unemployment, reducing the standard of living or otherwise endangering the Canadian economy."\(^{49}\)

Significantly, despite the committee’s agreement that immigrants should be "carefully selected,” it also added the warning that “[a]ny suggestion of discrimination based upon either race or religion should be scrupulously avoided both in the Act and in its administration…” Yet even here, discrimination against Asian immigration seems to remain acceptable “being based, of course, on problems of absorption.”\(^{50}\)

\(^{47}\) LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour – 8 August 1946 – Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy (Chair-J.A. Glen) "Policy with respect to Refugees." For Mackenzie King’s fear on the UN reaction to “discrimination” in Canadian immigration policy see LAC, William Lyon Mackenzie King Diaries, 1893-1950, MJ26-J13, 13 February 1947.

\(^{48}\) Canada, Journals of the Senate of Canada, Wednesday, 14 August 1946, 494.

\(^{49}\) Canada, Journals of the Senate of Canada, Wednesday, 14 August 1946, 493-4.

\(^{50}\) Canada, Journals of the Senate of Canada, Wednesday, 14 August 1946, 497.
Action on immigration in the cabinet and support from Canadians in general was therefore possible in 1946-47, even on humanitarian grounds, only with the promise that it would be stopped if Canada faced an economic crisis as it had in the years after World War One and during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Thus "absorptive capacity" and "selective immigration" were catch-all terms which could represent a range of approaches to immigration. Those who perceived certain groups as "unassimilable" (sic) could argue for their exclusion using these concepts, and those who imagined mass immigration as a benefit to Canada could argue that its enormous size and natural wealth could allow for the "absorption" of a nearly limitless number of immigrants each year. Canadians were interested in aiding the humanitarian crisis, but not at the cost of reducing Canadians' standard of living. So while the international context is critical to understanding the course of events, domestic pressures created limits on the policy options selected.

Remarkably, despite Canada's closed door policy in 1942, between 1947 and 1951, Canada allowed for the entry of more than 160,000 DPs from ethnic groups that had previously been "non-preferred"; a significant change to a Canadian population of approximately twelve and a half million people in 1947. The arrival and successful integration (although significantly not always assimilation) of such a significant number of people in such a short time from areas outside Britain and the United States shifted Canadian identity again in profound ways, not the least of which was a new sense of Canada as refugee receiving nation. Canada and its government

---

generally received positive press for its role in finding solutions to the European refugee crisis. And despite the short duration and some local resistance from labour organizations and some veterans groups to the idea of living and working with “New Canadians,” the project was generally considered a grand success. The DPs became the latest chapter in the narrative of Canada's development and the face of Canada was changed. Most significantly, the increasing importance of a human rights discourse in the post-war years created an atmosphere in which the concept of discrimination and its implications was seriously debated and the humanitarian refugee was recognized in practice. Although anti-Semitism and racial discrimination continued, this opening of a debate in the area of immigration and refugee policy, even before the adoption of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was significant.

By 1948 when the United States got into the business of moving DPs to North America the Canadian program began to slow down. There were still workers to arrive and family members to join them, but the greatest force behind the movement (a chance for Canada to choose the “best” workers and to be a recognized leader) was gone. Those “hard core” DPs remaining in Europe were generally aged, infirm or ill, considered poor choices for a program looking to fill Ontario’s bush camps. We see here the limits to the humanitarian logic of the movement and the importance of the domestic pressures. Only those who needed help and were perceived to be potential contributors to the development of the economy (or were immediate family of a

53 Freda Hawkins, 60. Point 9 of the 1975 Green Paper includes the following statement; "The settlement of post-war immigrants alongside our founding cultures had been one of the most positive chapters in Canada's post-war history, and the Committee looked to immigration to continue to contribute to the economic, cultural and social well-being of the country…"
worker) were allowed to come to Canada in this program. Others would have to either remain in Europe or find assistance elsewhere from a variety of religious and ethnic organizations.\footnote{For the account of one family’s search for means to get to Canada outside of the Department of Labour program, see Modris Eksteins, *Walking since daybreak: a story of Eastern Europe, World War II, and the heart of our century* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999).}

In 1949 this strategy seemed to be paying off. Industrial development was keeping up with demand, particularly in the pulp and paper and timber industry, and Canadians did not seem to be overly concerned by the changes. A CIPO poll from May 1949 asking about Canadians’ priorities for the “post-election [June 1949] government” found that the issue front and centre for Canadians was housing; 20% of Canadians (both French and English speaking) who answered this question suggested housing, while only 1.3% listed immigration.\footnote{http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/doc/gllp-49-may187-doc. Accessed 10 June 2008.} In 1951 the same question resulted in 38.8% suggesting that the “cost of living” was the most important issue of the day. Only 1.0% listed immigration.\footnote{http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/doc/gllp-51-aug212-doc. Accessed 10 June 2008.} The numbers of immigrants may well have seemed acceptable in a society that faced unemployment rates in 1949 and 1951 of 2.8% and 1.9% respectively.\footnote{John W. P. Veugelers and Thomas R. Klassen, “Continuity and Change in Canada's Unemployment-Immigration Linkage (1946-1993),” *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, (1994, vol. 19 no.3): 358.}

In the meantime, the 1949 Department of Citizenship and Immigration act was passed and on 18 January, 1950 the Department of Immigration and Citizenship was established. Immigration was no longer closely tied to the department of mines and resources, but was run by its own minister, the Hon. Walter Edward Harris, lawyer, World War Two veteran, and Louis St. Laurent’s former parliamentary secretary.
The Canadian government was giving serious thought to its stand on immigration in 1951. Fearing a loss of its sovereign right to select whomever it deemed desirable and under what conditions, Canada declined to sign the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. Similarly, the 1952 Immigration Act maintained the status quo on immigration protecting the Canadian government’s right to decline applications "by reason of such factors as nationality, ethnic group, occupation, lifestyle, unsuitability with regard to Canada's climate, and perceived inability to become readily assimilated into Canadian society."\textsuperscript{58}

These stipulations seem to have had some resonance with the Canadian public based on the results of a February 1955 CIPO poll. Although quite a large number of Canadians polled declined to state a preference based on ethnicity, these two questions demonstrate that a significant number of Canadians were seeking to stop mass immigration and had preferences about the ethnicity of settlers. The first section of this question asked about whether the respondent wanted to see the population of Canada rise or stay about the same. 48.0% preferred a “smaller population”; 42.9% chose larger and 6.2% thought it was “about right”.\textsuperscript{59}

The second, for those who sought growth, was open ended (respondents could choose more than one answer and had to come up with the categories themselves) about the preferred origins of settlers. 53.3% did not answer the question; 20.4% chose “North East Europe”; 18.8% chose the United Kingdom; 7.4% had “no preference”; 4.2% wrote in some other European group; 2.9% Mediterranean; 2.7%

\textsuperscript{58} Quoted in Knowles, \textit{Strangers at Our Gates}, 138.
did not know; 2.3% suggested the United States; 1.3% Central Europe; 3.1% other; 0.4% Asia; 0.2% USSR and Ukraine.\textsuperscript{60}

Canada continued the debate on discrimination into the 1950s. Under pressure from its Commonwealth ties and under the influence of Lester Pearson, Canada signed agreements in 1951 with India, Pakistan and Ceylon to raise their annual quota of immigrants above those of other Asian groups.\textsuperscript{61} But as we saw in the 1955 CIPO survey, Canadians continued to demonstrate a very low preference for “Asian” immigration.

Valerie Knowles is correct that Canada's response to the 1956 Hungarian crisis “paved the way for immigration authorities to respond more quickly and with more flexibility to later refugee and ordinary immigration movements…”\textsuperscript{62} However it would be a mistake to ignore the importance of the experience of the DP movement, the importance of the cold war conflict, and the continued strength of the economy (the downturn was not until 1957) which made the Hungarian movement itself a viable plan. In the context of the now familiar cold war struggle with the Soviet Union, providing aid to this group of refugees was both obvious (Canada was now a nation concerned with humanitarian issues abroad and these refugees were the victims of communism) and utilitarian, since adding anti-communist voters and workers to the Canadian population was perceived to be politically and economically beneficial to the nation as a whole. In January 1957, 41.5% of Canadians polled


\textsuperscript{61} Knowles, 137.

\textsuperscript{62} Knowles, 142.
approved “Canada’s immigration policy;” 35.5% did not. In July 1959 after the economic slowdown, 29.9% of Canadians polled thought the country needed immigrants “at the present time” and 63.9% disagreed. And yet, in January 1960 when Canadians were polled about allowing 100 refugees with tuberculosis into the country in honour of World Refugee Year, 53% approved. At a time when most were against immigration in general, there was still strong support for this limited humanitarian act.

It was not long before some Canadians called for changes to this approach and Canada’s immigration law. Prime Minister John Diefenbaker included revisions to Canada’s immigration law and an end to discrimination in his 1957 election platform and in his call for a bill of rights.

In 1958 Ellen Fairclough became Diefenbaker’s Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and initiated a period of high activity in the department. On 19 January 1962 Canada’s new immigration regulations officially ended the use of racial categories as criteria for selection, although restrictions on Asian immigration remained until the 1967 "points system." This system aimed to remove race and ethnicity from the calculations altogether, replacing them with educational and occupational criteria.

In her analysis of the process of producing the 1962 regulations, the political scientist Freda Hawkins placed responsibility for change firmly at the feet of

66 Knowles, 146. For more on Ellen Fairclough, see also Ellen Louks Fairclough, Saturday's Child: memoirs of Canada’s first female cabinet minister (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).
Canada's bureaucracy rather than with popular agitation or parliamentary fiat. "This very important policy change was made not as a result of parliamentary or popular demand but because some senior officials in Canada, including [Dr. George Davidson the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration], rightly saw that Canada could not operate effectively within the United Nations, or in the multiracial Commonwealth, with the millstone of a racially discriminatory immigration policy round her neck." 67 Polling data from 1961 supports Hawkins’ conclusions, as 53.1% of Canadians polled supported continued restrictions on the “admission of non-whites;” although 35.7% called for fewer. 68 In the end, change occurred despite any resistance. Comparable changes occurred in Australia in 1973 and the United States in 1975. Clearly, then, the role of individuals within Canada’s bureaucracy continued to have a significant impact on policy making in this period.

We have seen that Canadians expressed strong opinions about race in both private opinion and public policy in the twentieth century. Civil servants, politicians, intellectuals and private citizens linked immigration policy with national development and population growth throughout, tending to want to shut the doors when times were tough. Nevertheless, the DPs were given a chance in 1947 to become new Canadians and they paved the way for further waves of immigration and refugee resettlement.

67 Hawkins, 39.
II – Kanada

“…everybody in Canada is now working for the government – and happily so, if the cause of freedom is to prevail.”

- Anonymous

In order to understand the administrative and economic origins of the 1947 decision to allow for the entry of DPs, we need to bear in mind that postwar policy had its origins in wartime. And, with a difference of only two or three years between them, postwar problems like labour shortages looked very much like those that had occurred during the war. We shall therefore first examine wartime solutions to labour shortages in the Canadian pulp and paper industry which was the first industry to embrace DPs in 1947. This industry was particularly hard hit by the combination of rising demand and declining availability of labour. Pulp and paper operators were desperate for workers and at the same time, the Department of National Defence (DND) was trying to house thousands of German POWs on behalf of Great Britain in increasingly unwieldy internment camps. In 1943 the federal government allowed for the possibility of using volunteer enlisted men from among the POWs to live and work in some of Canada’s pulp and paper camps. The operation was a boon to struggling woods operators and they developed a relationship with Arthur

---

1 Canada is spelled Kanada in German. For many German POWs, particularly those that worked in the bush near Fort William and Port Arthur, their experience of ‘Kanada’ as reflected in interviews, letters and the decision to return after 1950 was overwhelmingly positive. This chapter reflects that experience.

2 Thanks to the staff of the Thunder Bay Historical Museum Society Archive (TBHMS), particularly Jeff Sumner who put together the reference file on POWs during World War II and to Tory Tronrud who was so accommodating during my visit to Thunder Bay. John Wesley Dafoe Ed., Canada Fights: An American Democracy at War (New York City: Farrar and Rinhart, Inc., 1941) 115-6.

3 For the purposes of this paper, “internment camps” were the barbed-wire ringed barracks compounds set up to house POWs, usually separate from those which housed “enemy aliens.” “Work Camps” were those usually remote camps that housed POWs who were engaged in productive labour for a private company. For more on the internment of civilians, see Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perrin and Angelo Principe ed. Enemies Within: Italian and other internees in Canada and abroad. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).
MacNamara⁴ and the Department of Labour that would carry over into the postwar years when they would use these links to press for a new source of willing workers.

By February 1947 the Department of Labour was receiving unsolicited petitions from the Ontario Pulp and Paper and Lumbermen’s associations asking for permission to import labour from the Displaced Persons camps in Germany.⁵ These petitions were initiated, in part, by skilled DPs in the camps who had written to Canada’s professional organizations seeking employment. However, it must also be noted that these requests were made to a receptive woods industry in Ontario that had had a recent, positive experience with European labour-- the German POWs. This chapter will present the POW experience in Canada as well as document the wartime labour needs of Ontario’s Pulp and Paper and Lumber Industries. It will explore the relationship these enterprises had with the Department of Labour, and the conditions under which private companies agreed to use POW labour – all with the intention of demonstrating that the 1947 scheme to import Displaced Persons was one in a series of schemes supported by Ontario industries designed as another stop gap solution to the problem of labour shortages in the bush which had become acute as Canadians became increasingly urban and industrial.⁶

Canada’s wartime labour shortages are part of the well known story of conscription during the Second World War. No political, military or labour history of

---

⁴ For more on Arthur MacNamara, see page 3, n.3.
⁵ One example is found at Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Department of Labour, RG27 v. 277, 1-26-2-1, pt. 1, Administrative – Immigration – Lumber and Logging, 4 February 1947 – W.A.E. Pepler, Secretary-Manager, The Pulpwood Committee of the Pulp and Paper Industry of Canada, Montreal, writes to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour. For more, see Chapter Four.
Canada from 1939-1945 fails to mention the tension between those who encouraged mass volunteerism for the army and those who wished to maintain a strong work force at home since the debate became linked to the contentious issue of conscription for service abroad. One of the most extensive and best-documented accounts of this critical situation is C.P. Stacey’s *Arms, Men and Governments*. This foundational work on Ottawa’s management of the war effort concludes that the general manpower shortage, as a subset of the conscription problem, had become “a national problem of the most serious nature.”

The most recent and most specialized study of Canada’s wartime labour crisis and the government’s management of labour shortages is Michael D. Stevenson’s *Canada’s Greatest Wartime Muddle*. Stevenson’s primary goal in this study is demonstrating the *ineffectiveness* of the National Selective Service (NSS) as a solution for labour deficiencies. This exceedingly broad organization was mandated in March 1942 to begin the enormous task within the Department of Labour of efficiently mobilizing Canada’s civilian work force for war aims. No man between 17 and 45 years of age could leave employment that was considered vital to the war effort without the permission of an NSS officer. The NSS was given the network of local Unemployment Insurance Commission offices to organize their work.

Stevenson provides an excellent outline of the bureaucratic history of the NSS, its place in the wartime government, and background on some of the individuals

---


8 C.P. Stacey, *Arms, Men and Governments*, 397.
involved in its organization. The NSS is an important part of this story since it directed the movement of labour both during the war and in the later DP schemes. As will be argued later, it is not a coincidence that the same individual, Arthur MacNamara, was the Associate Deputy Minister of Labour and Director of the NSS from 1942, Vice Chairman of the National War Labour Board, and after 1943 the Deputy Minister of Labour. Moreover, it would be MacNamara who organized the DP migration in the late 1940s.

The story of Canada’s use of German POWs in forest work and agriculture in Quebec between 1940 and 1946 has been told by Martin F. Auger in *Prisoners of the Homefront.* Auger reviewed the international laws governing the treatment of POWs, he assessed Canada’s treatment of POWs and enemy aliens, and he demonstrated how the labour of these groups contributed to Canada’s war effort. He divided the war into two phases: the first, between 1940 and 1943, was primarily civilian in nature as those working were generally civilian internees; the second, between 1942 and 1946, used the labour of German military personnel -- under the supervision of the DND but directly managed by private companies in a variety of industries. This is the phase that this chapter will examine in the context of Ontario industries, since this is the phase that gave a variety of Ontario pulp and paper and lumber companies experience with using the Department of Labour as a possible storehouse for short term labour solutions.

Stevenson has questioned the claim that the NSS was an “efficient” organization that effectively addressed Canada’s wartime labour shortages. Because

---


10 Auger, 19.
the NSS was “fractured” or “decentralized” in general, the relationships between organizations like the Pulpwood Committee of the Pulp and Paper Industry of Canada and MacNamara that developed during the war were pivotal in the process of organizing temporary solutions to wartime shortages and later in pushing for the DP migration scheme. The NSS was a central component in the efforts of these industries to manage manpower in the period, if only because the individuals involved developed a habit of making requests for labourers.

The question of labour supply engaged politicians only from time to time. They established national goals, or needs, but they left the means to their civil servants. And among the civil servants, MacNamara was the key. His experience in the Manitoba civil service in managing unemployment during the Depression was directly applicable to his new role in the NSS.

Even before MacNamara took on the role of Director of the NSS in 1942, Canada was facing significant labour shortages. On the question of unemployment, Canada’s statistics are less firm than they should be, but one available measure of the availability of work during this time is the percentage of unemployed union members reported by Canada’s trade unions. In December 1939 11.4% of union members were unemployed. In 1940 this number dropped to 7.4%. By December 1943 it was a

---

11 Michael D. Stevenson, Canada’s Greatest Wartime Muddle: National Selective Service and the Mobilization of Human Resources during World War Two (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001) 2. By taking this stand Stevenson has argued against Granatstein, Hitsman and Neary who emphasize the importance of the NSS in the war effort.

12 LAC, Department of Labour, RG27 v. 277, 1-26-2-1, pt. 1, Administrative – Immigration – Lumber and Logging, 4 February 1947 – W.A.E. Pepler, Secretary-Manager, The Pulpwood Committee of the Pulp and Paper Industry of Canada, Montreal, writes to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour. The wartime regulations limiting the movement of labourers were lifted August 15, 1946 but pulpwood organizations continued to look to MacNamara and the National Employment Service for solutions. For more on the relationship between the National Employment Service (est. 21 December 1945) and the NSS, see Stevenson, 27, 33.

13 For a list of Ontario Companies employing POW labour in July 1945, see Appendix A.
remarkable 0.8%. This downward trend continued until the end of the war when it rose for the first time since 1938 to 1.4% in September 1945. It was 3.0% at the end of that year and dropped in 1946 to 1.5%.\textsuperscript{14} This tells us that in unionized industries like forestry and mining there was essentially full employment in the years between 1942 and 1946 and therefore the task of filling relatively unattractive work in the remote bush camps was not simple. The job became even more difficult at the end of the war, when the federal government lost its ability to compel miners and loggers through the NSS to stay on the job in the interests of fighting the war.

Elliot M. Little was the NSS Director in 1942.\textsuperscript{15} He was an electrical engineer by training. The former president of the Quebec based Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills was known for his plain talk and slightly confrontational manner.\textsuperscript{16} Therefore he was straight forward in his assessment of the labour situation with forest industry managers when he spoke with the Canadian Manufacturers Association in Toronto on June 8, 1942. The labour situation in the bush was already clear to him and he did not pull any punches. “You may feel that you can go to your own gate any morning and pick a few men to fill vacancies or new jobs. I suggest you drop that idea right now. Canada is rapidly approaching the point of extreme labour shortage.”\textsuperscript{17} At this time he suggested four kinds of labour that could be used to fill the growing gaps; those “diverted from peacetime work,” the unemployed, women,
and young men.\textsuperscript{18} He informed the Canadian Congress of Labour that Canada needed “almost 200,000 men and women to meet the requirements of industry and the armed forces by the end of [the] year. And in addition, … 100,000 men in our logging operations to meet pulpwood requirements and the increased demands for timber…”\textsuperscript{19}

In an address to the Trades and Labour Congress Little emphasized the importance of increasing the efficiency of those already working in essential industries rather than looking to hiring young people.\textsuperscript{20} He also warned that there would be difficulties; “I promise you that the road will not be easy. I can tell you we are headed for temporary restrictions of more and more of the basic liberties of the people – restrictions in order that those very liberties may be preserved.”\textsuperscript{21} It is clear that officials at the Department of Labour were increasingly concerned. In January 1943, the \textit{Labour Gazette} was reporting serious labour shortages in Ontario agriculture, bush work and mining.\textsuperscript{22}

L.E. Westman, Assistant Director of the NSS, expressed concern with the manpower situation in a speech given to the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs at Lake Couchiching in August 1942. He revealed the surprise he and others felt when it became clear that Canada’s industries were unable to continue production without significant intervention; “[initially] …the idea that we could possibly run into a tight labour situation where our shortages of essential workers in trades and industries

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Little, \textit{Commonsense in Labour Relations}, 5.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Department of Labour, Elliot M. Little, \textit{Facing Realities; An address delivered before the Canadian Congress of Labour}, Ottawa, September 15, 1942 (Ottawa: Progressive Press, 1942) 4.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Little, \textit{Labour Responsibilities in Wartime}, 5.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Little, \textit{Labour Responsibilities in Wartime}, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, Vol. XLIII “Monthly Employment Conditions” January 1943, 136.
\end{itemize}
would run into thousands was almost inconceivable."23 Despite calls for “progress in the scientific overall allotment of workers’ duties,”24 Westman also recognized that “the greatest possible discretion must be left to local officers.”25 Even those at the centre of the NSS acknowledged that central policy was highly influenced by local requirements as Stevenson has suggested.

The man ultimately responsible for all this was Canada’s Minister of Labour, Humphrey Mitchell. He was born in the United Kingdom in 1894. He was elected as Member of Parliament for Welland and appointed to the cabinet by Mackenzie King in 1941. He was particularly suited to serve in his working class riding and as the Minister of Labour because of his own origins as a machine operator and union activist.26 In June 1943 Mitchell addressed the House of Commons on the question of manpower saying that

> Our manpower policy is quite clear… It is to provide the greatest possible number for our armed forces, while at the same time supplying the necessary men and women for our war industries, farms, base metal mines, lumber camps, railways – inland and sea-going shipping.27

Resource extraction was obviously a priority and unfortunately some of the best workers in these industries were also in the armed services. Solutions needed to be found. Campaigns to encourage agricultural workers to log in the off-season, the use of Italian and Japanese civilian internees, and increasing the employment of

---

24 Ibid, 16.
women where appropriate were all considered. However, Mitchell and others considered the use of women of limited use in industries with “more serious labour shortages” like agriculture, mining and logging, where industry required “able-bodied men” and “[t]he work [was] heavy.” However, another option presented itself. Thousands of able-bodied German prisoners of war were sitting in internment camps across Canada. Perhaps it was time for them to earn their keep?

The use of POW labour was not without limitations. Until 1942 industries were primarily using civilian internees to supplement their labour force since the 1929 Geneva Convention Relating to the Treatment of Prisoners of War significantly restricted the use of POW labour to industries that did not contribute to the war effort. Auger cites the articles relating to POW labour from the 1929 Convention.

According to Article 27 of the Geneva Convention, belligerents could employ as workmen prisoners of war who were physically fit, according to their rank and abilities. (Officers and persons of equivalent status were exempt from employment.) Articles 29 and 30 indicated that no prisoners of war were to be employed on work for which they were physically unsuited and that they were not to work excessive hours or longer than was permitted for civilian workers employed in the same work. Article 31 stated that work done by prisoners of war was to have no direct connection with the operations of the war…Finally, it was prohibited in Article 32 to employ prisoners of war on unhealthy or dangerous work.

Thus officers could not be compelled to work; POWs were not permitted to work in war industries; and they could not be compelled to work under conditions that civilians employed in the industry would reject as dangerous or excessive.

29 Canada, Department of Labour, Labour Gazette, Vol. XLIII “H. Mitchell’s June 23 Report to House of Commons” 897. See also Canada, Department of Labour, Labour Gazette v. XLV (i) “Report on Employment Conditions” May, 1945, 893 “… all areas (of logging) report a shortage of skilled workers who are physically fit to undertake the heavy work required of them.”
31 Ibid.
Significantly, none of these restrictions applied (until 1949) to civilian internees. As Auger suggests in his study of POWs in Quebec however, this emphasis on civilian internee labour was changing as other Canadian industries began to use POW labour to recoup some of the costs of internment and support the needs of the home front.

On May 10, 1943, P.C. 2326 opened the door for private use of “the services of prisoners of war in agricultural and other labour.”32 Mitchell addressed Parliament on this item, referring to the British precedent of the use of Italian prisoners of war and explaining the ways prisoners would be housed and the industries in which their labour would be used. He also noted that “[p]rojects providing suitable employment and for which camp facilities [were] available or [could] be supplied with little added cost [would] receive favourable consideration at the outset.”33 Bush work had obvious advantages in this respect since camps were easily set up near labour sites and would require “the employment of a minimum personnel to supervise” and maintain a secure environment due to their physical isolation.34 Off the record, Captain (later Major) George Forbes, an inspector for the Department of Labour, admitted that in his opinion, this decision to use POW labour should have been made earlier. 1943 was, according to Forbes, “something like two years late.”35

While Ontario forest operators had ongoing difficulties attracting young (skilled) men into the bush camps (even at the height of the Great Depression filling the need required some compulsory movement of labourers)36 the situation became

33 Ibid., 742.
34 Ibid., 741-2.
35 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 7 February 1944.
particularly difficult when able-bodied males enlisted in large numbers into the armed forces or moved into factories producing armaments rather than remote bush camps. Therefore, in 1942 there was a commonality of purpose between the pulp and paper industry and the federal government: both wished to see the bush camps remain open and productive. Moreover, the Departments of National Defence and Labour were looking for ways to reduce the threat of escape and violence in the POW internment camps, while keeping costs as low as possible.

The result was this Department of Labour initiative to manage prisoners of war as workers. Pulpwood cutting camps were year round operations (unlike timber operations); they were in relatively isolated areas of the province, and they already had existing facilities to house and feed groups of workers (usually about one hundred in each camp). While the solution seemed ideal, there were some difficulties in handing over POWs to not only civilian, but private management.

Employers wishing to participate in the scheme were required to demonstrate through an on site inspection that their labour camps conformed to the requirements as set out in the Geneva Convention and by the RCMP. These included a properly secure site, the provision of proper sleeping quarters (comparable to those provided for “depot troops”), basic hygiene requirements, medical services, recreation, and willingness to provide a system for prisoners to file complaints. These conditions were monitored by the International Red Cross and any complaints about treatment were directed to their Swiss headquarters as a neutral third party. The Red Cross was also responsible for paying POWs a daily wage to be returned upon repatriation of $6.60 a day for enlisted men and $11.00 for officers. Any company that lacked the
required facilities needed to build them before employment of POWs was authorized by the Department of Labour. P.C. 5022, June 2, 1943 established the first Directorate of Labour Projects PW to oversee the process and by July 1943, the federal government had laid out a wage system for the POWs engaged by private Canadian businesses. P.C. 5550 called for wages to conform to the 1929 Geneva Convention’s minimum, but also acknowledged that if businesses were to get the POWs to cut a reasonable amount of pulp or fuel wood each day there would have to be some sort of “incentive.” As such, companies were allowed to pay 50 cents for an eight-hour day or “piece-work wage rates, appropriate to the nature of the work, which will permit of earning on a production basis equal to approximately fifty cents per day.” However, in practice, despite attempts to harmonize the system, prisoners were frequently paid 50 cents for the first cord of pulpwood cut and as much as a dollar for any subsequent work per day. This is, of course, a much higher wage than the one described in P.C. 5550. The fifty cents wage expected for eight hours of work in the bush became the minimum standard expected by POWs, even by those working inside the internment camps. P.C. 1780 (March 16, 1944) attempted to equalize camp work wages, which had been twenty cents for a four-hour day, and

38 Under the 1929 Geneva Convention, POWs were entitled to have their standard pay set aside for repayment upon their return to Germany. In addition, they were entitled to 50 cents a day payable in canteen credits rather than cash. This made for a challenge for companies employing POWs in the bush since they had to continually maintain a certain level of merchandise available in the canteens to satisfy the POW’s desire to see his theoretical wages transformed into real property.
POW bush work rates set in P.C. 2326 (May 10, 1943).\textsuperscript{40} All of these regulations were combined in P.C. 6495 (August 18, 1944).\textsuperscript{41}

While camps were established by private firms (some had been relief camps during the Depression) they were monitored closely by the DND which was paid a daily fee of $2.00 per prisoner in order to cover the costs of security. The camps were guarded by members of the Veterans Guard of Canada (VGC) under contract of the DND. They were therefore older men with some military experience. While there were very few escapes, the isolation of the POW work camps was the more likely cause, not the effectiveness of the guards or security regime.

In 1941 there were 80,248 men registered as working loggers in the census. Of these, 14,454 were working in Ontario.\textsuperscript{42} Their labour was urgently needed -- some would have even classed woods labour as vital to the war effort. Unfortunately, the armed forces, which guaranteed year round employment and a decent wage were a powerful counter-attraction for woods workers, and there was no labour reserve left to drain. The places vacated were, therefore, available, and that is where the POWs fitted in. An average of approximately 8,500 POWs -- 10 per cent of the workforce -- were working in logging every year from 1943 to 1946. The great bulk of these worked at the head of the lakes for operators based in Fort William and Port Arthur, later Thunder Bay.\textsuperscript{43} This was a significant boost to the wartime labour force, despite the generally lower productivity of POW labour.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, Vol. XLIV, 450.
\textsuperscript{41} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, Vol. XLIV, 1178.
\textsuperscript{42} Canada, Department of Statistics, \textit{Census of Canada, 1941}, vol. VII. (Ottawa: King’s Printer, 1946), 8.
\textsuperscript{43} LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 8, “Meeting of Labour Project Inspectors, Port Arthur, Feb. 11-12, 1946, 1. For a sense of the importance of Ontario labour projects, compare this with the numbers reported for
R.S. (Stu) Young, a University of Toronto Forestry graduate, was working as a local Superintendent for the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Company (Great Lakes) in the Spring of 1943 at Savanne, Ontario, and was therefore a witness to the importance of these workers at the head of the lakes. His impression of the time was that labour was otherwise “scarce.” “There was a terrific shortage of labour at that time. And, if it hadn’t been for the prisoners of war, I’m sure that a lot of the paper mills would have had to close down or gone on short time due to lack of work.” The Department of Labour certainly agreed with the assessment that POW labour was required to solve shortages in 1943.

In theory, the POW workers assigned to bush work were volunteers seeking a break in the tedium and tension of prison camp life. The first group of prisoners to arrive at Savanne were from the enormous POW internment camp at Lethbridge, Alberta. Young concluded that they volunteered because of the “monotony of the camps,” and were happy to have a way to occupy themselves. Robert Schumacher, who had been captured during the attack on Belgium in May 1940, volunteered because he had felt increasingly “uncomfortable” in the Alberta camps because of

---

44 For more on POW productivity, see below.
45 Ontario Archives (OA), C255, Thunder Bay Labour History Interview Project – R.S. Young #7a)
46 Canada, Department of Labour, *Labour Gazette*, XLIII, October, 1943 “Logging operations in the region were in full swing, but the demand for bushmen was still mounting and few applicants were available for the work. It is reported that through lack of workers logging was practically at a standstill in the Pembroke area, while in the Arnprior district 400 bushmen were required for sawmill production, which has been curtailed thirty per cent owing to labour shortage. Prisoners of war were being put in to solve the labour shortage on several of the larger limits, but the over-all logging picture showed that 5,000 men at Timmins, 3,000 at North Bay, 1,000 at Kapuskasing and 1,800 at Sudbury were required for vital lumber work, with other districts asking for smaller (but still substantial) numbers – all alike reporting comparatively slight prospect of meeting requirements. Sawmills were affected in lesser degree. Some of the smaller ones had been forced to close when men were absorbed into larger mills, and some of these in turn had to close down temporarily because of lack of labour for loading and despatching.”
47 OA, C255, Thunder Bay Labour History Interview Project – R.S. Young #7a)
ideological extremism among some of the POWs. He felt that leaving for the isolation of the bush camps was safer.\footnote{TBHMS, M21/1/8 Robert Schumacher, Tape 1, Interviewed 20 May 1988 by Steven High.} In retrospect this seems to have been a good strategy given the now infamous murder of POW Dr. Karl Lehmann at the hands of fellow prisoners interned at Medicine Hat, in 1944. Whatever the reasons, hundreds of POWs volunteered during the war to cut pulpwood in Ontario.\footnote{Both Young and Schumacher reported that those in a second wave of POWs were “selected” rather than volunteers, although both were unclear about how exactly this occurred.} Young thought they were “a pretty good bunch,” particularly those who had been in the merchant marine, detained in the opening weeks of the war. He was not impressed by the “arrogant” air force POWs, but according to him “in most cases they did their work.”\footnote{OA, C255, Thunder Bay Labour History Interview Project – R.S. Young #7a) }

In return for completing the quota of a cord per day, POWs at Great Lakes received a fifty-cent credit in the Canteen to spend on a variety of items. Initially there was some flexibility about prisoner purchases. Civilian clothes were forbidden to POWs, but other purchases, such as jewellery, luggage and a variety of items, were possible.\footnote{See Appendix B – “List of Purchasable Articles in PW Canteens.” Also, Capt. Forbes comments on canteen purchases LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 6. “I am going to get authority to have more stuff kept in the stores. You cannot blame them for spending their money. I feel the list I have send (sic) you is too restricted, and I am going to get it increased, I think.” Compare this with the later criticisms of POW “appeasement.” See also note 58.} In addition to the fifty cent daily wage, each company was responsible for feeding and housing the POWs and for paying the DND a daily fee of $2.00 per prisoner per day. The POWs were not cheap labour, but the extra hands were certainly welcome given both the shortage of workers, the rising demand for newsprint and the lucrative export of pulp and paper to the United States.\footnote{OA, C255, Thunder Bay Labour History Interview Project – R.S. Young #7a) }

Although POW labour was a boon to operators, it came with challenges. In February 1944 representatives from the Department of Labour, and the various
employers using POW labour in their woods operations at the Lakehead, met in Port Arthur, Ontario to exchange ideas and find solutions to difficulties that had arisen. The Department of Labour took the initiative for calling the meeting, sending out an announcement inviting the CEOs and woods managers of interested companies to attend. Minutes of the meetings held between February 1944 and February 1946 show that despite attempts to regulate the operation and administration of these private POW bush camps, a certain amount of improvisation was common.

In fact, according to Captain G. Forbes, the Department of Labour inspector, the first meeting was called because of concerns about the creative solutions one firm was using to solve production issues. This unnamed firm had unilaterally instituted a bonus system for its POW workers with some success, but had unwittingly stimulated a flood of requests from POWs working at other sites for the same treatment. The Department of Labour was not amused, but as we have already seen, the practice became widespread. Forbes went as far as to threaten to refuse any further requests from this company for POW labour. There is no evidence that he ever followed

---

53 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. The announcement was signed by Lt. Col. R.S.W. Fordham, Director of Labour Projects, PW. It should be noted that this set of minutes for Military District 10 meetings at Port Arthur between 1944 and 1946 are unusual. There are no comparable documents for Military District 2 or any other region. The country had been divided into four “districts”; Ottawa (Toronto, Southern Ontario and Chatham), North Bay (Northern and Eastern Ontario), Port Arthur (Central and Western Ontario; Manitoba) and Calgary (Alberta and British Columbia). It is not clear at this time whether this is because other regions did not meet in this way to discuss their experience of dealing with POWs or whether extant documents are stored elsewhere. In any case, the Department of Labour records at LAC only include the Port Arthur meetings.

54 These camps were exclusively for POWs and a handful of civilian staff. There were no civilian internees working in these operations. They were housed separately, but some were also engaged in pulpwood or firewood cutting elsewhere. See Auger, *Prisoners of the Homefront*.

55 Minutes of the February 7, 1944 meeting report that 51 labour camps were in operation, housing approximately 4,000 prisoners. Minutes of the May 15, 1944 meeting indicate that there were 41 camps and 4,000 prisoners being employed “in the Port Arthur area” at the time. LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 7 February 1944, 2 and 15 May 1944, 2.
through on this threat, but his level of frustration was obvious.\footnote{56 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944, 9.} At a later meeting, Captain Forbes observed that the nature of life in the bush itself made some changes to the administration of POWs necessary; “Although there are certain regulations in regard to prisoners that apply while in internment camps, it is rather difficult to apply that same type of discipline in a work camp...It is a problem – I realized right from that the start that it would be a big problem.” However, he also reminded the assembled employers that the POWs “belong[ed] to the Department of National Defence” and therefore certain measures to “control” and “observe” were required.\footnote{57 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 15 May 1944, 2.}

Captain Forbes was generally very positive about the work of these firms in February 1944. He acknowledged that POW productivity varied according to the areas in which they were working, but also acknowledged that the employers’ willingness to provide services such as recreational facilities and high quality food would have a positive impact on the prisoners’ attitudes and therefore their productivity. This is a stark contrast with the attitude of Lieutenant-Colonel R.H. Davidson, the recently appointed Director of Labour Projects, POW, who later, in January 1945, railed against “appeasement” in the camps.\footnote{58 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 15 January 1945, 2. By “appeasement” he meant any attempts by the employers to make labour camps comfortable in order to increase production.}

Productivity was clearly the main issue in January, 1944. Forbes’ perspective was that one could not expect stellar production from prisoners. He informed the employers that “Prisoner-of-war labor (sic) [was] not the ideal form of labour. When the idea of putting out prisoners was first mooted, it was never thought you would get the same work out of them, we were just offering a substitute.” In this he was in line
with others’ estimates that good civilian, Canadian, bush workers could cut 1 ½ - 2 or more cords a day, while expectations for POWs were about ¾ to 1 cord. This, according to the industry representatives, was about the minimum productivity POWs could maintain before they became a liability. H.S. Mosher of the Newaygo Timber Company Limited (Newaygo) reported that for the first month he worked with POWs their average dropped from ¾ to ½ a cord per day average. The result was that the cost per cord was twice what it cost for a civilian crew to cut a cord. The POW average was $8.00/cord. He took this as “…an indication that unless you get production it doesn’t pay to keep prisoners and [they] would be forced to return them on the basis of not being able to produce.” He felt that the use of incentives had improved the situation somewhat, raising production to just above a cord a day. The “bonus cord” was, in his opinion, “the cord that would turn the tide in favor of prisoner-of-war labour.” B.F. Avery representing the Great Lakes Paper Company (Great Lakes) agreed, saying that if POWs did not work “they should be returned to the internment camp.”

In the end, the Department of Labour tried to dissuade employers from sending POWs back to internment indiscriminately but also insisted that bonuses were out of the question. Instead, emphasis was placed on defining “the task” according to local conditions. This caused complications for employers already using bonuses since they would have to be removed (theoretically) and for those employers

59 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944 minutes, 5.
60 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944 minutes, 13.
61 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944 minutes, 14.
who had up until this point paid the wage without insisting on a minimum level of production.\textsuperscript{62}

In May wages and quotas continued to be an issue, as well as dentistry (and healthcare) for the POWs. Capt. Forbes believed that the wage system was “the main issue” since there had been changes to the system since the previous meeting.\textsuperscript{63} A variety of approaches to quotas had been developed in the bush camps. Some, depending on the quality of the stands in which POWs were working, preferred quotas of one cord a day in order to receive the maximum fifty cent wage, while others paid fifty cents for the first cord and as much as a dollar for each subsequent cord cut. Some even offered the fifty cents a day to POW workers “straight without any strings” in order to ensure some sort of production every day.\textsuperscript{64} The amount cut and daily quotas varied considerably from location to location. A.J. Auden from Abitibi Power and Paper (Abitibi) reported that the 300 POWs they employed had been producing an average of .88 cords per day since they arrived. After the initial “training period,” they were cutting “about a cord” a day. The company paid $1.00 a cord over the quota into a “recreational fund” that POWs could access when they wanted to make improvements to the camp facilities. If the average for the week was below one cord per man per day, the POWs received .30 pay.\textsuperscript{65}

Quotas were not the only contentious issue. A.J. Auden from Abitibi was very concerned about POW dental health. The issue of dental care resonated with the

\textsuperscript{62} LAC, RG27, v. 965, File 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944 Minutes, 20, for Fordham’s conclusions on bonuses and 23 for his comments on sending POWs back to internment.

\textsuperscript{63} LAC, RG27, v. 965, File 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 15 May 1944 Minutes, 1.

