

Shaping Destinies: Women and the Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada (1956–1958)

Sheena Trimble

<https://doi.org/10.30608/HJEAS/2022/28/2/10>

ABSTRACT

By December 1958, Canada had admitted almost 38,000 Hungarian refugees, forced to flee their country after Soviet forces crushed the October 1956 uprising. A rich historiography has examined this migration from a range of perspectives, but an analysis of women's actions and attitudes represents an uncharted approach. Archival research reveals that Canadian women expressed opinions and took on a variety of roles related to the refugee movement. Examining those opinions and roles not only offers a novel perspective on Canada's response to the refugee crisis, but it also provides insights into the evolving roles of women in Canadian society. The weight of intersectionality often muted the voices of women of Hungarian origin, both Canadians and refugees. Yet, refugee women were accorded a symbolic power that played its own role in the movement, and they found ways to exercise their agency to achieve their desired admission and settlement outcomes. (ST)

KEYWORDS: Canada, Hungarian refugees, women, attitudes, actions

Introduction

The Hungarian uprising in the fall of 1956 and the fate of some 200,000 refugees who fled the country following brutal suppression by Soviet forces captivated the attention of Canadian women along with the rest of the world.¹ Canadian advocates of refugee relief found the Liberal government's initial response of giving priority to Hungarian immigration applications half-hearted. Those advocating more forceful action sparked a public outcry, taken up by the press,

opposition parties, and even the Department of External Affairs. For days, the minister of citizenship and immigration, J. W. Pickersgill, adhered to his department's "gatekeeper" role before finally bowing to pressure (Dirks, "Canada and Immigration" 7; Dirks, *Canada's Refugee Policy*, 193–99; Donaghy, "An Unselfish Interest?" 264–67). On 23 November 1956, he sought Cabinet approval to simplify admission procedures and charter aircraft to bring refugees to Canada.² The movement began in earnest when Pickersgill announced, on 28 November 1956, that the Canadian government would bear the cost of transport. By the end of 1958, 37,566 Hungarian refugees had been admitted, marking a watershed in Canada's refugee policy.³ The Hungarians were the first group of refugees admitted in such large numbers in such a short period of time, facilitated by favorable government policies and widespread mobilization within Canadian society (Dreisziger, "The Biggest Welcome Ever" 42).

A rich historiography has examined this migration from a range of perspectives, but an analysis of women's actions and attitudes related to the admission and early settlement processes represents an uncharted approach. It has the potential to call into question stereotypical representations of 1950s Canadian women as being singularly preoccupied with domesticity, maternity, and consumerism (Owram 7, 22; Strong-Boag 315–19). Indeed, archival research reveals that Canadian women expressed opinions and took on a variety of roles related to this remarkable migration. Examining those opinions and roles not only offers a novel perspective on Canada's response to the Hungarian refugee crisis, but it also provides insights into the evolving positions of women in Canadian society.

The 1956 refugee movement largely surpassed previous waves of Hungarian immigrants, and it brought a more youthful and more highly-educated group to Canada (Patrias 23–25; Dreisziger, "Toward a Golden Age" 207). At the same time, it replicated the male-female imbalance that had been typical of previous generations. At the turn of the century and during the interwar period, Hungarian migrants had often been temporary male "sojourners" who came

to Canada in the hopes of making sufficient money to return home and buy land. Families or fiancées followed when amassing sufficient savings took longer than expected or when it appeared that life in Canada offered better long-term prospects. After World War II, the immigration of Hungarian displaced persons also initially involved the admission of the male “breadwinner” who would only gain the right to sponsor his dependents after fulfilling a one-year work contract (Patrias 4–7, 10–12, 20–21). By the 1951 census, the male-female ratio was still imbalanced among persons of Hungarian origin, but the gap had been closed to 1 female for every 1.2 males.⁴ Still, the weight of intersectionality—the imbrication of two or more subaltern identities (Nakano Glenn 105), woman and ethnic minority in this case—often muted the voices of women of Hungarian origin when it came to expressing their opinions about the admission of the 1956 refugees. Among the refugees, women were clearly in the minority, primarily because their direct participation in the uprising had been more limited than that of men (Pető 45)—in 1957, one female refugee was admitted to Canada for every 1.74 males (Kalbach 48). Yet women were accorded a symbolic power that played an important role in the movement.