\textsuperscript{64} LAC, RG27, v. 965, File 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 15 May 1944 Minutes, 7. A.G. Pounsford, Provincial Paper Ltd.

\textsuperscript{65} LAC, RG27, v. 965, File 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 15 May 1944 Minutes, 7.
other employers, who also made pleas for improvements in financial support for
dental work or perhaps the construction of a central location where POWs could be
sent for medical and dental care from across the region. Representatives from
Provincial Paper, Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper and the Pulpwood Supply
Company agreed that this was a difficulty in their operations as well. It was difficult
to convince private dentists to travel to the often remote camps for the fees provided
by the Ministry of Labour. Some employers chose to keep a dentist on retainer
privately as in investment in maintaining a fit work force as one might maintain
mechanical equipment. Such a comparison was made explicitly by at least one
company representative. Others took POWs to the nearest town for treatment as
required, occasionally without real supervision. Johannes Lieberwirth, a former
POW, was quoted as saying that

On one occasion a group of POWs went to Kenora for dental care,
accompanied by a guard. The guard proceeded to visit a local bar and drink
himself into unconsciousness. … ‘the POWs had to pull the guard back to
camp on a toboggan. One of the fellows was carrying the guard's rifle so that
it wouldn't get slush on it. But when they got close to camp, he realized that
he'd better lay the rifle on the toboggan.’

Life in the bush clearly required occasional improvisation on the part of employers,
workers, and the Department of Labour.

It is likely that this variation in employers’ approaches to the use of POW
labour caused some anxiety in the Department of Labour, because by December 1944
the stated goal was to create “a precise, fully-controlled system, uniform throughout

66 Jake Macdonald, “The Beast of War and the Beautiful Lake,” in *The Beaver*, April/May 1996, 29-31. For another example of POWs sent unescorted to town for dental work, see TBHMS, M21/1/8
Robert Schumacher, Tape 1, Interviewed 20 May 1988, by Steven High.
the entire country.” As Stevenson’s work suggests, there is no evidence that this ideal was ever realized. Woods operators were generally an independent lot. They were used to running their own businesses as they pleased. Owners relied extensively on woods managers and local superintendents to solve minor (and sometimes major) crises in the camps as they arose: improvisation based on the constraints of local conditions was standard – all towards the goal of maximizing production, minimizing costs and maintaining sufficient numbers of workers in each of the bush camps to handle the seasonal requirements. This management style did not always sit well with the DND and Department of Labour, which were trying to maintain a level of consistency in their policies towards the POWs across the country. Keeping track of the accounting paperwork alone was a huge task; made only greater when a variety of payment strategies or casual reporting practices were used. Nevertheless, as the war continued the Department of Labour continued to consult with employers, and woods operators and their camp foremen became more skilled in managing POW labour and encouraging satisfactory levels of production. The stop gap then became a viable production strategy for this industry and memory of this plan would contribute directly to the search for another solution in 1946-7.

After early negotiations over the rights and responsibilities of each of the parties involved; including the quota and wage system, enforcement of weekly tasks and the use of civilian guards, the division of responsibilities between the DND, the Department of Labour and the employers was clarified, at least officially. Standing orders circulated to employers set out this division without any ambiguity; National
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Defence was responsible for “Security and Discipline only;” the employers were “in effect the agents of the Department of Labour” and as such were responsible for “Housing, feeding, clothing, medical, dental [and] Work Contracts.”

More specifically, employers were contracted to provide and administer:

- Clean, warm accommodation;
- Food well-cooked, suitable to climate. Separate kitchen for POWs where POW cooks are employed;
- Sanitation and general camp cleanliness;
- No priviledges (sic) to POWs, other than those permitted by regulations;
- No "appeasement" policies,\(^68\)
- No payments in cash; payments by a credit at the "Van".
- Provision of a "Van" at which only prescribed goods may be purchased in limited quantities by PsOW;
- No fraternization by civilian employees;
- Accident compensation;
- First Aid Kit;
- Medical care – local physicians
- Emergency dental treatment when Canadian Dental Corps Officers are NOT immediately available;
- Eye examinations (test combinations of lenses supplied by Project Inspecting Officer, Port Arthur, Ont., on request of employer);
- Clothing – lumbermen’s boots, work gloves, overalls – (MARKED);
- Arrangement for supplying newspapers and magazines as permitted;
- Transportation of PsOW to railhead.\(^69\)

By most accounts, including Auger’s assessment of the camps in Quebec, conditions for German POWs were as good as could be expected, especially in Ontario’s bush camps.\(^70\) Comments about the quality of food and the beauty of the landscape (except perhaps the huge amount of snow) recur in accounts of German wartime experiences in Canada. Heinz Willman, a former POW, reported in the

\(^{68}\) For a description of what is meant by appeasement here, see note 58.

\(^{69}\) LAC, RG 27, v. 966, f. 4, “Standing orders for personnel of POW labour projects” April 1945, 1 and 5.

\(^{70}\) Captain Forbes believed that conditions in Ontario bush camps were better than in Quebec operations. He reports that they run “more smoothly” and that while in Ontario camps provided about 400 cubic feet per prisoner, Quebec camps only had 250. LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944, 27.
1990s that he had been overjoyed with the food available in the camps along the Little Pic River and at Neys; “I never ate as good in my life as I ate at the camp…We had sides of beef, pork, pies, everything.” The experience certainly made an impression on the young man and in 1950 he returned to Canada, settling in Fort William/Port Arthur and opening a European specialty grocery store.

Although the prisoners’ diet was universally praised and life in Ontario was eventually seen to be preferable to life in wartime Europe, the climate came as a shock. Many arrived in July to a scorching summer and the winter of 1944 was exceedingly cold. Schumacher reported that there was four feet of snow at Current River in January 1945 and that conditions almost caused him to give up and return to the Alberta internment camp from which he came. A civilian working at Neys reported that temperatures could dip to 42 below and that even when the horses were kept in the barn, the POWs went out to cut their daily quota.

Despite the occasional extreme weather, there were few escape attempts. In April, 1944 there were “approximately 4,117 POWs” working “chiefly in fuel wood, pulpwood, and lumbering operations,” where “Employers [were], in general… well satisfied with the work of the prisoners, and in many instances… asked for an increased number.” H. Mitchell attributed the success of bush camp security to “careful selection” of prisoners and “sufficient” guards. In contrast, those who had lived in these camps as prisoners felt that the physical isolation was a much greater
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72 TBHMS, M21/1/8 Robert Schumacher, Tape 1, Interviewed 20 May 1988 by Steven High.
74 Canada, Department of Labour, Labour Gazette, Vol. XLIV, 565.
factor in discouraging permanent escapes. Capt. Forbes called these “deliberate escapes” in order to distinguish them from those that “were not made with the purpose of getting away, but curiously enough for the fixed purpose of getting sent back to the internment camp.” Forbes’ assessment seems to be confirmed by the Department of Labour’s “History of Labour Projects PW” which reports that as of February 1946, of the thousands of POWs that had been working in the bush, only six “remained at large.” However, occasional “walkabouts” were quite common. Records of the Ontario Attorney General report a 1944 incident where it was reported that POWs were “roaming highway and farms near Hurkett.”

Although escapes were a significant issue because of public concerns for safety, far more frequently conflict arose in the camps over the issue of “malingering”. As we have seen in industry representatives’ concerns about quotas and wages, production was the primary incentive for participating in this project, whether it was for purely economic reasons or for some larger patriotic goal. D.A. Clark, representing the Nipigon Lake Timber Company, may not have been an elegant speaker, but his stated purpose is clear- to help the war effort.

I don’t like these swine any more than anybody else…if I didn’t want production for a good reason, to produce pulpwood, to help somebody else produce ships and guns for our own boys – I will do everything I can – I don’t want to appease any German at all but I’ll do anything under the sun if I think I can buy a gun for some poor devil who needs it.

---

75 There are quite a few stories of prisoners taking off for short periods of time only to return or be returned to the work sites. There are, however, relatively few reports of successful (ie permanent) escapes.
76 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 5, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs, 7 February 1944, 8.
77 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 24, History of Labour Projects PW, 4-5.
78 OA, RG4-32, Attorney General Central Registry Criminal and Civil Files. 1944.
79 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7: Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 15 January 1945 minutes, 16.
For similar reasons, the defence and labour departments wished to keep the costs of maintaining the POWs to a minimum. Keeping the POWs working was therefore a key concern to the Canadians; and keeping work within reasonable limits was the goal of POWs. Some seem to have managed this quite well. Herman Hutt, a former POW, estimated that he could cut the required daily quota of a cord in three hours, leaving the afternoons free to relax however he chose.80

Others resisted work in a variety of ways, including strikes. George Rautavuori worked as a civilian cook at several POW camps around Neys. In June 1944 he wrote home about troubles the camp was having with prisoners refusing to work. At this time some were “shipped out” and the camp waited for replacements. By October he observed that there were “troubles with [the] Germans over work quotas.” By November, the POWs struck. An officer arrived in camp, ordered a German staff sergeant leading the strike to return to internment, and sentenced the entire camp to twenty days on restricted rations (bread and water). The officer also reported that the POW leaders had been sent to solitary confinement and required to cut their own firewood for heat.81 This was not an isolated incident. German POWs were generally less willing, or as one Department of Labour official put it, they showed a “strong disinclination to work,” by the fall of 1944.82 The quota was variable from the point of view of the employers and the Department of Labour to
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80 TBHMS, M21/1/1 Herman Hutt, Interviewed 29 August 1988 by Steven High.
81 TBHMS Reference Files: War: Prisoner of War Camps; “Notes of Events recorded in letters by Mr. Geo. Rautavuori to his parents at 123 Rowand Street, Fort William.”
82 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 24, History of Labour Projects PW, 10. Some have suggested that after D-Day in June, 1944 there was increased resistance to work among the POWs.
some extent. However, by 1945, from the prisoners’ perspective, quotas had taken on the character of a “military order”.  

Although there does not seem to be much evidence of wrecking, there was some concern among employers that POWs were attempting to damage Canadian industry by breaking tools, especially steel axe blades since steel was so crucial to the war effort. Industry representatives estimated that “normal” POW tool use was twice that of a civilian employee. Any POW found to be requiring new blades after fewer than 25 cords of wood cut, or a new axe handle before 40 had been cut, was to be reported to inspectors.  

It is unclear whether poor blade maintenance in these cases was wrecking or just the side effect of having an untrained, unmotivated work force. Nevertheless, the issue arose and was therefore on operators’ minds, particularly after 1944.

By January 1945 employers had had enough of malingering and of the time it was taking to have troublesome prisoners removed from the bush camps. There was some concern about a “holiday” coming up on January 30th. This day may have been marked by POWs as the anniversary of Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor in 1933. There was considerable debate about whether the quota for a day off should be made up on another day; whether there was no need for extra work; how the orders should be enforced; and whether an order for making up the quota should be issued at all, given that consistent enforcement at all the camps would be exceedingly difficult.

The result was a push for a detention camp in Hurkett, to which employers could send troublemakers quickly for “retraining” and to teach the others that continued failure to

83 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 15 January 1945 minutes, 32.
84 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 15 January 1945 minutes, 23.
85 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 15 January 1945 minutes, 12 and passim.
meet the weekly quotas was unacceptable. It was hoped that this would reduce the number of POWs seeking a “holiday” back in internment. Initially the idea came from the inspectors, Col. Streight and (now Major) Forbes, but the details were left to the industry representatives to work out. Great Lakes donated land for the camp and agreed to build a list of specific facilities required. The proposal was that the “cost [would] be distributed amongst employers employing prisoners of war from whose camps [would] come the prisoners going to detention…on [the] basis of [the] number of prisoners employed.” A vote was taken. The resolution was passed and it was sent on to Ottawa for confirmation. Despite these concerns over productivity and the challenges of managing POW labour, this group had a significant, positive impact on the pulp and paper industry’s bottom line.

In the end, Arthur MacNamara complimented the inspectors for managing the process “in a very satisfactory manner,” once “the initial period of difficulties” had passed. The Ontario projects had run 106 bush camps, two detention camps (at Hurkett and Hearst), employing an average of 8,659 POWs, and involving 19 companies. Forbes positively glowed when he described the inspectors’ relationship with these firms as one of “very pleasant mutual cooperation…officials [were] very patient and co-operative,” although he also acknowledged that this was not always the case. No wonder. As Forbes emphasized, only the use of POW labour had kept these firms running in the face of extreme labour shortages. “…The employment of PW

86 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 7, Minutes of Meetings re: POWs. 15 January 1945 minutes, 2-6 and throughout the meeting.
87 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 8, “Meeting of Labour Project Inspectors, Port Arthur, Feb. 11-12, 1946, 1.
88 LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 8, “Meeting of Labour Project Inspectors, Port Arthur, Feb. 11-12, 1946, 1. For a sense of the importance of Ontario labour projects, compare this with the numbers reported for the entire country: At the “height of operations” 169 projects, 15,984 POWs average. RG27, v. 965, f. 24, “History of Labour Projects PW” 3.
labour has been the salvation of the local paper industry; for without this production, the mills would … [have been] closed down.”

Whether or not this is the case, it is very significant that a large number of employers in the industry in 1946 believed it to be true. By 1945 POWs had cut 1,450,000 cords of pulpwood making “a most important contribution to Canadian economy for the post war period” according to the Department of Labour, including benefits to the transport industry, local merchants who benefited from the improved purchasing power of mill employees, and support for Canada’s balance of payments from exports of pulp and paper to the United States.

Although the real numbers are unknown, it has been estimated that approximately 6,000 POWs requested to remain in Canada at the end of the war. POWs like Herman Hutt signed petitions that had circulated in 1945 requesting permission to remain in Canada. This request was denied and, in accordance with Britain’s treaty obligations, all were returned to Great Britain beginning in 1946. After working in Great Britain for a time, the POWs were eventually repatriated to Germany. Lieutenant Myles Penny estimated that approximately 1000 former German POWs who had worked at the head of the Lakes during the war eventually returned to the area and became Canadian citizens. Some even returned to work in the bush again. One of Thunder Bay’s most prominent examples of someone who
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91 TBHMS, M21/1/1 Herman Hutt, Interviewed 29 August 1988 by Steven High.
92 TBHMS, Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal, 29 December 1995, (page unknown). "Lieut. Myles Penny, curator of the military museum, said 25 to 30 percent of the 3,600 German POWs sent to Northwestern Ontario during the Second World War returned and became Canadian citizens. Most made important working contributions to their community said Penny."
93 TBHMS Reference Files: War: Prisoner of War Camps; Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal, 29 December 1995 (page unknown)
returned, was Robert Schumacher. Having spent the war at Longlac, Schumacher was sent back to England in 1946. In 1947 he was back in Germany and was already planning his return to Canada in 1951 on a one-year woods work contract for the Newaygo Timber Co. near Hearst. This time he was receiving three to five dollars for each cord he cut. Because he was already skilled at the work, he soon paid off the price of his ticket (a loan from the Federal Government) and moved on to his next job. By the time of his death in 1999, he was an established activist, philanthropist and “friend of the community” of Thunder Bay.  

Major Forbes seems to have mixed views on the desirability of retaining POWs in Canada. In 1946 he commented positively on German requests to remain in Canada, since “some of our best citizens are of German origin.” In the end he did not consider it a good idea to allow former POWs to remain because of his fears that dangerous individuals might remain undetected. R.S. Young’s level of respect for these men as workers is apparent in his comments on their return to Germany after the war; “I think it’s unfortunate that some of them that wanted to stay in Canada and were not allowed to ... Because there would have been some excellent citizens among them.”

POW labour in the bush camps continued to be significant for a time after V-E and V-J days in 1945. Reviewing Canada’s “manpower situation” in March, before

---


96 OA, C255, Thunder Bay Labour History Interview Project – R.S. Young #7a)
the end of the war in Europe, labour minister Mitchell reported that 9,000 POWs had wintered in the nation’s woods operations. Not only had “the Timber Controller and the industrial associations…expressed satisfaction” with the supply, he predicted that the numbers requested and used would rise in the coming year.\textsuperscript{97} By August, with the war in both Europe and Japan over, the situation had changed significantly. On August 31\textsuperscript{st} Mitchell told the press that 12,000 German POWs, largely working in timber camps, were “soon to come out of active employment.”\textsuperscript{98} This transition to civilian labour was not going to be painless. In one region, Port Arthur, it was reported that in August 1,900 workers were needed in the bush “where some companies report that they have more prisoners of war on their payrolls at present than civilians.”\textsuperscript{99} This was not the case universally, but nevertheless, adjustments were going to be required.

One might think that the manpower situation in the forestry industry would begin to look promising after VE day. Service men were beginning to be released from the armed forces and were returning to Canada needing work. However, even as early as December 1943 there was mounting evidence that returning soldiers would not necessarily be returning to the woods. Two thousand members of the Canadian Forestry Corps had been stationed in Great Britain and were released to return to Canada in September 1943. In December, parliament was informed that of this number only 584 had agreed to return to woods work.\textsuperscript{100} By June 1945 it was clear that there were some significant roadblocks in the way of a full return to the bush on

\textsuperscript{97} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, v. XLV, 624.
\textsuperscript{98} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, v. XLV, 1275.
\textsuperscript{99} Canada, Department of Labour, \textit{Labour Gazette}, v. XLV, 1378.
\textsuperscript{100} C.P. Stacey, \textit{Arms, Men and Governments: The War Policies of Canada, 1939-1945} (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer for Canada, 1970), 411.
the part of the pre-war labour force. Returning soldiers were looking for work in cities. Seasonal work such as logging had become relatively unattractive to the veterans who were looking for permanent, lucrative, largely urban, work. In September 1945 the *Labour Gazette* reported that a campaign to enlist as many farmers as possible for bush work was “under way.” It also suggested that “Discharged service personnel [were] another source…but many of those experienced in logging [were] reluctant to return to this type of work, and, in spite of the offers made by logging companies to train new workers, few applicants [were] available.”\(^{101}\) In addition, it was felt that “physical disability and lack of sufficient skill [were] also deterrent factors.”\(^{102}\)

After the war, some people began to complain that POWs might be taking work from returning Canadians seeking work. Major Forbes dismissed this as a concern since he had seen evidence that most Canadians had “little inclination to work in the woods or on the farms.” In fact, he reported that one company had sent its entire group of POWs back to internment in the hope of returning wholly to civilian labour and that this experiment had been “without much success.”\(^{103}\) The *Labour Gazette* reported that “While men recently released from the armed forces seem[ed] reluctant to accept the type of heavy labour for which their services [were] in demand” most in Ontario were placed in new work within a month of their registration.\(^{104}\)

\(^{101}\) Canada, Department of Labour, *Labour Gazette*, v. XLV, 1564.
\(^{103}\) LAC, RG27, v. 965, f. 8, “Meeting of Labour Project Inspectors,” 5.
\(^{104}\) Canada, Department of Labour, *Labour Gazette*, v. XLV, 1567.
In fact, it was not just reluctance on the part of Canadian men to work in the bush that was causing problems for woods operations. It was also the increasing demand for their product. In a September Department of Labour report on employment conditions it was reported that “[w]hile the overall demand for workers continue[d] high, a decline [was] apparent in the labour requirements of all industries except mining and logging. The need for workers in the logging industry almost doubled during the month.”

Also significant was the fact that the number of skilled workers available to the industry was relatively low compared to the number of unskilled applicants seeking employment. The woods, mining and construction industries could only absorb a limited number of unskilled applicants as long as the number of available skilled workers remained low. If the number of skilled workers available for work in remote areas could be improved, then more of the young, unskilled, returning veterans could be accommodated.

Due to continuing manpower shortages, it was decided that POWs would remain in Canada until the spring of 1946. Many POWs welcomed the opportunity because of the difficulties of life in postwar Europe, but obviously they were anxious to know when to expect their repatriation and release. Some rumours and confusion clouded the issue of release among POWs, but eventually they were shipped to the United Kingdom where they continued to work until repatriation in 1947.

It is worth noting here that a good worker, even one from a country with which Canada was at war, could be respected by Canadian woods operators and workers. Of course this was not universal, extremely ideological POWs remained

105 Canada, Department of Labour, *Labour Gazette*, v. XLV, 1561.
106 Canada, Department of Labour, *Labour Gazette*, v. XLV, 1855.
terrifying to Canadians and some Canadians were not prepared to change their opinions on any POWs. However, some conceded that working Germans had demonstrated potential as “good citizens.”

Timber and pulp and paper continued to be critical to the federal plans for improving the postwar economy and housing situation. As a result, the federal government was taking the post war manpower needs of the woods operators quite seriously in these years.

During the war, Arthur MacNamara had characterized the NSS as “a body of regulations, aimed at channelling our manpower and woman-power into the spots where each may render the most effective service…to [the]… war effort.” Significantly, he saw the NSS continuing to have an influence on the direction of labour after the war.

I do feel… that National Selective Service will leave to the Department of Labour a heritage of administrative machinery and administrative experience which should contribute mightily in the direction of assisting in that period [in post-war Canada] of full employment which the experts predict, and for which we all sincerely pray.\(^{107}\)

It should come as no surprise, then, that he felt quite comfortable continuing to maintain ties with employers and that they would continue to approach him and his department for solutions to their manpower needs.

In October 1945 a campaign was under way to fill vacancies in woods operations across the country. Some of these vacancies were caused by the realization that with war’s end the possibility of using of POW labour was going to disappear. During this campaign the *Labour Gazette* reported that 9,500 prisoners

were currently working in lumber camps. The Department of Labour estimated that
50,000 men were needed and that the bulk of these positions eventually would be
filled through the efforts of the Woods Labour Committee (Department of Labour),
Dominion Forest Service, and departments of defence, and munitions and supply.

It was no longer sufficient to find any workers; they needed to be willing.
Both the federal government and the woods operators had begun to seriously consider
the value of screening applicants so that companies would be left with fewer losses
due to workers leaving the camps without cutting enough pulp or fuel wood to cover
transportation and set up costs. This push for men willing to work in the bush was
linked explicitly with reconstruction plans and, as such, was a priority. In September,
Mitchell explained;

It is very much in the national interest that woods operators should secure all
the workers they require. Home building in Canada will be helped or
hindered next year, to a large extent, by the cut of saw logs in the woods
during this winter. The pulp and paper industry – producing paper for
Canadian use and also very important in our export trade – will require a
heavy cut of pulpwood. The reconstruction of Britain and Continental Europe
will call for huge quantities of lumber – and Canada must be prepared to meet
a large part of this demand.

Despite department attention and media coverage, the woods industries were still
looking for experienced workers in November.

And so, in the fall of 1946, after the departure of the POWs, woods operators
found themselves scrambling yet again to fill the bush camps with workers willing to
stay. Members of the Ontario Forest Industries Association worried about how many

---

requirements.” “...in order to cut down...losses to employers involved in transporting and outfitting
individuals who on finding themselves unsuited to woods work, leave the job before the employer is
reimbursed...”


November, 1945” 1855.
farmers would come to cut wood during the winter; how productive university students would really be during the summer; how best to use the media to encourage men to choose this kind of life; and how to get some of those (now very skilled) German workers back. Despite these anxieties, some strategies had been developed during the war that would emerge again when the opportunity to hire DPs arose in 1947.

First, camps with adequate (and increasingly modern) facilities had been built and had been monitored by the Department of Labour. This prior knowledge of the existence and the quality of facilities at these camps made the application process for employers wishing to hire DPs much simpler in 1947. Some new camps had even been established for the purpose of accommodating POWs and could now be filled with willing civilian labour, such as the DPs after 1947.\textsuperscript{111} Second, much as the wartime rationalization of cabinet performed by Arnold Heeney continued into the post war period, the Department of Labour had expanded its responsibilities under Arthur MacNamara.\textsuperscript{112} Employers had become comfortable submitting “orders” for workers to the department and continued to use this option when labour shortages arose after 1945. Third, some of the staff of inspectors and liaisons remained in place; moving from POW inspectors to liaison officers for immigrants.\textsuperscript{113} The following chapters will explore how these strategies were used during the planning

\textsuperscript{111} The Link, March 1948, vol. 1, no. 2, 12. This is Great Lakes Paper’s employee magazine. In this case while discussing the work of a particular Black Sturgeon camp the paper noted that it was originally established during the war to house POWs.
\textsuperscript{112} Francine McKenzie, “A.D.P. Heeney: The Orderly Undersecretary, 1949-1952,” unpublished manuscript.
\textsuperscript{113} TBHMS, M21/1/8 Robert Schumacher, Tape 1, Interviewed 20 May 1988 by Steven High. Schumacher mentions a Capt. Andrew whom he knew during the war as a Department of Labour official, as well as after the war as an immigrant liaison officer.
and implementation of the next labour scheme: the movement of the Displaced Persons.
It is essential that in selecting Displaced Persons, great care be exercised to ensure a reasonable division of nationalities.\(^2\)

[Canadians] …clung to the image of themselves as a thrifty, hard-working, pioneer people who would do their Christian duty to their fellows but could not afford the generosity of the elite powers.

- John W. Holmes, *The Shaping of Peace*\(^3\)

… I think by and large they are *the kind of people Canada wants* [emphasis added] provided, and I think this is a very important point, that they are not allowed to regard the contract into which they have entered as a scrap of paper to be torn up as soon as they see a favourable opportunity to escape from its obligations. They have undertaken, with full knowledge of what is entailed, certain obligations. If they are allowed to escape these obligations and leave before their contract expires, they will ill deserve the benefits of life in this country.\(^4\)

What makes a good Canadian is not race, creed or national origin but skill, loyalty and determination to be one.\(^5\)

Between 1945 and 1962 Canadian immigration policy underwent dramatic changes. As we saw in Chapter One, Canada emerged from the war with an outdated, restrictive policy and a growing sense of its obsolescence. Over time, under pressure from a new generation of external affairs officers, religious, ethnic and industry groups, this policy based on racial criteria was abandoned for one based on an applicant’s potential economic contribution to the nation—their suitability for a

---

\(^1\) A portion of this chapter was presented at the biennial conference of the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States on November 15, 2007 in Toronto, Canada. Thanks also to Robert Bothwell, Jeff Kilpatrick, Wilson Bell, Janine Rivière and Alexandra Guerson for their comments on an early draft.

\(^2\) LAC, RG27, v. 277, f. 1-26-2-1, pt. 1, 6 June 1947 Cable to George V. Haythorne from A.H. Brown at the Department of Labour.


\(^4\) This quotation and many of the others which make up the chapter titles of this thesis, is from a memo prepared by Dr. Urquhart at the Des Joachims dam to Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission on the arrival of the first group of DPs sent as construction workers. It was found in the former, now closed, Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 19 December, 1947.

\(^5\) LAC, RG26, v. 101, f. 3-18-2, Senate Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, Brief submitted by Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, 246.
The years between 1945 and 1953 are therefore a significant transition period in the development of this new sense of Canada’s place in the world, when the coexistence of both the antiquated and novel approaches to immigrants are evident and in tension.

The 1947 labour immigration scheme to bring DPs to work not only in forest industries, but also into an expanded array of remote operations, including mining and construction was the result of a convergence of priorities. The federal government’s desire to appear humane, helpful, and effective through timely assistance to Europe’s refugees was assisted by the pulp and paper industry’s continued need for workers and Canadians’ growing acceptance of certain kinds of ethnic diversity. The obvious profitability of the scheme and assurances that only “suitable” DPs would be selected made the decision to open immigration in this case palatable to a wider Canadian public. Or, in Holmes’ terms, Canada’s “Christian duty” would not require too much “generosity.” Canadians in 1944-47 were convinced both of their moral duty to participate in a solution to Europe's refugee problem and in their civic obligation to protect the Canadian economy and society from the arrival of disruptive or "undesirable" immigrants. Therefore at root, debates swirled around the question: what kind of DPs were “suitable?” What kind of people did Canada want?

The DPs were situated immediately and obviously at the intersection of Canada's post-war international role and its domestic economic development. It should come as no surprise then, that in planning for their selection and movement we find these issues being worked out in practice. Individuals involved in the project

---

were reconciling a variety of contradictory ideas and worked at finding practical solutions to ideological dilemmas like the question of how to maintain “selectivity” while avoiding accusations of “discrimination”. The prime minister had emphasized the urgent need for Canada to assist in the humanitarian crisis in Europe and Canada's right to select those who "are of a type likely to make good citizens.” However, this came with the sometimes contradictory goal that Canada should also consider removing “objectionable discrimination” from its immigration policies. Therefore Canada would consider immigration to the extent that it did not "change the fundamental composition of the Canadian population."7 The confidence individuals involved in the process had in their ability to judge "occupational suitability" will emerge as the key to their own faith in the non-discriminatory basis of the procedure.

This chapter examines these negotiations in some detail, highlighting the variety of institutions, organizations and individuals with a stake in the immigration process. It will show that the convergence of international and domestic priorities in 1947 paved the way for the acceptance of this scheme, despite any remaining resistance to immigration in general or the arrival of “non-preferred” groups specifically. Further, we will see how lingering ideas about the qualities of particular ethnic groups continued to have a significant impact on assessments of suitability for particular jobs and even Canadian citizenship. In this phase of the plan Canadians were necessarily looking at the potential suitability of applicants primarily in their economic roles. Chapters five and six demonstrate how this suitability was tested.

---

again when DPs arrived in Canada through their commitment to fulfilling the terms of their contracts and engaging in language and citizenship training.

Each of the interest groups involved in the plan to bring DPs to Canada were very conscious of the need for economic safeguards and development in 1945. No one wished a replay of the economic downturn that accompanied the end of the First World War. The Department of Labour was working at the forefront of these efforts. Humphrey Mitchell, continued to be actively involved in labour concerns and MacNamara continued to act as a channel for the concerns of industry managers as he had during the war.

There was much to be done as military production continued to be converted to civilian use and returning military personnel found work in civilian occupations. The Department of Labour estimated that over the course of 1945 approximately 400,000 members of the Canadian armed forces were released from active service, and that more than 250,000 of these workers entered paid employment. 46,000 were registered as unemployed and "unplaced" with the NES.\(^8\) Leaving aside the question of women workers forced out of paid employment, the Department of Labour was proud of the way such large numbers of the returning servicemen and women were reintegrated into the Canadian work force at the close of hostilities. Of course, they were helped considerably by the strong Canadian economy which boomed despite fears of recession.

The forest industry was expanding in 1945-6. Increasing demand for newsprint and housing pushed labour demand upwards in the bush camps when other war industries were contracting or shifting into civilian production. Despite the return

\(^8\) *Labour Gazette*, v. XLVI, 514.
of such a large number of workers, the expansion of forestry operations, and the fact that woods work had "not proved particularly attractive" due to its isolation, physical demands, and seasonal nature, meant that operators were under pressure to find ways to increase their work force.\(^9\) Previously, when Canadians were predominantly agricultural workers, the seasonal nature of woods work was a benefit. Farm workers could move to the bush camps during the relatively quiet winter season and get the cash necessary to run their farms for the rest of the year. However, between 1939 and 1945 approximately 700,000 Canadians became "wage and salary workers," and many of these had left the farm to enter manufacturing.\(^10\) Not only were workers moving off farms and away from the seasonal farm/forest labour cycle, those that remained on the farm were more able to get cash without winter bush work. Improved social support from the federal government in the form of family allowances, veterans' benefits and mortgage assistance made it increasingly possible for farmers to avoid winter woods labour.\(^11\) Despite the disincentives for farmers to leave their families in the winter cutting season, both the Department of Labour and the woods operators continued to rely on farmers, particularly those from the Prairie region, to fill seasonal labour needs at the head of the lakes where the impact of the departure of the POWs was most acute.

In the spring of 1946 Canadians were preparing to send the German POWs back to Great Britain. Canada had maintained approximately 33,000 POWs in its

\(^9\) *Labour Gazette*, v. XLVI, 516.
\(^10\) *Labour Gazette*, v. XLVI, 519.
\(^11\) LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 1, National Selective Service, Woods Labour, Camp Conditions, 31 July 1946, memo to A. MacNamara from George V. Haythorne re "Woods Labour Committee Meeting." "It was pointed out that family allowances and other social legislation were important deterrents to the men accepting woods work. The prospects for larger farm crops and higher farm incomes, it was suggested, might probably also reduce the number of farm workers accepting woods employment in the fall..."
custody since the outbreak of the war as an agent of the British Government. As discussed in Chapter Two, the approximately 11,000 POWs who worked in the Canadian forest industry, particularly in northeastern Ontario had a significant impact on the economic viability of both the pulp and paper industry and the supporting communities. While the federal government was successful in arranging that the POW work parties be sent to Europe at the latest possible date, it was inevitable that these workers would eventually need to be replaced in a market where "...neither the average Canadian youth nor the returned ex-serviceman desire[d] work in the woods."\(^\text{12}\)

One solution undertaken in 1946 was an intensive publicity campaign to convince those released from war production or from the armed services to consider working in the bush camps. After receiving reports of both labour deficiencies from the woods operators and the coming demand for forest products during the summer of 1946, the Department of Labour, represented by its “Associate Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries,” George V. Haythorne, was searching earnestly for more information about camp conditions and labour requirements in order to organize the Woods Labour Campaign of 1946-7. Haythorne was 36 years old in the summer of 1946. He had been an investigator in the National Selective Service between 1942-3 and went on to become Associate Director of that organization until 1946 when he became Associate Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in the Department of Labour. He would have had considerable experience in the process of the selection and distribution of workers into the forest, mining, and construction industries. He

\(^{12}\) Labour Gazette, v. XLVI, 574 and 662.
left the organization on a Guggenheim scholarship and finished his PhD (in Economics) at Harvard University in 1949.\footnote{For more on G.V. Haythorne, see The Canadian Who's Who v. viii, 1958-1960, Toronto: Trans-Canada Press, 493.}

In July 1946 the Department of Labour assumed potential workers would come from among the unemployed, farmers looking for seasonal work, and possibly Japanese Canadians.\footnote{LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 1, National Selective Service, Woods Labour, Camp Conditions, George V. Haythorne to Mr. H. Hereford Re: Plans for Woods Labour Campaign, 1946-7, 8 July 1946.} While wartime controls over labour transfers and publicity were gone, Haythorne noted with pleasure that industry representatives had expressed a willingness "to continue on an informal basis with the Department in these matters."\footnote{LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 1, National Selective Service, Woods Labour, Camp Conditions, George V. Haythorne to Mr. H. Hereford Re: Plans for Woods Labour Campaign, 1946-7, 8 July 1946.} To this end the first meeting of the Woods Labour Committee, (WLC) was organized for July 29, 1946 to organize the campaign. Although its first meeting was scheduled to be held in Winnipeg, this group, under Haythorne’s chairmanship, met regularly in Ottawa and should not be confused with the Woods Labour Advisory Committee (WLAC) chaired by H.P. Crabb\footnote{H.P. Crabb was the Chairman of both the WLAC and the Prairie Regional Advisory Board to the NES in Winnipeg.} in Winnipeg and Port Arthur under the Prairie Regional Advisory Board of the National Employment Service (The NES was the postwar incarnation of the NSS). The WLC and the WLAC both became important links between forest industry representatives and the Department of Labour, eventually playing key roles in the movement to encourage the Cabinet to agree to the extension of contracts to DPs with Ontario pulp and paper operations.

The 1946-1947 publicity campaign was based on print and radio ads on the theme "The Woodsman and his Job". In October 1946 the following script for an advertisement was planned for local radio broadcast.
CAN YOU USE EXTRA CASH THIS WINTER?
AS WITH MOST OF US THE ANSWER IS – YES.
WELL THEN, LISTEN CAREFULLY AS TO HOW YOU CAN GET
YOUR SHARE. THOUSANDS OF JOBS ARE NOW OPEN IN THE
LUMBER AND LOGGING INDUSTRY, EAST OF WINNIPEG. THERE
IS ONE WAITING FOR YOU.
ACT NOW DON'T DELAY.
CAMP CONDITIONS HAVE IMPROVED AND WAGES HAVE BEEN
BOOSTED.
GOOD FOOD IS THE ORDER OF THE DAY. RAILWAY TICKETS
BOTH WAYS WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE EMPLOYER IF YOU
WORK 78 DAYS OR LONGER. EXPERIENCED MEN ARE NEEDED
BUT INEXPERIENCED WILL ALSO BE HIRED IF THEY ARE
PHYSICALLY FIT AND WILLING AND ABLE TO DO HEAVY WORK.
THOSE JOBS ARE OPEN NOW – GET AN EARLY START. APPLY
IMMEDIATELY TO YOUR NEAREST NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT
OFFICE. REMEMBER THE ADDRESS --- YOUR NEAREST NATIONAL
EMPLOYMENT OFFICE.17

This script demonstrates that the Department of Labour and operators were
still relying on Prairie farmers to make up labour deficiencies; that they were willing
to take measures to move workers to remote areas as long as they were guaranteed a
sufficient return on their investment (travel expenses paid after 78 days); and finally,
that cash was still considered a significant incentive for seasonal bush workers. We
also see that even after the end of the war, the NSS, now the NES, remained an
important clearing house for woods labour despite complaints from woods operators
that the quality of NES recruits was not always high.

In addition to short radio spots like this, the Department of Labour was
involved in the production of longer radio broadcasts on the subject of woods labour.
MacNamara participated in a fifteen-minute recording produced by the Department of
Labour with D.A. Gillies, of Gillies Brothers and Company. Gillies was President

17 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 1, National Selective Service, Woods Labour, Camp Conditions, 7
October 1946. W. Duncan to H.P. Crabb, Chairman of Woods Labour Advisory Committee.
from 1938-1961 and was also former President of the Canadian Lumberman's Association. The broadcast was entitled "The People Ask – Labour needs in Woods Operations".18

The setting was a log cutting contest at the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto. This sawing contest was one of many held across the province of Ontario in 1946-7. They were designed to raise awareness of woods work and to encourage young farmers to choose work in the bush. In this recording, the two men (MacNamara and Gillies) watch the contest, admire the physical appearance and skill of the participants, and discuss both conditions in the camps and the importance of Canadian pulp and paper internationally.

The farmers in the audience were reminded that bush work was a fine way to raise "good money" to buy one's own farm, chiefly because there was nowhere to spend any cash earned in the bush. To dispel rumours of poor conditions in the bush camps, MacNamara set about asking questions he thought "men [were] asking about work in the woods." In return, Gillies assured MacNamara and his audience that all camps were inspected by health inspectors and that they were "clean," "warm," "comfortable" and provided, "splendid meals" and "good eats," at 5800 calories per day average.19 In addition to publicizing the improved camp conditions, MacNamara


19 This diet, while not remarkable for bush workers in Canada, is significant when compared to wartime averages in Canada and most significantly as we will see below, when compared to the diet available in post-war Germany. In 1945 the food ration for Germans living in the American zone was 1240 calories per day, but General Lucius Clay, the Commander of the American Military Mission in Berlin, believed that individuals were generally lucky if they received two thirds of this amount. DPs in the camps run by the Allies were allowed slightly more than this, but even when the German ration was raised several years later, the new allowance was only 1550 calories per day. Bush work necessarily requires a high calorie diet, but the contrast is remarkable nevertheless. Lucius D. Clay, *Decision in Germany*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1950), 31 and 100.
appealed to the patriotic nature of the potential bush workers. He told his audience that despite a 10% rise in the number of men working in the woods in 1946, 25,000, young men were still required to keep up with the demand for Canada's pulp and paper at home and abroad and to replace the aging work force.

When asked about "the type of man best suited to woods work" Gillies painted a very romantic picture of Canadian manhood. The ideal woodsman in his estimation was "strong physically" like the competitors at the Fair, whose "muscles rippled under their skins." The young farmers who worked in the bush during the winter were in "excellent trim" and it was a "pleasure to look at their strong healthy bodies." In addition, their physical skill and coordination was obvious to an observer who watched their saws move through the wood "like a knife through butter." They displayed emotional qualities like "endurance," "grit," "perseverance" and "good sportsmanship," as well as joy at "working in the open." In sum, these were "strong, virile men" who represented the ideal woods worker in Gillies' opinion. Although experienced woodsmen were obviously preferred, Gillies was quick to clarify that the key was to find men with "suitable" physique and "temperament" who could be given the necessary training. When men were "unsuitable" in these basic qualities operators had trouble keeping them in the camps. The key then was some basic desire and ability to do the work required at a pace that would ensure a decent wage on a piecework basis.

At this point in the recording a second audience is implied: the woods operator. MacNamara asked Gillies if he had any suggestions for improvement for the Department of Labour and the NES and Gillies suggested that many workers
currently being sent by the NES were "unsuitable" in physique or temperament and therefore did not stay long in the camps. Further, he suggested that operators were getting most of their (more suitable) labour through their own agents rather than the NES. Gillies recommended that the NES take "increased care in selection" of workers and provide applicants with more information before they agree to a contract so as to avoid taking on those unsuited to this "well paid, healthy and virile occupation." In return, MacNamara suggested that operators continue to improve working conditions and provide training where none was available during the war. In conclusion, he assured operators that the NES had committed to making a considerable effort to help bring "more manpower" to the bush.

It is here, as we will see in greater detail below, in assessments of the man “suited” to woods work in both physique and temperament, where Canadian prejudices based on race and religion had the most impact on the immigrant selection process. Even some Canadian-born men could be considered “unsuitable” for work in the bush. The claim that selection based on “occupational suitability” was not “discrimination” was deeply rooted in both ethnic stereotypes and in the history of the selection of Canadian workers for pulpwood and timber cutting. Some groups like French Canadians, the German POWs, Ukrainian, and Finnish immigrants had a history in the bush that re-enforced the idea that they were generally well suited to the work. On the other hand, operators, bush workers and administrators were convinced that Jewish men would never be satisfied in the bush camps and would therefore be poor choices for contracts in pulpwood cutting. In 1948 MacNamara could (and

---

20 See below for an extended discussion of the Department of Labour’s approach to the selection of immigrants for specific industries based on ‘race’ or religion.
did) argue that despite his commitment to the idea that Jewish men were not “occupationally suited” to bush work, the Department of Labour could not be justly accused of discrimination, since the number of Jewish DPs accepted as garment workers was high. Discrimination for MacNamara would have been the refusal or restriction of Jewish workers as a whole, not in particular industries where assumptions about “suitability” were considered rational and real measures of potential.21

Woods operations were not the only companies struggling after the loss of the POWs in 1946. One of the Department of Labour's primary priorities at the time was to ensure that agriculture maintained at least the minimum of workers necessary to ensure the 1946 harvest. Under pressure and with the financial support of Great Britain, Canada agreed to place 4,000 Polish veterans, who had fought with the Allies during the war, on Canadian farms in July 1946. As was in the case of the POWs, the cost of transporting these workers from Europe was covered by the British government. But unlike the POWs, the Polish workers were sent only to agricultural work and were free to leave their placements after their contracts were concluded. MacNamara considered this "experiment" in labour movement a success: and it served as an explicit starting point for the organization of subsequent labour immigration schemes including the movement of DPs in 1947. This is clear evidence that practical consideration of expanding certain kinds of immigration was underway well in advance of the government’s public statement on immigration in May, 1947.

Operators had their own ideas about how to increase the number of workers in the bush camps. In July 1946, at the first meeting of the WLAC, it was suggested that "consideration should be given to bringing in another group of Polish veterans." A second request for Polish veterans came in October of the same year from Graham Pipher, a personnel manager from Marathon Paper Mills of Canada, Port Arthur, a firm that had used POW labour extensively during the war. He suggested that the Poles could best be used in pulpwood cutting during the winter rather than travelling directly to Canadian farms during the relatively quiet winter season. Pipher's idea was rejected in the subsequent correspondence between Crabb and MacNamara due to the fact that "strengthening of the agricultural labour force in Canada" was the objective sought in this scheme, not re-enforcement of the bush labour force.

Nevertheless, the woods operators continued to consider their options. The situation seemed particularly desperate to some of the Ontario woods operations in November 1946 because of reductions in productivity due to a labour dispute. Newaygo Timber reported that 380 men walked out causing the loss of 6460 man-days. Brompton also reported a loss, although other companies reported additions to their work force because of the movement of strikers from other companies’ camps.

In December 1946 it was decided to move the meetings of the WLAC to Port Arthur, Ontario from Winnipeg given that MacNamara was "anxious that every effort

---

22 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 1, National Selective Service, Woods Labour, Camp Conditions, 31 July 1946, memo to A. MacNamara from George Haythorne re "Woods Labour Committee Meeting."

23 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, NSS Woods Labour and Camp Conditions – Advisory Committee – Minutes and Correspondence, 10 October 1946, Graham Pipher, Personnel Manager Woodlands Division, Marathon Paper Mills of Canada, Port Arthur, Ontario to H.P. Crabb (Chairman, Regional Advisory Board, Winnipeg)

be made to fill woods labour demands, especially in the Lake Head area which was particularly affected by the withdrawal of prisoners of war. It was agreed among the industry representatives that the log sawing contests and other publicity work organized by the Department of Labour had been successful given an estimated increase in the labour supply of 15%. It was also agreed that demand for pulp and paper had also increased, further increasing the labour requirements in the industry. Most significantly, the woods operators concluded that "selected immigration was probably the only long term solution to the shortage of woods labour…"

In this sense, Canadian industries in 1946-7 wanted immigration, but under new conditions; based rhetorically on economic need, but informed by lingering ideas of race.

Despite growing pressure to allow for immigration without discrimination “as regards nationality, race, religion or citizenship…” Canadian opinions about immigration and ethnic "preferences" were most certainly taken into consideration by the Department of Labour and the Cabinet Committee on Immigration Policy in 1946-7. Industry representatives were consulted specifically as to their preferences and reports from Europe included extensive discussions about the relative merits of various groups.

---

25 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, NSS Woods Labour and Camp Conditions – Advisory Committee – Minutes and Correspondence, 25 November 1946, memo from A. MacNamara to Crabb, Chairman, Prairie Regional Advisory Board, Winnipeg.
26 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, NSS Woods Labour and Camp Conditions – Advisory Committee – Minutes and Correspondence, 3 December 1946, Memo to A. MacNamara from George V. Haythorne re: Woods Labour.
27 For more on the emerging international human rights discourse see Ross Lambertson, Repression and Resistance: Canadian Human Rights Activists, 1930-1960 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005) and for a later expression in UN legislation affecting Canada see LAC, RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2, 14 November, 1949, United Nations General Assembly, “Discriminations practiced by certain states against immigrating labour and, in particular, against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees.”
In February 1947, Haythorne, suggested to a regional forestry advisory group that he was interested "to learn what qualifications they would like to see in the immigrants, such as age limits, marital status, nationality preferences [emphasis added], the numbers needed and whether or not they would be prepared to offer year-round employment…”28 The pulp and paper industry in northern Ontario had been happy with the Germans; they wanted to share in the labour potential of the Poles; they felt Latvian and Estonian loggers would be "suitable"; and they encouraged the government to consider the merits of each group.

Concerned about labour shortages in Canada’s resource industries, the cabinet passed order in council P.C. 371 on January 30, 1947, providing opportunities for immigrants slotted to work in agriculture, mining and forest industries to enter the country. Haythorne advised Crabb, that the operators were sure to have read this order and immigration was “more than likely to come up” at their next meeting.29 Furthermore, Haythorne encouraged him to assess the ways immigration could be a solution that operators would support. It appears that information was moving back and forth from Ottawa and the WLAC. In this case, Haythorne was soliciting information about

…what qualifications they would like to see in the immigrants, such as age limits, marital status, nationality preferences, the numbers needed, and whether or not they would be prepared to offer year-round employment on a contract basis as [was] done in agriculture with the Poles.

28 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2 – National Selective Service (NSS) Woods Labour and Camp Conditions – Advisory Committee – Minutes and Correspondence - 11 February 1947 George V. Haythorne, Associate Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Department of Labour to H.P. Crabb, Chairman, Prairie Regional Advisory Board, Winnipeg.
Haythorne supported the idea of contracts in order to give “some protection” to all involved “with respect to living and working conditions.” As the cabinet moved forward it was appealing to the forest industries for details of their labour requirements and specifications.  

These questions were posed directly to the woods operators assembled at Port Arthur by Crabb on February 14, 1947. The secretary summarized the discussion that followed writing that “definite opinions” were aired on the topic of immigration and “the Committee expressed an interest in bringing in groups of able bodied persons to cope with what appeared to be an imminent shortage of labour in the woods industry.” Operators with concerns about the administration of such a scheme were assured that 95% of the Polish veterans were placed “successfully” in Canadian agriculture because of “the screening methods” used by the Department of Labour. While this was of some comfort to operators, larger operators were used to participating in the selection of workers through the NES and one, a delegate from Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper suggested that company representatives might be sent to Europe to “assist in the selection of immigrants for bush work.”

The groundwork for such a selection was already being laid. General Maurice Pope, Chief of the Canadian Military Mission in Berlin, sent a detailed report on his impressions of life in the DP camps to the Department of External Affairs in the fall of 1946. In addition to comments on living conditions, the economic difficulties

---

30 Ibid.
31 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, 14 February 1947, Minutes of the fifth meeting of the WLAC, Port Arthur, Ontario, 6-7.
32 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, 14 February 1947, Minutes of the fifth meeting of the WLAC, Port Arthur, Ontario, 7.
faced by refugees in the camps, and the state of food rations in the occupied zones,
Pope also included an assessment of the "popularity" of various ethnic groups from
the perspective of the Allied administration. He witnessed the fact that the British
administrators preferred Balts, and the Americans Ukrainian DPs. He ranked the
groups in order of preference as "émigré Russians, Mennonites, Ukrainians, Balts,
Poles and Jews, the last two about equal." He continued;

These observations upon nationalities are a good deal beside the point. It is
not their characteristics as D.P.'s which interest us so much as their
potentialities as future citizens. Docility, so much praised among the Balts, is
not the highest attribute of a citizen of a democracy. We have enough of all
these peoples in Canada to be able to estimate their respective worth for our
economic needs. As to the humanitarian aspect, the diversity of background
from which they emerge makes it impossible to calculate their comparative
deserts.34

Clearly Pope's perspective was shaped by the idea that individuals could be
assessed based on ethnic origin and his recommendations to external affairs and the
内阁 follow from these assumptions. In this he reflects a prevailing attitude of his
time and place. What is significant is that while Pope’s assessments of ethnic
preference are based on some sense of general personal quality, others at the time,
like the forest operators and the Department of Labour, were using ethnicity as one
means of measuring future economic productivity. As we saw above, “occupational
selection” while based to a large degree on ethnicity in this period, also aimed to
evaluate potential contributions to Canadian economic life in specific industries. In
this sense it might be seen as a transitional phase in movement towards the 1962
immigration law.

After the request for Polish veterans and before the DP decision was complete, other options were considered by woods operators, including getting permission from the federal government to allow the return of former POWs currently living in Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland. One representative at the WLAC meeting on February 14, 1947, raised the issue saying “that his company [Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper] had received many letters from former POWs…requesting the Company’s assistance to return to Canada for bush work.”

Significantly, other operators had also received letters from former POWs as well as from four hundred Lithuanian DPs claiming to have had “forestry experience.” The minutes of this meeting report further that the woods operators felt that “these people would make suitable and desirable immigrants.” We can conclude from this discussion that early in 1947 woods operators were considering ways to participate with the NES to select and bring immigrants, be they former POWs or possibly DPs on 10-12 month contracts to work in the Ontario bush camps. They had suggested that, as was customary in the NES labour selection process, operators should send representatives to ensure “suitable” workers would arrive. And finally, the Committee passed a strongly worded resolution supporting European immigration to be forwarded to the Department of Labour.

In view of the apparent impossibility of meeting the increasing labour demands of the woods industry in this area, the Committee wishes to go on record as being of the opinion that the ONLY [emphasis in original] solution

---

35 LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, 14 February 1947, Minutes of the fifth meeting of the WLAC, Port Arthur, Ontario, 7.
36 Other documents suggest that there were also requests from Estonian and Latvian DPs with forestry experience, including training in forest management.
to the problem is in immigrating (sic) able bodied persons from the Continent of Europe.\textsuperscript{37}

While the Department of Labour and the cabinet were obviously taking the lead in defining the scope of European labour immigration at this time, it is also clear that individuals like MacNamara welcomed and encouraged the input of woods operators in arranging the practical details since they had so much experience in this area. In March, MacNamara wrote to Crabb supporting the work of the WLAC and saying that it might “be able to help… in developing arrangements for handling any immigrants who may be made available for woods employment at the Head of the Lakes.”\textsuperscript{38}

The woods industry's calls for immigrant labour were echoed further at the April 17\textsuperscript{th} meeting of the Woods Labour Committee (WLC) in Ottawa. This committee, chaired by Haythorne was in communication with both the WLAC in Port Arthur, Ontario and the federal cabinet. C.R. Mills, representing the Forest Industries Association (Toronto) and W.A. Walker of the Canadian Lumbermen's Association (Ottawa) reiterated the industry's concerns about the current labour shortage and the industry’s "definite interest in obtaining immigrants."\textsuperscript{39} Two days later, on April 19\textsuperscript{th} Order in Council P.C. 1329 removed restrictions on the practice of bringing immigrants to Canada on contract labour in industries other than agriculture. All remaining administrative barriers to contract labour in natural resource industries had

\textsuperscript{37} LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, 14 February 1947, Minutes of the fifth meeting of the WLAC, Port Arthur, Ontario, 7.

\textsuperscript{38} LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 2, 24 March 1947, A. MacNamara to H.P. Crabb

\textsuperscript{39} LAC, RG27, v. 1521, T6, pt. 3, 17 April 1947, Draft minutes of the fifteenth meeting of the Woods Labour Committee held in the Confederation Building, Ottawa, at 2:30 pm on Thursday, April 17, 1947 – Chair – George V. Haythorne, Department of Labour.
been removed and the way was now open for the Department of Labour to organize contract labour in pulp and paper cutting and mining.40

At the same time as the pulp and paper industry’s attitude towards immigration was under consideration at the beginning of 1947 William Lyon Mackenzie King was about to enunciate Canada's position on immigration in Parliament. He presented a bill to the House of Commons on May 1, 1947 which emphasized Canada's right to select immigrants who were seen to be the best potential citizens and he restated the government's responsibility to ensure that immigration never exceeded Canada's "absorptive capacity," or its ability to maintain the existing standard of living. The parliamentary record shows that old concerns such as unemployment and anti-Asian nativism were in tension with new priorities such as Canada's international humanitarian goals and post-war security. The result was a dance balancing international responsibilities, government assessments of Canadian perceptions of immigration, business interests and interdepartmental politics.

Despite his age and increasing weariness with the pressures of government, no one was more up to this kind of political manoeuvre than Mackenzie King. His speech in parliament presenting both Canada's moral responsibilities and its rights as a sovereign state provided both an opening for Canada's doors to Europe's refugees and a safety valve to calm those who feared change.

The most often cited passage of this speech is his assertion of Canada's right to select its future citizens: "…Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting the

---

40 There is currently some uncertainty about the date of this order. Alan Green cites the date of P.C. 1329 as 19 April 1947.
persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens. It is not a "fundamental human right" of any alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege. It is a matter of domestic policy.\textsuperscript{41} Having seen the practical implications of anti-Chinese and Japanese sentiment in Canada in 1907 and throughout his long career, he was unwilling to allow unrestricted immigration. Significantly, in the case of the DP scheme, international commitments were profitably linked to domestic economic policy.

As we saw in Chapter One, this link between domestic and international policies was made explicitly in Keenleyside’s memo to Beaudry. By being early adopters of the DP labour scheme Canada could look good internationally, get first choice of the available immigrants and demonstrate the federal government’s interest in immigration to the general public, all without sacrificing Canada’s economic position.\textsuperscript{42}

It was this profitability for Canadian operators that was the key to this scheme’s implementation. The Canadian Government was not prepared to bring thousands of refugees from Europe, no matter what international commitments it had made in theory, without being able to give assurances to the Canadian public that the program would not interfere with the ability of Canadians to work as they wished or reduce Canadians’ standard of living. It was, after all, “selective immigration” that was desired across the country.

On May 20, 1947 C.D. Howe, as Acting Minister of the Department of Mines and Resources, submitted a request to cabinet based on the principles of

\textsuperscript{42} LAC, W.L. Mackenzie King Correspondence, mfm c-11038, 386210-1. H.L. Keenleyside to Laurent Beaudry, Acting Under-Secretary for External Affairs, 15 May 1947, Ottawa.
Keenleyside’s memo, to allow for the immediate immigration of 5,000 Displaced Persons to Canada giving the following reasoning:

a) It would constitute a real and practical development in a very distressing situation. b) The Canadian example might lead other countries to take similar steps with further beneficial results. c) It would enable Canada to select the refugees who are to be admitted and to take only those that seem the most desirable. If action is not taken until an International Agreement is reached, Canada will have to take its share from the general pool thus including many who may not be of desirable types. d) It will allow the Canadian Government to point out to its own people that Canada was the first country to make a serious effort to contribute to a solution of this problem. It will also attain a wide degree of recognition abroad and bring very favourable publicity to Canada.

On May 27, 1947 the cabinet committee on immigration policy discussed this situation and recommended to cabinet that "Canada should agree immediately to admit 5,000 persons from the D.P. camps…” and that the government should find available shipping to bring four hundred from Europe "immediately" without waiting for the IRO to come into existence. In his summary of the benefits to Canada and the world if this policy were to be implemented Howe echoed Keenleyside, saying;

…the proposal…would constitute a true humanitarian act; would improve the type of displaced person that will ultimately reach Canada without increasing the total number to be admitted; might stimulate other countries to make an early contribution to the solution of the refugee problem an enhance the reputation of Canadians as humanitarian and practical people. It will add

---

43 LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration – 20 May 1947, Minister of Mines and Resources "To his Excellency the Governor General in Council – Proposal that Canada admit 5,000 selected displaced persons without waiting for an International Agreement on this subject."

44 LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration – 27 May 1947, 2. This meeting was chaired by C.D. Howe as Acting Minister of Mines and Resources and included J.A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce; C. Gibson, Secretary of State; L. St. Laurent, Secretary of State for External Affairs; H. Mitchell, Minister of Labour; A. Fournier, Minister of Public Works; Raymond Ranger the Privy Council Office Secretary; and also present: A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour; H.L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources; L.B. Pearson, Undersecretary of State for External Affairs; A.L. Jolliffe, Mines and Resources (Immigration Branch), R.G. Riddell from External Affairs and R.G. Robertson from the Prime Minister's Office.
nothing to the financial burden which Canada will, in any case, have to accept.\textsuperscript{45}

After years of discussion in government and years of waiting in the DP camps of Germany, the order had finally been given. Canada would arrange for the selection, employment and transportation of the first of many future Canadians under the DP immigration labour scheme. Mackenzie King and his government had found ways to earn international credibility; support their allies’ efforts to find solutions to the European refugee crisis; provide a desirable labour pool for an important industry and stave off domestic fears of open immigration.

Once the order in council was passed on June 4\textsuperscript{th} procedures were developed\textsuperscript{46} and plans were begun for ways to explain the decision to Parliament and the Canadian public. Should the prime minister wish to bring these matters to a public audience, some background on the decision might be necessary, particularly on the ways in which the government had taken Canadian fears into consideration. Keenleyside prepared a briefing memo for this eventuality which included a section on the delay as Canada waited for an international agreement "on the disposal of people in these Camps," and on the history of the decision.\textsuperscript{47} This almost petulant policy history was removed from the text by a later reader. The edited draft does include a statement that the number of DPs selected would be applied to any quota Canada was obligated to

\textsuperscript{45} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration – 20 May 1947, Minister of Mines and Resources "To his Excellency the Governor General in Council – Proposal that Canada admit 5,000 selected displaced persons without waiting for an International Agreement on this subject."

\textsuperscript{46} Readers may also wish to consult Milda Danys, \textit{DP: Lithuanian Immigration to Canada After the Second World War}, (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1986) for more on the procedure as it was finally adopted.

\textsuperscript{47} LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration – 4 June 1947, H.L. Keenleyside to C.D. Howe. "If either you or the Prime Minister should desire to make a statement on the Orders of the Day this afternoon, the attached text may be useful."
fill under future agreements with the IRO and reassurance that members of the Immigration Branch and the Department of National Health and Welfare would be in Europe to ensure the best DPs were selected. Canada's moral obligation was restated and parliament was reminded that "[a]ll parties represented…[had] repeatedly indicated their interest in the humanitarian problem posed by the existence of the Displaced Persons.”

After much debate and with great care Canada had opened its doors wide enough to allow for an initial group of 5,000 Displaced Persons. But the question remained: who would be “the right kind of immigrants from the D.P. Camps”?

To begin, DPs needed to convince employers that they could fill a labour gap. Employers would submit "orders" to the Department of Labour as they had during the war to the NSS, who, with the Immigration Department, the RCMP and medical teams, would select candidates from the available pool of labour in Germany. Labourers would agree to 10-12 month contracts with specific firms and in return they would receive wages equal to those paid to equally experienced Canadian workers and the ability to become landed immigrants (and, it was assumed, Canadian Citizens after the necessary years of residency). The costs of travel from Europe were to be paid by the IRO and employers would pay up front travel costs from Halifax to the bush camps (taking portions of the immigrants' pay cheques to pay off the travel costs over the course of the year and reimbursed at the end of the agreement).

The cost of moving workers to remote camps had been an ongoing issue for the pulp and paper industry, and the practice of taking portions of new workers' pay

---

48 LAC, RG27, v. 895, 8-9-63-1, pt. 1, Department of Labour - Cabinet Committee on Immigration – 4 June 1947, H.L. Keenleyside to C.D. Howe.
49 Ibid.
cheques to pay off travel costs over the course of the season and reimbursing the workers at the end of the contract was not uncommon in order to protect the companies' investment in each recruit. And so, the DPs’ travel expenses were generally managed in the same way. In the same spirit, employers were in the habit of participating in screening applicants so as to avoid situations in which workers “leave the job before the employer is reimbursed for his initial outlay.”

Although the historian of Lithuanian immigration Milda Danys suspects that the forestry operators sought representation on the European selection committees because they were “suspicious that the government would take the opportunity to foist charitable cases on them,” the well-established practice of operator participation in the selection process in cooperation with the NES was in place years before the DP project was initiated. In 1945 the key issue was screening for workers who were fully aware of the difficulties of “camp life” and who were physically suited to the work so that employers’ investments in travel costs would be met and labour turnover, which was always high, could be minimized. The woods operators concluded that to ensure the best selection, industry representatives should maintain a permanent presence in the local NES offices and participate in the selection process. No doubt the presence of company representatives in Europe gave operators some confidence that they would see some return on their investment of travel costs for the DPs from Halifax to the bush camps, but it was a pre-existing practice.

50 Labour Gazette v. XLV, p. 1751, “Woods Labour Committee studies requirements”.
51 Danys, 87. I am indebted to Milda Danys’ work, particularly to her extensive discussion of life in the DP camps, the work of the selection teams, and working conditions for DPs while under their initial contracts. Although Danys’ work focuses on the Lithuanian immigrants, Parts I and II of DP remain a valuable resource for anyone interested in this immigration scheme.
52 The administration of DP travel will be discussed further in Chapter Four, but for the purposes of understanding the operators’ investment it is important to know that the IRO was willing to pay for the
In March 1947, even before cabinet had agreed to the plan, an interdepartmental Immigration-Labour Committee (ILC) had been established in Ottawa on the initiative of the Minister of Mines and Resources.\textsuperscript{53} It was agreed that employers would submit requests for workers through the NES as they had during the war. These applications would be “screened carefully” and immigrants would be assigned in four categories; agriculture, logging and lumbering, mining and domestics.\textsuperscript{54} These plans were discussed and approved in cabinet on March 26, 1947.\textsuperscript{55} It is worth noting that a similar British DP immigration project was, according to Danys, passed on April 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1947. Danys also claims that MacNamara received a report on the British plan in May and it became a “model” for the Canadian project, although the two immigration schemes were in the planning stages simultaneously.\textsuperscript{56}

By April 22, 1947, the Ontario Forest Industries Association could report that a survey of its members showed that they were interested in bringing between 7,500 and 9,000 workers to Ontario.\textsuperscript{57} It was decided that each employer application would be considered on its own merits, taking into consideration their record with the Department of Labour during the war, their facilities, and need. Some of these

\textsuperscript{54} LAC, RG26, v. 101, f. 3-18-3, Immigration-Labour Committee, General File, 17 March 1947, Memo from A. MacNamara to Jolliffe, Director of Immigration.
\textsuperscript{56} Danys, 70-71.
applications requested workers by ethnicity, others only specified “men for work in the woods.” Among the first applications were requests from the Abitibi Power and Paper Company, Spruce Falls Power and Paper, and the Great Lakes Paper Company. Each of these firms had used POW labour extensively during the war and had a firm working relationship with MacNamara and his staff. Special arrangements were made for representatives of these companies to attend a session of the ILC on May 14th “to discuss selection, transportation and placement of Woods workers.”

The ILC began early in May to accept these early requests by companies well-known to the Department of Labour. They also recommended that these groups continue to participate in the selection process by joining representatives from the Immigration Branch, the RCMP, the Department of Labour in Germany. Members of the Department of Labour, medical, security and immigration officers, and industry representatives were commissioned with the task of going to Europe and choosing the workers most likely to thrive in remote areas doing the skilled and semi-skilled manual labour that Canadians had ceased to find attractive. They arrived with an implicit sense of what it was to be a Canadian man and explicit criteria for filling the required labour contracts.

One might characterize this sense of "Canadian-ness" by its dominant themes - Canada was northern in culture. Its economy was rooted in the extraction of primary resources, and, the result was an almost romantic reliance on a particular kind of

58 LAC, RG26, v. 72, pt. 1, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings – 8 April 1947- 16 December 1947, 22 April 1947, Harold Capp of Little Current, Ontario requested “15 Estonians for employment in a small logging and sawmill camp.” Another in the same file from Gillies Brothers made the more general request for “men for work in the woods.”
masculine labour. The romanticized ideal of the woods worker as it exists in Northern Ontario even today was nicely characterized by Thomas Dunk, an anthropologist interested in working class culture in Thunder Bay, who writes that the ideal woods workers were

…celebrated for their physical strength, courage, perseverance, and their drinking binges and spending sprees… The celebration of physical strength, practical skill, the willingness to withstand discomfort stoically, and being able to "drink like a man"...60

Canadian search teams were on the lookout for immigrants who were most likely to approximate this ideal in the form of a potential Canadian farmer, miner, and woods worker. By May 17, 1947, the secretary of state for external affairs had sent a telegram to the High Commissioner's office in London requesting that teams select 1,400 single, experienced, skilled, woods workers.61 And, by May 27th, the age requirement had been dropped from 25-45 to 20-40 years old. Candidates were required to pass a basic health inspection and demonstrate "suitability for work in the woods". The goal was to have skilled workers ready to sail for Canada on July 15th, August 7th and 8th, 1947.62

On May 29th, industry representatives left Canada by air for London. The three included a representative from Abitibi, Emile Tarnowecky (aka Tarnowski)

61 LAC, RG26, v. 101, 3-18-3, Immigration-Labour Committee – General File. The May 17th telegram requests “...single men between 25 and 45 with some experience with the axe and cross-cut saw in the woods; men with experience in river driving and pulp-wood peeling; men with training in feeding and stacking logs for saw-mills; timber cruisers and scalers if available.” Note the specificity of the experience requested by the employers. It is quite safe to say that few of those who eventually came would have this level of skill in woods work.
(aged 54), Andrew Opaski (aged 39), and Guy Alexander Kingston (aged 45). We do not know much about these men, but there is some evidence that one, Tarnowecky, caused the Department of Labour some anxiety. In June there was a rather ambiguous, but clearly negative, report from one of the Department of Labour representatives about Tarnowecky's behaviour abroad. A.A. Heaps was the child of Polish, Jewish immigrants to Britain and himself an immigrant to Winnipeg in 1910. He represented Winnipeg North and the CCF Party in Parliament from 1925-1940. He was an activist against quotas on Jewish immigration and anti-Semitism as well as for old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. Descriptive material associated with Heaps' files at Library and Archives Canada suggests that he had "retired to private life" by 1940. Although biographies like the archival description and the account written by his son Leo do not mention his participation in Germany, it seems that it was indeed he who was the prominent member of Canada's selection team. In this capacity he sent a communication to MacNamara explaining some of the difficulties he was facing abroad. Among these concerns was the "irresponsible" Tarnowecky. Heaps had come to the conclusion "that unless you know the people

---


64 Biographical information on "Albert Abraham Heaps" comes from the Library and Archives Canada biography and administrative history for the Heaps personal fonds, MG27-IIIC22.

65 Leo Heaps mentions briefly his older brother David, who studied in Paris and the fact that both Heaps' sons, Leo and David served in Europe during the Second World War. Leo Heaps describes the years after 1940 as "a life of anonymity" and "semi-private life." It is unclear why Heaps' activities in Germany after the war are left out of this account. It is possible, but highly unlikely, therefore, that the A.A. Heaps working in Germany on selection is some other individual. Leo Heaps, The Rebel in the House: The Life and Times of A.A. Heaps MP (London: Niccolo Publishing Company, 1970), 162.
who go on government missions we are better off without them." We do not know much more about the details of his behaviour, but it is reasonable to say that there were disagreements on the team during the first months abroad.

Each team consisted of six to eight members, including at least "one Immigration inspector, one doctor, one RCMP Officer, one Department of Labour official and one representative of industry and Women Officers… to select domestics…" and interpreters. Most of the men who would fill these roles were already waiting in Europe. Representing the Department of Labour were Haythorne, Heaps and V.C. Phelan, the department's Director of Information. In 1946, V. "Cyril" Phelan had been in Europe for some time. He represented the Canadian Government at the International Labour Organization on the Committee on Iron and Steel and had acted as Chair of the sub-Committee on Industrial Relations. In 1947, he was the Department of Labour Special Representative to the Canadian Military Mission, stationed in Frankfurt.

The immigration officer in charge of the process was O. Cormier, who was a consul in the Canadian embassy in Paris and had run the immigration process from

---

66 "Another matter that I wish to draw to your attention. There are three representatives with us looking after their employers' interests. One of them has been getting us into many difficulties. Yesterday at Esslingen which is just outside of Stuttgart the local head of the Inter Governmental Committee on Refugees protested to me on the actions of this particular person and of course I had to put the man in his place. He is an irresponsible type and I don't think anything I tell him will make him act any differently. My own feeling is that unless you know the people who go on government missions we are better off without them. The man I am referring to runs an employment office in Winnipeg for the Abitibi Company and his name is Tarnowski (sic). I am completely isolated here as since leaving England I have not had a word from the outside." LAC, RG27 v. 277, f. 1-26-2-1, pt. 1, Administrative – Immigration – Lumber and Logging, 27 June 1947, A.A. Heaps (Frankfurt) to MacNamara.

there since 1938. He took charge of the DP immigration scheme for the Immigration Branch. His leadership style was a significant factor in the difficulties faced by selection teams in co-ordinating efforts between departments in 1948; particularly between the Immigration Branch and the Department of Labour since he pushed for centralization of the screening and transportation process. MacNamara was not interested in having decisions passed through Cormier, claiming that the Immigration Branch was merely interested in numbers, not choosing “suitable” applicants.

A portion of the first group of woods workers was scheduled to sail from Bremerhaven on July 23, 1947; another in mid-August. Group two left Germany in mid-September. On September 13, 1947, the acting Minister of Mines and Resources, the eminent C.D. Howe, wrote to the Acting Chief, PCIRO, James Colley in an attempt to streamline the selection and embarkation process, since the program had been expanded by recent orders in council. Keeping in mind his wide responsibilities for Canada’s postwar economic reconstruction, Howe was keen to ensure an adequate and regularly reinforced labour supply. He asked for the IRO to organize camps at "suitable locations in Germany and Austria" so that immigrants could be quickly processed when shipping became available and would "make possible reasonably long term planning, ensure the utilization of all steamship berths made available and

---

For more on Cormier’s appointment to Paris in 1938 see LAC, RG25, v.1870, f.1938-316 and for his role in Germany, see LAC, RG2, f. I-50-2, Privy Council Office – Immigration – Refugees and Displaced Persons; 1945-1947, 9 December 1946, Riddell, Undersecretary of State for External Affairs, in letter to Intergovernmental Committee (IGC) on “plan for Formation of a Balt Settlement.”

enable the procedure of selection, assignment and movement to operate smoothly.  

The pool Howe was requesting the IRO collect was to be made up of 1,500 men "suitable for heavy industry work", 1,500 "for outside rural construction work" and 1,000 "who have had some experience in building construction work," 1,000 "suitable for lumber camps" and 2,000 women for domestic work. Howe was planning for a time when Canada would move about 3,000 DPs per month.  

As the number of DPs being chosen for specific industries grew, and pressure increased on the Department of Labour to fill orders within a relatively tight time frame (such as for the winter cutting season) tension between the Department of Labour and the Immigration Branch increased. Immigration was focussed on moving as DPs as quickly as possible and the Department of Labour wished to ensure that those DPs who made it on the boats were suitable to fill the time sensitive contracts with employers. On December 19, 1947, G.G. Congdon, representing the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources wrote MacNamara explaining the difficulties of sending orders to the PCIRO and suggesting that Cormier become the central point for clearing the various orders with the PCIRO.

All this processing takes time and the actual movement of DP's is all under the control of the PC IRO. The best we can do is to request the PC IRO to try and forward by any one boat the number of various bulk movements we want but to be effective this request must be in the hands of the PC IRO at least from four to six weeks in advance.

In order to avoid confusion and conflicting instructions, Mr. Cormier is of the opinion that these requests should all be sent to the Officer in Charge of the Canadian Government Immigration Mission as he is the only one who is

---

71 Ibid, 2.
readily able to give information as to the numbers and groups who have been processed and granted visas and could be prepared for sailing. He would then transmit the departmental request to the proper officials of the PCIRO and assist them in every way possible to carry out these requests by following up the matter as closely as possible.\textsuperscript{72}

This set the stage for growing tension between Department of Labour officials who had been working to bring workers for specific jobs in Canada and the Immigration Branch that considered itself responsible for the movement of immigrants. In a June 4 memo from MacNamara to his staff in Germany he wrote, "...our joint activity is suffering from lack of co-operation and an excessive determination to regiment activities." And further, he blamed the situation on a May 14\textsuperscript{th} "edict" issued by Cormier. In this edict Cormier requested that

Wing Commander Innes [the Acting Chief of Operations, IRO (Canada)] would instruct [his] Resettlement Staff in Germany and Austria that they should be guided only by official directives sent from this office under the responsibility of the head of the Mission regarding all relevant operations; assembly, selection, examination of, as well as allocation of passages to Displaced Persons under any of the Canadian projects.\textsuperscript{73}

The result, MacNamara argued was that

...since this edict was issued we are getting... the workers someone feels like sending, rather than those we need...The edict also stresses the 'quota system' of so many from each camp for Canada which is surely none of our concern. What we are after are suitable settlers. The instructions, apart from getting us garment workers when we want farmers and apart from the fact that we never seem to know what classes we are to get, until they are on board ship, has created dissention and Colonel Davidson, Miss Amas, Miss Sauriel and Mr. Lee have asked to be relieved.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} LAC, RG27, v. 282, f. 1-26-20-1, pt. 1 – Administrative – Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 19 December 1947, Department of Mines and Resources, G.G. Congdon, Director, to A. MacNamara.

\textsuperscript{73} LAC, RG27, v. 282, f. 1-26-20-1, pt. 1 – Administrative – Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 4 June 1948, memo from MacNamara to Phelan, Davidson, Mitchell, McLaren, Keenleyside, Jolliffe.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
Officers of the Department of Labour were very confident in their ability to judge “occupational suitability.” Woods, mining and hydro operators had entrusted them with the task of filling specific jobs for a reason – they had experience at doing exactly this. In spite of the obstacles associated with working in Europe, language, logistical chaos and political complexity, this was familiar territory for the Department of Labour’s representatives in Germany. However, the lessons learned from long experience in the NSS and NES did not leave them with open minds about the potential of Jewish workers. Of course, Jews were not the only group for which these men harboured significant prejudices. One might suspect that if the movement of Chinese or Black workers was even suggested similar arguments would be found for their exclusion based on suitability. However, in this context it was Jewish men who were singled out as unsuited for manual labour.

The correspondence between the Department of Labour and prominent members of the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC) on the issue of Jewish immigration under this scheme most clearly demonstrates how the balance between discrimination and selectivity was worked out in practice.⁷⁵ Despite the lessons of the Holocaust, the growing discourse in Human Rights and a commitment to arrange immigration policy without discrimination, these officials responsible for making policy in the Department of Labour were convinced that certain groups, like Jewish men, were unsuited to outdoor labour; that they obviously lacked occupational suitability in this

---

⁷⁵ Significant portions of this debate occurred in correspondence on the issue of the movement of female DPs into domestic service. Although this movement is not a primary focus of this work, debates on the assessment of these women have relevance. For more on the movement of domestic workers see Marilyn Barber Immigrant Domestic Servants in Canada CHA and Multiculturalism Program, Government of Canada, 1991 and Milda Danys DP: Lithuanian Immigration to Canada after the Second World War (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1986).
area. This was explicitly argued in the correspondence between MacNamara, Saul Hayes, the CJC’s national executive director.\textsuperscript{76}

As progressive as MacNamara was in promoting Jewish DP immigration in general, he was working under certain assumptions about the ways Canadians perceived differences between national and religious groups. This correspondence tells us a little about his own personal prejudices, but most importantly, it also reveals some general assumptions within the Department of Labour about selectivity, discrimination, and race. In January, 1948 Saul Hayes wrote to him, asking for clarification about the rejection of Jewish applicants from the DP immigration program. Mr. Hayes was most concerned with the painfully ironic situation of Jewish women being rejected for positions at Jewish hospitals in Quebec. He also incidentally inquired about woods workers. The drafts of MacNamara’s response to this inquiry are extremely helpful in understanding his logic at the time.

In defence of his project, MacNamara emphasized that an accusation of discrimination could not be leveled at the entire project, that is, across a variety of employment categories. He denied that as a whole any "race or another [was] being favoured or being discriminated against." This was true, he argued, because despite the low number of Jewish loggers or domestic servants, more than half of "about 2,000 garment workers" under consideration would be Jewish, "to accommodate the fact that the garment trades constituted a field in which Jewish people excel, and in

\textsuperscript{76} Saul Hayes was a lawyer, activist, and director of the Canadian Jewish Congress from 1941 to 1959. He worked to remove considerations of race and religion from the National Selective Service criteria during the war and was a respected representative of the Jewish Community. As a result of his work affecting change in the NSS he would have had previous contact with Arthur MacNamara. For more on Saul Hayes, see Ross Lambertson, \textit{Repression and Resistance: Canadian Human Rights Activists, 1930-1960} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 204 and Gerald Tulchinsky, \textit{Branching Out: The Transformation of the Canadian Jewish Community} (Toronto: Stoddart Publishing, 1998), 131, 200, 273, 276, 287, 292 and 323.
which workers of other racial extractions appear to engage in relatively small numbers."\textsuperscript{77}

Furthermore, on the question of domestic servants, he claimed that "no one will argue that this is a field in which girls of Jewish extraction in Canada have ever sought to engage in any substantial numbers, and certainly the experience of the public Employment Offices over the years has lead to contrary conclusions."

MacNamara makes a similar claim for logging, citing a number of cases in which Jewish loggers did not complete their undertakings.\textsuperscript{78}

He defended the Department of Labour saying

I do not feel that you have called into question the matter of whether in the over-all picture the number of persons of Jewish extraction who are being brought to Canada reaches a total which might be regarded as fair in the light of all the circumstances. In any event as the Department of Labour is concerned with occupational selection, and not with the determination of representation of various racial groups in its phase of selection, I shall not discuss the broader question at this time. To sum up: the Labour Department, responsible for selection of Displaced Persons under the aspects of occupational suitability and acceptability by Canadian employers, must continue to exercise its function without racial prejudice in any direction.\textsuperscript{79}

Note that MacNamara both acknowledged the importance of avoiding "discrimination," bringing Jews to Canada, and the emphasis on suitability from the perspective of the job and the employer.

In the same spirit, Keenleyside commented on a draft of this letter suggesting that it should

be emphasized that in no case is there a hard and fast rule, but that we try to select in each instance the particular individuals that would seem to be most likely to fit easily and efficiently into the opening in

\textsuperscript{77} LAC, RG27, v. 3531, f.3-262-38-1, pt. 2, 15 January 1948, A. MacNamara sends a draft response to W.W. Dawson of the Information Branch for his input.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
Canada. Above all, of course, we are governed by the Prime Minister's statement that immigration is to be non-discriminatory, but at the same time is not to be used as an instrument to effect any major change in the racial, religious or social constitution of Canada.\textsuperscript{80}

Whereas MacNamara emphasized the suitability of an individual for particular employment, Keenleyside took this a step further – applicants needed to “fit easily and efficiently” into the job, but also must not contribute to “any major change” in Canada’s “social constitution.” When considering the question of "How heavy a stream of DPs would we want arriving in Canada as a maximum?” Phelan, assumed "the answer…turns in part at least on whether plans succeed to carry more British migrants to Canada."\textsuperscript{81} The key then, for him, seemed to be the balance between relatively "desirable" (British) and "undesirable" groups.