Historians tend to chronicle the activism regarding Hungarian refugee admission in an anonymous way that provides little information about the individuals involved (Dirks, *Refugee Policy* 194–97; Patrias 23–24; Dreisziger, “Golden Age” 204). Passing references to women can be found in some works, but these provide only snippets of information on women’s roles or attitudes. Susan M. Papp’s 1986 article on “Hungarian Immigrant Women” reserves only two paragraphs for the 1956 refugees (44). Other published works serve as primary sources including four autobiographies of refugee women.⁵ Two oral history collections contribute additional testimonies of transition to life in Canada.⁶ By drawing upon these sources, as well as the archives of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Canadian Welfare Council, women’s associations, and local welfare organizations, this article provides an insight

into Canadian women's views on their country's response to the Hungarian refugee crisis and their actions in support of, or in opposition to, refugee admission. Hungarian refugee women's oral histories, autobiographies, and rare correspondence with government demonstrate that, despite their precarious situation, they found ways to exercise their agency to achieve their desired admission and settlement outcomes.

Facilitating admission, reception, and settlement

On 6 November 1956, just two days after Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest, the Catholic Women's League of Canada sent a letter to Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent expressing "deep admiration for the people of Hungary in their struggle for freedom against a foreign oppressor and urg[ing] that every possible aid be given to alleviate their sufferings."⁷ The significant Catholic presence among earlier Hungarian immigrants and strong anti-communist sentiment would have impelled the league to action. Other women's associations may not have had the same sectarian motivations, but support for the refugees' rejection of communist tyranny was widespread. As the days and weeks passed, the Canadian Federation of University Women, the Women's Division of the United Nations Association of Canada, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the National Council of Women of Canada, the Women's Missionary Society of the United Church of Canada, and even individual women communicated their support for admitting Hungarian refugees to Canada.⁸ The desire to help the refugees once they arrived was so profound that a plethora of voluntary organizations engaged in intense activity in many host cities.⁹ The fact that countless women and women's associations involved themselves in the reception and settlement of Hungarian refugees would also have been interpreted by the federal government as endorsement of their admission.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration was responsible, to a certain degree, for the multiplicity of actors involved in receiving the Hungarian refugees. It organized a

meeting on 27 November 1956 with representatives of national voluntary agencies, Hungarian Canadian organizations, and the government of Ontario to ensure that the voluntary sector and the provinces would help shoulder the burden of refugee reception and settlement. Civil society was to be tapped in unprecedented ways: “the Department . . . made it clear that it was willing to utilize the services of anyone . . . willing to receive and care for a refugee or a refugee family even if only for a short time.”¹⁰

Among the thirty-four people present at the meeting only four were women, representing the Canadian Welfare Council (Marion Murphy), the Canadian Hungarian Relief Committee (Peggy [Mrs. Douglas] Jennings), and the department’s Citizenship Branch. Murphy and Jennings expressed concerns that the department’s scenario would place a heavy financial burden on homes and voluntary agencies. The deputy minister, Laval Fortier, claimed that the department’s limited funds meant that “[t]he only possible solution . . . was to recruit socially-minded persons in Canada to receive and care for the refugees.” He responded in a similar vein to Murphy’s query as to whether government funding would be made available to help hard-pressed social agencies hire additional staff to meet refugee needs. Fortier claimed that church groups could be used to “develop offers to receive and care for the refugees without the special establishment of a costly government agency.”¹¹ Having accepted to pay for refugee transport, the department sought to save on all other budget lines. This implied relying heavily upon women’s contributions, through their voluntary work and by opening their homes to refugees. Even professional women, a significant portion of the staff of social agencies, were expected to take on extra work with little prospect of additional staff being hired to help with the increased workload. For Fortier, the solution lay in distributing the burden among multiple sources of voluntary assistance. He asked the organizations present to contact their “associates and affiliates” in an effort to “reach all persons or agencies . . . who might be in a position to help.”¹² Government officials and non-profit representatives alike emphasized the need for