Although a large number of Jewish DPs may have preferred Palestine to Canada and therefore failed to apply for immigration, nevertheless, there seems to be a large preference to Catholic Poles in the selection process. A survey of the Canadian periodical press and Department of Labour radio broadcasts from the time suggests that this was generally in keeping with government perceptions of the wishes of a Canadian public who feared a large movement of Jewish refugees, particularly in Quebec.

In a February 1948 radio script, prepared for Keenleyside, the Canadian public was told that of the 11,000 DPs who had already arrived, 25% were Poles, 25% were Ukrainians, 20% were Lithuanian and 8% were Jews.\textsuperscript{82} It should be noted

\textsuperscript{80} LAC, RG27, v. 3531, f.3-262-38-1, pt. 2, 19 January 1948, Keenleyside's comments.
\textsuperscript{81} LAC, RG27, v. 282, 1-26-20-1, pt. 1 – Administrative – Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General – 29 November 1947 – V.C. Phelan to the Deputy Minister of Labour, A. MacNamara
that most of these categories are national, while "Jews" is based on racial/religious criteria. Also, it is significant that there were other groups with more than 8% among the arrivals. What then was the message being conveyed to the Canadian audience? It seems the message was - Don't worry. A smaller percentage of immigrants is Jewish than you feared. This is not an isolated example and the others can be found in the periodical press at the time, including the Toronto publication *Saturday Night*, whose editor, B.K. Sandwell, was active in the civil liberties movement. In this case, even Edith Ferguson, a social worker who had been working in Germany with DPs, who was actively urging increased Jewish immigration and increases in the number of aged and infirm DPs, informed her readers that

Jews of various nationalities make up approximately twenty-one percent of displaced persons in Germany, a smaller proportion than is commonly supposed. Allowing for those who will go to Palestine, the number of Jewish D.P.'s entering any one country will comprise a relatively small percentage of the entire group.

So, we see that despite her personal belief in the humanitarian cause, she acknowledges that Canadians are interested in the number of Jews arriving as DPs and presumably also the well-known fear among Canadians of change in Canada's ethnic balance as most famously expressed by Mackenzie King in the May 1st speech on immigration. This concern on the part of the government was probably justified.

---

84 For more on Edith Ferguson, see Franca Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada* Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006, 3 and 5.
85 Edith Ferguson, "Large Source of Labor in Europe's D.P.'s in *Saturday Night*, 13 December 1947, 22.
given the kinds of polling data discussed in Chapter One. In 1946 Canadians preferred just about anyone, including Germans, to Jewish immigrants.\textsuperscript{86}

On January 26, 1948, Hayes sent MacNamara a letter that while cordial, seems justifiably frustrated in its tone.

I quite agree with your statement that the program for the selection of displaced persons as a whole has to be considered. … If officers responsible for the selection of displaced persons, under whatever project in operation, function without motives of racial prejudice, then we shall feel comforted though in some of the occupational classifications Jewish applicants cannot come forward. The burden of our complaint is that workers in the field have charged the opposite. I am sure that you and your Minister would deplore any instances of the violation of these principles of equitable treatment as much as we do.\textsuperscript{87}

So, while Hayes is willing to be polite in characterizing the project as a whole, he was not convinced that selections were being made in Germany without racial prejudice. MacNamara's letter of January 28\textsuperscript{th} seems to assume that the issue had been resolved. It is not nearly so clear that Hayes felt the same way.

Similar logic was used by Don Pryor, the Director of Public Information of the IRO in a letter to J.H. Allard, the Chief of Mission, IRO Canada on January 26, 1950. This correspondence was initiated in response to a \textit{New York Times} article of January 10, 1950 that accused Canada of maintaining an anti-Semitic immigration policy. In defence of the program, Pryor claimed that 14% of immigrants were Jewish and that "…some job categories [had] been reserved for Jews exclusively on the basis of a realistic appraisal of refugee backgrounds."\textsuperscript{88} So once again we have both the desire to avoid accusations of discrimination, the willingness to allow

\textsuperscript{86} 1946 Gallup poll data cited in Lambertson, 208.
\textsuperscript{87} LAC, RG27, v. 3531, f.3-262-38-1, pt. 2, 26 January 1948, Saul Hayes to Arthur MacNamara.
significant Jewish immigration, and race based criteria being used to assess suitability for particular types of work.

How can we understand this formulation of discrimination as a category outside of the judgments of occupational suitability? I would suggest that particular popular assumptions about Jewish immigrants had become so "natural" to those involved that discrimination itself became invisible. MacNamara and his team were so convinced that Jewish workers were unsuitable in bush work that it was inconceivable to prefer them in the selection of workers to fill forestry contracts. But what were these assumptions and where did they come from?

**Perceptions of Jewish Labour**

Negative interpretations of the immigration of East European Jews to New York City between 1880 and 1924, and to Canada during the same period, provided the vocabulary for Canadian fears of a vast Jewish immigration and informed their assessments of "occupational suitability". It is this wave, according to Louise A. Mayo, that sparked fears in the United States of the urban, Jewish ghetto, the tenement, Jewish Radicalism and unassimilability. Stephen Speisman shows a similar process underway in Ontario at the same time. Previously, the predominantly British born Jews of the Holy Blossom congregation were relatively well integrated into British, Protestant, Ontario culture. However, anti-Semitism became more vocal and less "genteel" when larger and more visible waves of East European Jews began

---

to settle in Toronto. Thus Canadians had their own "evidence" of difference. To these contemporary observers Jews were obviously urban, unassimilated and interested primarily in trade, particularly the rag trade.\(^{90}\)

It is not a stretch to think that if the United States Immigration Commission could claim in 1911 that it was "well known" that "Jewish immigrants settle almost entirely in the cities,"\(^{91}\) and that Canada's most visible Jewish communities were in its big cities, that employees of the Canadian Department of Labour would too. It would be easy for them to make an educated assessment of "occupational suitability" and decide that Jewish DPs would not be content to remain in remote northern Ontario logging camps, even without the occasional DP living up to these expectations. Nor is it a stretch that they would conclude that since Jews were known for "preserving their own individuality to a marked degree"\(^{92}\) that Jewish "assimilability" might be an issue.

The central aspects of the Jewish stereotype, urban-ness and unassimilability became significant barriers to success in applications in the DP labour scheme. At a time when selection committees were looking for the men most likely to become good Canadians quickly, and labourers "of rugged physique and good physical strength required to perform in the open…,"\(^{93}\) the image of a Jewish labourer did not conform to preferences in key areas.

---


\(^{92}\) Ibid. 73.

\(^{93}\) LAC, RG26, v. 118, f. 3-24-41, Admission to Canada of Groups of Immigrants for Employment by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission, Dec. 6, 1950, Recruitment of Trades and labour in Britain – Brief Description of Trades, etc. requirements.
It would be inaccurate to claim that *all* members of the selection committees were acting the same way, or under the same assumptions about race. A.A. Heaps, whom we met earlier, was a prominent member of the Canadian selection team in Germany. It would have been impossible for him to be unaware of anti-Semitism among the team's members given his years of activism in this area.

There is some evidence that selection based on race was actually a matter of serious contention between at least one industry representative and the Department of Labour. In July 1947, representatives had become uncomfortable "regarding the selection of DPs on the basis of racial origin…" On July 11, C.R. Mills, of the Ontario Forest Industries Association wrote to C.E. Smith, the commissioner of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources about these events. His understanding was that

> With respect to the conditions experienced by the selection team, I can give you no information other than that there was dissatisfaction on the part of some authorities over the rejection of Jewish applicants. It is understood that this has *not* been straightened out.  

Some went as far as to threaten to quit, although by July 18th the ILC was told that "the matter had been satisfactorily adjusted" and two would remain in Europe. It seems the matter arose again in January 1948 when Phelan, complained about the amount of time he needed to take explaining … why we were not to pick any of these people for heavy labour – we must have discussed the subject on a least ten occasions, and he [Davidson, another Dept. of Labour employee] fully understood and even fully agreed. Yet, after he had picked the sixty-four iron workers for Imperial

---

95 LAC, RG27, v. 277, f.1-26-1 pt. 1, Administrative – Immigration – Lumber and Logging, 11 July 1947, C.R. Mills, Manager, Ontario Forest Industries Association to Mr. C.E. Smith, Commissioner of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources. [emphasis added]
Iron, he boasted to me that in spite of pressure he had passed only one of these people. When I promptly told him that was one too many, he answered: "Maybe the doctor will refuse him!" I think this illustrates the difficulties on the side of selection.  

While the author of this memo does not name this undesirable group, it is clear from both the context and other evidence in the files that it is the Jews to whom he refers. While few would be surprised to find such a comment made before the Second World War, it seems rather shocking to find it in January 1948.

Anti-Semitism continued, although changing, after the war. There was a significant selection bias against Jewish applicants for emigration to Canada under the DP labour scheme. And, significantly, there was considerable pressure against these biases and assumptions from a variety of groups; the international community through the United Nations and its agencies, from Canadians doing humanitarian and government work in Europe after the war, and from Jewish organizations in Canada.

Considerations of "occupational suitability" primarily based on gender, health, nationality and religion, were clearly important determinants in "desirability" in this program, despite attempts to design an immigration program without "discrimination" and based on "skill, loyalty and determination," Phelan's memos to Ottawa demonstrate that being Jewish was enough to disqualify applicants from many categories of employment. Canadians involved in selecting Ontario woods workers and potential new Canadians valued immigrants who could easily be imagined as skilled heroes in a tale of Canadian development in the northern woods. The stories of Jewish immigration that they had been telling themselves (and hearing from the

---

96 LAC, RG27, v. 277, f.1-26-1 pt. 2, 27 January 1948, - Director of Information Branch, confidential to A. Macnamara
United States) did not allow for a Jewish woodsman. The numbers accepted under this scheme followed accordingly. The first wave of woods workers to arrive in Canada in October 1947 only included 1.4%, that is 43 of 3005, Jewish workers despite the fact that in June 1947, according to UNRRA, 21% of DPs in Germany were Jews. In contrast, among the first arrivals 45.1% were Polish, 24.2% were Lithuanian, 12.3% were Ukrainian, 6.9% were Latvian. 97

**Perceptions of other ethnic groups**

In 1945-50 thousands of Eastern Europeans displaced by the war were waiting in Germany for permission to emigrate. 98 Looking for ways to get out of Europe while legislation passed through the United States Congress, Baltic DPs had begun sending requests to Canadian organizations, including the Ontario Forest Industries Association. Most of these requests were written by individuals with real logging experience and post-secondary training in forestry. Employers were comfortable with the idea that Baltic DPs were "northern" like the Polish veterans and earlier Finnish and Ukrainian immigrants who had worked in the industry. This northern-ness meant they would have had experience with something like the Canadian climate and would be more familiar with a Canadian landscape. These ethnic categories (Ukrainian, Polish, Baltic, and German) were therefore considered assets in the selection of workers for the pulp and paper industry.

It should be emphasized here that both requests for employment and workers were often framed in these ethnic or national terms. In late 1946, Aleks Berzins, a

97 LAC, RG26, v. 72, pt. 1, f. 2122/76, Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees – Department of Migration and Settlement - Lumbermen for Canada – 17 October 1947 "Nationalities and Religions of D.Ps who have arrived in Canada"

98 For more on conditions in Germany in the period, see Chapter Four.
Latvian woods worker, sent applications to several Canadian pulp and paper firms seeking employment. His requests were initially refused, but it did initiate a discussion in the cabinet about the virtues of using labourers from the Baltic nations. Norman Robertson forwarded his letter to the cabinet noting that "favourable impressions of the Balts [had been] formed by Canadian officials who have had the opportunity of visiting displaced persons camps…" In the days following, the Cabinet began a discussion considering a "group settlement" plan for Baltic DPs. Group Settlement was set aside when the employers began requesting workers for specific jobs, but the Baltic DPs remained a preferred group. In a similar case, four hundred displaced Lithuanian woods workers appealed to several firms in the Ontario pulp and paper industry looking for work. When the WLAC met in February 1947, as it had throughout the war, it considered the petitions of the DPs and "the opinion was expressed that these people [the Lithuanian DPs] would make suitable and desirable immigrants." 

As we saw above, General Maurice Pope, had his own ideas about race, which were communicated to the cabinet in November 1946. He claimed to be basing his observations on "a ten months' casual acquaintance with D.P.'s and D.P. problems acquired during [his] consular work in Germany, followed by a two weeks' tour of D.P. centres…" He spoke with high-ranking officers, mid-level managers and UNRRA workers. He acknowledged that he failed to consult DPs themselves, "except some who were also UNRRA employees." While Pope did not have a strong

---

preference for the Baltic DPs as many did, he was quite clear about the relationship between the selection of DPs and their role as future Canadians. If Pope had a negative opinion about the potential of Baltic DPs, it was still based on assumptions based on their worth as members of an ethnic group.

But what, made an applicant suitable besides basic gender, age and health requirements? The documentary evidence suggests that the potential to assimilate, based on assumptions about the nature of individuals within particular national groups was important. While teams were sent out with marching orders "to insure (sic) a reasonable division of nationalities," the goal seems to have been finding national groups that could be defended to both industry and the interested public. One officer, responding to this brief, reported his expectations for a "reasonable division" to be a majority of Baltic DPs, since this group was "particularly suitable from the point of view of assimilation," and "a number of Ukrainians as such action [would] be favourably received in some quarters," and since there were already many Poles in Canada, there "was no particular necessity for "getting more, although they would not be rejected if they were available." Their potential would then be put to the test during the contract year. Did workers live up to their commitments to government and employer? Did they demonstrate the “determination” to be Canadian? Immigrants had to want to come to Canada. It was recommended to Cabinet that

---

102 LAC, RG27, v. 277, f. 1-26-2-1, pt. 1, Administrative – Immigration - Lumber and Logging, 7 June 1947 to Haythorne, Canada House from Deputy Minister (Jolliffe)
103 LAC, RG26, v. 101, 3-18-2, Senate Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, 246.
individuals who had been previously rejected by the USA were not suitable, since "their ultimate objective would be to enter the United States."  

Next there was an expectation, as we saw in the telegram to the High Commissioner in London, that the teams would find experienced, specialized, skilled loggers among the DPs. It quickly became apparent that among the applicants claiming to have experience in the woods, most had been limited to the occasional tree removal on family farms, not professional work in the remote bush. In the next chapter we will see that what the DPs lacked in specialized skills they eventually made up in commitment to the process and a willingness to work hard. But it would be difficult to say that professional qualifications defined desirability, with the exception of a handful of petitions sent from trained Baltic foresters to the Ontario Forest Industries Association.

Despite lingering fears, the immediate post-war years can be seen as a period of transition in Canadians' tolerance of ethnic and religious difference. Lambertson argues that the combination of Canada's improved economic position and the World War Two experiences of the Holocaust in Europe and Japanese deportation in Canada, shifted the emphasis of Canadian civil rights activists from the defence of "libertarian" to "egalitarian" values - from "British Liberties" to "Human Rights." Furthermore, he argues that this new emphasis on human rights spread from these activist groups to Canada's legislative bodies and into the public realm. In 1947, this process of transition was relatively new and well-worn ethnic stereotypes remained.


105 Lambertson, 16.
Significantly for the history of the movement of DPs, some of these worn out perspectives were critical to the way Department of Labour officials understood the requirements of Canadian industries.

In conclusion, the intersection of Canadian international responsibilities and domestic fears strongly influenced behaviour in this period. The development of this scheme was an exercise in governmental action in the face of perceived negative public opinion. From the prime minister down, Canadians felt compelled to assist in humanitarian efforts, but feared threats to their own sense of the strength of the economy and Canadian identity. The emphasis individuals placed on difference varied, but a variety of forces were continually pressuring decision makers to increase official tolerance of ethnic and religious difference, increase immigration, and ensure a steady stream of new Canadians willing to work in the bush camps.

Decisions made in the selection of DPs for this immigration project reveal some significant assumptions being made at the time about Canada, labour, and citizenship. We see the importance of maintaining resource industries like pulp and paper to the post-war economy. Despite the rise of manufacturing and service industries in these years, there is a strong sense that forest products (and fishing, mining and agriculture) provide a foundation for Canadian economic development. Related to this is the sense of the importance to Canada of maintaining a workforce of fit, muscular, skilled, men to assure the nation's resources become a source of real income.

In addition to notions of Canadian resources, these decisions have also demonstrated the emerging sense of responsibility in international humanitarian crises.
felt by Canadians at every level. In the face of fears about cost and change, Canadian civil servants, policy-makers, intellectuals, professionals, and public were inclined to believe that Canada, as a nation with wide spaces, abundant resources and adequate food supplies had a moral obligation to open its doors to Europeans in need. This sense of global citizenship would become even more pronounced in the next decade when Canadians chose to participate in aid programs like the Colombo Plan, military participation in Korea, and support for peacekeeping with the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt in 1956 and onwards. In the meantime, Canadians were doing their part by working to integrate New Canadians into Canadian society.
IV: “Full of the miseries of life in Europe”

While Canadians debated the advisability of increased immigration from Europe, more than a million Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Yugoslavians, and others were waiting in “assembly centres” for permission and assistance to leave Germany – by travelling west, the only acceptable direction for refugees fleeing not only the social disruption of Germany, but the specter of Soviet communism. While conditions varied from camp to camp, those living in them were all indeed faced with what Milda Danys has called “a temporary life.” Under these conditions families were being re-assembled or reconstituted; young people were learning vocational skills that were impossible to use during the war; schools were opened; arts pursued; and most significantly, individuals waited and sought ways to get out of Europe.

Previous chapters told the DP story from the perspective of policy and business elites in Canada. These groups were actively collaborating in a struggle to manage Canada’s labour needs, public opinion, and Canada’s relationships with its allies. However, a significant part of the story remains—What were the conditions in

---

1 This quotation and many of the others which make up the chapter titles of this thesis, is from a memo prepared by Dr. Urquhart at the Des Joachims dam to Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission on the arrival of the first group of DPs sent as construction workers. It was found in the former, now closed, Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 19 December 1947.

2 Attempts were made by UNRRA welfare workers to refer to the DP camps as “assembly centres” in order to distinguish them from concentration camps, but nevertheless the term “camp” was widely used. Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray, *Armies of Peace: Canada and the UNRRA Years*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 103.


Europe that made such a lasting impression on observers and caused an international solution to seem so pressing? And, why would individuals living in Germany in 1947 seek employment in the Canadian bush? Finally, what was it like to wait in the camps, apply for emigration, and travel to Canada?

This chapter is intended to present the human side of these events. It will be a brief portrait of life and conditions in the UNRRA (1945-1947) and IRO (1947-1951) camps in Germany\textsuperscript{5} where most of the Displaced Persons in Europe were waiting for resettlement abroad in July 1947. Using UNRRA and IRO relief materials, accounts of individuals who traveled to inspect the camps, petitions to Canadian professional organizations and Canadian government planning documents, this chapter will introduce readers to the main issues facing DPs in Europe: trauma, political and social instability, educating the next generation, and the acquisition of meaningful work abroad—including the process by which camp residents learned about their various options, volunteered, were selected, and moved to Canada.

As a result of this glimpse of “the miseries of life in Europe” in 1945-8, we will be able to understand more fully in Chapter Six why most DPs were so grateful for the contracts under which they lived and worked in Canada in their first year, despite conditions that were certainly challenging and might seem unduly hard from a twenty-first century perspective.

\textsuperscript{5} Mary Kinnear, \textit{Woman of the World: Mary McGeachy and International Cooperation} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 162. “Over nine hundred displaced persons camps were set up in Europe and North Africa, the majority in Germany.” Holborn cites an IRO report that showed 604,556 of the total 1,619,008 people registered by the IRO lived in Germany, 33,049 in Austria, and 29,170 in Italy. The balance were scattered across Europe, North Africa and Asia. Louise Wilhelmine Holborn, \textit{The International Refugee Organization: A Specialized Agency of the United Nations, Its History and Work, 1946-1952}, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 189.
Dr. Urquhart, the Hydro physician whose comments give this chapter its name, was correct in his general assessment of the living conditions faced by the DPs in Europe after the war.\(^6\) In 1945, by all accounts, Europe was on the move. Waves of refugees were flowing back and forth in front of the advancing and retreating armies of the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union and Germany. More than seven million foreign workers in Germany were suddenly free to leave the factories and farms to which they had been tied for so many years, some for as many as six. In addition, mass movements of populations uprooted by war were flowing across Europe in at least two directions. Tony Judt put it very succinctly when he wrote: “Between them Stalin and Hitler uprooted, transplanted, expelled, deported and dispersed some 30 million people in the years 1939-1943. With the retreat of the Axis armies, the process was reversed.”\(^7\)

Among the throng were folks emerging from vastly different circumstances: German refugees, war criminals, concentration camp survivors, former POWs, civilian refugees from allied nations and those from Eastern Europe who had been brought to Germany as forced labour. Clearly each group needed immediate attention and each had to be handled differently by the occupying powers.

At the end of the war the SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force) established some legal guidelines to classify those that were to be treated as “displaced persons,” as opposed to former military personnel, German

\(^6\) Dr. Urquhart sent a detailed memo to the managers of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission in 1947 describing the first group of DPs sent to work on the Des Joachims Dam, Rolphston, Ontario. Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 19 December, 1947.

\(^7\) Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 23. For more on the movement of populations in 1945, see also Wyman, 17-22, who cites the number of foreign workers in Germany at eight million, 22. Holborn places the number of “nationals of other European countries including civilians and prisoners of war…”at more than 8.5 million. Holborn, 15.
refugees and other groups. DPs included the “slave” labourers, or “Ost” from Eastern Europe, who were forced to work in German industry under various kinds of coercion. Also included in this category were concentration camp internees, members of foreign regiments under German military command, former prisoners of war and other non-Germans who found themselves in the Allied zones after V-E day. As Kathryn Hulme sympathetically explained, “the Allies invented a new name for the OST people, indicating their state of being rather than a generalized place of origin.” The vast majority of these people were swiftly returned to their home countries. Approximately seven million were repatriated by SHAEF between May and September, 1945. UNRRA worked to move “more than a million” between November 1945 and June 1947. However, by 1947 it was clear that around two million were unwilling to return to homelands which were now under Soviet control. Some were willing to kill themselves rather than face a future under the Communists. In should be noted that this meant that almost by definition, all the DPs interested in emigration to Canada were anti-Communist. While this did raise questions about their wartime political affiliations it also helped to convince an increasingly anti-Communist public that these particular refugees had a just cause and would be an asset to the country.

---

8 Wyman, 25 and Mary Kinnear, *Woman of the World: Mary McGeachy and International Cooperation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 154. Wyman’s summary of the groups that fell into the DP category included “… evacuees, war or political refugees, political prisoners, forced or voluntary workers, Todt workers and former members of forces under German command, deportees, intruded persons, extruded persons, civilian internees, ex-prisoners of war, and stateless persons.”


10 Holborn, 23.

11 Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray, *Armies of Peace: Canada and the UNRRA Years*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 338. On the suicides of Russian ex-POWs upon forced repatriation and the feelings of Polish DPs on repatriation, see Hulme, 45-7.
According to IRO materials, those receiving IRO aid on August 31, 1947 “…were 278,293 Poles, 98,256 Ukrainians, 29,336 Yugoslavs, 22,192 Estonians, 77,550 Latvians, 47,884 Lithuanians, 7,559 Czechs, 9,026 Hungarians, 8,460 Rumanians, and 1,143 Turks… [and] an additional 20,000 without, or with an undetermined, citizenship.”¹² 204,636 of these people were Roman Catholic, 92,944 were Jewish, 87,648 were Protestant, 78,616 were “Greek Orthodox” and 44,649 were “Greek Catholics”.¹³

These DPs, those non-Germans who remained in the western zones of Germany in 1947 and who had not been found guilty of war crimes or treason,¹⁴ were the primary mandate of the new IRO until such time as they had either been repatriated or resettled. The IRO constitution defined the term “displaced person” as:

a person, who, as a result of the actions of the authorities of [Nazi Germany or another fascist state] has been deported from, or has been obliged to leave his country of nationality or of former habitual residence, such as persons who were compelled to undertake forced labour or who were deported for racial, religious or political reasons.¹⁵

DPs were entitled to refuse repatriation if they could show that they were likely to face:

i) Persecution, or fear based on reasonable grounds of persecution because of race, religion, nationality or political opinions, provided these opinions are not in conflict with the principles of the United Nations, as laid down in the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations;

ii) objections of a political nature judged by the Organization to be ‘valid’…

iii)…compelling family reasons arising out of previous persecution, or, compelling reasons of infirmity or illness.¹⁶

¹² Holborn, 189.
¹³ Holborn, 189.
¹⁴ Holborn, 586.
¹⁵ Holborn, 585.
¹⁶ Holborn, 585.
As the relationship between the Soviet Union and its former allies grew less friendly, the validity of DP objections to repatriation became more compelling to officials of the IRO and its member governments. An option besides repatriation was going to have to be found for approximately one and a half million residents of the IRO camps.\(^{17}\)

The history of the DP camps and their management goes back to August 1940, when Winston Churchill promised the people of Europe that if they would only sacrifice at the present and assist in Hitler’s destruction, help would come later in the form of “all immediate food, freedom, and peace.”\(^{18}\) As the war turned in the Allies’ favour and attention was turned to planning for the peace, the allies began to organize ways to fulfill this promise. In 1943 UNRRA was established and officials worked diligently to plan an emergency response despite the difficulties of assessing need in areas that remained under Nazi occupation. Social workers, medical staff, and military planners compiled suggestions for UNRRA volunteers and staff based on their experience with populations in need during the first years of the war. The wish list included a calorie goal of 2,650 per day for an average adult (not doing heavy labour); clean clothing, including two sets of underwear so no one would miss work or school on wash day; psychological counseling; emergency medical care and

---

\(^{17}\) This was certainly true by March, 1947 when Dean Acheson addressed the Committee on Foreign Relations as quoted by Holborn, 23. In his statement he makes it clear that “differences in political views and fears of persecution or reprisal…” were valid considerations in repatriation refusal assessments.

\(^{18}\) Kinnear, 148.
rehabilitation. The gap between conditions on the ground and the achievement of these goals was soon discovered to be enormous.

Initially, groups were gathered by region in order to simplify the process of communication between UNRRA officials and DP leaders. They came having faced every imaginable and unimaginable trauma. Reports of revenge killings, beatings, and looting were “fairly commonplace events” in the early days of the UNRRA camps as people came face to face with their persecutors and collaborators. After reports of the poor conditions within the camps, particularly the ones housing Jewish DPs, reached Truman, changes in the ways DPs were grouped and housed were initiated with mixed results. Attempts were made to allow for more freedom of movement in the camps and to separate Jewish DPs from their wartime persecutors.

DPs were assigned billets in every kind of available housing: barracks, apartments, private homes and former factories. Camps ranged in size from a few hundred to many thousands, like the UNRRA camp at Wildflecken, the former SS training camp in Bavaria described by Kathryn Hulme. This camp included sixty “blockhouses” which housed 350 persons each with additional people housed in the former stables. Canadian General Maurice Pope’s report to External Affairs described housing in the DP camps as “poor” and

over-crowded, but…not more so than the quarters in which the poorer D.P.’s lived in their own countries. To a Balt bourgeois they would seem pretty uncomfortable. They are, I should think, less cozy but more sanitary than the poorest residential districts in Canada. My driver thought them not inferior to

---

20 Armstrong-Reid and Murray, 176.
21 Armstrong-Reid and Murray, 172.
22 Danys, 43.
23 Hulme, 9.
other-rank military barrack accommodation, but perhaps he overlooked the mixture of ages and sexes in the camps.\textsuperscript{24}

One man, the son of DPs just arrived from Europe, named F. Rehwald, reported to the Christian Council for Resettlement of Refugees (CCCRR) that refugees were sleeping fourteen to sixteen per room on straw sacks.\textsuperscript{25} Many former DPs shared stories about the living conditions in Germany. More than one recounted the need for a blanket hung carefully to provide a minimum of privacy in a crowded, shared room.\textsuperscript{26} Barracks style facilities, while functional, initially lacked personal touches, but over time the residents made improvements to their “temporary” homes; flower gardens, stills, kitchen gardens, small animal (sometimes not so small animal) husbandry and common areas sprung up in camps across Germany.

In addition to altering their physical environments where possible, DPs also took opportunities to change camps altogether if compatriots, friends or family were discovered at another location. In 1945 a growing number of DPs arrived in the western zones of Germany requiring aid, often seeking out camps rumoured to house DPs of a particular ethnic group. The camp at Hanau, for example, began with forty DPs from the Baltic and grew to house “3,300 Lithuanians, 1,700 Latvians, and 1,000 Estonians.”\textsuperscript{27} Camps therefore began to take on the quality of ethnic enclaves to some extent—providing opportunities for the development of cultural and educational activities specifically geared to members of a particular ethnic group.

\textsuperscript{24} LAC, RG2, I-50-R, Privy Council – Immigration Reference Papers, 6 November, 1946, Canadian Military Mission – Berlin to Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa, 3.

\textsuperscript{25} LAC, MG29, v.120, 22, Canadian Christian Council for Resettlement of Refugees – Meetings – Minutes and Reports, 1947-8, 1951, Notes on an Immigration Meeting held at the home of Dr. T.O.F. Herzer, on Monday July 26, 1948, at 8:30PM for the purpose of Discussing the new DP bill which was recently passed in the USA.

\textsuperscript{26} Interview with Ann Kiperman Ragovin, 8 August 2008, and Hulme, 91.

\textsuperscript{27} Wyman, 44.
Making camp life more comfortable was only the beginning of what was necessary. There were always issues requiring sensitive management in the DP camps because of the scars left by war time experiences. Often DP groups could be quite unstable and prone to panic. More than one UNRRA representative remarked on the power of rumours among the DP population.28

The extreme psychological stress displayed among the youngest of the DPs were of great concern to UNRRA officials since they were seen to be the ones most likely to be successfully rehabilitated. In addition to the emphasis social workers placed on work with young people, the difficulties faced by children and young people are particularly important to note because of the relative youth of the DPs as a group, particularly those that were eventually selected by Canadian teams in the period between 1947 and 1950. Because of the nature of the jobs being filled, teams were given clear instructions about the health and age of applicants, ideally between 20 and 40.29

Because of the high mortality among the elderly during the war years, 61.2 % of the DPs at the end of 1947 were between eighteen and forty-five.30 In the particular camp in which Becky Althoff was working, there were 5,000 Jewish DPs, of whom 1000 were children – 595 between sixteen and eighteen years old. She attributed the high survival rate of adolescents to the value put on adolescent labour by the Nazi

28 Armstrong-Reid and Murray, 176.
30 Wyman, 89. Although the numbers do not represent identical age groups, the scale of the difference might be appreciated by noting that in the data supplied by the Canada Yearbook 1947, in 1945, 30.2% of Canadians were between 20 and 44 years old. Even adding individuals between 18-20 and 45, this is still a significant difference. [Based on numbers published in Dominion Bureau of Statistics, The Canada Yearbook 1947: The Official Statistical Annual of the Resources, History, Institutions, and Social and Economic Conditions of the Dominion (Ottawa: King’s Printer), 1947, 140.]
regime and the relatively higher likelihood that small children would be harboured if an opportunity arose.\textsuperscript{31}

When young people arrived in the DP camps they were often in a state of shock, having been required to take on responsibility beyond their years and having experienced any number of traumatic crises. As a result, young DPs were dealing with an array of psychological issues and “could be expected to be unhappy, anxious, afraid, possibly apathetic and backward, and troublesome, defiant, and maybe delinquent…” until they had had time to recuperate in a stable, loving atmosphere.\textsuperscript{32}

Some, particularly the Jewish DPs, were dealing with particularly extreme trauma. These are the young people with whom Becky Althoff was working and upon whom she based her reports. To communicate the types of issues she saw among young Jewish DPs she created anonymous, “characteristic” portraits. While Althoff’s “characteristic” boy may not have represented every individual’s experience, the experience of non-Jewish DPs, or of the experience of youths who had been reunited with members of their family, the impact of wartime trauma on the youths Althoff studied is nevertheless an instructive place to begin.

Her summary of the psychology of a “characteristic adolescent boy,” seventeen years old, orphaned, and of Orthodox Jewish background, was as follows:

The adolescent boy in the camp had a seemingly lackadaisical attitude toward work and school. Often he was involved in petty black-market activities, had no routine for sleeping, eating, work, or play. For the most part, in a D.P. camp, he was left to his own devices.

Overt symptoms of personality disturbance were manifested in enuresis, night terrors, depressions and moodiness, feelings of loneliness and


\textsuperscript{32} Kinnear, 164. The author would have liked to consult the original report, but was unable to travel to the Hoover Institute or to the Harvard Law Library to consult extant copies.
isolation, lack of response to others, secretiveness, and suspicion. The usual adolescent was generally excessively hostile and negative toward any discipline. Althoff also described the “characteristic” female adolescent at Foehrenwald, a sixteen year old, orphaned, Orthodox Jewish girl:

She complained generally of somatic illnesses, such as headaches and head pressure, weak heart, painful menstrual periods, insomnia, and generalized aches and pains. She was reluctant to accept medical care. During the years in concentration camps menstruation ceased altogether and was now being re-established with considerable irregularity and discomfort. She appeared moody, tearful, insecure, slow in learning, fearful, and apathetic. She related poorly, gave perfunctory replies, and seemed to be suffering from almost complete loss of affect.

While these summaries represent only a sketch of the psychological landscape of young DPs, they do suggest that DPs, in general, were likely to see lingering effects of the wartime experience in their emotional lives that might be improved or worsened by the conditions in which they were living.

The rehabilitation of women who had been forced into prostitution during the war years was also of great concern to UNRRA welfare workers. It was thought that these women were particularly vulnerable and should be helped “to resume a normal life” through work projects. The most colourful description of such a group occurs in Hulme’s memoir, The Wild Place. In it she recounts the enthusiastic work of Polish Madame Stanislawa who, as a former “public woman” during the war years, was interested in helping other women find a new role in DP society. Hulme writes:

Madame Stanislaw, Diplomaed Engineer, wore ski pants and a wool peasant blouse belted about a narrow waist. Her short cropped hair clung closely to a

---

33 Althoff, 19.
34 Althoff, 20.
sculptured skull. Harsh lines of pain gave her face a forbidding look, until she spoke, and then her deep voice seemed to draw you behind the scenes, as it were, behind the pale unsmiling face and tragic eyes to the place where her single remaining emotion lived – her love for the tough unbeaten women whom she ruled with a hand of iron. They obeyed her like schoolgirls in love with their teacher.³⁶

In this case, the initiative for rehabilitation came from within the DP community, but the impulse was one that was shared with UNRRA and IRO social workers. Women who survived the war trading their bodies were encouraged to find another way in their new post-war lives.

In addition to psychological baggage, DPs arrived in varying states of physical ill health. Malnutrition, tuberculosis, venereal disease, and lice were the most common illnesses brought by DPs into the camps. UNRRA and IRO staff were particularly vigilant about the spread of disease. Alert medical teams and valiant hygiene efforts by camp residents and managers acted together to prevent any major outbreaks of cholera-- a minor miracle in the aftermath of war.

DPs arrived by every possible conveyance, singly and in mass movements of thousands. Upon arrival at an UNRRA or IRO camp they were greeted by medical and welfare staff prepared to dust each with DDT powder, do a basic medical assessment and send those in need to the available medical facilities. In addition, new arrivals were registered, given a meal and basic supplies including “soap, blankets, and cooking and eating equipment.”³⁷

---

³⁶ Hulme, 88.
³⁷ Kinnear, 163.
While the daily ration of food may have been “unappetizing” and “monotonous” to a Canadian observer,\textsuperscript{38} the fact was that DPs were not dying of starvation in large numbers, even in the comparatively impoverished English or French zones and during the unusually cold winter of 1947. In addition to requisitions from the German countryside, DPs were provided supplementary rations from American supplies or voluntary donations like the Red Cross packages. Years later the author’s mother often remembered the joy she felt when as a child she was given an American orange at a camp Christmas celebration. Daily calorie rations for DPs may have declined considerably between 1945 and 1948. Wyman suggests that while the 1945 rations were generally over 2,000 calories per day on average, the average had dropped by 1948 to about 1600 calories per day, way below the 1944 goal of 2,650 that UNRRA set for itself.\textsuperscript{39} Danys is even less optimistic about the average daily calorie intake of DPs, citing Canadian health reports that put the average at 1,550 calories per day. She also attributes the rising rate of TB infection among DPs to “overcrowding and poor nutrition.”\textsuperscript{40}  

The DP advocate and son of DPs, F. Rehwald mentioned above, reported to members of the CCCRR in July 1948 about the conditions in which his parents had been living in Muehlenberg, Germany. He said they found the food “bad and insufficient.” The diet he described consisted of black coffee and dry black bread “mixed with straw and bran” for breakfast; watery soup with potatoes and “very little fat” for lunch and nothing in the evening. He was critical that only those over seventy

\textsuperscript{39} Wyman, 52.
\textsuperscript{40} Danys, 51.
with a medical certificate were allowed white bread and that DPs were allowed only one ounce of butter, a tablespoonful of marmalade and a tablespoonful of sugar and a little cheese per person once a week.\textsuperscript{41} Rehwald’s observations were necessarily more critical than those of UNRRA or IRO staff since his goal was to convince the CCCRR of the great need for assisting DPs still in Europe, while UNRRA memoirs often focus on efforts to improve the situation for DPs during their time in the camps. Rehwald’s daily menu is very meager indeed compared to the Red Cross package windfall described by Hulme in \textit{The Wild Place}.\textsuperscript{42}

Because DPs were often grouped (or chose to group themselves) with others who shared a common ethnic or religious identity, opportunities arose for the reproduction of cultural institutions; artistic and educational.

Among the first and most lasting efforts at improving living conditions in the DP camps was often work towards the establishment of schools. Primary education, vocational and language training were priorities among DP camp committees, with varying levels of support from UNRRA officials who, depending on their commitment to repatriation, perceived schools to be too “permanent” a measure. Maurice Pope’s impression of schooling in the DP camps in general was that it “varie[d] from the wholly pathetic to the reasonably adequate and successful. School supplies [were] short, especially in the British zone.”\textsuperscript{43} Wyman quotes an UNRRA employee who commented that “in each camp, the first order of business was to set

\textsuperscript{41} LAC, MG29, v.120, 22, Canadian Christian Council for Resettlement of Refugees – Meetings – Minutes and Reports, 1947-8, 1951, Notes on an Immigration Meeting held at the home of Dr. T.O.F. Herzer, on Monday July 26, 1948, at 8:30PM for the purpose of Discussing the new DP bill which was recently passed in the USA.
\textsuperscript{42} Hulme, 52-70.
\textsuperscript{43} LAC, RG2, I-50-R, Privy Council, Immigration Reference Papers, 6 November 1946, Canadian Military Mission – Berlin to External Affairs, Ottawa, 3.
up a hospital. The second order of business was to open a school.”

Therefore, often schooling commenced early with lasting results. One former DP, Ann Kiperman Ragovin, told the author about how she learned her first Hebrew at an UNRRA camp near Ulm in 1946 at the age of fourteen. In thinking about this experience, she commented that whenever she reads or recites Hebrew it is this Hebrew that she learned in the DP camp that she “uses.” The power of this experience for her spiritual life is therefore immediate and ongoing. Her father taught a class in pattern making for young tailors in the camp and her brothers learned tool and die making at a DP vocational school. In addition to formal schooling, she also received practical training from older women in the camp as she assisted them in the community baking every week for Shabbat. Initially unemployed teachers were more than willing to volunteer their days training anyone who was interested. Camp schools only grew further once UNRRA or IRO began to pay teachers a wage, however meager.

The desire to provide cultural continuity and training for what was to come next were powerful forces on the development of DP schools. In addition, as the possibility of emigration became more likely, there was an increased demand for relevant language and vocational training. Danys argues that the concentration on ethnic education and identity was more significant for the ways in which DPs thought about themselves and their experience in emigration than it had been in their pre-war lives. Strangers from home were often treated like family in diaspora, who, because of class, educational, geographical, or personal reasons would not have been

---

44 Wyman, 99.
46 Wyman, 179.
47 Danys, 42. See also Wyman, 158.
considered friends before the war. To combat the loss of identity in displacement, DPs substituted a more acute sense of themselves as being from a particular lost culture and actively embraced any opportunities to pass it on.