coordination. Regional citizenship liaison officers would contact interested organizations at the local level to promote the establishment of “coordinating committees.” It was suggested that Constance Hayward, a liaison officer based in Ottawa, oversee the work of the officers in the regions. Two other women, Charity Grant in Toronto and Françoise Marchand in Montreal, were among the regional citizenship liaison officers involved.¹³

A memorandum of 6 December 1956 outlined the framework for coordination between the department’s citizenship and immigration branches while underscoring the preeminence of the latter. The Citizenship Branch was to encourage coordinating committees “to assist” officers of the Immigration Branch by meeting trains, finding accommodation, and distributing “creature comforts.”¹⁴ The female liaison officers and the volunteer and professional women who became the backbone of the coordinating committees were thus cast in the role of helpmate to the almost exclusively male immigration officers, “self-made men” who had few qualms about expecting more highly-educated women liaison officers and social workers to follow their lead (Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration* 337, 246–47, 96–97; Knowles 210; Armstrong-Reid and Murray 173–79; Bourbeau 5). As for voluntary women, the Catholic Women’s League’s 1957 annual report provided a typical list of the accessory and gendered tasks they were to perform:

Each Province [*sic*] reports meeting trains, work at clothing depots, assistance with housing, furnishing and employment and social assistance. Christmas parties, showers, entertainment and providing of wedding receptions with cake, outfitting of bride, etc. The spiritual side was not neglected. Religious articles were distributed, arrangements were made for special Masses, transportation to church provided.¹⁵

The case of the Canadian Welfare Council’s Committee on the welfare of immigrants

The role of the Canadian Welfare Council, a national, non-profit organization, in the Hungarian refugee movement is of particular interest because of the sizeable representation of women on its staff and advisory committees. Its Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants, created in 1954 to assemble national organizations with an interest in “the adjustment of immigrants,” was no exception.¹⁶ In early 1957, Phyllis Burns, an experienced social worker and educator, became the Director of Welfare Services for the council as well as secretary for the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants.¹⁷ Burns quickly went to work organizing a special meeting for 14 January 1957, of committee members and government representatives, that would focus on the Hungarian refugees. Local welfare councils and social agencies had been conveying concerns about challenges at their level and it was thought the committee could facilitate “co-operation between public and private services” and seek “clarification on present policy or the development of new policies.”¹⁸ Burns’s background information for the meeting pinpointed questionable Department of Citizenship and Immigration policies: housing refugees in private homes rather than government-financed hostels and providing financial assistance in the form of vouchers rather than cash and only as a “last resort.”¹⁹ During the meeting, Bessie Touzel of the Ontario Welfare Council argued that refugees should have the option of staying in hostels, but Laval Fortier continued to assert that private homes were a better solution because they acclimated refugees to “the Canadian way of life.”²⁰ Fortier and his officers were seldom swayed by the social welfare experts, often women, who promoted best practices from their field that respected the needs and “dignity” of the refugees.²¹

Of the thirty-two participants in the meeting, fifteen were women: representing the Canadian Welfare Council’s board of directors, the Catholic Women’s League, the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA), the Travellers’ Aid Society, the Montreal Council of Social Agencies, and the Montreal-based *Centre social d’aide aux immigrants*. Two women social workers from the Ontario Welfare Council and the Welfare Council of Toronto were

invited as guests and Constance Hayward was among the government representatives.²² At this point, the balance between voluntary and professional women was relatively equal, with two nuns from the *Centre social d'aide aux immigrants* adding a third dimension. The committee made little effort to include women of immigrant background, and meeting in Ottawa made it difficult to draw participants from outside of Ontario and Quebec.