Despite the forced idleness which most DPs faced in the camps because of their exclusion from the official, local, German economy, there were, in fact, a number of employment opportunities for adults, like teaching, that helped families get along in a variety of ways. Each camp was run by both UNRRA/IRO officials from abroad and DP camp committees and support staff. Trusted DPs acted as translators and mediators between the international staff and the camp populations. DPs filled the gamut of support roles as drivers, janitors, carters, police, medical and nursing staff, warehouse personnel, wood cutters, mechanics, tailors, cooks, kitchen staff etc. depending on the requirements of the camp in which they lived; their own interests, and training. The author’s grandfather, trained as an army medic (*feldscher*) worked as a driver for an American doctor who gave some modest material support to the family and might have provided an opportunity for emigration to the United States if a Canadian opportunity had not promised a quicker departure from Europe. This was critical, as in the minds of the DPs, it was important to get out of Germany as quickly as possible.

***

---

48 Interview with Ilme Pentere, 29 September 2008.
49 Wyman suggests that 90% unemployment in DP camps “was common”. Wyman, 113.
50 The camp literature is full of portraits of DP support staff. Since UNRRA/IRO workers worked so closely with these individuals they often came to represent the human side of the DP equation for these people. In *The Wild Place*, Hulme points out that each worker tended to have “his” or “her” DP, with whom they had a particularly close relationship. For Hulme it was probably her Polish driver, Ignatz and her translator, “The Countess.”
The process of organizing a solution to the DP question was taking longer than most had anticipated. Previous to July 1, 1947 with the commencement of the IRO’s responsibilities, the military had provided transport, security and provisioning; UNRRA had been broadly in charge of repatriation and the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (IGCR) had been organizing resettlement efforts. The IRO was conceived as a replacement for UNRRA and first discussed by the United Nations at its first session in San Francisco (1945) in order to relieve the governments of Great Britain and the United States of the great financial cost associated with administering the camps and to integrate and thereby hopefully speed the process of resettlement.

As time went on and the obvious preference, American immigration, remained impossible, families considered every available option, including Britain, Belgium, Australia, Canada and locations in South America. The United Kingdom and Belgium were first to arrange for temporary work permits for DPs. However, having just survived the war themselves, these societies were in no position to be overly generous with rations or living conditions for their guests. A European contract would not get a DP far enough away from either the effects of the past war or the theatre of the next. In the case of the United States, it took several years for Congress to pass legislation allowing for the entry of DPs, and once it had passed, the United States became the preferred destination.

In the meantime, some of those waiting in the DP camps began to take action on another alternative -- Canada. In February, 1947 the Canadian Department of

---

51 The relationship between the organizations is a complex one, see the introduction to Holborn, *International Refugee Organization* for details and Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray, for an analysis of the bureaucratic relationships and their history.
Labour opened an administrative file on “Immigration-Lumber and Logging”. The impetus for this new file seems to have been a letter sent to the department from W.A.E. Pepler, the secretary of the Pulpwood Committee of the Pulp and Paper Industry of Canada, based in Montreal on February 4, 1947 to Arthur MacNamara, the deputy minister (and future prime mover in the DP labour-immigration project).\(^5^2\) Pepler had received a request written by a Mr. I. Kagis addressed to “the Chief of the Canadian Forestry Service, Ottawa.” Kagis was writing on behalf of a group of Latvian foresters (approximately 400) living in Germany who were unemployed or without work in their field. Pepler believed that it would be helpful for the department to consider the matter and he volunteered to collect information from the industry on the possible demand for workers like these Latvians in Canadian industry.

Requiring more information about the situation, MacNamara forwarded a request to A.L. Jolliffe, the director of immigration, who confirmed the existence of the letter from the Latvians and further added that it was “one of the many appeals submitted on behalf of displaced persons in the various zones in Germany.”\(^5^3\) The DPs had been taking action and it would seem that this was a significant factor in MacNamara’s decision to take an immigration-labour proposal to the cabinet committee on immigration and to the forest industry.

While the bureaucratic process was underway and DPs continued to wait, some foresters kept writing. On March 3, 1947 a group of Estonian foresters wrote to


\(^{5^3}\) LAC, RG27, v.277, 1-26-2-1, part 1, Administrative – Immigration-Lumber and Logging, opened February 1947, 17 February 1947, A.L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour.
the “Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Section”, Ottawa. In this case, the letter’s authors chose to highlight the political position of the Estonian workers in addition to the problem of remaining “idle” in the camp; “They have no prospects to return to their native country because she is occupied by [an] alien power whose political attitude and actions are not acceptable to most Estonians.” The authors were quite well informed about Canada’s economy and the place of the forest industries within it and correctly guessed that Canadians would be interested in workers with their expertise and experience working in a northern climate. The assessment they provided of the numbers of foresters in western Germany included sixty foresters with a four year university degree; as well as “forest superintendents and foremen” and “skilled lumbermen” totaling “about 3000 men.” The authors included syllabi from the University of Tartu’s department of forestry as evidence of their training and experience both in Estonia and Sweden. Furthermore, they offered the labour of their families with whom they would like to emigrate “in order to find a new home…Many sufferings (sic) and difficulties would then be removed from these people and Canada will get many good and undertaking (sic) working hands…”

By June the pulp and paper industry had filled out surveys on labour demand; physical, age, and ethnic preferences; drafted a contract for suitable DPs; and organized representatives to go to Europe to work on selection teams. Now the DPs just had to convince the teams that they met all of the political, health and labour requirements established by the Cabinet and would meet the expectations of industry managers. No simple task.

By all accounts, the conditions under which Canadian selection teams were working were extremely difficult. In 1946, when earlier teams were in Germany working to facilitate the initial close relative scheme, there were some basic recommendations made to make the teams’ work possible. The areas that seemed to be in most need of improvement were in transportation, interpretation, and centralization of the immigration administration.\textsuperscript{55} These issues, while improved, largely continued to be the working reality for the selection teams in 1947-8. In May 1948, V.C. Phelan assured MacNamara that when the Department’s plans for shipping DPs fell through it was “simply because it [was] not humanly possible.” He complained of the small staff, co-ordination with the IRO, delays in acquiring travel documents, shipping limitations and the difficulty of making last minute changes.\textsuperscript{56} The selection teams had to interview 4,000 applicants in order to select the first 1,500 woods workers. A report to the Cabinet dated August 8, 1947 informed Ministers that "Fifty per cent [more if the first statistic is to be believed] of those interviewed were rejected on medical and other grounds." The slow pace of the selection teams' work was blamed on "a) Lack of transport for our Officers. b) Difficulty in locating many of the prospective immigrants. c) Difficulty in securing ocean transportation. d) Inadequate facilities of IGCR\textsuperscript{57} in Germany.”\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} LAC, RG27, v. 282, f. 1-26-20-1, pt. 1 – Administrative – Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 14 May 1948, V.C. Phelan to MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour.
\textsuperscript{57} Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees run by the Provisional Committee, International Refugee Organization
These concerns sparked a tour of the situation in Germany by the Director of Immigration and the Assistant Director, Public Health Services, Department of National Health and Welfare. The acting Minister of Mines and Resources, J. A. MacKinnon, submitted recommendations to Cabinet in order to improve the working conditions of the Canadian selection teams. These recommendations provide a snapshot of the difficulties facing the teams at the time. Among these was the call for a new centre of operations in Heidelberg, in the American zone, close to the PCIRO headquarters, co-ordinated by Cormier. It was hoped that this would mean less travel for the Canadians, which was always difficult, and easier co-ordination with the group responsible for bringing applicants together for interviews. To further assist the movement of officers around Germany, it was recommended that "six Canadian Ford Station Wagons and two Ford five passenger Sedan cars be purchased and shipped to Germany as soon as possible..." since transportation difficulties were "seriously impeding the work" of teams.\(^59\) The level of difficulty in relying on local transport and the reason for the request is clear.

All movement within the Military Zone or international travel is either by military train or motor transport. Every trip outside of a mile or two means one or other of these modes of transportation. Travel by military train requires the obtaining of movement orders, permits, etc., which takes hours and sometimes longer to obtain. An enormous amount of time is lost in this way. Motor transportation is, generally speaking, not available. Our Officers receive every help from the various authorities but the same is inadequate. Many of the camps can only be reached by car and our Officers have to wait hours to obtain a car to transport them. All organizations are extremely short of motor transport.\(^60\)


\(^{60}\) Ibid.
Even the related issue of wear and tear on clothing was causing difficulties for the teams to the extent that MacKinnon's memo included the recommendation of coordinating clothing requisitions with the British Army.\textsuperscript{61}

Some of the complications involved in conducting interviews are clear in the recommendation that "six competent and trustworthy interpreters be sent from Canada…" since "the teams are largely dependent on the honesty and intelligence of the interpreter and at present the situation in this respect in unsatisfactory." The teams no longer felt that relying on DPs and local individuals as interpreters was satisfactory and they sought qualified Canadians with knowledge of "Polish, German and Slavic dialects".\textsuperscript{62}

The life of a DP seeking to emigrate included a seemingly endless round of registration, administrative checks, medical checks and identification verification. Each step in the process could mean the long-term separation of family members, or worse, it could become an excuse for the selection teams to reject an application outright.\textsuperscript{63} Initial registration included a series of questions that ranged from the routine to the politically fraught, any of which could become cause for rejection later. In addition to name, marital status, and sex, the DP was asked to include

\begin{itemize}
\item claimed nationality,
\item number of accompanying family members,
\item number of dependents,
\item birthplace,
\item religion (optional),
\item full name of father,
\item full maiden name of mother,
\item desired destination,
\item last permanent residence or residence
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{63} Wyman, 58.
Jan. 1, 1938, usual trade, occupation or profession; performed in what kind of establishment; other trades or occupations; languages spoken in order of fluency; amount and kind of currency in your possession; and signature\textsuperscript{64}

Another American registration form also included information on appearance, changes in religion in the last five years; all occupations since 1933; and the following questions in English and German:

Were you, or any family member going with you, ever repatriated or deported by the U.S. Government? Do you presently belong to any political party? If yes, give name of party and position held. Were you ever a member of the NSDAP or any of its affiliated organizations? If YES, give name of organization and position held. Were you ever a member of any political party or similar organization in any country that you have lived in? Have you ever served in the armed forces of any country? List all countries you have traveled or lived in since 1939. Do you have any relatives in the United States? Names, relationships. Did you ever work for, or were you ever connected with any publishing, radio or propaganda agency? Did you ever help the war effort of any country with which the United States was at war, by working in armament factories, scientific research organizations or by contributing financial aid to any organization of foreign countries? List all close ties of family, property, or business that you might have in any country outside the United States. Give full details. Were you ever convicted in any court, whether civil or military, in any country? If yes… Do you have any physical or mental defects?\textsuperscript{65}

Answers to questions about wartime activities must have been very complicated to communicate to American officials. Aside from the difficulties of translation, one might speculate that there were also significant cultural transpositions required in conveying the reality of a DP’s wartime experiences to the selection teams. If a selection team member was unaware of the coercion involved in forced factory labour or military service, for example, how would they interpret answers that included labour in armament factories or military service under German command?

\textsuperscript{64} LAC, MG30, E-504, vol. 1 of 1, Private Papers, W.J.A. Wallace, scrapbook, AEF DP registration card.

\textsuperscript{65} LAC, RG2, I-50-2, Privy Council Office – Immigration – Refugees and Displaced Persons, July 1946, American Joint Distribution Committee Munich – Emigration Service – Personal Data Form – in English and German.
These are questions that remain ambiguous today, let alone in the emotional aftermath of the war. Not only did DPs have to answer these questions (in languages other than their own native tongue) but they were required to reproduce the answers over and over again without error at numerous and various verification check points.

An IRO schematic of the selection and embarkation process identifies ten points on the flow chart with security, identification and documentation checks independent of the literacy testing, trade testing, labour selection and consular interview. There were, of course, an additional seven points of medical checks designed to weed out those with communicable diseases, particularly tuberculosis, or who would otherwise become a burden on receiving governments.\(^{66}\)

While the frequency of security and health checks might initially seem excessive, they were required each time individuals were moved from location to location in order to assure an anxious Canadian government and public that those who were screened and selected in Germany were the same individuals who were arriving in Halifax; that they came fit to work and that they would not incur any significant medical costs soon after arrival.

Initially Canadian selection teams were sent to Europe in March 1946 to screen applicants under the close relative scheme. To be eligible under this plan an individual had to be either: “wife, father, mother, unmarried child, unmarried brother or sister, nephew or niece who is under sixteen and whose parents are both dead [or t]he fiancée of an adult male, legally admitted and resident in Canada, who is in a

\(^{66}\) International Refugee Organization, *Migration from Europe: A report by the Director-General to the General Council of the International Refugee Organization on experience gained in the field of migration through the processing and transportation for resettlement of more than one million refugees and other migrants*, (Geneva: International Refugee Organization, 1951), fold out schematic attached to the appendices.
position to receive, marry and care for his intended wife...”

The Canadian government arranged for potential applicants to be assembled by the IRO, who would do the initial chest x-ray and blood tests required by the selection team. The Canadians provided two teams to examine those coming forward and assess the medical reports. Each included an immigration officer, a doctor from the Department of National Health and one RCMP officer to handle the security aspects of the screening. Later interpreters, industry representatives and female officers were added to assess applicants’ “occupational suitability.”

In the early stages the selection process moved faster than the shipping end of the scheme, but as the program expanded, more advance planning was required. Coordinating the process was difficult and made more complicated, of course, by post-war shortages of transport and shipping. In theory, the cabinet sent its notice of authorization to the General Supervisor, Canadian Immigration Activities in Europe, O. Cormier, and to the PCIRO, who notified its headquarters in Geneva. Geneva then sent orders to its field officers regarding how many DPs should be collected in each of the zones. Each of the officers collected his/her allotment and then notified Cormier, who arranged for the Canadian teams to proceed to the collection centres. Once the selection process was complete, successful applicants were sent back to their original location to wait for notice that they should travel to the “interzonal staging area” in Diepholz, just south of Bremerhaven, the main German port of departure, one week before embarkation. More often, the Department of Labour representatives in Germany scrambled to fit the best available individuals with specific industry orders forwarded to Germany directly from the Department of

---

Labour. This caused considerable tension between immigration and labour – between Cormier, who felt he was best qualified to assess government requirements and the Department of Labour staff who were under considerable pressure to fill industry orders in a timely fashion.  

In Diepholz, DPs had a further identification verification, medical check, and signed their labour contract. Two days before boarding they underwent an additional identification, visa and contract verification by a Canadian official. The amount of time ideally required by the PCIRO between the time Canadian authorities notified them of the desired number and type of emigrants and embarkation was about four to six weeks, all going well.

By August 1947, the teams had approved 16,000 for movement under the close relative scheme, and in order to fill the first forestry order for 1,500 woods workers in the bulk movement scheme it took processing almost 4,000 additional applications. “Fifty per cent” were rejected outright because of problems with their medical checks or “other grounds.”

While the process was formidable, many applicants were resourceful and strategies for success in the process were shared among the DPs. Based on extensive interviews with former Lithuanian DPs, Danys was able to identify some of the

---


69 UNRRA was disbanded on July 1, 1947. The PCIRO ran the show until 1948 when the IRO finally emerged officially.

70 LAC, RG27, v.282, 1-26-20-1, part 1, Department of Labour, Administrative – Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 19 December 1947, G.G. Congdon, Department of Mines and Resources to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister.

71 LAC, RG2, I-50-2, Privy Council Office – Immigration – Refugees and Displaced Persons. 8 August 1947, Memorandum to the Cabinet – Immigration Inspection and Selection of Displaced Persons in Germany and Austria. It seems as if the remainder of the 2,000 that presumably passed were sent in subsequent transports.
tactics they felt were effective. First, there was a shift in the way DPs reported their work experience. Despite years of higher education or professional experience, knowing that Canadians were looking for labourers and loggers, Lithuanian DPs began to emphasize their experience in tree cutting. As Danys points out, most had lived on farms at some point in their lives and as a result they had cut firewood. This did not make them experienced loggers, but if they were young, healthy, single males, willing to work it made no difference to the Canadian selection teams. Danys’ informants also shared a tip on shaking hands with the Canadian selection team. If a Canadian shook one’s hand it was important to return with a firm grip. Apparently members of the selection team were using handshakes as a measure of a man’s quality as a labourer. Too dainty a grip communicated “white hands” to the team and an applicant’s chances of being selected were lowered.

While experience could be bluffed away, problems arising in the numerous medical checks were more problematic. The basic health requirements for DPs were the same as for applicants under the close relative scheme. They had to be free of communicable diseases, particularly TB and venereal disease. Danys states that a number of the former DPs she interviewed were aware of a practice they called “lending lungs”. Since applicants were required to go to a separate facility with an x-ray machine and return with their plates, it was, according to Danys, relatively simple for folks to send a proxy of about the same height and weight. There is some evidence that the Canadians were aware of the practice and sought ways to eliminate

---

72 Danys, 90-1.
73 Danys, 93.
74 Danys, 93.
it, but managing practices under the control of the IRO or even by officers abroad was not easy.\textsuperscript{75}

It was simpler for medical officers on the selection teams to identify a variety of other conditions that were considered unacceptable for heavy labourers in Canada. The requirements for those seeking work in Canadian mines were particularly rigorous. The goal was a male between 18 and 40, at least 150 pounds, with eye measurements of 20/30 in the best eye, 20/80 in the worse, no major tooth decay, clear airways, tonsils out or healthy, both eardrums intact, “normal exercise tolerance”, “non-rheumatic heart”, no hernias, varicose veins above the knee, “deformities”…“that interfere with normal activity or increase accident hazard”, no “major amputations or thumb or index finger of working hand,” no painful flat feet, no serious skin disease, no enlarged organs, venereal disease, or arthritis, normal kidney function, a “satisfactory” family history, clear lungs and “mental stability.”\textsuperscript{76}

Those that passed successfully through the array of tests and interviews were given the chance to sign a contract with a Canadian employer. Initially, those who were interviewed by representatives from the pulp and paper industry, from Great Lakes Pulp and Paper and Abitibi, were given a pamphlet on what kinds of conditions to expect in Ontario bush camps. While these pamphlets contained accurate descriptions of conditions in the camps run by these particular firms in northern Ontario, they caused confusion later when DPs made the assumption that eastern

\textsuperscript{75} Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 18 November, 1947, A.W. Murdock to Mr. C.E.S. Smith, Commissioner of Immigration, Department of Labour, Woods Building, Ottawa, Ontario.

Ontario camps were paying the same kinds of wages and provided the same kinds of facilities.\textsuperscript{77}

The woods workers were the first wave of DPs who signed contracts to come to Canada. This contract was among the first.

I _____ do hereby undertake that if admitted to Canada I will accept employment in Lumbering Pulpwood or Logging operations work with such employer as may be approved by the Minister of Labour for Canada or his representatives at the wage rates and under the working conditions prevailing in the locality of employment for comparable classifications of employment and that I will conform to the prevailing rules and working regulations of the employer by whom I am employed.

I understand that I may be required to reimburse the employer for transportation from Port of Disembarkation in Canada to place of employment but that if I remain in the employment for a term of ten months no such charge will be made.

I understand in agreeing to take such employment that employment is guaranteed by the employer for a minimum period of ten months.

Dated at ____ this ___ day of ____ 1947
Signature of Displaced Person

I certify that the above undertaking was interpreted to me in my own language and that the contents thereof are fully understood.
Signature of Displaced Person
Witness
Interpreter\textsuperscript{78}

Later contracts for work in metal mining and construction for Ontario Hydro contained similar stipulations but were more extensive, presented in English and German, and committed both worker and employer to twelve months of work, rather than ten.

\textsuperscript{77}LAC, RG27, v. 277, 1-26-2-1, part 1, Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, Department of Migration and Settlement, Attachment ‘A’ to Directive dated 4 June 1947, “Notes on Living Conditions and Work in the Pulp Wood Camps of Northern Ontario”. This pamphlet on working conditions in Ontario caused some confusion later when other woods workers working for smaller firms or working in eastern Ontario were surprised to find that they would be paid a different salary or work under different conditions.

\textsuperscript{78}LAC, RG27, v. 277, 1-26-2-1, part 1, 13 June, 1947, Cable from A.H. Brown to G. Haythorne, Department of Labour.
These conditions were repeated in the official “welcome letter” presented to successful DPs by the Department of Labour “just prior to embarkation for Canada.”

TO YOU WHO HAVE CHOSEN TO MAKE YOUR HOME IN CANADA  
in English, French and German

Canada Welcomes you. In Canada you can find a new homeland far from your troubles of the past.

You have promised to work for one year at a stated job and this you must do. The possibility of bringing additional thousands from displaced persons camps to Canada is dependent upon your co-operation with the Department of Labour in carrying out your part of this undertaking.

Your rate of pay will be the same as is given Canadian workers if you perform the same work and other working conditions will be the same.

Canada enjoys a high standard of living. You have an opportunity by your own hard work to share that high standard with other Canadian workers.

The cost of your train fare in Canada may be deducted from your wages.

After you have worked for one year at the job you agreed to you may then, if you like, take other work.

After you have become well established you may make application for the admission of your dependents. If your employer endorses your application and if your dependents meet the physical and other requirements of the Canadian Immigration Department, transportation will be arranged by the International Refugee Organization as soon as possible thereafter.

We wish you well and if you have troubles that cannot be cured by talking to your employer get in touch with the nearest office of the National Employment Service or with the Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

…

Signed by Humphrey Mitchell and Arthur MacNamara

Note the link drawn between the behaviour of the first workers under contract and the possibility of more being given the same chance. Since there was no practical way for Canadian businesses to punish malingerers or workers who left their contracts early, the most compelling force keeping DPs on the job was the idea that their labour would provide evidence of the worthiness of the entire group, both in Canada and waiting in Europe. Later, the former DPs would remind the government and employers of this commitment.

79 LAC, RG26, v. 86, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, Original Welcome Letter.
The promise here is that DPs would find political and economic stability in Canada; that they would be treated as well as Canadian workers; that after one year they would be free to work in whatever area they chose; and that if they kept their commitments, they would be able to bring their families as well. Once the selection process was complete, and the paperwork signed, DPs returned to their camp residence to wait for notice of a date to ship out.

***

In January 1948 accommodation for a transatlantic passage (if you could get it) cost between $130.00 and $140.00 on the CPR ship Beaverbrae II. This ship, one of at least five used for the purpose of moving DPs and other refugees from Europe, was built in Hamburg in 1938 and originally called the Huascaran. It served as a submarine depot ship during the war and was captured in 1945 in Norway. It was sent to Canada as part of the war reparations owed to the country. In August, 1947 in light of the shortage of shipping space, the cabinet made a deal with the CPR line. In exchange for three years of service in the movement of refugees, the government would spend $300,000 of the $600,000 necessary to make the ship suitable for passenger travel.

In September, 1947 it was sent to Sorel, Quebec for retrofitting in order to accommodate the passage of refugees. It was renamed the Beaverbrae II on 7 February and collected its first refugee passengers at Bremerhaven on 28 February, 1948. Unique in the fleet, the Beaverbrae II sailed under a Canadian registration with

---

80 LAC, RG27, 2-26-20-1, part 1, Administrative, Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 28 January, 1948, Montreal “Operation Memorandum” sent by CPR to A. MacNamara.
81 LAC, RG27, 2-26-20-1, part 1, Administrative, Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 26 August, 1947, J.R. Baldwin, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet to C.D. Howe, Acting Minister of Mines and Resources.
a Canadian crew of 116. This ship could accommodate seventy-four passengers in the promenade deck cabins and a further 699 in “dormitory” style quarters. In 1954, when she was sold to an Italian shipping firm, she had made fifty-two crossings in Canada’s service and transported more than 38,000 refugees. At 9000 tons and 469 feet in length, the Beaverbrae II was one of the smaller vessels used by the IRO in the transportation of DPs. The General M.B. Stewart, an American troop ship that made twenty-four trips with DPs to North America, was 523 feet long and could move as many as 3,000 in bunk accommodations. The giant British former ocean liner Aquitania also made twenty-five trips carrying as many as 2,052 third class passengers on each passage from Europe.

The Beaverbrae II was supplied with eight “special personnel” in addition to the regular ship’s crew. These included an IRO Escort Officer, and assistant IRO Escort Officer, two “stewardesses” and medical staff: a doctor, nurse, dispenser, and hospital attendant. There was a canteen on board where passengers could purchase toiletries such as soap, razor blades, shaving cream, toothpaste and cigarettes. Extra facilities on board were absent and largely irrelevant because of the number of passengers indisposed due to sea sickness. The close quarters and rough seas meant that for most this was no holiday voyage.

In 1948, Col. Colin Gibson, Secretary of State between 1946-9, future Minister of Natural Resources, and future member of the Supreme Court of Ontario,

83 LAC, RG27, v. 285, 1-26-24-6, Immigration – Displaced Persons – Health and Welfare, Red Cross Assistance to Displaced Persons, 5 November, 1948, Kathleen Dyson’s report to Mr. Jolliffe, “Report on Trip of “Samaria” leaving Cuxhaven, October 21, 1948”. The issue of seasickness was not confined to this particular crossing, interviews with former DPs have confirmed that it is likely to be one of the strongest memories people have of the experience.
crossed the Atlantic on a transport carrying DPs. He subsequently wrote to Arthur MacNamara about the experience and suggested that the government should provide an information officer on board to answer DPs’ questions about Canada since the British and American ships might not have a single Canadian crewmember. MacNamara in turn contacted Chester H. Payne, the Assistant National Commissioner of the Canadian Red Cross Society with a request that they consider assigning staff to this role. He was particularly concerned about upcoming transports to Halifax on British Cunard ships carrying 1200 DPs each. The intention was to “experiment” with having an information officer on board who could “give information to the immigrants on various aspects of Canadian life and customs and to answer inquiries, on these matters, of displaced persons.”

A twenty-three-year-old Toronto woman named Kathleen Dyson was put forward by the Red Cross and sailed as an information officer on the R.M.S. Samaria leaving Cuxhaven on October 21, 1948. Payne’s recommendation described Miss Dyson as “quiet in manner…not lacking initiative…completely dependable and conscientious.” She was a graduate in modern languages from the University of Toronto and spoke French, German and Spanish. The salary for this “trial run” was set at $175.00 per month plus “necessary and reasonable traveling and living expenses while not on board ship.”

---

On November 5th, Dyson reported on her experience on board the *Samaria* to immigration and labour officials in Ottawa. She found the embarkation run by the IRO “orderly,” taking only two hours to complete. In the early stages of the voyage, Miss Dyson introduced herself to passengers, letting them know she was available to answer questions and “trying to stimulate interest in their new homeland.” She found this was relatively easy because of her Red Cross uniform which made people predisposed to accept her. 87

Most of Miss Dyson’s contact with DPs was with the young women coming to Canada to work as domestic servants. Dyson spent most of her time assisting IRO officials in their care. The majority of questions she answered were therefore related to the domestic scheme itself: “They wanted to know what would happen to them if they were placed in a home where they were unhappy, or what would happen to them if they took sick and could not work…”88 Other questions were nevertheless more general and probably reflected questions that other DPs might have shared.

They were also interested in prices of such items as clothing, food, and even radios. In addition, I had many enquiries about various towns and cities, distances between various points, the climate in different parts of the country, and many other miscellaneous questions. Many of the passengers were curious about other employment opportunities in Canada which would be open to them after they had fulfilled their contracts; again, I referred them to the National Employment Service. 89

88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
Dyson also noticed that many were worried about learning English and took the opportunity to tell them about basic English classes that would be available to them in Canada.

Prior to arrival, each passenger was given a colour coded tag according to their immigration status: blue for those in the German fiancées group; orange for the IRO passengers; black for those moving under the support of the Canadian Christian Council for Resettlement of Refugees (CCCRR); green for those sponsored by a Ukrainian organization; brown for the Mennonite group. The tags included personal identification numbers and destination information. Miss Dyson believed that the distribution of job placements that occurred at this point “caused a considerable amount of confusion”. However, she also felt that the “immigration inspection and actual disembarkation…was quite orderly and was carried out with much less confusion than the previous inspection of the same ship.” Once each group had disembarked, had proceeded to the “sheds” for immigration procedures, and heads of households had passed the luggage through customs, everyone could be connected with trains to the proper destinations across Canada. From this point on the “new Canadians” were no longer the responsibility of the IRO, they had become the responsibility of their employers.

Coming out of both the trauma of war and enervating camp life, in 1947-50 DPs were actively seeking ways to re-establish their families, identities and working

---

90 LAC, RG27, 2-26-20-1, part 1, Administrative, Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 28 January 1948, Montreal “Operation Memorandum” sent by CPR to A. MacNamara.
lives. Ann Ragovin and her remaining family reunited and then immersed themselves in education and training until they were sponsored to enter the United States. I.

Kagis, the Latvian forester and his Estonian counterpart, Elmar Kohh, were willing to solicit work through professional organizations in Canada. And Eduard Miil weighed his options, looking for the quickest way out of Europe – a one year labour contract with the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission.

They were anxious to escape Europe’s “miseries:” the close quarters; forced idleness; poor food; and political instability. The United States was moving cautiously towards the possibility of immigration, but in the meantime Canada emerged as a good option. While complicated, the process of selection and travel was eased to some extent through the exchange of experience; hopes for the future and conversations with willing Canadians. Nevertheless, as the new Canadians detrained at tiny stations like Moor Lake, Ontario, the bush would come as a shock.
Life in Canada was seen by Dr. Urquhart and his contemporaries as a privilege. In order to legitimately enjoy this life, European DPs were expected to fulfill both the legal contract signed in Germany and the social contract assumed by Canadian participants in the process: that newcomers would be engaged in productive labour; provide housing for themselves and their families; take an active role in the life of the community; learn the language; and maintain a high standard of political loyalty. These expectations were communicated explicitly and implicitly in a variety of ways before travel to Canada, upon arrival, and in the interaction between new Canadians and their “gatekeepers.”

This chapter will lay out the first of these responsibilities – contracted work and fiscal responsibility-- the ability to support themselves and dependents in Canada. It was upon this duty that all else hinged. Dr. Urquhart was clear about this when he wrote;

I think by and large they are the kind of people Canada wants provided, and I think this is a very important point, that they are not allowed to regard the contract into which they have entered as a scrap of paper to be torn up as soon as they see a favourable opportunity to escape from its obligations. They have undertaken, with full knowledge of what is entailed, certain obligations. If they are allowed to escape these obligations and leave before their contract expires, they will ill deserve the benefits of life in this country.

Eventually, after years of waiting, months of planning and weeks of traveling, DPs began to arrive at their job placements in Canada. This labour that they had been

---

1 Franca Iacovetta convincingly shows that the contacts immigrants had with social workers, government officials, medical practitioners and others were significant in their development of a sense of Canadian-ness or becoming Canadian. Franca Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006).

2 “Operation DP” and this quotation are from a memo prepared by Dr. Urquhart at the Des Joachims dam to Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission on the arrival of the first group of DPs sent as construction workers. It was found in the former, now closed, Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 19 December 1947.
contracted to perform was at the centre of their responsibilities to the government, their employer, their families remaining in Europe, and their future claims to being Canadian at all.

Since the experiences of female domestic servants have been described elsewhere and a significant number of the men travelling to Canada were destined to work in Ontario bush camps because of industry employers’ early interest in European labour, the focus here will be on male experiences in Ontario pulpwood cutting, dam construction, and mining operations, and when appropriate, comparable practices in Quebec. DPs were working under difficult conditions, but the importance of the contract and the desire to remain in North America created a situation in which the vast majority fulfilled the terms of their agreement. This chapter will discuss this aspect of DP life and the final chapter will further investigate other ways that employers behaved towards this unique group of workers; the provisions employers made for language, and citizenship training; and assessments of the program as a whole.

After passing through the selection and immigration process, DPs arrived in Halifax and became the responsibility of the Department of Labour and the employers holding DP contracts. When healthy DPs arrived, this was a relatively seamless process whereby individuals were given train tickets to their final destination before

---

3 Significant work has already been done on the work of female domestics in Canada and will therefore not be considered in great detail here. As a result, we will be able to see how the process unfolded for a predominantly male group of immigrants in a multi-ethnic setting. For more on the lives of domestics see Marilyn Barber, *Immigrant Domestic Servants in Canada* (Ottawa: CHA, Canada’s Ethnic Groups Booklet #16, 1991) and Milda Danys, *DP: Lithuanian Immigration to Canada after the Second World War*, (Toronto: Multicultural History Society, 1986).
they left the ship. However, when they were unable to travel due to illness or maternity, the transfer of responsibility for their welfare was less clear.

While during wartime Red Cross volunteers were able to work hard at very little cost to the taxpayer, wartime volunteerism was not a sustainable option by 1947-8 and the Red Cross was unable to perform all of the health and social welfare functions the government would have liked it to take on with respect to arriving DPs. While the Red Cross was willing to provide these services, it required government funding to do so. In the meantime, the Red Cross was providing nurseries, snacks, information and emergency first aid to immigrants on a volunteer basis.

In addition to the debate over funding Red Cross services, problems arose if a new arrival should become ill in between the time the port doctor did a final check and the time the DP’s train left the station. If someone fell ill after the port doctor had gone home there was no responsible staff available to give medical care. Most significantly to those concerned, since most DPs had no money, and the Immigration Branch had completed their portion of the process, it was unclear who would pay for necessary hospitalization. In one case, Jolliffe, happened to be in Halifax and could give the go ahead for the hospitalization of an infant in distress. If he had not been on site, it was unclear what could have been done to save the child.

---

4 LAC, RG27, v. 285, 1-26-24-6, Immigration – Displaced Persons, Health and Welfare, Red Cross Assistance to Displaced Persons, 21 September 1948, Chester Payne, Assistant National Commissioner, Canadian Red Cross Society to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour.


In April, G.A. Lough, the Unemployment Insurance Commission (UIC) Manager in Halifax advised MacNamara that the situation could be remedied if immigration authorities were given permission to call port doctors back to work and return ill immigrants to the pre-clearance area if they should fall ill after hours or after being passed through the process.

The facilities for handling such cases are there. That is, the Immigration have a hospital and have doctors but have no authority to take them back in after they have gone through without someone being responsible for the payment of their bills. This appears to the writer as the only thing that is lacking and were they permitted to take these people and told they were to give them medical attention and what department or firm would be responsible, the situation could be overcome.\footnote{LAC, RG27, v. 285, 1-26-24-6, Immigration – Displaced Persons, Health and Welfare, Red Cross Assistance to Displaced Persons, 23 April 1948, G.A. Lough, Manager, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Halifax to A. MacNamara, Department of Labour.}

While it is unclear what action might have been taken on the issue of handing immigrants back to the Immigration Branch, the decision on the Red Cross was certainly plain. Prime Minister Mackenzie King and the federal government believed that the Red Cross provided its services voluntarily and solicited donations from the general public, and therefore was not in a position to ask to share expenses with the taxpayer.\footnote{LAC, RG27, v. 285, 1-26-24-6, Immigration – Displaced Persons, Health and Welfare, Red Cross Assistance to Displaced Persons, 11 August 1949, Jolliffe to Dr. W.S. Stanbury, National Commissioner, Canadian Red Cross Society.}

By 1953, after the DP movement was complete and Canadians evaluated the years of experience in welcoming arriving immigrants, authorities were able to make some conclusions about the real needs of immigrants at the docks. In addition to information and emergency aid, one advocate recommended that authorities provide “comforts and amenities” such as:
proper rest-room facilities, facilities for washing up, changing clothes, preparing baby's formula, etc. Arrangements for food between the time of arrival and the clearing of customs or the leaving of the next train; provision for the temporary care or entertainment of children; assistance to mothers with large families; arrangements for overnight accommodation if required between trains; the provision of newspapers and dozens of other such items required.  

But for the DPs arriving in the late 1940s, the “amenities” may have varied considerably depending on the skill, creativity, and dedication of the particular volunteers on duty when their ship arrived at Halifax Harbour.  

Once the baggage had been unloaded from the ships, heads of households had cleared customs, and the specially chartered Canadian Pacific (CP) trains were ready, all healthy passengers were allowed to board. Opportunities had been available on ship and in Halifax to ask about the journey and examine maps, but the long trip across great distances through densely forested countryside was still quite remarkable for those who had lived in the more densely populated countries of Europe. Some DPs were traveling as far as British Columbia, but the vast majority was ticketed for locations in remote parts of Ontario and Quebec.  

160,367 DPs (workers and their families) were moved to Canada by the IRO and on to locations in Canada in less than five years between April, 1947 and January, 1952.  

By February 1950, 3,473 woods workers had arrived. Most of these were sent to Ontario in the first wave during 1947-8.  

7,004 DPs worked in construction for the Hydro Electric Power Commission (HEPC) in Ontario and 8,250

---

worked in Canada’s mines.\textsuperscript{12} 57% of immigration in general in these years was to locations in Ontario.\textsuperscript{13} Given that the total population of Canada registered in the 1941 census was 11,506,655 and the total population of Ontario was 3,787,655, this movement was not insignificant.\textsuperscript{14} Most were Polish or Ukrainian, while the nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were relatively well represented (nearly 10,000 each) among the DPs given their relatively small population size. (See Table below)

\textbf{DP Movement by Nationality, April 1947 – January 31, 1952}\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakian</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>18,528</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>16,028</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} LAC, RG2, 1-50-5-M Immigration – Immigration-Labour Questions (Interdepartmental Committee) Minutes of Committee, 15 February 1950.
\textsuperscript{13} LAC, RG27, v. 914, 8-9-112, pt. 3, 8 June, 1953, Department of Citizenship and Immigration “Minutes of the 51st meeting of the Departmental Advisory Committee on Immigration,” 8 June 1953, 267.
\textsuperscript{14} Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, \textit{Eighth Census of Canada} vol.4, (Ottawa: Edmond King’s Printer, 1941), 5 and 10.
\textsuperscript{15} I have retained the “racial” distinctions made by Statistics Canada in the compilation of this table, so Hungarians are “Magyars”, Latvians “Lettish” etc. LAC, RG26, v.140, 3-40-4– Statistics – displaced persons 1949-1956, Immigration to Canada showing Displaced Persons, by Racial Origin, from April 1947 to 31 January 1952.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavian</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettish</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>9,499</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magyar</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>36,962</td>
<td>23.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumanian</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>26,130</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160,367</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first wave of DPs to arrive was allotted to the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Company and Abitibi Power and Paper. As we saw in Chapter Two, ongoing labour shortages in the bush had caused both of these companies to become actively involved in the use of POW labour during the war and both had strong institutional relationships with the Department of Labour and personal links with Arthur MacNamara.

On August 1, 1947, 425 DP men arrived to work for Abitibi and 300 for Great Lakes. On August 23 a further 41 were sent to Great Lakes and 595 were assigned to the Spruce Falls Paper Company. All were sent to relatively remote areas of Ontario; the Great Lakes workers were sent to Valora, 60 miles south of Sioux Lookout; Savan near Fort William (present day Thunder Bay); Black Sturgeon, near Kenora; and
Fraser Creek, north of Nipigon. The bush locations for Abitibi and Spruce Falls, while different, were equally remote.\textsuperscript{16} To get a sense of the effort required just to get to these camps we need only look at the advice W.G. Andrews, the Area Representative for the UIC and the Department of Labour at Fort William gave A. MacNamara when a group of journalists were interested in visiting some of the pulpwood camps.

Nipigon Lake Timber Company and Brompton Pulp and Paper Company camps can both be visited from the town of Nipigon without inconvenience to these companies in the way of accommodation as the Pressmen would be able to stay at one of the Hotels in Nipigon and proceed from there to the camps in the morning and return at night. In the case of the Great Lakes Company, they would have to go to Valora by train and stay over night at the camp or camps.

I had in mind the Pigeon Timber Company at Neys but I do not think the Pressmen would appreciate the twelve mile walk from Camp 76 to Camps 77 and 78 all of which is up-hill walking.

The lumber companies have requested that they be given some notice as to the time of arrival of these Pressmen in order that they may arrange their transportation and accommodation accordingly. May I add that these gentlemen be advised to wear or carry warm clothing and heavy footwear as the going at this time of the year is rough and can be very cold.\textsuperscript{17}

The trip from Halifax to work sites required several days to complete. Meals were available to the immigrants with the possession of coupons. These were provided after the Department of Labour representative on the train had given authorization and charged to the employers or organizing group.\textsuperscript{18}

Among these employers was the HEPC of Ontario. In 1947-8, Ontario faced a significant electricity shortage. The combination of growing manufacturing demands


\textsuperscript{17} LAC, RG27 v. 3531, 3-26-38-1 pt. 2, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants – General Correspondence, 15 October 1947, W.G. Andrews, Area Representative, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Fort William, Ontario to A. MacNamara.