A second special meeting, scheduled for 25 February 1957, was preceded by a memorandum from Burns outlining concerns raised during consultations with coordinating committees across the country: a diminishing supply of free housing, refugees arriving in communities with limited employment opportunities other than undesirable farm labor or domestic work, and a need to clarify roles between “public officials” and “citizen groups” as well as “among officials of various Branches and Departments [*sic*].”²³ Of the twenty-nine representatives of social and voluntary agencies and local coordinating committees who attended the meeting, fifteen were women.²⁴ The absence of government observers allowed for a freer exchange of views and frank criticism of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration’s policies, including its miserly approach to providing financial assistance, its refusal to acknowledge the benefits of hostels, and its preoccupation with immediate employment rather than finding the “right job for the refugee.”²⁵ Grace Hartman of Sudbury’s Hungarian Relief Committee reported that several refugees sent to her city had left for Toronto as soon as they had made enough money. Refugee trepidations about life in small cities were matched by some vexation with the refugees themselves. Hartman referred to grumblings in Sudbury that presaged criticisms that slowly began to gain ground across Canada based on the idea that “too much [was] being provided for Hungarians giving them a false idea of their own responsibilities.”²⁶

At the conclusion of the meeting, it was decided that a letter would be sent to Minister Pickersgill to seek clarification on certain policies and to press for more intensive orientation

and language training. The committee also recommended that the minister be informed of “[t]he need for more direction and control in the treatment of Hungarians who [were] confused by the complete freedom . . . accorded to them in contrast to what they [had] been accustomed to.”²⁷ Jean Henshaw, of the Montreal Travellers’ Aid Society, undoubtedly played a role in making this recommendation as she expressed similar sentiments in November 1957. Citing her thirteen years of work with postwar immigrants, including thirty months in displaced persons camps, she felt well-qualified to offer this reductionist interpretation.²⁸ Historian N. F. Dreisziger’s assessment that the Hungarian refugees had grown accustomed to a system that placed them in jobs and housing, paid for vacations, and provided free education and medical treatment does, however, give some credence to her observations (“The Refugee Experience” 72–73).

Joseph Kage, Jean-Baptiste Lanctot, Dorothy Gregg, Henshaw, and Burns prepared the letter for Minister Pickersgill and had it sent on 12 March 1957.²⁹ His response revealed an unwillingness to adopt what the committee saw as best practices in social welfare when it came to providing adequate financial assistance, housing immigrants in hostels, or placing them in suitable employment.³⁰ Although disappointed with the minister’s response, the committee concluded that government had at least recognized the value of a public-private partnership in the “field of immigration.”³¹ Another decade would elapse, however, before the Department of Citizenship and Immigration would develop more openness to the advice of social welfare experts and the women who made up their ranks (Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration* 170, 322). In the immediate term, the Hungarian refugee movement impelled the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants to restructure its own membership by inviting more people with local experience to become permanent members. This brought five new women onto the committee, three of whom were social workers including Françoise Marchand, now with the Montreal *Conseil des œuvres*.³²

Assessing women's roles in receiving the refugees

Although the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants had limited success in convincing the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to adopt some of its recommended measures, it remained an important player in the relationship between government and non-profit actors. Using its access to senior government officials, the committee kept up the pressure to clarify roles between the two sectors and to implement best practices in social welfare. It also acted as a conduit between coordinating committees and senior department officials, thus serving as an alternative source of information to front-line immigration officers. In functioning at almost complete parity, the committee provided an important national tribune for women involved in refugee reception and settlement. Traditional women activists—members of women's organizations—were among the initial members, but the Hungarian refugee movement brought more professional welfare workers onto the committee, first as guests and then as regular members. This mirrored what was happening at the local level where almost all the coordinating committees included the participation of welfare councils. Since women's longstanding predominance in the charitable welfare sector was matched by their predominance in its professional version, the welfare councils were usually represented by professional women.³³ Phyllis Burns was perhaps the epitome of the new face of immigrant welfare services. As an experienced and respected social worker, she provided critical support and information for the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants and interacted with senior immigration officials on a relatively equal footing. That she had gained the respect of the department, as well as its ear, was demonstrated in August 1957 when the new minister of citizenship and immigration invited her, along with a handful of men representing other national organizations, to discuss curbing refugee admissions.³⁴