\textsuperscript{18} LAC, RG27, 2-26-20-1, pt. 1, Administrative, Immigration – Transportation of Immigrants – General, 28 January 1948, Montreal “Operation Memorandum” sent by CPR to A. MacNamara.
and reduced rainfall put great pressure on the province’s hydro electric production capacity. The proposed dam at Des Joachims (Da Swisha to those in the know) became a flagship project, held up as evidence of the literally concrete action taken by the HEPC and the provincial government to ensure further economic growth for the province of Ontario. This was therefore a priority construction project. Progress was vital and the HEPC was encouraged to seek additional labourers from among the European DPs. The importance of the project for the provincial economy and the relatively high number of DPs involved (approximately 2,500) ensured that this was a well-documented case. Our analysis of HEPC conditions therefore relies heavily, but not exclusively on the Des Joachims documents. Workers at other, smaller HEPC camps would have experienced a wide variety of conditions. In some cases they may have worked in a suburban area such as the Kipling Avenue Transfer Station in Islington (now Toronto). Others, working on clearing transfer lines for example, lived in temporary bush camps in conditions rather like the most primitive pulpwood cutting camps.

When workers arrived in Ontario, most stops, like Moor Lake, were isolated outposts. This stop was where HEPC workers, who were assigned to the Des Joachims (Da Swisha) dam project at Rolphton, left the train. The woods, the cold, and the work were going to take some time to get used to. In a creative writing project in 1977, the author’s mother recollected her mother’s (Elise) first impressions of the Ottawa valley.

Driver: Here we are, dear folks, at the end of your long ocean and train voyage.

Elise: In a forest! In the middle of a forest. Yes, father wrote me in Stuttgart and said we would be like pioneers. (Her voice chokes up and she clears her throat.)

(The children are skipping around excitedly pushing and jostling each other and clinging to their mother. "Mother," "Mother," "Mother.")

Edward: stands up and walks to the table, leans on the table as though overcome by emotion. The door opens and Elise with Tony 12, Ants 11, Endla 9, are bundled in sweaters and scarves enter followed by Driver who stands at the open door.

Driver: Edward, I've brought your family safely. No more Europe. You've all waited long enough for this moment – a whole year! So, (pause) I'll go now – (his voice trails off wistfully and he quietly exits.) I'll check tomorrow...

While the events which inspired this vignette occurred a year after the initial arrival of Eduard Miil to Rolphton under contract to HEPC, one can see that he had the foresight to warn his wife of the kind of life they would be living in northern Ontario. He warned her about the forest and their rudimentary housing and yet it still came as a shock to her. However, the overriding emotion depicted here, particularly among the children, is great relief at being away from the dangers of Europe. The long trip and isolated life was worth it in Eduard’s estimation. What Elise thought is not quite as clear.

When the first Hydro workers arrived at Moor Lake at seven AM on a cold Sunday morning in December, 1947, they were issued blankets and settled at the construction camp around noon. After lunch Hydro managers began interviews with the new arrivals to assess their background, skills, and physical health. After February

---

20 Endla Gilmour, *The Bowl of Fruit*, 1977, unpublished, author’s collection. This was clearly an incomplete draft. I have retained the author’s text as it is in the manuscript, despite any errors in grammar or spelling.
1948, intake interviews also included questions about each worker’s dependents abroad so that the government would have a sense of how many DPs remaining in Europe they would assist to come to Canada after the initial contracts were complete.\textsuperscript{21} By nine PM the next day they had completed interviews and had a sense of whom they had been sent.

While instructions had been given to the IRO to provide workers with proper clothing for outdoor work, managers from the HEPC noted that some had arrived without proper overcoats, boots or long underwear.\textsuperscript{22} Photographs of the DPs working for the HEPC include several of individuals choosing outdoor clothing at the Des Joachims dam camp store. Brand new boots were piled on a table and a row of new coats hung behind the shoppers.\textsuperscript{23}

The first twenty-five were equipped personally by Personnel Manager, P.L.F. Riches, who took them shopping for proper clothing because they had neither the proper equipment nor cash. These men were put right to work on Monday afternoon. The others were also equipped and assigned jobs quickly. First impressions of the personnel department were that “[t]he men [were] of a superior quality both physically and background and evidently they have been carefully chosen and are

\textsuperscript{21} LAC, RG26, box 72, v.2, Immigration Labour Committee meeting minutes, 17 February 1948.
\textsuperscript{22} LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 23 December 1947, HEPC personnel department to A. MacNamara, Department of Labour. For an example in the pulp and paper industry, see RG27, v.3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, 12 August 1947, Memorandum to Mr. A. MacNamara from George V. Haythorne Re: Movement of Woods Workers from Europe, in which heavy boots are the only clothes required.
apparently able to start work immediately.” The physical health of these early recruits was generally better than those who came later since selection teams in Germany had a larger pool of single, healthy men from which to choose in 1947 than later.

The HEPC doctor who was responsible for doing health checks on the arriving workers was one, Dr. Grant. Dr. Urquhart summed up his report on their physical health writing that the examination was directed particularly to general physique, the presence of infestation, infectious skin diseases and infections of the mouth and throat. He reports that the general physique and cleanliness of the group were above the general camp average. There were two cases of minor skin infection and one case of infestation. There were no sick. The pre selection examination had been thorough and they all had with them their chest x-rays. Further physical examination at this time was not deemed necessary.

Those with relatively “undesirable” qualities such as dependent children or greater age were more successful later, after the first selections had been made. Labour representatives in Germany had been instructed to ensure that some of the first workers assigned to HEPC had potential to become foremen or work crew ‘bosses’ on the work site. The result was that Hydro officials were aware that there was the potential for more white collar workers to arrive in these early days. However, among these first workers were men who had lied or hidden aspects about their pre-war occupations. Some had been students, professionals, or other kinds of white collar workers with a minimum of lumbering, mining, or construction

---

25 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
26 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, J. Dibblee, Manager of Personnel to R.L. Hearn, Commissioner, HEPC.
experience.  

It did not take long for managers to catch on and to agree to ignore this aspect as long as they worked hard. The Manager of Personnel at Des Joachims noted this concern after reading about the first group to arrive.

It is gratifying to find that this first group of 92 is of excellent quality, composed of men who are eager to go to work immediately.

We were a little sorry to discover some professional men in the group. We hope they will be sufficiently responsible to give a good return for their pay but we realize that their work will not be as satisfying to them as to persons accustomed to day labour.

It was at this point, days after the December arrival of the first DP workers at the Moor Lake station, that Dr. Urquhart wrote his memo to HEPC management entitled “Operation D.P. – Des Joachims”. His observations are particularly interesting because he apparently spent time speaking with the men and compiled his “impressions wholly unrelated to the information obtained through the formal interviews.” It is worth examining his memo in some detail both because of its content and because the conclusions were passed up to HEPC’s leadership, Chairman R.L. Hearn, and to A. MacNamara, as well as Canada’s representative to the IRO, James Colley.

To Urquhart these workers “[appeared] no different to any group of officer class German prisoners which [he had] seen.” He had no confidence in his ability to

---

27 Interview with Kostas Astravas, 6 October 2008.
28 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 18 December 1947, J. Dibblee, Manager of Personnel, HEPC, to R.L. Hearn, Commissioner, HEPC.
29 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
30 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
31 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 23 December 1947, Murdock, Personnel Manager, HEPC to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, 23 December 1947, Manager of Personnel to Mr. James Colley, Chief of Operations, IRO, Royal Bank Building, Sparks and Metcalfe Streets, Ottawa, Canada.
32 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
discern their nationalities or politics, but he was quite convinced that they were primarily educated men with backgrounds in white collar occupations. It is possible he overestimated this quality among the group as a whole, given that two former doctors and a lawyer took the opportunity to ask him, as a colleague, about their chances of practicing in Canada. He attributed their success at getting through the selection process to their connections to the occupation bureaucracies in Germany and to their survival skills, calling them “knowledgeable and shrewd”. While he was convinced that these were not “labourers” as we saw above he also concluded that they were “the kind of people Canada wants [emphasis added] provided,…” they fulfilled their contract obligations.33

In this case, and arguably in the case of most managers and much of the Canadian public, while there were particular labour needs that were to be filled by young, male, healthy labourers, they had a weak spot for hard working, intelligent men as long as they fulfilled the legal and social contract expected of them.34

These men are probably deserving but much must be taken on trust. They have been given a great opportunity. They must prove themselves worthy of this opportunity. They have been dealt with kindly and honestly; they must in turn prove the honesty of their intentions. Let us see to it that they receive neither more nor less than their just due until they have shown that they are worthy. They must not be spoiled by over kindness or over sympathy.

The great privilege of the Canadian way of life must be bought and paid for honestly. Let us do all in our power to see that in this, their first Canadian contact, they appreciate that nothing less is expected of them.35

33 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December, 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
34 There were exceptions, of course, particularly when the effects of anti-semitism or other prejudices came into the calculation.
35 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 19 December 1947, Dr. Urquhart to HEPC management.
Woods operators were also content after meeting the DPs for the first time. M. McChesney of the Rudolph-McChesney Lumber Company made a point of writing to A. MacNamara to let him know that his group were settled and “appear[ed] to be very happy and contented. They [were] a fine bunch of fellows, really anxious to work and [were] making every effort to co-operate with us in every possible way.” 36 On occasion there were misunderstandings, usually do to language failings on either side, but these were generally sorted out without incident. 37

It would take considerably difficult conditions to dishearten this group of workers since the mere fact of being in North America was considered a great blessing. The gratitude many felt for the opportunity was palpable at an evening service held on Christmas Eve, 1948, at the Ross Lake camp in Haliburton, Ontario, by the Rev. Gordon C. Smyth. His memory twenty-five years later was that sixty-five men, “90%” of whom were DPs, attended the service, arriving by horse and sleigh over five feet of snow. They sang hymns in several languages and communicated their appreciation through an interpreter. The mood he remembers was wistful and grateful. 38

Nevertheless, there were a handful of contracted workers who tried to leave their positions and raised latent fears among managers about what to do with DPs under contract who broke the agreement. If deporting “malingersers” was

36 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 4 December 1947, M. McChesney to Deputy Minister of Labour.
37 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 11 January 1949, Gaston Beaudry's report on inspection of Power Corporation of Canada: “Interviews with the D.P.’s revealed that some were not eating their fill and that they were told that they could not get a second helping. This was proved to be false. It turned out that they were told not to cut the queue but to go at the end of the line instead; this was not properly understood. Otherwise generally happy and contented. sgdn Gaston Beaudry, Area Representative”
38 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 21 September 1966, Rev. Gordon C. Smyth to HEPC Chairman, Mr. George Gathercole.
prohibitively difficult, what kinds of control would managers have over problem labourers? While generally enthusiastic about the first group of DPs to arrive, the HEPC management was already concerned about what they could do to ensure DPs fulfilled their contracted responsibilities. C.R. Mills of the Ontario Forest Industries Association was concerned that companies maintained the right to dismiss DPs where they were "guilty of any one of the five major offences, drunkenness, theft, etc…" He received assurances from the Department of Labour that this was the case. Any DP guilty of criminal offences were dismissable if not deportable. Any solution had to involve transferring a worker to another position rather than outright dismissal, since release from the contract was not an option.

The Des Joachims Manager of Personnel wrote of his concerns about “certain men who have contracted to work for us because that was the only way they could get to this country, and who have no intention of staying with us for the duration of the contract.” This fear was based on early experience of the DPs since one of the first group of 92 had “disappeared” and been reported to the RCMP already. His concern was that the government was not willing to deport DPs. The HEPC’s best solution, in his opinion, was to advertise the fact that anyone “who leaves his job in this manner” would be sent back to Europe.

…we are most strongly of the opinion that the proposal to ship back to Germany or Austria those men who fail to keep their contract constitutes the only satisfactory discipline that may be imposed by an employer such as ourselves. The alternatives are far from satisfactory. If such a man is kept at the camp, but not employed, he inevitably will breed trouble to say nothing of the unnecessary expense. To put him on harder or more disagreeable work

after he has been returned to the camp is an equally unsatisfactory suggestion, for he will do as little work as he can irrespective of the physical hardship or disagreeable quality of the job. If, however, we make nothing but a token effort to bring him back to camp after he has disappeared, we fear that the success of his exploit is bound to induce many of his fellows to try the same thing. In view of the peculiar circumstances under which these men are employed, and particularly because of the threat of firing the man must have the reverse of the desired effect, we wish to urge upon you as strongly as we can, a procedure which makes it possible to return the occasional defaulter to Germany.41

While most men who came to Canada in this labour project remained at their assigned work long enough to fulfill the terms of the original contract, there were some who did not. These cases reveal part of the social cost of neglecting the terms set by the Canadian government and assumed by the more established members of Canadian society. The National Employment Service (NES) had been informed by the Department of Labour of its responsibilities in cases where workers declined to work in their assigned jobs. Regional Offices of the NES were instructed to encourage woods workers who have left their employers to return to the same or other woods employment. If the workers are unwilling to return to such employment, they will be informed that they cannot be referred to any other type of employment until the end of the initial ten-month period.42

In August, 1947, just after the first wave of woods workers was sent to the bush, the first incident was reported. In this case, a worker who had been assigned to the Great Lakes Paper Co. at Cameron Falls was informed by a relative in Oshawa that there was work available nearby. Under normal circumstances this would be exactly the kind of good news that any immigrant would be glad to receive through a

41 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Labour Department, 23 December 1947, HEPC Manager of Personnel to A. MacNamara.
42 LAC, RG27, v.3531, 3-26-38-1, pt.2, Suggestions and Representations Immigrants – General Correspondence, 29 July 1948, Memorandum to Mr. A. MacNamara from George V. Haythorne Re: Arrangements for Woods Workers from Europe.
process that immigration historians call chain migration—family ties draw
individuals to the locations where work is available. However, in this case, there was
a contract to fulfill first. Mr. Delahey of the Great Lakes Paper Co. was quickly in
touch with the Department of Labour and steps were taken to encourage the worker to
return for the balance of his agreement. This case was complicated by the fact of the
DP being Jewish. Solomon Grand, of the Canadian Jewish Congress had contacted
the department on his behalf and on behalf of four other Jewish workers who wished
to leave the bush. After a candid conversation with Mr. Grand, he agreed that they
needed to stay “at least for the initial period, and was prepared to do all he could to
persuade both the workers and the man in Oshawa,…, that their undertaking be
fulfilled.”

A second case was brought to the department’s attention by the Spruce Falls
Power and Paper Company who were concerned about the fact that one of their
woods workers had taken employment in Toronto with a man named Katz. In
considering how to handle the situation, a representative of the Canadian Citizenship
Registration Branch decided to write M.G. to remind him of his commitment to the
Department of Labour. He described the letter as “friendly”.

In preparing the attached we did not have in mind making dire threats but
rather in a more or less friendly way to encourage Mr. [G] to reconsider his
position and honour his undertaking by returning to and remaining in his
assigned employment for the required ten-month period.

The following is a draft of this letter:

---

43 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants, General
Correspondence, 12 August 1947, George V. Haythorne to A. MacNamara.
44 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants, General
Correspondence, 17 October 1947, George H. McGee, Assistant Director, Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries advising Mr. J.E. Duggan, Registrar, Canadian Citizenship Registration Branch, Secretary of
the State Department of draft letter to Mr. [M.G.] re leaving his assigned work under woods
employment scheme.
Dear Mr. [G]:

We have been informed by the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company that you have left their employ without their permission or the permission of this Department and they understand that you have accepted employment with Mr. Katz in Toronto.

We trust that your absence from their operations will be of a temporary nature only and that you intend to return at an early date.

If, on the other hand, it is not your intention to honour the terms of the undertaking which you signed with this Department before coming to Canada, we ask you to seriously consider the following:

Although you may wish to later enter some other industry, we feel that in requiring you to remain in woods employment for a ten-month period we are asking a small return for the expense undertaken in arranging for your selection and transportation to Canada to say nothing of the eventual privilege of becoming a Canadian citizen.

Your actions in not living up to your undertaking with this Department may jeopardize your case if you should later wish to apply for Canadian citizenship.

If you left your employer before repaying any advances such employer may have made for transportation or other charges on your behalf, you will be subject to such legal action as that employer may care to take in recovering such debit.

No decision has yet been reached as to action that may be taken by this department in your case. We trust, however, that you will carefully consider your position and will return to your job with the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company with the least possible delay.

Yours very truly,

W.W. Dawson, Acting Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division

While surprisingly friendly, presenting G’s absence as “temporary,” the implications of a decision not to return to the bush are clear—G could be sued for the cost of his travel and he would imperil his chances of ever being Canadian. We do not know what decision G. made, but the disdain with which authorities treated his decision to leave before the terms of his contract were complete is clear.

Other temporary absences occurred from time to time. L.W. a DP working for the HEPC in Toronto went missing temporarily from the Kipling Transfer Station.

---

45 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants, General Correspondence, 17 October 1947, draft letter to Mr. [M.G.].
twice in 1948. In one case he was gone overnight “having overstayed” at a friend’s house. In the second case he left without permission for a week to get married, leaving the HEPC with questions about what managers were entitled to do to punish such behaviour. Unfortunately, the desire of Jewish workers to leave work was, in the minds of some pulp and paper managers and Department of Labour officials, confirmation of the lingering belief that Jewish men were not appropriate choices for manual labour and bush work in particular.

In another case, a DP sought permission to leave early to follow his vocation as a Russian Orthodox Priest. V. Rev. George Burdikoff, representing the Canadian Diocese of the Orthodox Church, petitioned the Department of Labour for permission to move Peter Dubowik, an ordained priest, from his placement with the HEPC at Glasgow Station, in order to fill a much needed parish vacancy in Ottawa. Dubowik had arrived on the General Stuart in March of 1948. He therefore had more than ten months remaining on his contract when the request was made for his transfer in May, 1948. When the HEPC originally declined the request they argued that

The Commission has need of all of the displaced persons in Construction camps throughout the Province where we are endeavouring to speed up the supply of electric power so urgently required. We feel that a precedent would be established if release should be granted certain individuals, and it is possible that our labour ranks might be rather seriously depleted. We find that Mr. Dubowick has only been with us a little over a month, and feel that he should continue for the duration of his employment agreement keeping in

---

47 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants, General Correspondence, 12 August 1947, George V. Haythorne to A. MacNamara. See also Chapters One, Three and Four for more on anti-Semitism and the concept of “occupational suitability”.
48 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 9 May 1948, V. Rev. George Burdikoff, Windsor, Ontario to The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario [referred to Mr. J. Dibblee].
mind that he might perhaps be a very definite help from the professional angle amongst the fellow employees with whom he is associating in the camp.49

Despite sympathy for the goals, and pressure from the diocese, the precedent was too dangerous from the HEPC perspective. Nevertheless, the recommendation to release Mr. Dubowik was granted by W.W. Dawson, the Supervisor of Immigration and Farm Placement in June.

We are hesitant to recommend the release of any worker, regardless of other qualifications that he may have, but there has been at least one precedent for action in connection with a case of this kind, and I therefore am prepared to recommend that you release Rev. Peter Dubowik from his undertaking to remain in designated employment for a period of twelve months, provided that he reimburses you for any transportation costs from Halifax to place of employment in Canada.

I would like to state in connection with this case that the worker himself is most reluctant to ask for this concession, as he fully realizes the importance of all displaced persons’ completing their work undertaking. I (2) do not think that release of this case will create a precedent that will prove difficult in the future, as I feel that release for spiritual purposes is much easier to justify than would be the case if the worker was going to engage in any other activity.50

The Department of Labour’s willingness to release Mr. Dubowik is curious. What circumstances made this contract breach acceptable? The text gives us some clues. First, and significantly, a request was made rather than a worker presenting an employer with a fait accompli. At no time did Mr. Dubowik fail to show up for work without permission. In the view of the employer he behaved at all times in accordance with his contract. Second, the DP himself was “reluctant.” This was a request from the Russian Orthodox Church to the HEPC, rather than from an individual pressing to sidestep his contractual obligations. This made the decision

49 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, 13 May 1948, J. Dibblee, HEPC Manager of Personnel, to V. Rev. George Burdikoff, Windsor, Ontario.
much more palatable. Note that his right to future citizenship was never questioned, rather he was “assisting” and his purposes were “spiritual” rather than economic or personal.

All this worry about malingering or deserting workers seems misplaced given the infrequency of such cases among the DP workers. By 1949 only 250 complaints had been filed by employers against individuals who were failing to live up to their contractual responsibilities. 51 As a group the DPs were remarkably responsible in fulfilling their responsibilities. To get a sense of how responsible they were one need only look at the record of British workers arriving in 1950 to work for the HEPC under the Empire Settlement Act. HEPC personnel had hoped to retain more than 75% of the British workers as they had the DPs who came in 1948. However, of the first 91 to arrive, twenty-seven had been transferred, one was arrested and one was absent without leave. 52 British workers were generally less content with working conditions under the HEPC and the program ended up costing the HEPC more money than it had ever anticipated. 53 This must have contributed to the maintenance of the lingering suspicion of British labourers in the Ontario bush.

In the end, by June, 1952, 352 of the 2000 British workers had arrived and only 105 were still working for the HEPC. 247 had left before the completion of the contract, half of whom had paid for half the travel costs as required under the contract. 8 did not start work at all, 88 of these workers left the HEPC having worked

51 LAC, RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2, 3 November 1949, R.M.W. (Department of Mines and Resources) to Mr. Jolliffe.
53 Further study about the conditions leading to labour unrest among the British workers would be interesting, but a tangent for the purposes of this study.
“one month or less,” and 47 worked “two months or less.” The result was that
$1,535.97 was owing to the HEPC from current employees on their travel costs and
$30,065.59 was owed by ex-employees, many of whom had disappeared. One must
consider, then, that lingering fears about European labourers were based on persistent
negative stereotypes rather than direct experience in this case.

While only a small percentage of contracts were broken, those that were
represented a real problem for employers and by extension, the Department of
Labour. While in principle deportation was an option, in reality it was untenable.
Therefore, Arthur MacNamara sought the help of the foreign language presses in
Canada to publicize the importance of completing these agreements and to link this
responsibility directly with their hopes of becoming Canadian citizens. To this end he
wrote:

There are, however, cases where the workers, regardless of
consequences to their fellow nationalists who are still in Germany, refuse to
carry out the terms of the undertaking given on the application forms. There
are cases too where a good deal of reluctance and unsatisfactory service is
evident and there are still others where men and women deliberately leave
their positions.

You will appreciate that it is very necessary for these people who are
taking their first step towards becoming Canadian citizens to carry out the
undertaking made. It is in the hope of bringing home these facts that the
editorial facilities of your paper are requested.

There have been instances where employers and well meaning friends
or relatives have endeavoured to induce workers to leave their job and accept
other employment and this practice, of course, is not in the best interests of the
new arrivals. The future of this movement depends on the success of those
immigrants already in Canada in becoming assimilated and it would be
unfortunate if the general public were led to believe, through the actions of a
few, that the programme as a whole was not satisfactory. It would be
appreciated if we could have the co-operation of the newspaper of which you
are editor in urging workers who come from Displaced Persons camps to stay

54 LAC, RG26, v.118, 3-24-41, Admission to Canada of Groups of Immigrants for employment by the
HEPC program.
in their jobs in accordance with their Undertaking to the Minister of Labour and in impressing upon employers, relatives and friend the necessity and advisability of completion of the employment period in the occupation for which these men and women applied, before any change is suggested. …\(^{55}\)

In the end, while the department felt some responsibility towards employers who had advanced the cost of bringing contracted workers from Halifax, the work of tracking down absent workers was more costly than the loss of labour.\(^{56}\)

Not all the contracted workers who left employment did so because of the prospect of better work alternatives. Since medical care was still paid for by individuals at this time, many were forced by medical circumstances to leave the job site and seek the aid of the provincial and federal governments. Early in the fall of 1947, employers were critical that ill workers had slipped through the screening process and arrived unable to work. Managers from Great Lakes Paper and Nipigon Lake Paper Company raised the issue of medical costs with the Department of Labour and by November, 1947, a draft order-in-council had been prepared placing responsibility for such cases on the federal government. If employers could demonstrate that workers had become ill while abroad or during their contract year, the federal government was responsible for the cost of medical treatment, long term care, or burial.\(^{57}\) On June 11, 1948 there were eight recently arrived DPs housed in

\(^{55}\) LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Labour Department, 19 January 1949, A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour to foreign language press. \\
\(^{56}\) LAC, RG27, v.282, 1-26-20-1, pt. 1, Administrative, Transportation of Immigrants, General, 3 September, 1948, F.M. Hereford to A. MacNamara. \\
facilities for the mentally ill. Others were unable to work due to “chronic ailments”.

If early management assessments of the DPs described the new arrivals as otherwise generally content in their new situations, what were the conditions that met the DPs upon arrival in Ontario and how did they compare with life in Germany? What kind of work were they doing and what was life like for those men who stayed on the job? The most important factor to consider in assessing working conditions in Canada is that no matter how difficult, they were a remarkable improvement from conditions in the DP camps in Germany. Workers ate better than they had perhaps in their whole lives. They were all employed. They were paid comparable wages to Canadians with similar experience. And, they had goals; fulfill the contract, learn English, and bring any remaining family to Canada.

In Germany, representatives from Great Lakes Pulp and Paper and Abitibi Power and Paper provided the DPs interested in working for these companies a pamphlet on the conditions they could expect in northern Ontario. While it later caused some confusion on the issues of wages among those who worked for other firms in other locations, it was a relatively accurate description of the way camps were set up and run by these companies who were the first to hire DP loggers.

In all cases, because of government requirements for the labour scheme, workers could expect to be paid the same as local workers with the same experience. However, because of variations in the quality of work locations and skill, piecework

---

58 LAC, RG 26, box 72, v. 2, 11 June, 1948, Immigration Labour Committee Minutes, Medical and Hospital Costs in respect to DPs.
workers with no experience might earn significantly less than more experienced co-workers. Each was assigned a stand of timber on which to work each day. They were generally paid per cord of wood felled, split and piled. As a result, the quality of the area to which they were assigned could make a huge difference to their ability to earn a living wage. While this was not an issue when companies were using POW labour, the DPs did need to be treated fairly. In one case, a Department of Labour area representative found that because the staff at one Abitibi camp were against the idea of DP labour, they had assigned DPs to inferior stands, resulting in a likely average daily wage of about $3.00, less than half what they could expect for an average day’s work elsewhere. The department stepped in and the hope was that “adjustments had been made.”

The issue was raised again at the Woods Labour Advisory Committee in December 1947. The Department of Labour’s representative, W.G. Andrews noticed that

> [s]ome, … had been dissatisfied with the conditions they found on their arrival in Canada which situation he felt might be attributed to the too rosy picture that had been painted in Europe of conditions in the woods camps. Others had been dissatisfied because of a misunderstanding as to the basic wage rate to be paid and because of a feeling in some quarters that they were being placed in inferior timber stands but these difficulties and misunderstanding were gradually being eliminated. Reporting on production he said that after a month’s training the average d.p. was able to cut from 1 ¼ to 1 ½ cords per day and that this figure was gradually moving upwards.

The average daily production for men cutting eight foot lengths varied “from 1 ½ to 5 single cords.” More importantly, “very few men put up 5 cords a day and an

---

60 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 17 October 1947, W.W. Dawson, Acting Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division to Mr. C.B. Davis, Manager of Woodlands, Abitibi Power and Paper Co. Ltd.

61 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 2 December 1947, Minutes of the eighth meeting of the WOODS LABOUR ADVISORY COMMITTEE, Sub-Committee of the Prairie Regional Advisory Board – Labour Department.
average for any one camp 2 cords per day per cutter indicate[d] a crew of experienced cutters.\textsuperscript{62} Clearly, if most DPs were cutting between one and two cords a day and were paid by piecework calculations, they may have been making significantly less than more experienced cutters.

Because of confusion arising about the differences between companies with camps in northwestern and northeastern Ontario,\textsuperscript{63} and in order to follow up on DP working conditions, the Department of Labour collected reports from its field staff on living and working conditions in the camps to which DPs had been sent. We can therefore make some generalizations about conditions in northern Ontario as a whole where the majority of woods workers were sent. In general, camps were 56 to 64 km from the nearest town. While this was quite a distance, workers from many of the camps spent weekends in town and arrangements had been made to get them there and back. Only eleven of the camps across Ontario who reported to the department were without telephone or radio contact with the outside world. So while isolated to a great extent, in emergencies and in off hours significant outside contact was possible.\textsuperscript{64}

Despite evidence that some camps may have been stingy with the good cutting areas initially, in 1948, most labour representatives reported that DPs were working on stands considered “good” in northeastern Ontario and “fair to good” in the northwest. As a result,

\textsuperscript{62} TBHMS, Series B 28/1/1, Great Lakes Paper Company Fonds, The Link, v.2, n. 1, January 1949, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{63} This report defines the boundary between west and east as a north-south line running through Sault Ste. Marie.

After a short initial familiarization period, the great majority of men worked on a piece-work basis. Earnings, even in the relatively early stages when most reports were submitted, were estimated to average around $7.00 per day. It is of interest that instructors were available to assist new men to learn the work in every camp visited.65

These skills were important for new workers to obtain in order to be able to earn a good wage and to maintain a high level of safety in what could be a dangerous profession. If new cutters found themselves working in a region where local workers were in the habit of cutting eight foot lengths rather than four as was the case in some of the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Co. camps, it was also important for workers to have “considerable brawn” to do their job well. Workers needed to clear their stand of windfalls and brush; take down trees across their cleared roadway; trim the branches off fallen trees; and cut them into appropriate lengths, leaving four inches or so for wastage. After a day’s quota had been cut, the worker then had to pile the lengths of wood on skids parallel to the road to be moved by horse, or later, by truck. When lengths were long, this job of piling the day’s cutting was “generally conceded to be the toughest part of the job…”66

Once the cutter completed his day’s quota, he was free to walk back to camp where a hearty meal and a warm cabin waited for him. After maintaining his equipment (as experienced wood cutters knew was key to his safety and productivity) his time was his own. Men lived in log, log and board, or, in northwestern Ontario, frame buildings. Some had electricity (half) and others used gas or kerosene lamps.67

Camps were built to conform to provincial health standards although they were

65 Ibid.
necessarily remote. Workers were provided with “steel beds, mattresses, blankets, sheets and pillows.” Heating was “suitable,” generally provided by wood stove and some buildings had electric light. Food was plentiful and generally very well received by camp residents. Supplies were available for sale at the camp store. Recreation facilities such as “recreation rooms, radios, reading material” and in some cases “occasional moving pictures” would be made available. DPs were warned before arrival of the “handicap” of blackflies and mosquitoes, but also promised that repellent would be available at the camp store. When workers needed medical care, it would be available, for “a very small fee.”

Since considerable time during the evenings was spent in camp, recreational facilities were important. More northeastern Ontario camps had rec rooms than in northwestern Ontario, but those that did not tended to report plans to build them in the near future. In contrast, northwestern camps were more likely to show movies regularly, although this was a relatively common practice in both areas. Some companies provided athletic equipment of various kinds as well as transport to town on the weekends. The Central Patricia Mine reported that workers had been provided with a “…Club House equipped with theatre, bowling alleys, pool tables, etc. Excellent swimming is provided from dock or artificial beach. Soccer games are played between our mine and Pickle Crow with D.P.’s making up most of the

---


LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 8 April, 1948, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines Ltd. to W.W. Dawson Acting Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division, Department of Labour.
teams…”  All parties involved were keen to have their new Canadians reading about Canada and learning English, so most camps also provided reading areas stocked with appropriate reading material.

Table 2: Camp Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NE Ontario # of Camps</th>
<th>NW Ontario # of Camps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from nearest settlement</td>
<td>22 Average 42 miles</td>
<td>25 Average 34 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village accessible over weekends</td>
<td>20 Yes</td>
<td>18 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12 No</td>
<td>6 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>15 Log</td>
<td>16 Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Frame</td>
<td>23 Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheets, pillows etc</td>
<td>34 Yes</td>
<td>28 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. room</td>
<td>20 No</td>
<td>9 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 No</td>
<td>19 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>16 Yes</td>
<td>22 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 No</td>
<td>6 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/radio</td>
<td>27 Yes</td>
<td>22 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 No</td>
<td>6 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand quality</td>
<td>1 Excellent</td>
<td>-- Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Good</td>
<td>12 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Fair</td>
<td>13 Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Poor</td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>25 Piecework</td>
<td>26 Piecework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Day work</td>
<td>7 Day work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average earnings</td>
<td>3 $5-6</td>
<td>5 $5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 $6-7</td>
<td>12 $6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 $7-8</td>
<td>10 $7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 $8-10</td>
<td>6 $8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor available</td>
<td>34 Yes</td>
<td>29 Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Department of Labour assessments of DP working conditions in Ontario and Quebec were favourable. Most of the newly arrived workers were content sleeping in company dormitories for a small daily fee. In most cases, DPs were charged between $1.70 and $2.00 a day for room and board. Some companies, like

---

71 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 11 June 1948, monthly report, Central Patricia Gold Mines.
72 English language classes, reading recommendations and study programs are considered further in Chapter Six.
the Hollinger mine at Matachewan, Ontario offered housing two men to a room in single beds. A comparable report from a gold mine at Belleterre, Quebec, stated that sleeping areas were clean, spacious, comfortable and warm, consisting of a corridor with rooms on both sides, each occupied by two workmen some by three or four. Beds [were] of the double decker type made of metal. There [was] constant hot water in the ablution room where facilities [were] provided for washing clothes. Carbolic soap [was] plentiful and supplied by the employers. Toilets [were] kept clean. Satisfaction was expressed concerning the meals by both D.P.’s and Canadian workers.

Living conditions were generally a step up from the camps in Germany, but the biggest improvement was the change in diet. Like the German POWs who lived in some of these same camps until 1946, the European DPs had not eaten a diet as varied and calorie rich in years, if ever. Cafeterias at Des Joachims produced “900 loaves of bread, 300 pies, and innumerable cakes, cookies, and doughnuts” and consumed 300 gallons of milk daily. Early reports that beet farm labourers were working under harsh conditions made the Department of Labour sensitive to criticisms about working conditions. It was therefore very careful to monitor the situation and generally proud of the modern, healthy, clean conditions in camps like Des Joachims.

From time to time camp life was presented to the Canadian public. One view of the life of a DP was a 1949 National Film Board of Canada (NFB) film entitled “Abitibi.” This twenty-two minute film, directed by David Bairstow, told the story of
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73 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 8 April 1948, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines Ltd. to W.W. Dawson Acting Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division, Department of Labour.

74 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 12 January 1949, report of inspection of Belleterre Quebec Gold Mines Inc. by Gaston Beaudry, Area Representative, Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Willy, a Polish DP, who was working in Quebec at a gold mine at Val d’Or. In this film, the DP, Willy, starts work as a “trammer’s helper” and takes on his role on “a trained team” with “higher skilled” workers who show him what is expected of him.\(^\text{76}\) This seems to be how many DPs were trained in their new jobs. Kostas Astravas also worked at the Val d’Or mine. He and several other friends volunteered to work in Quebec after having studied medicine at the Baltic University. The mining managers were interested in getting the new arrivals working quickly, so Astravas was assigned to work with “a twenty year man” for two weeks, and then he was on his own. Despite having to work with explosives (TNT), there was no safety training, only whatever the more experienced worker could pass on in the first weeks underground. Usually injuries were minor. However, there were fatalities on occasion, usually because of negligence or lack of training.\(^\text{77}\)

While men were reportedly given some training as mentioned above, there is significant evidence that there were nevertheless some problems with work related injuries among the DPs in not only mining, but forestry and hydro construction as well. The Great Lakes Paper Company produced a monthly magazine called *The Link*. Employees of the company were provided with social updates, industry data and news from head office in this friendly publication. In addition to gossip, there were serious issues addressed on its pages, one, workplace safety is particularly relevant here.

In its first volume, *The Link* addressed growing concerns about workplace safety since “[t]he number of accidents during 1947 [would] be more than double that

\(^{76}\) NFB (1949), “Abitibi,” 22 minutes, Script, Bernard Devlin, Director, David Bairstow.

\(^{77}\) Interview with Kostas Astravas, 6 October 2008.
for 1946.” The author of this article, while aware that many factors might be involved, attributed this enormous growth in the number of workplace accidents primarily to “the employment of "green" labor…” Among the injuries mentioned in this article were a “fractured skull, broken legs, broken collar bone, and severe axe wounds.”

Safety concerns were taken up again in January 1948. In an article called “Safety Rules in the Woods” new employees were advised about the hazards likely to cause injury such as hanging limbs; bad planning while cutting; improper use of pulpwood hooks; failing to see obstacles while skidding logs and becoming crushed and most importantly, poor axemanship.

Other advice in October suggested that A little care on the part of workmen by seeing that all branches which might interfere with a clear swing of the axe are cut away, might prevent an axe cut to a leg or some other part of the body. Take a look and see that there are no dead trunks for your tree to strike when falling. Keep your axe and saw sharp and in good condition.

All of these dangers would be particularly likely to cause injury when an inexperienced woodsman was involved.

Because the DPs continued to be the responsibility of the Department of Labour during their first year in Canada, there is a record of events that ended in injury or fatality in Department of Labour files. In each case, the Immigration-Labour Committee was required to note the circumstances and implicitly assess whether responsibility for the injury lay with the government or the employers rather

---

than individual negligence or chance. Most fatalities seem to have been accidental (often drowning) or due to mental illness. The cases of suicide, drowning and work place injuries reveal much about the pressures faced by recent arrivals, ways DP workers spent leisure time, and the potential hazards of the kinds of work they were doing.

In January, 1948 the Canadian Citizenship Council held its “National Conference on the Citizenship problems of the New Immigrants” in Montreal. Among the issues presented were the problems of “isolation” and “socio-psychological problems.”

The most isolated among them are the bush workers living in the distant traditional lumber camps. In all such large camps, the companies do their best to provide the immigrants with recreational and educational facilities. The Ontario Education Department has appointed special instructors who live in the camps. Life in the smaller camps of 20-25 men is more isolated. The specific problems faced by these men are reported to be: language problems, limited opportunities of participating in activities leading to group consciousness, lack of opportunities for expressing initiative and for developing individual skills.\(^\text{81}\)

For some, the combination of mental illness, wartime trauma, and isolation became too difficult to bear. In addition to the number of DPs who were committed to sanatoria\(^\text{82}\), three DPs killed themselves in 1948. One DP (married, 36 years old) with a history of mental illness hung himself in jail in October, 1948 after being incarcerated “under the Mental Hospitals Act.”\(^\text{83}\) A second hanged himself in February, 1948 at the Kormack Lumber Company camp at Chapleau Ontario. He

---


\(^\text{82}\) LAC, RG26, v. 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes 11 June 1948 and 2 March 1948.

\(^\text{83}\) LAC, RG26, v. 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 30 November 1948.
was thirty-two years old and single.\textsuperscript{84} In one terrible incident, a case of domestic violence between an engaged couple ended in the murder of S.S., a thirty-one year old domestic servant and the suicide of A.V. a thirty-five year old woods worker. In this case

On September 23, immediately prior to leaving her home for work at the Willett Hospital, Miss [S.] was shot and instantly killed by [A.V.]. [V.] shot himself and died a few hours later. N.E.S. reported that they had been advised by the Superintendent at the hospital that [S.] agreed to continue working until the end of September, and it was expected that they would be married soon after that date. Hospital authorities stated that [S.] had been very unsettled for a few weeks prior to the tragedy and the nature of the trouble between them is not known. A double funeral service was held at the Sacred Heart Church, Paris, Ont., on September 24, 1948.\textsuperscript{85}

In addition, the Immigration-Labour Committee documented one case of attempted suicide by a female DP working as a domestic servant in Kingston.\textsuperscript{86}

Of the eleven fatalities reported in 1948 to the Immigration-Labour Committee, four were deaths by drowning. In most cases, these seem to be the accidental result of leisure activities near the water. I.V., a young twenty-three year old miner at the Central Patricia Gold mines “took the wrong path in the dark and stumbled into the river” on June 1, 1948. While not mentioned, there is a strong possibility that alcohol may have been involved.\textsuperscript{87} M.K., another single DP (aged 29) drowned in the Ottawa River near Rolphton on May 24, 1948. In his case, the coroner “believed the deceased was riding on the running board of a car accompanied by one [K.M., not a DP] (who was killed instantly) and which crashed into the bridge railing. [K.] was apparently catapulted into the river.” There was no decision in this case.

\textsuperscript{84} LAC, RG26, v. 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 2 March 1948.
\textsuperscript{85} LAC, RG26, box 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 2 November 1948.
\textsuperscript{86} LAC, RG26, box 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 23 November 1948.
\textsuperscript{87} LAC, RG26, box 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 29 June 1948.
about responsibility for the death since there was “not sufficient evidence to lay a charge against the driver of the car” found. 88 One DP in Manitoba drowned while swimming for recreation in the Souris River. 89 The last case was an accidental drowning of a twenty-seven year old farm worker who likely fainted and fell into an irrigation canal while he was washing his feet. No inquest was considered necessary in this case. 90 In general the leisure time deaths seem consistent with the kinds of accidents that occur when water activities are common; not unlike the deaths that occur today when young men gather together on long weekends at the cottage.

Some fatal injuries occurred at work. Three cases were reported to the Immigration-Labour Committee in Ottawa. 91 One workplace fatality occurred at the San Antonio Gold Mines operation in Bisset, Manitoba. Z.B. was single and twenty-two years old when he was hit by an ore car and crushed against support timbers. He had been in Canada just under three months when the accident occurred on April 7, 1948. 92 The second workplace fatality occurred at the Hollinger mine at Matachewan, Ontario. Four months after arriving in Canada, V.M., a twenty year old, single miner died from pneumonia caused by injuries caused by a falling rock. He died on April 18, 1948 one day after the accident. 93 The third occurred at a HEPC construction project subcontracted to the Atlas Construction Company. S.M. was 31 and married. He arrived on the Marine Marlin on May 10, 1948 and was assigned to the McConnell Lake dam project. On September 2nd he “was hit on the head by a...
falling piece of lumber” and died the same day. In each of these three cases, the deaths were deemed “accidental” by inquest. In the end the fact that only three deaths by injury were reported in 1948 is remarkable considering the number of inexperienced labourers heading to the bush. Minor injuries continued to be a concern for employers, however, since the numbers of accidents continued to rise with the arrival of new recruits. Great Lakes Pulp and Paper attempted to raise awareness of the importance of workplace safety in 1951 with a “safety competition.” While not as exciting as more traditional logging competitions, the fifty dollar prize to the camp with the best record must have been appealing.

The hazards of a miner’s life were well known. In some cases, when individuals had worked under duress during wartime in mines, they were unwilling to accept work in the mining industry. In these cases it was relatively easy for the NES to find alternative arrangements in either woods work or construction. Although a miner’s life underground was hard and hours were long (twelve hour shifts), the barracks that K. Astravas and his friends lived in were new and clean. Brand new housing was built for arriving DPs at Des Joachims as well. Since employers had agreed to provide “suitable” housing for the DPs, old lumber camps and new construction sites had to do some building just to come up to the minimum expected by the Department of Labour. The first housing at Des Joachims was barracks style dormitories. These were built in an “H” shape with forty men housed on each side in double bunk beds. There were washrooms in the centre between the two wings and a
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94 LAC, RG26, box 72, v. 2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 9 November 1948.
95 TBHMS, Series B 28/1/1, Great Lakes Paper Company Fonds, The Link, v. 4, n. 9, October 1951, 19.
common table along the centre of each dorm. Photographs of the site show the transformation of the camp area from remote lumber station to bustling small town, which eventually included small but tidy homes for executives and self-built houses for DPs, hoping to bring family from Europe.

In May 1948, the HEPC proposed a program to assist both Canadian born and recent immigrant employees build family homes close to the Des Joachims dam site and save a nest egg for a time when the construction project was complete. As the HEPC flagship construction project of the time, steps were taken to attract permanent employees. The goal was to keep DPs after the completion of their initial contracts, and to attract “Canadian” employees until the project was complete (1951). To these ends the HEPC proposed a scheme to encourage savings, loan cash, company land, and construction supplies to its employees. HEPC management estimated that 200 DP and 50 “Canadian born” families would take advantage of the offer and build homes with the assistance HEPC provided. They could either use an HEPC blueprint, or build according to their own plans as long as it came up to code.

There were specific sanitary, fire, and building regulations that needed to be met. In the end, the expectation was that employee builders would take one of the newly serviced (water, but not electricity) 40X100 foot lots, build a home, plant a vegetable garden, live happily and safely in the community, all the while saving a
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99 LAC, RG26, v.72, v.2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 1 June 1948. “Hydro Housing Project for D.P.’s and Canadians.”
nest egg for their post Des Joachims lives. To do this, the HEPC’s plan was to lease land to employee builders at three to five dollars a month until no more than twelve months after the dam’s completion. At this time the money handed to the HEPC as rent would be returned to the builder with interest as a “nest egg” for future use once the family had left the site and handed over the building to the HEPC to use as it saw fit.\(^\text{100}\)

It is unclear whether the plan was implemented exactly as it was described here. However, what is clear is that eventually the Rolphton town site was composed of a variety of small homes for executives built to common plans\(^\text{101}\) and workers’ homes self built on the edges of the settlement. In this photograph taken in 1952 one can see a frame house in the background, sealed with tarpaper.\(^\text{102}\) Whether the savings plan was actually implemented, or not, it shows the great desire HEPC management had for keeping workers at this remote site in order to complete the dam and improve Ontario’s power situation as swiftly as possible. A significant side benefit was increased assistance to DPs in the construction of the homes required by statute before they were allowed to apply to bring their dependents from Europe.

\(^\text{100}\) LAC, RG26, v.72, v.2, Immigration-Labour Committee Meetings, Minutes, 1 June 1948. “Hydro Housing Project for D.P.’s and Canadians.”


\(^\text{102}\) Rolphton, 1952, Elise and Endla Miil in front of the home built by Eduard Miil in order to get permission to bring them from Germany, author’s collection.
Communities like the one at Rolphton, where there were large numbers of employees and their families, had very active calendars of community events. The DPs became a part of these groups, making their own cultural contributions. Choirs, dance troops, and artists shared their work with the “locals” and often made an impression on contemporary observers. Among the artists living at the Des Joachims dam project and featured in the “Des Joachims Portraits” were “[t]hree talented young new Canadians who are making their presence felt at Des Joachims in a very pleasant way. With crooner Alexander Juhas are accordion players Peter Pastuch […] and Eugenius Nickel, […]”. The *Hydro Staff News* also included photos of the Des Joachims Estonian choir and the accomplished Latvian artist, Nikolai Grebze.  
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103 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029, OR-930.01 54-28, *Hydro Staff News*, May/June 1949.
other historians have observed, the “colourful” ethnic displays were easily integrated into local perceptions of the “new Canadians” as “other.”104

This survey of the work and living conditions found by DPs upon their arrival in Canada uncovers the key to understanding DP life in the first years. As problematic as some workplace conditions may have been, a return to life in Germany was never an option. As a group, therefore, DPs were very willing to work hard in jobs that they might not have otherwise chosen for the ten or twelve months required by their contract with the Department of Labour. Most, therefore, passed the first test set for them by the wider Canadian society. They had sought out a life in Canada; they were deemed suitable by the selection committees; they signed contracts and fulfilled the terms as required and they engaged in labour considered useful to the development of the Canadian economy.

Once new Canadians had passed the first test, willingness to work and fulfill the terms of the labour contract, other-ness was acceptable up to a point. However, there were strong forces like the HEPC building program at work communicating additional responsibilities as new Canadians to former DPs. The social contract will be the subject of the next chapter.

104 Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers*, 94-98.
VI: “The great privilege of the Canadian way of life”

Citizenship means more than the right to vote; more than the right to hold and transfer property; more than the right to move freely under the protection of the state; citizenship is the right to full partnership in the fortunes and in the future of this nation.

- Paul Martin, 1946

At root, the labour contracts given to DPs were a practical way to fill chronic labour shortages and encourage quick expansion of pulp and paper and hydro production. More significantly, we have seen in the previous chapter that the contract became a strong measure of a worker’s right to share in Canada’s future as a Canadian citizen. A blackboard example at the Des Joachims project in 1948 expressed it well: “I kiss my shovel. It is my passport to freedom in Canada.” The labour agreement was the crucible that turned DPs into new Canadians. However, labour was not enough. The work of a citizen needed to be accomplished with the knowledge of how it contributed to Canada’s future.

Without question the primary duty of arriving DPs was to the labour contract. Failure to fulfill the terms of the contract amounted to a failure to demonstrate a legitimate claim to future citizenship. This chapter will focus on the second contract DPs were required to fulfill—the social contract. In a variety of ways ideals of Canadian citizenship were communicated and reinforced during the contract year through language and citizenship training classes. Classes were organized, taught and taken during a time when Canadians were engaged in a public debate on the nature
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1 This quotation and the others which make up the chapter titles of this thesis, is from a memo prepared by Dr. Urquhart at the Des Joachims dam to Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission on the arrival of the first group of DPs sent as construction workers. It was found in the former, now closed, Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 19 December 1947.


and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship, having passed the Canadian Citizenship Act in 1946. The question of course content and the importance of the project to teach citizenship to the former DPs were therefore considered urgent and when combined with the provincial mandate over educational matters, resulted in a flurry of communication between municipal, provincial, and federal levels of government as well as a variety of citizenship committees, religious groups and voluntary organizations.

In the year before most of the DPs arrived, the Polish veterans who had come and been given work primarily in the sugar beet industry were offered language classes designed “to encourage them to participate in the life of the community, to take advantage of the educational facilities offered to them and to give them essential information about Canada and our way of life.” This program was considered “successful” and so similar plans were made to provide English language and citizenship classes for the DPs.4

Language and citizenship classes were intended to give the former DPs the tools they needed to reach the ultimate goal – Canadian citizenship. The stated purpose of language and citizenship classes, according to a proposed syllabus for an Ontario English class for new Canadians was:

To train the student in English, so that he can read, write and converse sufficiently for general purposes.
To inform the student as to our laws, customs, and the rights and duties of a Canadian citizen.
To bring the student to the ultimate goal of becoming a Canadian citizen.5

---

The Director of the Canadian Citizenship Branch, Frank Foulds, summarized the national immigrant training goals in 1947.

1. What makes a good Canadian is not race, creed or national origin but skill, loyalty and determination to be one.
2. Adjustment to Canadian life and economy on the part of the immigrant is a matter of training involving;
   a. Knowledge of language.
   b. Appreciation of Canadian democratic traditions.
   c. Acceptance of full responsibility as a citizen in the local community.
3. Plans are already being formulated under the Canadian Citizenship Act to provide training for all applicants for Canadian citizenship in every geographical area. This will involve:
   a. Language courses in English or French.
   b. Courses of instruction in Canadian history, geography, elementary business practice, and the forms and functions of government.\(^6\)

Workers had demonstrated their determination through commitment to the labour contracts. Language and citizenship classes would provide the tools to allow “adjustment,” “appreciation,” and “acceptance.”

This same approach to growth through immigration and emphasis on citizenship through knowledge and labour was reiterated in 1953 by Laval Fortier, the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in the years immediately after the DP labour scheme.

Il s'ensuit que l'objectif de notre politique d'immigration est de faire venir des personnes qui contribueront au développement du Canada et qui, tout en gardant des attaches avec leur pays de naissance, deviendront dans un temps relativement court de loyaux et utile citoyens." English: "the objective of the immigration program is to attract those people who are likely to make a contribution to the development of Canada, and although retaining an

attachment to the country of their birth, to become, in a reasonably short period of time, useful and loyal citizens. [Translation in the original.]

It was recognized that because large numbers of DPs were living in relatively isolated areas, employers would need to take on significant responsibilities in this area if the program was to be successful. This was not a surprise to employers holding DP contracts. They had been informed from the beginning by the Department of Labour that this would be part of the deal and had embraced these responsibilities, at least in their communication with the department. The J.J. McFadden Lumber Company was among the early employers of the woods workers. The firm was aware of its responsibilities in the area of citizenship and took pains to reassure the Department of Labour that this was so. In October, 1947, early in the scheme, C.E. Smith, the company’s general manager wrote to MacNamara on this issue.

In receiving the one hundred Displaced Persons we quite recognized our responsibility as Canadian citizens and have briefed our entire organization regarding their background and the necessity of treating them in such a manner as to make good citizens of them.

We will welcome the recreational and educational material which you are preparing to distribute and will arrange to have it properly distributed.  

Similarly, the Hydro Electric Power Commission (HEPC) was aware from the beginning that steps would be required to provide assistance “canadianizing” the new arrivals. Having received notice from forest managers about kinks in the process, the HEPC wished to organize as smooth a transition as possible from the DP camps to the job site. For the HEPC manager of personnel, this required advance knowledge of the nationalities of the men who would arrive under the Department of Labour’s scheme.

8 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 24 October 1947, C.E. Smith, General Manager, J.J. McFadden Lumber Company to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour.
Our information from certain representatives of the forest products’ companies is to the effect that they were obliged to accept groups of Displaced Persons without any advance information as to the names, nationalities and languages of the people selected. In our telephone conversation November 5th, you confirmed this fact with me.

The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario feels very strongly that we should receive this information well in advance of the actual arrival of the parties of Displaced Persons. Only if we have such information, will it be possible to plan in advance the segregation of groups of men in terms of common language or common race. This segregation we deem necessary if we are to make a serious effort towards teaching and “Canadianizing” the men.

This made a certain amount of sense when managers planned to provide a few weeks training under instructors of the same language group. If an employer could provide an experienced Polish miner to orient Polish DPs-- so much the better. However, in most cases German became a lingua franca among DPs and further specialized instructors was unnecessary.

Even before arrival in Canada, workers were being taught both English and what was expected of them in Canadian society. The Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization (PCIRO) gave woodsmen waiting to ship out for Canada at Diepholz, Germany a vocabulary list in English and German that was designed to give them the basics for lumber camp life. Basic vocabulary included “bag, boat, box, Canada, coat, cook, country, fire, food, put, road, sharp, sign, take, thing, get, go, great, hat, horse, house, hook time, together, train, wood, work, keep, make, meal, mister, [and] morning”. The list also included “special words” such as “axe, boss, bunk, bunkhouse, camp, cook house, file, fir, province, saw, skid, [and] spruce.” Some basic phrases were also included in the loggers’ vocabulary list.

---

9 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 6 November 1947, Personnel Dept. to Mr. C.E.S. Smith, Commissioner of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources, Woods Building, Ottawa.
1. I am John Schmidt.
2. This is my bag.
3. There are great woods in Canada.
4. This is a spruce tree.
5. And that is a fir tree.
6. Mr Brown is the camp boss.
7. Put your things in the bunk house.
8. We take our food in the cook house.
9. We get to Canada by boat and to the camp by train.
10. Your saw is not sharp.
11. Take a file and make your saw sharp.
12. Limb the tree with the axe.
13. Skid the wood with the horse.
14. The road has a sign.
15. Do not make fire in the wood.
16. Put your things in the box.
17. When do we go to work?
18. We go to work after the morning meal.
19. Put your hat and coat on the hook.
20. Keep your things together.
21. Canada is a great country.
22. There are nine provinces in Canada.

This limited fifty word vocabulary seems to have been designed to get the men to the jobsite, start work safely, and settle in. However, those that compiled this list did not resist the temptation to provide a first lesson in citizenship along with basic English; 1. “Canada is a great country;” 2. “There are nine provinces in Canada.”

Embodied in this basic English lesson we see the two key elements again – labour and knowledge.

Managers communicated with each other about difficulties they were facing in managing new labourers through the same kinds of channels they had used to share experience in managing POWs. They shared information about their efforts to provide adequate language training for the DPs through both informal, private...
networks and the Department of Labour. In February, 1948, T.E. Little, the manager of the Waite Amulet Mines in Noranda Quebec, wrote gratefully to K.C. MacKenzie in the HEPC personnel branch for his help in this regard. Although these men had not yet met in person, MacKenzie had sent reading material and advice about setting up employee run English courses. In return, MacKenzie shared information he had received from the Department of the Secretary of State on citizenship materials and his thoughts on the use of the Canada Yearbook as a text.\(^\text{11}\)

Franca Iacovetta’s *Gatekeepers* is an excellent treatment of the way post-war immigrants to Canada interacted with “native” institutions. She masterfully follows the document trails left by social workers, legal and medical institutions to tell the stories of immigrants in Canada during the Cold War. While it is clear that the post-war immigration boom accelerated the process of reconsidering “the meanings of family, morality, citizenship, and democracy,” the parliamentary record suggest that these debates began not just “in response to the European newcomers,” but among legislators in 1944-1945, months before the huge wave of European immigration began.\(^\text{12}\) John Diefenbaker claimed in parliament to have raised the issue of “un-hyphenated Canadian citizenship” with Mackenzie King in August, 1944. This conversation was later reported in the House of Commons during the debate on citizenship and suggests that resolution of the question was desired on both sides of the House, although with differences. Diefenbaker advocated the adoption of a Bill

\(^{11}\) Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 12 February 1948, T.E. Little, Manager, Waite Amulet Mines, Limited, Noranda, Quebec to Mr. K.C. MacKenzie (sic), Personnel Branch, Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

of Rights along with the citizenship law in order to strengthen “Canadian Democracy.”

According to his own retrospective account, after returning from Europe in February 1945 and being appointed secretary of state in April, Paul Martin saw the need for a separate Canadian citizenship and communicated the idea to Mackenzie King. Although he was a junior minister, Martin felt that there was a link between his suggestion and the prime minister’s comments during a campaign stop in Winnipeg in May 1945. Mackenzie King commented on the importance of a distinct Canadian citizenship and pledged to pursue this goal in the next Liberal government. With Mackenzie King’s blessing committees worked through the summer to draft an appropriate bill. Paul Martin presented it to Parliament on October 22, 1945. In his opening comments he remarked on the confusion surrounding the concepts of “Canadian Nationality,” “Canadian citizenship” and “British Subject.” He argued that it was “extremely undesirable that there should be confusion about so fundamental a matter.”

It seems that wartime confusion over the status of individuals seeking Canadian protection was at least part of the government’s concern in drafting this bill, particularly the difficulty of documenting the naturalization of British subjects who came to Canada from other Commonwealth countries.

In addition to clarity, the bill also introduced a measure “to provide facilities to enable applicants for certificates of citizenship to receive instruction in the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship;” and further “… by

---

15 Canada, House of Commons, *Official Report of Debates*, 22 October 1945 1335. This bill was set aside and a second was introduced on 20 March 1946, 131.
appropriate ceremonies, impress upon applicants the responsibilities and privileges of Canadian citizenship.” Citizenship education, therefore, became integrated into debates on citizenship, democracy, and nation in 1945. 16 Debate continued on these issues into 1946 when the statute passed in the House and continued in the public realm after its implementation on January 1, 1947.

Nevertheless, Iacovetta is correct in her assertion that along with contact with the immigrants came an explosion in such debates. At this time there was great optimism surrounding the recent passing of the Canadian Citizenship Act.17 Previously Canadians had remained British subjects, albeit with Canadian identities added, now, newly minted Canadian citizens were debating the responsibilities of citizenship in their communities, their nation, and the world. The oath of allegiance required one to "faithfully observe the laws of Canada and fulfill [one's] duties as a Canadian citizen."18 What these duties were was a matter for consideration and discussion.19 Even by 1946, Paul Martin’s speech on the occasion of the second reading of the citizenship bill included references to the contributions of new Canadians and the importance of impressing upon them “the great opportunity which under our law we hope we shall be able to give them.” This, he hoped would “do a

---

18 Canada. Statutes of Canada, 1946, 82.
19 For more on the debates of the immediate post-war period, see the introduction to Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, Cultures of Citizenship in Post-war Canada, 1940-1955, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 3-26. Although I think the authors have overstated the consensus among “political historians” seeing the period as “monolithic,” it is helpful to emphasize the social transformations under way in the period and to avoid falling into the trap of assuming Canadian and American post-war cultures were identical. For an excellent example of the citizenship responsibility debate, see Canadian Citizenship Council, Responsible Citizenship in Fifty-One: Report and Proceedings of the First National Conference on Canadian Citizenship, Ottawa: Le Droit, [1951] While this conference occurred after the main movement of DPs was complete and is obviously influenced by the mass immigration of 1947-51, I believe that the emphasis participants placed on the multiple layers of responsibility; family, local, national and international, were likely on the minds of Canadians in 1947-8 as well.
great deal to make these new Canadians more valuable citizens.”

Martin even laid out some of the institutions he imagined would assist in this process. The hope was

To lay before these new Canadian citizens the recognized facts of the Canadian scene, to lay before them through properly prepared material, prepared perhaps by non-governmental organizations who have the sanction of educational authorities, historians and so on, facts which will inform them not only of the opportunities and the privileges which they will acquire as future Canadian citizens, but of the obligations, for we cannot emphasize too much that along with privileges go obligations in citizenship.

Obligations were conceived in this context as local, national, and international. Regionalism or provincial identities were inadequate, since “Canada … [was] a nation among nations of the world” and since “half the world [was] in ruins, with starvation and chaos besetting the countries of Europe that were once the seat of power and influence.”

All Canadians were considered likely to benefit from classes that would reinforce good citizenship, it was claimed, “by teaching the intelligent use of leisure time; by promoting the wider use of libraries, museums, and art galleries; and by emphasizing the social and cultural aspects of education for those who are no longer attending schools, colleges or universities.”

For the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Company, the “good citizenship” of its employees was something to be proud of: For one employee writer good citizenship was about community, industry and family life, support for government initiatives and responsible labour:

---

[The Great Lakes employees’] distinguished record adds up to the sound and solid citizenship. Great Lakes are (sic) mostly married folk with families, own their homes, and take a more than average active part in the affairs of their community. They recognize their responsibilities as mature and stable citizens and they enjoy the fruits of well-balanced work and recreation.  

Employees were further encouraged to buy Canada Savings bonds, perform acts of charity and keep “regular savings.” Personal financial security was linked directly with the security of the nation. Threats to personal political decisions were also linked directly with national security.

In October 1947, there were reports in the local Fort William, Ontario press that DPs were being targeted by communist agitators. Employers feared that without intervention, the new workers would be susceptible to what the government considered unhealthy political influence by unions and more dangerous elements from abroad.

Don Murie, manager of the Fort William Chamber of Commerce, said today subversive elements were working among the displaced persons in camps in the district. He said many "rackets" were being carried out to divert the DPs to the Communist way of thinking.

He said it was the chamber's intention to approach anyone having contact with the DPs to expose these elements.

The chamber congratulated and supported E.V. Ross assistant director of adult education, for his educational program in helping the displaced persons to learn English. The Chamber hoped, Mr. Murie stated, that this work would be enlarged.

This speculation about the politics of the new workers became a matter of concern for managers and Department of Labour officials in the fall of 1947 after a representative of the Thunder Bay Timber Operators Association in Port Arthur.

---

forwarded this article to G.H. McGee, the Assistant Director of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries in the Department of Labour.

Since talking to operators and Major Andrews, I feel certain that the solution to the Communistic propaganda in the camps is to put out Canadian propaganda. This can only be done through your Department and if these DPs are to become good Canadian citizens, your Department should take action at once on this question. It is impossible for Major Andrews to do this as he is more than fully occupied with administrative and other problems.26

The primary front for communicating this “Canadian propaganda” was the community language and citizenship class.

Since education is a provincial responsibility under the British North America Act of 1867 (BNA Act), the federal government, while supportive, generally handed over responsibility for English and citizenship classes to the provinces and their proxy, the employers. We saw in the previous chapter how the Department of Labour followed up with employers about the construction of reading rooms. The importance of language classes was further reinforced by efforts to provision these libraries with appropriate texts. Most important to these efforts was Dr. I.A. Richards’ *Pocketbook of Basic English*. Although this was an American text, it was generally believed to be the best ESL resource available until a Canadian alternative was found.27

---


DPs were understandably eager to learn English and encouraged attempts to provide resources to this end. Employers were inclined to turn to the Department of Labour if they had questions about how to assist them gain language training. In December, 1947, M. McChesney of the Rudolph-McChesney Lumber Company Limited sent a note to MacNamara.

We are supplying only the English newspapers to these men and they are not interested in any other publications. They are very anxious to learn the English language and of course we have placed well educated Canadian born employees of their own nationality, to work with them and teach them our way of life.

If your Department has anything in the line of literature which might be beneficial to these men, we would be very glad to deliver it to them.

Once reports about DP interest in language classes had filtered in to the Department of Labour from a wide number of employers, A. MacNamara made a point of assuring them that the department had taken steps to assist managers with this aspect of camp life. Copies of the following letter were sent to twenty-one managers, including the Ontario Forest Industries Association, Great Lakes, and Abitibi.

Information from various sources indicates that Displaced Persons who have been brought to Canada for woods work are very interested in learning our language. They also want to know more about our country. We have been in touch with the Ontario Department of Education through the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State Department and understand a number of operators are making arrangements to have instruction in English carried out in woods camps where Displaced Persons are employed.

---

28 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 2 December 1947, Minutes of the Woods Labour Advisory Committee, Sub-Committee of the Prairie Regional Advisory Board – Labour Department, held at Port Arthur, Ontario.
Andrews: “It was his experience that the majority of these men were well educated and were particularly interested in learning the English language. In this, their adaptability and attentiveness was being used to good effect under the language programme administered by Mr. Ernest Ross of the Department of Education of the Province of Ontario.”

29 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 4 December 1947, M. McChesney of Rudolph-McChesney Lumber Company Limited to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour.
I feel sure these workers will react favourably to any efforts that may be made to improve the educational and recreational facilities available to them, and that any expenditures incurred in improving these facilities will pay dividends in the long run.

We are taking steps to obtain certain recreational and educational material which we would be prepared to distribute gratis to the various camps in which Displaced Persons are employed.

In the meantime, we would like to have your assurance that you will arrange for some one to be named in your organization to look after the care, distribution and advantageous use of any material we may be able to supply.

We would also appreciate hearing of any plans or arrangements you may already have in connection with this important phase of the workers' welfare.

I am sending similar letters to all operators to whom displaced persons have been allocated. 30

In addition to foreign language and English newspapers, the materials that were recommended to employers included I.A. Richards’ *The Pocketbook of Basic English* and Citizenship Branch publications *How to Become a Canadian Citizen*, and *Facts about Canada*, which was available in English, Polish and Ukrainian. 31

In addition to assistance to provincial and local education initiatives, the federal Department of Labour participated in national efforts to educate both the general public and new Canadians. The National Film Board (NFB) was instructed to create films that would make it possible for immigrants “to understand what opportunities are here for them in Canada, encourage them to become Canadian citizens, and show them how they may adjust happily to the Canadian way of life.” 32

Various federal departments were involved in the creation of a script for CBC radio’s


“The People Ask” to publicize government efforts at helping DPs become citizens.\(^{33}\)

In January, 1948, a public relations officer forwarded a draft script to MacNamara for his approval. It is worth considering in some detail.

First, it is important to note that although this was written for presentation by an Ontario government official, E. Cross of the Community Programmes Branch, it required vetting by the federal Department of Labour’s point man on DPs, Arthur MacNamara. It emphasized the general Canadian responsibility for “welcoming” DPs properly, giving them a good foundation upon which to build their future citizenship.

Naturally we are all interested in the general welfare of the new arrivals. We want them to feel they are welcome. We want to offer as much assistance as we can. That assistance can take various forms and be contributed by various organizations and individuals.\(^{34}\)

While there was much to occupy the Canadian public in the years between 1946-48, the topic of citizenship and its attendant responsibilities was certainly much discussed. The new citizenship law brought the question of Canadian rights and responsibilities into the public realm in a variety of forums and it is therefore no surprise that it was raised again here. The link between education, knowledge, and the actions of a good citizen are clearly presented in this script.

There is a great deal being said about citizenship with reference to the New Canadians and I think we should ask ourselves first, what constitutes good citizenship. I would define a good citizen as one who is informed on national and local problems, who uses his vote and who takes his responsibility seriously as a member of his community, his province and his country. A native-born Canadian receives in the course of his formal education, instruction as to what a citizen's responsibilities are. But what about the New

\(^{33}\) The CBC Radio Archivist in Toronto, Ken Puley, was unable to find evidence that this program ever aired. It may have been aired live without a recording, or it may have been aired between January and July 1948, a period for which there is no record for “The People Ask”.

\(^{34}\) LAC, RG27, v. 282, 1-26-21-2, Immigration of Displaced Persons – Publicity – Radio Broadcasts etc. 29 January 1948, Gordon Anderson, Public relations forwards possible script for Mr. Cross's part of the program to MacNamara.
Canadian? Before he can become a responsible member of his community he must know something of the laws, the historical background, and traditions of Canada. As a first step he must learn to read and speak in English.35

Since, in this worldview no other instruction or broader community participation was possible without a knowledge of English or French, English language classes became the focus and the job site the place to begin in Ontario.

The province of Ontario through the Community Programmes Branch of the Department of Education is organizing classes in Basic English and general information for these newcomers. Owing to the fact that immigrants from Europe are scattered all over the province, and are engaged in various types of employment, all the way from lumbering and farming to factory work and domestic service, it has been necessary to follow more than one pattern in organizing classes. Wherever it is possible, classes are located in the schools and are financed jointly by municipalities and the province and provincial grants [under] the night school regulations. Local Boards of Education are co-operating wholeheartedly in this plan through opening school buildings and supplying teachers. Where the New Canadian (sic) are working in camps in Northern and Western Ontario a different procedure is necessary. In most of these localities there are neither schools nor trained teachers available. Accordingly a volunteer from the camp staff may be selected and given a brief training course or a teacher brought in from outside and installed right within the camp itself. This is arranged in co-operation with the industry involved, and the instructor, who is usually employed to perform other duties in the camp, teaches English at night. These classes usually operate on a basis of two evenings per week, with two hours of instruction per evening. Then again, where an immigrant is employed on a farm, which is isolated, making it impossible for him to attend a night school, every effort is made to supply books and procure help from the employer or someone interested in assisting the new arrival.36

When this script was prepared, 4100 students were enrolled in Ontario classes. By 1953, the number of students in “English for Newcomers” classes in Ontario’s high schools and vocational schools was 15,346.37 Responsibility for managing

35 LAC, RG27, v. 282, 1-26-21-2, Immigration of Displaced Persons – Publicity – Radio Broadcasts etc. 29 January 1948, Gordon Anderson, Public relations forwards possible script for Mr. Cross's part of the program to MacNamara.
36 Ibid.
37 OA, RG2-77, box 1, Ontario Department of Education, Community Programmes Branch, Adult Education, Minutes and Correspondence, Rural Community Night School Material 1948-1958 (charts and statistics), 15 December 1953, Minutes of the Joint Committee on Evening Classes established by
these classes in Ontario lay with the provincial Department of Education Community Programmes Branch in conjunction with local school boards, the NES and employers, depending on local needs.

The Department of Education supplied textbooks for the Basic English and Citizenship classes and made arrangements (sic) for teachers, either through the school principals(sic), inspectors and school boards, or independently, depending on the locality of the classes.\textsuperscript{38}

In urban areas like Toronto classes were held in public schools like the King Edward School on Spadina Avenue, not more than a kilometre from the University of Toronto, where the Adult Education Board met to discuss language and citizenship classes for the entire province. This pilot project begun in 1945 initially taught “five groups of new Canadians” and responses to the program were considered “enthusiastic” by the Director, Harry Markman.\textsuperscript{39} By November 1947, the provincial board of education had sent “[m]ore than 3,000 students’ texts” and “130 teachers’ kits containing 13 reference books each, a total of nearly 5,000 books.”\textsuperscript{40} Among the recommended titles were the texts of I.A. Richards: \textit{Pocket book of Basic English} and \textit{Learning the English Language}. Citizenship texts included \textit{Canadian Democracy in

---

\textsuperscript{38} LAC, RG27, v. 282, 1-26-21-2, Immigration of Displaced Persons – Publicity – Radio Broadcasts etc. 29 January 1948, Gordon Anderson, Public relations forwards possible script for Mr. Cross's part of the program to MacNamara, 3.

\textsuperscript{39} OA, RG2-77, box 1, Ontario Department of Education, Community Programmes Branch, Adult Education Minutes and Correspondence, 9 February 1946, Minutes of the Ontario Universities Adult Education Board, 5.

\textsuperscript{40} OA, RG2-77, box 1, Ontario Department of Education, Community Programmes Branch, Adult Education Minutes and Correspondence, Ontario Adult Education Board Minutes, 1945-1948, 26 November 1947, Report to the Ontario Adult Education Board, 2.
Action and Building the Canadian Nation, a rather advanced text written by Dr. George Brown.\(^{41}\)

Although they may have received text books and advice from the Department of Education, employers needed to provide their own facilities and teachers to fill the need for language and citizenship classes in more remote locations. From discussions with mining, Hydro and forestry associations, the department of education learned that, whenever possible, it was preferable for employers to hire individuals who were knowledgeable about both the industry and education. They could therefore work as both employees of the company and as English teachers.\(^{42}\) It was thought that this would make relevant language acquisition more likely and would speed workers on their way to workplace integration.

The Central Patricia Gold Mines, Ltd. provided two weeks intensive English training for the DPs from “men who spoke their own language” followed by the opportunity to attend night classes twice a week in a local school. These classes were run by a local public school teacher. The twenty men involved in this program had a reported attendance of “100%”, as of February 14, 1948.\(^{43}\) A Hollinger Consolidated mine at Matachewan provided its workers with night school classes of one and a half

---


\(^{42}\) OA, RG2-77, box 1, Ontario Department of Education, Community Programmes Branch, Adult Education Minutes and Correspondence, Ontario Adult Education Board Minutes, 1945-1948, 26 November 1947, Report to the Ontario Adult Education Board, 2.

\(^{43}\) LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 14 February 1948, T.T. Tigert, Assistant Manager and Mine Superintendent to the Department of Labour.
hours twice a week, and reported that “some of the men [were] progressing rapidly with the language.”

Once new Canadians had enough English or French to converse with co-workers and employers and to learn about Canada and its customs as presented by the citizenship classes, they were expected to demonstrate further their willingness to be good citizens by becoming active participants in the community. But responsibility for this integration was not seen to lie with the immigrants alone and this idea was clearly articulated in the CBC radio script.

There is one other responsibility we should not overlook while we are discussing citizenship and that is the assimilating of the New Canadians into our communities as neighbors and friends. This is a responsibility which belongs to every Canadian and which I think we can all agree is essential to the building of a strong united nation. The organization of classes to teach these newcomers the English Language and to provide instruction in civics, history and geography and our Canadian way of life is well under way. Classes are an essential preliminary and can be organized by governmental agency but the welding of these people into the life of our country is the personal responsibility of each and every one of us. The final lessons in citizenship will come to these New Canadians from those of us they meet from day to day. Whether the result is good or ill is in our own hands.

To this end, in addition to Ontario teachers and employees hired by the community programmes branch, voluntary organizations like churches, the YWCA, IODE and the Canadian Legion ran language and citizenship classes. Rev. Jack

---

44 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 8 April 1948, H.H. North, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., Young-Davidson Mine, Matachewan, Ontario to W.W. Dawson Acting Director, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Division, Department of Labour.
45 LAC, RG27, v. 282, 1-26-21-2, Immigration of Displaced Persons – Publicity – Radio Broadcasts etc. 29 January 1948, Gordon Anderson, Public relations forwards possible script for Mr. Cross's part of the program to MacNamara.
Patterson of the Lakehead United Church Mission Branch assigned to the Great Lakes Paper camp at Black Sturgeon explained his motivation for participating since Study courses which improve the minds and knowledge of those who take part are part of the program. [sic] These can prove of value in future years for those employees whose knowledge of the English language is limited. They can also be of benefit to anyone who wishes to increase their knowledge of various matters. Good citizenship is stressed and this in the long run would prove of benefit to Canada as a whole. 47

Educators and industry managers were pleased when the former DPs expressed gratitude for the language and citizenship training they had received. This seems to have confirmed the validity of the goals in the minds of the ‘gatekeepers’.

The new arrivals were now well on their way to becoming good citizens. In one case, students at the courses offered in Belleville, Ontario at the local high school organized a night of “euchre and dance” to thank the community. In the assessment of the UIC manager present, efforts at cross-cultural understanding in the workplace and at events like this would pay “dividends in the years to come.” 48

You may be interested to know, Sir, that the New Canadians, who attend the Belleville Collegiate Institute for classes in English and Civics Tuesday evenings, entertained their employers, the Principal of the High School and his wife, their teachers and their wives, the writer and his wife and several other city officials and their wives to a euchre and dance in the Collegiate Gymnasium a couple of weeks ago. Several of the Newcomers gave dances in their native costumes and all in all a very pleasant evening was had by the employers and all those attending. A very dainty lunch was put up at 12 o'clock in the school cafeteria and all expenses were paid by the New Canadian group attending these classes at Belleville.

This is the second annual one of these get-togethers put on by the Newcomers to Canada and it was done with the thought of expressing their gratitude to their employers and the various Civic, Educational and Governmental officials who had smoothed the way for them in getting located.

48 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 7 February 1949, H.H. Reed, Belleville Manager, UIC to A. MacNamara, Department of Labour.
in a new country and accustoming themselves to a new language and new customs and conditions.\textsuperscript{49}

The author seems to have made a point of noting that not only did the students provide cultural entertainment and a “pleasant evening”, but that they had covered the cost of the event, demonstrating their financial maturity and community spirit.

Once workers had completed their contracts, the Department of Labour felt that it had further responsibilities in assisting them in becoming part of the broader community by providing them with some basic employment counseling. A. MacNamara suggested that this was in the department’s (and the nation’s) best interest although it should be done “without being pushed.” The UIC agreed, going further suggesting “counseling this group of DP's after they have completed their original term of agreement for employment is distinctly an NES obligation. Everything that can be done to assist these people will be done…”\textsuperscript{50} Some local labour representatives in Ontario had already been taking steps in this direction, giving advice to workers as their contracts ended about how to pursue work in areas more closely linked to their original expertise.

We try to get one of our men into each camp just prior to the completion of the contract, and they give whatever help and guidance they can. A good many of the workers will eventually show up at employment offices. I think it would be time well spent if local office managers gave special attention to directing these men into a type of employment where they can make the greatest contribution, and where it would be possible for the worker to arrange for the bringing out of any dependents that he may have in Europe at the earliest possible moment.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{49} LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 7 February 1949, H.H. Reed, Belleville Manager, UIC to A. MacNamara, Department of Labour.
\textsuperscript{50} RG27, v. 286, 1-26-30-2, Immigration – Follow up work re Displaced Persons Counseling and adjusting highly skilled DPs into their vocations, 8 July 1948, A. MacNamara to A.H. Brown and 16 August 1948, Executive Director, UIC, S.H. McLaren to MacNamara.
\textsuperscript{51} RG27, v. 286, 1-26-30-2, Immigration – Follow up work re Displaced Persons Counseling and adjusting highly skilled DPs into their vocations, 20 August 1948, W.W. Dawson, Department of Labour to A. MacNamara.
This informal counseling was codified under the UIC in a memo to its regional offices by November, 1948. Under this protocol local officers were encouraged to divide the workers into two categories: those that were assigned work in line with their skills and aspirations and those “who have been so anxious to enter Canada that they have taken a job below their normal skill, training, or experience.”

Those in the first category were encouraged to remain in the jobs in which they worked under contract, or at least in the industry originally assigned. If they required help finding work in another part of the country the NES was particularly well suited to give assistance in this regard. In principle, those who arrived with professional qualifications from abroad were encouraged to investigate ways to requalify themselves in Canada. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some young men with education were encouraged to return to university, particularly in the field of Engineering where their Canadian work experience was most relevant. Many found work elsewhere through communication within the DP community. Some readily shared information about factory or industry openings and provided informal support such as accommodation or transportation sharing.

In addition to official classroom lessons, there was an awareness among employers that there were other actions that they could take to encourage their new workers to feel Canadian. The suggestion was made by the HEPC chairman that a prominent flag flying according to established traditions would communicate the

---

52 RG27, v. 286, 1-26-30-2, Immigration – Follow up work re Displaced Persons Counseling and adjusting highly skilled DPs into their vocations, 9 November 1948, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Employment, General Information, Subject: Employment Counseling for DP's.
53 Interview with Kostas Astravas, 6 October 2008.
importance of the nation to the firm’s employees.\textsuperscript{54} Others emphasized the importance of recognizing strength in common purpose and diversity of origins among a firm’s employees. Great Lakes Paper was proud of the various Christmas traditions practiced by its employees in January, 1950. Reports of Ukrainian Christmas traditions were meant to "give … a better understanding of our fellow man and thus bind strongly together the individuals that make up our cosmopolitan family."\textsuperscript{55}

It is remarkable how quickly the former DPs were integrated into the structure and communities of the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper Company. While there were occasional jibes thrown at individuals who complained about the food or lacked skills in the woods, all evidence seems to point to a swift integration of DPs into the Great Lakes work force, if not the managerial class social elites. The pulp and paper industry had a long history of ethnic diversity in woods camps and with a few notable exceptions, as long as men were willing and able to work, they seem to have fit in without much difficulty.