Some coordinating committees developed good working relationships with local immigration authorities while others were sidelined by self-sufficient officers. The Immigration

Branch was similarly not always well-disposed to working with the Citizenship Branch.³⁵ In Montreal, Françoise Marchand either did not face such obstacles or found a way to overcome them. According to Yvan Corbeil, Lisette Laurent-Boyer, and Mireille Richard, Marchand served as “the linchpin in coordinating the efforts of everyone involved in aiding the refugees” (52, 54–55).³⁶ If the archives of local coordinating committees could be found, they would certainly help to flesh out the role of the female citizenship officers and to determine the extent of the participation of minoritized women on the committees or in other local efforts. The Ottawa committee provided a rare example of a Hungarian Canadian woman attaining a leadership role in the dominant society of the day by appointing “Mrs. Javorsky, President of the local Hungarian Association,” as co-chair with a male counterpart.³⁷ Charity Grant recruited Freda Hawkins to Toronto’s local committee as a representative of “new immigrants” (Hawkins, “Canada’s Hungarian Refugee Movement” 110–12). As an independent British immigrant, Hawkins may have had little in common with the refugees, but the experience eventually led to her becoming a renowned scholar of Canadian immigration policy.

The archives consulted do not show women’s associations making the kind and quantity of political intercessions that they had during the migration of some 190,000 displaced persons to Canada between 1945 and 1952 (Trimble 83–100). Comparing the two movements is complicated, however, by the fact that the migration of displaced persons occurred over a longer period and involved a greater number and diversity of immigrants. Since the Hungarians benefited from considerable political support within government and civil society, women’s associations may have concluded that their backing was superfluous. This hypothesis is supported to some extent by a resolution, passed by the National Council of Women in June 1957, that made a link between the generous response to the Hungarian crisis and the desirability of applying that approach to refugees who had been languishing in European camps for years. They, like the Hungarians, were depicted as being fervently anti-communist and thus

worthy of asylum despite their age or infirmity.³⁸

Women on the front lines in Canada and Europe

Some organizations, other than the local coordinating committees, were formed for the sole purpose of helping Hungarian refugees. Such was the case of Montreal's *Œuvre des réfugiés hongrois* (ORH), created in December 1956 to consolidate Catholic aid among the French-speaking majority.³⁹ Gertrude Notebaert, a social worker and director of the *Service d'accueil aux voyageurs*, also took on the directorship of the ORH. She had an astute awareness of the challenges of providing immigrant services in a province where government and citizens alike were at best ambivalent and at worst hostile to postwar immigration, seen as rarely reinforcing the francophone, Catholic majority. Her work was subject to a roller coaster ride of "alternating popularity, unpopularity, indifference." According to Notebaert, the Hungarian refugee movement, thought to be composed principally of Catholics, created "a hurricane of mercy for the persecuted of communism."⁴⁰ Notebaert's work with the ORH facilitated the admission of Hungarian refugees to Quebec and their settlement in the French-speaking milieu. It won her the respect not only of that milieu but also of federal authorities and national organizations and led to her becoming a member of the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants.⁴¹

On 5 November 1956, Peggy (Mrs. Douglas) Jennings assumed the direction of the newly-created Canadian Hungarian Relief Committee, organized to help the Canadian Hungarian Federation with fundraising that had begun during the Hungarian uprising.⁴² The creation of the relief committee dovetailed with a shift in responsibility for fundraising from the federation to the Canadian Red Cross Society. The latter worked with associations such as Jennings's committee to raise and distribute funds. Dreisziger described how people of Hungarian origin, including women active in the community, were supplanted "by prominent