The general public, employers, employees, and government officials involved in the scheme all assessed the project during its first year of implementation and after. The most critical commentaries on the scheme came from local veterans’ and labour organizations, who were concerned that jobs were being taken from the existing labour pool unfairly. Unions who passed resolutions condemning the labour scheme included Local 864 of the International Mine Mill and Smelter Workers Union,

\textsuperscript{54} Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, 11 August 1949, Manager of Personnel to Dr. O. Holden re: Flags at Construction Projects.
Alberta; Lakehead Lodge 719, International Association of Machinists, Fort William Ontario; Ontario UAW-CIO workers; the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers – Thorold Local Union No. 84, Thorold Ontario; the Welland Branch of the Canadian Legion; the Distillery, Rectifying and Wine Workers International Union of America, Local Union no. 48, Waterloo, Ontario; and the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Sudbury, Ontario. In the case of at least the Lumber and Sawmill Workers' Union there were serious ideological differences between union workers and the DPs, who were generally vehemently anti-communist. This difference may have made the unions even more unwilling to accept the influx of foreign workers.

In each case, the unions and veterans groups expressed concern about the timing of labour-immigration. They feared that veterans and experienced workers

---

56 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters forwarded by the Department of Labour, 29 January 1949, Resolution of Local 864 - Fred Romanchuk, President Local 864, International Mine Mill and Smelter Workers Union, Alberta.
57 LAC, RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2, Displaced Persons – Admission to Canada of – 1945-1955, 1 February 1949, complaint from J.S.W. Bellingham, esq., the Recording Secretary of Lakehead Lodge 719, International Association of Machinists, Fort William to the Department of Labour.
60 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Immigration, General Correspondence, 1944-47, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants – General Correspondence, 19 February 1948, From Alex M. McCrae, Secretary/Treasurer, Welland Branch, Canadian Legion, Welland Ontario to Arthur MacNamara.
61 LAC, RG27, v. 3531, 3-26-38-1, pt. 2, Immigration, General Correspondence, 1944-47, Suggestions and Representations, Immigrants – General Correspondence, 25 February 1948, John H. Schnarr, Recording and Corresponding Secretary, Distillery, Rectifying and Wine Workers International Union of America, Local Union no. 48, Waterloo, Ontario to the Department of Labour.
would go without jobs while “indentured” workers were given preference. Some worried about the housing shortage, although the importation of European labour may have in fact given a boost to the construction industry through the expansion of Ontario’s available timber supply. In several cases, the Department of Labour attempted to assuage these fears; whether they were successful or not is unclear. What is clear is that unemployment was extremely low in most industries, although this was not the case regionally in the pulp and paper industry after 1948.

In general, the lumber camps were full by the first winter. A. MacNamara was advised by the Woods Labour Advisory Committee that

As to the present labour situation, indications are that camps are almost completely filled and experienced men are being turned away – a situation which, it was stated, has not previously existed in the industry for the last eight years. …The only demand likely to exist from now on during the current season will be the normal one of replacements for turnover.  

Firms who had been early adopters of this kind of labour solution saw benefits by the winter of 1947-8. The Great Lakes Paper Company got an “early start” in the 1947-8 season at the Lac des Mille Lacs (sic) concession because of the availability of DPs to work and the “fine weather.” The employee magazine raved about the work of those at the Cameron Falls Camp 16. “Under the foremanship of M. Bezugloy this camp employs about 83 men, 41 of whom are D.P.’s. It has produced some 9,000 cords for delivery this spring.” While it is difficult to know how much this particular camp had produced in the past, the implication from the tone is that this was a notable haul. Subsequent publications of the same magazine note that the

---

63 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 10 December 1947, H.P. Crabb, Chairman, Woods Labour Advisory Board, to A. MacNamara.
industry nation wide in 1948 produced 12.4 million cords of pulpwood, almost a
million cords more than in the previous year.\footnote{TBHMS, B28, Great Lakes Paper Company Fonds, \textit{The Link}, vol. 2, no. 9, 19.}

The stockpiles of pulpwood and the full camps were unusual, and so, the
pulpwood industry put a halt to its orders of DPs. In the years that followed, the
grateful industry representatives participated in the program as informal advisors to
mining and hydro managers and filled the camps with eager workers from the more
recent waves of post-war immigration. Some sent letters of thanks to the Department
of Labour. Mrs. M.J. Poupore of the M.J. Poupore Lumber Co. at Skead, Ontario
wrote directly to the minister giving her

sincere appreciation of the efficiency of [the] Department.

A request for 20 specified Displaced Persons was answered by the
arrival of 14 on the precise day they were promised; all were well-dressed and
very presentable; and have so far, proved intelligent, capable, and exactly
what we had hoped for. Great credit is due the officials who were responsible
for the screening, the out-fitting, and the conduct, of these persons, to Skead.\footnote{LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 21 April 1948, J. Poupore Lumber Co., Skead, Ontario to Hon.
Humphrey Mitchell.}

Approximately twelve letters sent to A. MacNamara between April 28, 1948
and January, 1949 were forwarded to the Senate Standing Committee on Immigration
and Labour as evidence of the positive results of the program.\footnote{LAC, RG26, v. 101, 3-18-2, 24 March 1949, Letters of thanks included with a “Memorandum for
Senate Committee” 22 March 1949.} Others are collected
in the department’s correspondence forwarded to the Immigration Branch. The first
letter arrived in December, 1947 from the HEPC and subsequent letters were
collected from Central Patricia Gold Mines Ltd., Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines,
Ltd., Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., and Golden Manitou Mines Ltd. and
others. These letters thanked the Department of Labour for its work and for the generally high quality of workers who had arrived in Ontario and Quebec. Andrew Robertson of Golden Manitou Mines, Val D’Or, Quebec wrote that after ten months

[The] men have turned out to be valued employees. Their deportment is excellent, they have been willing and anxious to learn their new trade and I can say that as far as this company is concerned, the movement of Displaced Persons to the mining district is not only a distinct success but has been of tremendous help in maintaining production.70

In addition to managers’ impressions, we can measure the success of this movement by the willingness of former DPs to fulfill their contracts and subsequently remain in the industries to which they had been originally assigned. 160,367 workers and their dependents came to Canada.71 3,473 were contracted as woods workers.72 W.G. Andrews, the Department of Labour’s area representative in Ontario was of the opinion in December, 1947 that 30-50% of the contracted woods workers would stay on after their initial ten months was complete.73 Although detailed numbers on retention rates seem to have never been compiled, the question of how many stayed on the job was asked by the Director of the Immigration Branch, Jolliffe. He was told that the Department of Labour “[did] not have the information in such detail as [had] been requested. To secure this information would require a very great deal of time.

---

69 For a variety of correspondence see LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3. Letters to the Department of Labour. 23 December, 1947; 6 April 1948; 8 April 1948; 6 November 1948.
70 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, Letters to the Department of Labour. 6 November 1948, Andrew Robertson, Golden Manitou Mines to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour.
73 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 2 December 1947, Minutes of the eighth meeting of the Woods Labour Advisory Committee, Sub-Committee of the Prairie Regional Advisory Board – Labour Department.
and effort on the part of members of their staff.”

Although the details may have been unavailable, the department did feel comfortable stating that “approximately 95% of the original contracts [had] been completed.” And further, “only some 250 complaints [had] been received by the Department of Labour from companies regarding the displaced persons not fulfilling their contracts.” Not only did they report former DPs overwhelmingly completed their signed agreements, but a significant number remained in their assigned industries.

It is estimated that over 50% of the displaced persons are continuing a second year in the type of employment in which they were placed on their arrival in Canada. This does not necessarily mean that they are with their original employer, but that they have stayed in the industry or occupation itself. In a number of cases they may have shifted from one employer to another in the particular occupation or industry. The approximate percentages in the case of certain industries are as follows:

- Mines 80%
- Hydro-Electric 65%
- Domestics 50%
- Railway Workers 10%
- Woodworkers 10%

The HEPC was particularly gratified because in their estimation, as many as 75% of the former DPs remained with Hydro after the completion of their contracts.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the exceptional success of the DP program is revealed by the relative failure of the plan to bring British labourers to Hydro after 1950. While the HEPC expected a higher percentage of the British workers to stay on after their contracts were concluded, the opposite was true. HEPC had difficulty

---

74 RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2, 3 November 1949, R.M.W. (Department of Mines and Resources) to Mr. Jolliffe.
75 RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2, 3 November 1949, R.M.W. (Department of Mines and Resources) to Mr. Jolliffe.
76 LAC, RG26, v. 118, 3-24-41, Admission to Canada of Groups of Immigrants for Employment by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission, 6 December 1950, Recruitment of Trades and Labour in Britain.
retaining British workers even for the period required by the contracts. In June, 1952 the manager of personnel had to admit that 105 of the 352 Britons who had arrived had remained. 247 were in breach of their contract. This number also included one arrest and one disappearance. British workers were unwilling to pay their travel expenses. As a result of the failure to retain workers and the high cost of travel paid up front, the HEPC was out a significant amount of money on the program. Contrast this with the movement of DPs, of whom 95% completed their contracts, and the exceptional willingness of the former DPs to live up to their commitments to the Canadian government and to their employers is clear. This difference may also reflect former DPs willingness to live in conditions considered less than ideal by British workers.

The first thank you letters from settled DPs also began arriving around Christmas, 1947. A group of Ukrainian woods workers contracted by Marathon Paper Mills of Canada took the time to write to the Department of Labour to express their thanks. Further letters followed to the department from DPs working for the HEPC.

The Lithuanian Association of Canada sent its letter of gratitude to the Governor General in October, 1949. The timing of the letter, however, was not merely the completion of labour contracts, but to refute allegations made by the Polish delegation in the United Nations about the conditions under which DPs were

---

78 LAC, RG26, v. 96, 3-11-3, 19 December, 1947, Roman Romanchukewich, Dipl. Forestry economist Goettingen (Group Leader), Woodworkers Camp 109, Stevens, Ontario to the Department of Labour.
living in Canada.\textsuperscript{79} Poland’s first criticism came in May, 1949. The focus of this resolution was the claim of improper treatment of domestic servants and sugar beet workers in Manitoba.\textsuperscript{80} In response, Canada extended “hospital service and medical attention to relatives” of DPs in their first year of work in Canada.\textsuperscript{81} Poland’s critiques continued to be of concern as the UN General Assembly agenda on 14 November 1949 included a criticism of governments, including Canada’s, for Discriminations …practiced… against immigrant labour, and, in particular, against labour recruited from the ranks of refugees and displaced persons, in respect of working and living conditions, social insurance, trade union rights and the right of protection of economic and occupational interests; in respect of the right to education and culture and in respect of other civic rights; …\textsuperscript{82}

In this case, testimonials from former DPs were a potent antidote to concerns about the treatment of workers. Materials in the \textit{Hydro News} suggest that the HEPC collected thank you notes from employees who arrived and completed contracts under this program.\textsuperscript{83} One such letter was available for examination. Alek Lazik, a former DP, residing in Windsor Ontario wrote to the manager of the Des Joachims development on 26 November, 1948.\textsuperscript{84}

Lazik was one of the first DPs to arrive at Rolphton. He was therefore one of the men assessed by Dr. Urquhart and the personnel department to be a high quality

\textsuperscript{79} LAC, RG26, v. 121, 3-32-2 – UN General Assembly discussion 14 November 1949, non-discrimination in immigration policy, 21 October 1949, A. Rinkunas, President Lithuanian Association of Canada and M. Norkus, Secretary, Toronto to the Governor General.
\textsuperscript{82} LAC, RG26, v. 121, 3-32-3 – UN General Assembly discussion 14 November 1949, non-discrimination in immigration policy, 14 November 1949.
\textsuperscript{83} The \textit{Hydro News} suggests that the files of P.F.L. Riches of the Personnel Branch include a collection of letters. Due to the closure of the Hydro Archives this has become difficult to confirm, although Freedom of Information requests have suggested that “no record” of these files exists any longer.
\textsuperscript{84} Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, Personnel Files, 26 November 1948, Letter from Alek Lazik (New Cdn) 1638 Drouillard Rd., Windsor, Ont to Mr. Richardson, Manager of Des Joachimes (sic) development, Rolphton, Ont.
potential citizen, if not an ideal labourer. He wrote this letter out of gratitude to both the HEPC and the Canadian government, which gave him “the opportunity to come to this country.” After his time with the HEPC he was grateful because, “[a]t last – I am not more D.P. – I am settled – and as a “New Canadian” I got a seldom good and fine settlement.” (sic) He continued;

… I am very thankful to the H.E.P.C. for the job I got and all arrangement which was done for me there. I have never been a physical worker before, but in spite of that the whole work there was an agreeable refreshment for me. Of course, physical work is a hard job, but the way in which we have been working – the way in which we have been met by Hydro Officers, formen and our Canadian fellow workers was an extraordinary fair and friendly. That was the key of my happy feeling in Hydro – a happy refreshment. Frankly speaking, I did not expect to find in such a large scale understanding, friendliness and good will- I am repeating – from the last worker in my gang (riggers) till my forman and the members of the staff. And that is this spirit of good will and friendliness in your camp which made me to feel happy and proud of starting my new life as a Canadian.

During my living in the camp I had the chance several times to be in closer contact with most of yours officers. I felt quite exactly what an outstanding example they showed in building such an atmosphere of good will. I remember their friendly faces with big pleasure, as well of our prist, doctor and teachers. I remember with special pleasure my “old” and last forman Clair Perrault, a dear and noble person, as well all my sympathetic fellows workers. On the end, I remember always You Sir, who took such a conscientious care about the whole work and everyone of us.

Once more my best thank to you and your Hydro staff and people.85

While it would be a mistake to assume that Lazik’s experience was one hundred percent positive and broadly representative of the experiences of all the men working at Des Joachims, let alone across the country, it does seem reasonable to conclude that his gratitude for the chance was genuine. Any difficulties he faced were worth it for a chance to be in Canada with a job, even if it was not the kind he

85 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, Personnel Files, 26 November 1948, Letter from Alek Lazik (New Cdn) 1638 Drouillard Rd., Windsor, Ont to Mr. Richardson, Manager of Des Joachimes (sic) development, Rolphton, Ont.
was used to. Lazik’s experience as it is reflected here also suggests that, at least in this case, the goal of providing positive experiences with local Canadians was successful. Lazik cites good relationships with his work crew, his foreman, and indeed with the camp manager, to whom the letter was addressed.

This seems to have been the conclusion drawn by HEPC management as well. The Manager of Personnel reported to the HEPC Chairman, R.L. Hearn that he believed it was

heartening to receive letters such as this for they establish beyond doubt the fact that some of the consideration shown displaced persons has helped to produce satisfied Canadian citizens. Undoubtedly it is also true that even among the displaced persons who are somewhat dissatisfied, there would have been a more serious condition had constant efforts not been made to treat them with fitting consideration.  

Lazik’s letter was affirming to the management of the HEPC for several reasons. First, Lazik represented the vast majority of workers who lived up to the conditions outlined in their contracts with the company and the federal government. Lazik arrived in Rolphton prepared to work hard at a job that he was not trained to do. He stayed for the year required of him. He paid off his travel expenses. He learned basic English and he displayed appropriate gratitude for the opportunity and the efforts made on his behalf, even if they also served the interests of the HEPC, the provincial and the federal governments. In doing so, Lazik, and the others like him demonstrated their “right to full partnership in the fortunes and in the future of [the] nation.”

---

86 Hydro Archives, Personnel Branch, AN 91.029 54-17, OR-930.1, Personnel Files, 3 February 1949, letter forwarded to Mr. D. Forgan, R.L. Hearn and Dr. O. Holden by Diblee, Manager of Personnel.

VII - Conclusions

The years between 1943 and 1953 transformed Canada at home and abroad. These were years in which the citizenship law was passed, the new social safety net was implemented, housing boomed and the doors opened again to mass European immigration. The federal government continued in its wartime role as the dominant force in federalism, increasing its annual spending and taking the lead in the nation’s economic life. Security was paramount in the new Cold War context and Canada found itself in the middle of international events during the Gouzenko affair and the war in Korea. Fear of the spread of communism abroad, revulsion at what the communists were doing in east-central Europe, and fear of communism at home all motivated Canadians and their government to take a more sympathetic view of immigrants who on the index of anti-communism would have been close to the top.

But it was not just that. A prosperous Canada, with a solid military record in the recent past could play a larger role in the world – had to play a larger role in the world, for 1939-1945 demonstrated what might happen if it left the world to fend for itself. Canada revelled in its new role as a middle power on the world stage, considering itself as a significant actor in the work of the United Nations and its organizations—a light year away from its interwar policies of political, economic and immigration protectionism. The danger of a historical periodization that ends in 1945 or only begins with the end of the war is that the origins of these dramatic changes and the difficulties faced in creating desired changes may be obscured.

The intention of this thesis has been to identify these continuities from the war into the postwar period in the area of perceptions of race, anti-Semitism, immigration,
Canadian citizenship and the economy. The decision to assist the movement of DPs from Europe to Canada was made in a transitional moment for Canadian society when it was changing its criteria of a “suitable” immigrant; debating the nature of citizenship; planning for development; and afraid of economic downturn. These particular refugees began the wave of mid twentieth century immigration because their needs, the international climate and Canada’s domestic interests happened to come together at the right moment. Although Mackenzie King was at the end of his political career in 1947, he was perhaps uniquely able to manage the balancing act required to both amend Canada’s immigration laws and keep fears at bay. He was able to manage a compromise between Canada’s international affairs, business interests, public perceptions of immigration and interdepartmental politics. Had any of these factors, or the presence of keen individuals within the civil service, been absent, it is difficult to imagine a similar result.

DPs directly experienced the implications of the fundamental changes underway in international conceptions of human rights, discrimination and in Canadian immigration policy after the war. They were assessed as both members of racial or religious groups and as potential contributors to Canada’s resource based economy. Their suitability was located in their origins, their experience and in their willingness to work hard at the roles assigned to them by the Department of Labour.

There is no doubt that these roles were very significant for how the movement was conceived, structured and managed. From the beginning, the doors were opened to DPs who would fill the chronic gaps in forestry. They were considered to be direct substitutes for wartime POWs and were requested through the channels previously
established for managing wartime labour shortages, specifically POW labour.

Informal networks of managers consulted with each other and the project expanded to other resource industries seeking muscle in the bush-- mining and hydro construction projects.

Industry participation in the project was therefore impossible without assurances that they would get a return on their investment. The cost of moving men from the coast to the work site was significant. New workers were known to be less productive than the experienced labourer. Therefore it was vital that contracted workers remain on the job for the duration of their commitment. This was the deal—life in Canada, but restricted labour mobility in the first year and ideally longer. The relationship between the federal government and Canadian industries is key here. Neither would have, or could have, been involved in this project without the other.

In addition to the implications for policy changes in the period, the DP project and the way it was implemented, discussed and assessed reveals much about how Canadians perceived the ideals of Canadian citizenship. In assessing the virtues of DPs, civil servants and industry managers were also revealing the characteristics they valued in Canadian society: work, knowledge of the country, engagement in the issues of the day, and community. Successful immigrants were therefore forged into Canadians by first demonstrating “occupational suitability” and willingness to work in their assigned roles; and second, by actively seeking knowledge of the country considered foundational for good citizenship. The final step in the process was integration into the life of the community: its events, economy, and concerns. In this
process the expectation was that ideally they would be assisted by other Canadians, who would provide “the final lessons in citizenship.”

What, then, can we conclude about what it was to be Canadian in general in these years, new or otherwise? From the dialogue on DPs we can see that being a good Canadian citizen might be divided into the willingness to participate in four areas: labour, study, social connection and political participation. While not all Canadians were expected to work in remote bush camps for the betterment of the nation, all were expected to contribute as they were best suited to the country’s development. The importance of the contract demonstrates not only the importance of work for citizenship, a DP’s desire to be Canadian, but also of the rule of law. DPs were expected to value the importance of keeping their word. Those that did not, like Mr. G., who sought work outside of the contract within months of his arrival, were viewed by civil servants as untrustworthy, disloyal, and unworthy to be citizens. A job opened doors to other areas of citizenship, like savings and the provision of the necessities of life for a family.

As we have seen, between 1906 and 1943 a balance of Canadians and Canadian policy makers were in agreement that immigration should be restricted to the “preferred” groups; settlers from Britain, the United States, family members and farmers able to support themselves upon arrival. The wartime crisis changed the context in which immigration and refugee policies were being made. A new generation of bureaucrats with wartime experience abroad and with extensive contact with foreign peers were returning to Ottawa concerned about the refugee crisis and

---

frustrated by the limits of old approaches to immigration. Canada’s continuing participation in international bodies like the United Nations and concern with the question of discrimination meant that there was a significant amount of pressure on policy makers to assist in refugee settlement. Furthermore, this pressure opened up a significant debate about ways to balance national interests and non-discrimination. In this process individuals like Riddell, Holmes, MacNamara and Wrong led the nation past the limitations of its own public opinion. Rather than a regular march in one direction in this area, Canadians have often expressed the desire to limit settlement. Nevertheless, some significant moments of refugee migration have occurred when individuals responsible were committed to change.

The movements of DPs and Hungarians occurred at convenient intersections of national economic interest and new international perspectives. In the 1960s, faced with changes to the Commonwealth, the boundaries were stretched again to include mass movements of “non-white” groups. By 1976, open refugee and immigration policies were “principles” borne out in practice during the height of the sponsored refugee movement of the 1970s and 1980s and expanded in 1997. In each case policy elites rather than elected governments or public pressure led the way.

The debates, disagreements, foot dragging and compromises initiated by individuals between 1937 and 1951 resulted in a shift among policy makers towards a sense of responsibility towards refugees. Continued waves of refugee settlement have reinforced this notion in the broader Canadian public.

In 1969 Canada finally ratified the 1951 Convention on the protection of refugees and the subsequent 1967 Protocol. After this date, the government of Canada
became a cautious supporter of humanitarian settlement. In 1972 Canada, along with other Commonwealth members was asked to assist refugees (of South Asian descent) carrying British passports to leave Uganda. 45.3% of Canadians polled approved of this action and 43.5% did not. 11.2% remained undecided.² The government acted anyway. Eventually 4,420 individuals³ came to Canada as the situation in Uganda became untenable. While limited in scope and courage, the government did manage to act on this matter despite a divided and possibly resistant public.

As a result of the work of Robert Andras, the minister of the newly created Canada Manpower and Immigration Department and Allan Gotlieb, his deputy, the 1967 regulations were reviewed, interested parties consulted, and findings published in the 1975 Green Paper on Immigration. Summing up the report, Andras wrote; "Canadians will want, I believe, an immigration policy that meets our social, economic and cultural needs, that respects the family, that is free from discrimination, and that keeps the door open to refugees."⁴ The recommendations made by this report and the practices developed under the “points system” formed the basis for the subsequent 1976 Immigration Act.

While Canada’s relationship with the Commonwealth obviously had a significant impact on its drive to end racial discrimination in immigration, the debate was begun in those crucial years around World War Two. By 1976, not only had the humanitarian impulse to help the world's refugees become more common in Canada, it had become one of the 1976 Act's "fundamental principles," which included "the

---

⁴ Knowles, 167.
promotion of Canada's demographic, economic, cultural and social goals; family
reunion; the fulfillment of Canada's international obligations in relation to the United
Nations Convention (1951) and the 1967 Protocol relating to refugees; non-
discrimination in immigration policy; and cooperation between all levels of
government and the voluntary sector in the settlement of immigrants in Canadian
society."⁵ Nevertheless, because of high unemployment and uncertainty in the
economy, only 10.2% of Canadians polled in 1975 preferred to increase
immigration.⁶

The pressures on Canada's immigration and refugee apparatus in this period
and in the following decades have been documented elsewhere,⁷ but it is important to
note the scale and variety of the movements organized after 1979. In this year Canada
created designated refugee classes that included refugees of the crisis in Indochina,
Latin America, and the Communist bloc. By 1981, Canada had opened its doors to
77,000⁸ Indochinese refugees. This occurred despite the fact that in 1979, when
polled, 51.4% of Canadians considered the 5,000 scheduled for 1979 “too high” and
36.6 thought 5,000 was “about right.”⁹ Public opinion changed dramatically between
February and November when the “Boat People” had become a cause supported by
Canadian churches and therefore more prominently discussed in the press. By July

---

⁵ Cited in Knowles, 169. See also Hawkins, 57-72.
⁶ http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/doc/gllp-75-jun377-
⁷ See particularly Knowles, Strangers at Our Gates; Dirks, Canada’s Refugee Policy; Hawkins,
Critical Years in Immigration.
⁸ Knowles, 174-5.
⁹ http://www.library.carleton.ca/ssdata/surveys/doc/gllp-79-feb421a-
1979, 48.4% supported allowing “more of these refugees to re-locate to Canada.”\textsuperscript{10}

By November 1979, 33.6% of Canadians thought that 50,000 refugees from Vietnam, 3,000 per \textit{month}, was “just about right.”\textsuperscript{11}

This era was perhaps the high water mark for Canada’s refugee activities. In 1986, the nation as a whole was recognized by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with a Nansen Medal in recognition of these sponsored refugee programs of the 1970s and 1980s.\textsuperscript{12} By the early 1990s, highly publicized examples of illegal arrivals and another economic downturn had reduced Canadians’ interest in refugee assistance and immigration although support for immigration rose again to a limited extent in the late 1990s.\textsuperscript{13} In 1997 Canada expanded its categories of possible refugees to ensure that some of those in need who failed to meet relatively specific convention criteria could still be assisted.\textsuperscript{14}

It is perhaps too soon to judge the long term effects of the “War on Terror” on Canadian attitudes and policies on refugees. Recent changes to Canada’s immigration regulations passed by the Harper Government in May 2008 suggest that there has been a revived emphasis on economic rather than humanitarian priorities and on ministerial discretion rather than bureaucratic regulation. Among the critiques made by the Canadian Bar Association aimed at this package was the claim that it would


\textsuperscript{14} A helpful quick reference resource on refugee policy is available at the Canadian Council for Refugees website. http://www.ccrweb.ca/history.html
mean a return to a time when ministerial discretion was absolute and unguided by bureaucratically imposed selection criteria.¹⁵

For the time being, examples like the movement to bring Karen refugees from Myanmar, formerly Burma, from Thai camps, suggest that Canadians will continue to accept some groups of refugees as the need arises. The post war positive experience of being widely known as a receiver nation is now deeply embedded in Canadian views of themselves in the world. Despite the return to ministerial discretion this may ensure that if any minister became negligent in applying the principles of the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which prohibits discrimination in general, or reduced perceptions of Canada’s willingness to welcome refugees in recognized crises, they would face significant public censure. This is neither “natural” to Canada, nor is it something we have always done.

Appendices

Appendix A – Ontario Firms employing POW labour

1945 – Camps employing German NCOs

Source: Department of National Defence Ontario Works Projects – July 19, 1945
LAC, RG24-C-1
Mfm: C-5367

Abitibi Power and Paper Co.
Brompton Pulp and Paper Co
Calong Timber Co. Ltd
Driftwood Land and Timber Co.
Great Lakes Paper Co.
Nenago Timber
Nipigon Lumber Co.
Nipigon Lake Timber Co.
Northern Paper Mills Co Ltd
Ontario Paper Co.
Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper
Pigeon River Timber
Provincial Paper Co.
Pulpwood Supply Co.
Spruce Falls Power and Paper Co.

1946 - Employers using POW labour

Source: LAC, RG27, Vol. 965, file: 8
January 17, 1946

Military District #2

Abitibi Power and Paper Co.
Algoma Central & H.B. Railway
Driftwood Land & Timber Co.
Kalamazoo Vegetable parchment
Newaygo Timber Co., Ltd.
Northern Paper Mills, Ltd.
Spruce Falls Power and Paper Co., Ltd.

Military District #10

Abitibi Power and Paper Co.
Brompton Pulp and Paper Col, Ltd.
Great Lakes Paper Co., Ltd.
Armour and Graham
Manitoba Paper Co., Ltd.
Marathon Paper Co., Ltd.
Newaygo Timber Co., Ltd.
Nipigon Lake Timber Co., Ltd.
Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Co., Ltd.
Ontario Paper Co., Ltd.
Pigeon Timber Co., Ltd.
Provincial Paper Ltd.
Pulpwood Supply co., Ltd.
Appendix B - Items available for Purchase in POW Canteens
Source: LAC RG27, vol. 965, file 10: Correspondence re: POW employment

“LIST OF PURCHASABLE ARTICLES IN PW CANTEENS
86. Subject to being available, the following lists of articles are purchasable in Prisoner of War Canteens; no other articles whatsoever may be handled without specific authority from National Defence Headquarters.

a) Tobacco, etc.
Ash trays, glass or plastic 1 per prisoner per year
Cigarettes 50 per prisoner per week
Cigarette holders (non-metal) 1 per prisoner per year
Cigarette papers 100 per prisoner per week
Cigars As available
Cigar holders (non-metal) 1 per prisoner per year
Lighter fluids 1 bottles per prisoner per year
Lighter flints 12 per prisoner per year
Lighter wicks 2 per prisoner per year
Matches as available
Pipes not to cost over $1.50
Pipe Cleaners unlimited
Tobacco ¼ pound per prisoner per week
Tobacco pouches (other than rubber or leather) As available

b) Confectionary
Candies (cough drops, peanuts and toffee not permitted) 1/8 pound per prisoner/wk
Chewing gum 1 packet per prisoner per week
Chocolate bars 1 bar per prisoner per week
Soft drinks (including homemade lemonade) 2 bottles per prisoner per week

c) Groceries
Biscuits and cake ¼ pound singly or combined per prisoner per week
Fruits – fresh, domestic as available
Ice cream as available
Fruit juices (tomato and apple only) as available
Buttermilk as available
Mustard as available
pickles as available
Sauces (domestic manufacture) as available
Vegetables - fresh, domestic For messes only
Vinegar For messes only
Yeast (bulk only) For messes only

d) Toilet Articles
Brushes, boot  as available
Brushes, hair  1 per 4 prisoners per year
Brushes, clothing  1 per 10 prisoners per year
Brushes, shaving  1 per 10 prisoners per year
Brushes, tooth  1 per prisoner per year
Cream, face (non-metal containers)  1 per prisoner per year
Combs, hair  1 per 4 prisoners per year
Mirrors, face (non-metallic)  1 per 10 prisoners per year
Mouth washes (non-alcoholic)  1 bottle per prisoner per year
Files, nail (non-metallic)  1 package per prisoner per year
Scissors, nail (small)  1 per 6 prisoners per year
Polish, shoe  as necessary
Powder, tooth (non-metal containers)  4 per prisoner per year
Razors, safety  1 per 4 prisoners per year
Razor blades (safety)  1 per prisoner per week
Shaving sticks  2 per prisoner per year
soap, face  1 bar or cake per prisoner per 3 months

Note: Tooth powder or cakes do not include Dentets or similar dental preparations.
Six packages of Dentets per year. Dental cream may be purchased in lieu of tooth powder or similar dental preparations.

e) Stationary, etc.
Blotters  As necessary
Books, scribbling (educational purposes only)  2 per prisoner per year as available
Brushes (oil and water painting)  as available
Fountain pens (not to exceed cost of $1.50)  as available
Glues and mucilages  1 small bottle per 20 prisoners / year
Gramophone records  4 per gramophone per month
Gramophone needles  2 boxes per gramophone per month, but over average of 2 needles per gramophone per day
Ink (not India)  As necessary
rulers, plain wooden  As necessary
Paints, oil and water (tubes to be accounted for)  As available
Paper, drawing  As available
Pencils, all colours  As available
Pencils, charcoal  As available
Pens, holders  As available
Pen nibs  3 per prisoner per year
Playing Cards  1 package per 2 prisoners per year

f) Clothing, etc.
Bags, laundry  As necessary
Cloths, face  2 per prisoner per year
handkerchiefs ½ doz per prisoner per year
laces, shoe As necessary
Pyjamas and nightshirts 2 per prisoner per year
Slippers, lounge (except leather) 1 pair per 2 prisoners per year
Socks (officers' Camps only) 4 pair per prisoner per year
Sport trunks (not khaki) 1 pair per prisoner per 2 years
towels, face 2 per prisoner per year
towels, bath 2 per prisoner per year
Trunks, bathing 1 pair per prisoner if swimming available
Underwear, summer (Officers' Camps only) 2 suits per prisoner per year
Underwear, winter (Officers' Camps only) 2 suits per prisoner per year
Yarn, mending As necessary
Yarn, sewing As necessary
g) Miscellaneous
Tumblers, glass 1 per prisoner per year
Fruit Salts and common remedies other than drugs. 1 per prisoner per year on authority of Camp Commandant.

h) Magazines
Any daily, weekly or monthly magazine or paper published in the United Kingdom or Canada.
Note: Except magazines or papers which contain matters of information in respect to Naval, Military and Air Force, such as drawings, specifications, etc.
Note 2: Copies of three daily and three weekly papers only may be purchased.
The following magazines or papers printed in the United States may also be sold in Canteens:
Colliers, Coronet, Cosmopolitan, Red Book, Look, Nazioni (Italian) NY, New Yorker, Readers Digest, Picture Post”

Appendix C – First Wave Applications

LAC, RG26, v. 96, f. 3-11-3 – Labour Department – Letters forwarded September 1947
Immigration-Labour Committee
Applications Approved

Woods Workers Group 1
- Spruce Falls Power and Paper, Ltd., Kapuskasing On 600
- Great Lakes Paper Company, Ltd., Thunder Bay District, On 400
- Abitibi Power and Paper Company, Head of the Lakes, On 500

Group 1 total 1500

Woods Workers Group 2
- Brompton Pulp and Paper, Nipigon, On 400
- Driftwood Land and Timber Co., Sault Ste Marie, On 50
- Hammermill Paper Co, Port Arthur, On 25
- Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment, Espanola, On 150
- Pembroke Shook Mills Ltd., Pembroke, On 50
- Staniforth Lumber Co., North Bay 25
- A.E. Wicks Lumber Co, Cochrane, On 150
- Kormac Lumber Co., Kormac, On 50
- Nipigon Lake Timber Co, Port Arthur, On 150
- Gillies Bros., Braeside, On 70
- Pigeon Timber Co., Fort William, On 300
- Mountjoy Timber Co., Timmins, On 40
- J.J. McFadden Co., Blind River, On 100

Group 2 total 1485

Woods Workers Group 3
- Barry's Bay Lumber Co., Barry's Bay, On 25
- Abitibi Power and Paper Co, Head of the Lakes 500
- Great Lakes Paper Co. Ltd., Thunder Bay District, On 400
- T.S. Woolings and Co., Ltd., South Porcupine, On (pending) 50
- Newaygo Timber Co., Ltd., Port Arthur, On 100

Group 3 total 1275

Appendix D - Original Welcome Letter

RG26, v. 96, f. 3-11-3, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Labour Department – Letters forwarded

TO YOU WHO HAVE CHOSEN TO MAKE YOUR HOME IN CANADA (in English, French and German)

Canada Welcomes you. In Canada you can find a new homeland far from your troubles of the past.

You have promised to work for one year at a stated job and this you must do. The possibility of bringing additional thousands from displaced persons camps to Canada is dependent upon your co-operation with the Department of Labour in carrying out your part of this undertaking.
Your rate of pay will be the same as is given Canadian workers if you perform the same work and other working conditions will be the same.

Canada enjoys a high standard of living. You have an opportunity by your own hard work to share that high standard with other Canadian workers.

The cost of your train fare in Canada may be deducted from your wages.

After you have worked for one year at the job you agreed to you may then, if you like, take other work.

After you have become well established you may make application for the admission of your dependents. If your employer endorses your application and if your dependents meet the physical and other requirements of the Canadian Immigration Department, transportation will be arranged by the International Refugee Organization as soon as possible thereafter.

We wish you well and if you have troubles that cannot be cured by talking to your employer get in touch with the nearest office of the National Employment Service or with the Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

…

Signed by Humphrey Mitchell and Arthur MacNamara
Selected D.P. Project Biographies

Croll, Hon. David Arnold (Q.C.)
b. 1900, Moscow, Russia to Hillel and Minnie (Cherniak) Croll. Jewish. Educated in Windsor, Ontario, the University of Toronto and Osgoode Hall Law School. Practiced law in Ontario and was elected Mayor of Windsor 1930-1934. Member of the Ontario Legislature from 1937-1945. September 1939 enlisted in the armed forces, served overseas, promoted to Lieutenant Colonel and discharged in 1945. Elected to the House of Commons 1945, Liberal MP Toronto-Spadina; re-elected in 1949 and 1953. Appointed to the Senate in 1955.

Haythorne, George Vickers (M.A., Ph.D)

Holmes, John Wendell (M.A.)
b. June 18, 1910, London, Ontario to Wendell and Helen (Morton) Holmes. 1932 B.A. University of Western Ontario; 1933 M.A. University of Toronto; 1943 joined Department of External Affairs; 1944-47 First Secretary at Canada House, London; 1947-8 Chargé d'affairs Moscow; 1949-1951 Head of UN Division, Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa; 1950-1 Acting Permanent Representative of Canada to UN; 1951-3 Member, Directing Staff, National Defence College; 1953 Assistant Undersecretary of State for External Affairs.

b. July 7, 1898, Toronto, Ontario to Ellis William and Margaret Louise (Irvine) Keenleyside. WWI veteran; 1920 B.A., University of British Columbia, 1921 M.A. and 1923 Ph.D. Clark University, 1945 LL.D., University of B.C.; 1928, Department of External Affairs; 1929-1936 First Secretary, Canadian Legation to Tokyo, Japan; 1938 Chairman of the Board of Review investigating charges of illegal entry of Orientals into BC; 1941 Assistant Undersecretary of State for External Affairs; 1944 Canadian Ambassador to Mexico; 1940-5 Member and Secretary of the Canada-USA Joint Board on Defence (1944 Acting Chairman); 1947-50 Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources and Commissioner for the NWT; January-October 1950 Deputy Minister of Resources and Development; 1950-1958 Directory General, UN Technical Assistance Administration; 1959 Chairman B.C. Power Commission.

MacNamara, Arthur James (C.M.G., LL.D.)
b. March 4, 1884, Toronto (Bracondale), Ontario; 1914 joined the Manitoba Civil Service; 1916-1919 served in RAF as Lieutenant; 1916, Chief Inspector Bureau of Labour, Manitoba; 1924, Deputy Fire Commissioner; 1929, Assistant Deputy

---

1 These biographies are based on information from The Canadian Who's Who, v. VIII (1958-1960).
Minister of Public Works; 1936, Deputy Minister of Labour and Deputy Minister of Public works, directing unemployment relief and drought assistance for the province of Manitoba; 1940 called to Ottawa as Chairman, Dependents' Allowance Board, Dept. of National Defence; July 1941 named Acting Chief Commissioner, new Unemployment Insurance Commission; 1942 Associate Deputy Minister of Labour and Director of N.S.S. for Canada; 1944 LL.D. University of Manitoba; 1943-1953 Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mills, Charles Ransom (B.Sc.F)
b. April 3, 1892, Merrickville, Ontario to A. Lincoln and Addie C. (Reid) Mills; Anglican; 1915 B.Sc.F. University of Toronto; 1917-1919 R.F.C. Lieutenant; 1939-1945 R.C.A.F. Wing Commander; Manager Ontario Forest Industries Association since 1946; ex-officio member of the Executive Council (Woodland Section) Canadian Pulp and Paper Association; Thornhill Golf and Granite Club member.

Pope, Lieutenant General Maurice Arthur (C.B., M.C.)

Robertson, Norman Alexander (D.C.L., LL.D.)
b. 1904 in Vancouver B.C.; B.A. 1923, University of British Columbia; Balliol College, Oxford; 1927 Brookings Graduate School, Washington D.C.; LL.D. University of British Columbia; Cambridge University, D.C.L.; 1929 joined External Affairs as 3rd Secretary; 1941 became Undersecretary of State for External Affairs; 1940-1952 Clerk of the Privy Council and Secretary to the Cabinet; 1952-57 High Commissioner of Canada to the UK; 1957-8 Canadian Ambassador to the USA.

Smith, Charles Edwin
b. July 25, 1900 at Ashland, Wisconsin, USA to Charles William and Theresa (McBride) Smith; Catholic; educated at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; General Manager Huron Forest Products Co. Ltd, successor to J.J. McFadden Lumber Co. Ltd; started in sawmill in various roles 1916-1945; President of Canadian Lumbermen's Association 1948-9; resident of Blind River.

Thatcher, Wilbert Ross
b. May 24, 1917 in Neville, Saskatchewan to Wilbert and Marjorie Belle (Price) Thatcher; United Church; educated at Moose Jaw; 1936 B.Comm Queen's University;
President Moose Jaw Hardware; 1945 elected to House of Commons as CCF member for Moose Jaw; re-elected in 1949 and 1953; 1955 resigned from CCF party.
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