Canadians, many of them women, who in turn could call upon influential Canadian individuals or institutions to help” (“Golden Age” 205; cf. Wipper 84, 89). Jennings’s involvement in Hungarian refugee initiatives reached a point where the Department of Citizenship and Immigration arranged for her to spend a month in Austria in December 1956. A Toronto member of Parliament outlined the expectation that upon her return she would use her “new knowledge and up-to-date information” to help with fundraising and to work with voluntary agencies to aid newly-arrived refugees.⁴³ It is difficult to fathom how Jennings obtained such support. There is no indication that she had any special training, but she apparently satisfied other criteria. As a member of the conservative Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, she and Mrs. B. B. Osler had created *Canadian Scene* in 1951 to provide the ethnic press with an alternative perspective to possible communist propaganda.⁴⁴ In other words, her cold warrior credentials were well established.

In December 1956, the Canadian Red Cross sent a team of seven people to Austria to run a refugee camp in Wiener Neustadt. The positions of director and doctor were reserved for men, but all other positions—nurse, social worker, nutritionist, administrator, and clothing specialist—were filled by women.⁴⁵ In May 1957, the camp’s social worker and former director of the Windsor YWCA, Olive Zeron, shared her perceptions of Hungarian refugees in a YWCA publication. According to Zeron, young Hungarians were forced to work in factories far from their families and were thus deprived of a “home life” and “moral or mental education.” Unused to so-called normal life, the refugees would need time and the aid of Canadians to adjust. Thanks to their “Christian heritage” and democratic values, Canadians were well equipped to help with this process and teach attitudes such as gratitude, since, as Zeron asserted, the Hungarians had “never been taught to be thankful.”⁴⁶ Zeron concluded by predicting that the intelligence and adaptability of the refugees, combined with Canada’s proven capacity to receive the world’s poor and persecuted and turn them into contributing Canadians, would

finally win out. Instead of drawing upon her professional training to develop a deeper understanding of the Hungarian experience, Zeron reinforced stereotypes of the moral superiority of countries like Canada based on Christian and democratic tropes. Historian Franca Iacovetta has indicated that this interpretive frame was not foreign to other Canadians working in the field of social welfare during the cold war (Iacovetta 487–88). A June 1957 YWCA workshop report echoed the sentiment that Hungarian refugees lacked gratitude, but the author had sufficient insight to question why this might be bothersome to YWCA women and what they expected from doing charitable work.⁴⁷ Her spirit of inquiry did not extend to a consideration of different ways of showing thanks. The accounts of women refugees often speak of gratitude, thus suggesting a disconnect between the expectations of some Canadians and the modes of expression of some refugees (Romvay 93; Mihály 145).

In February 1957, Jean Huggard, another Canadian social worker, was sent by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to teach English in a camp in the Netherlands. Huggard offered less moralistic predictions of refugee adaptation than Zeron. She believed that although “some [would] certainly adapt readily and do well, others [would] just as certainly have many rough times.”⁴⁸ In her assessment, housewives “seemed to be less worried about the future. Perhaps because they had never assumed any active part before, they felt a good measure of security as long as their own family unit was maintained” (Huggard 271–76). This interpretation of the lived experience of Hungarian housewives seems colored more by the perspective of a woman used to working outside the home than informed by a professional lens. As demonstrated by Iacovetta, the social work lens of the time was as much influenced by cold war ideologies as by a “family ideology” of breadwinning fathers and dependent wives focused on home and children (484, 489–91).

Change of government, change in Canadian attitudes

In the summer of 1957, the Hungarian refugee movement appeared to fall victim to the newly elected Progressive Conservative government's fears of an economic downturn. On 11 July 1957, Cabinet accepted the recommendation of the acting minister of citizenship and immigration, E. D. Fulton, to discontinue the admission of refugees on open placement visas, in other words, without "pre-arranged" employment. Friends, voluntary agencies, and church groups were removed from the list of authorized sponsors, leaving only close relatives or employers with the right to sponsor refugees.⁴⁹ Curtailing the movement had been in the works since at least mid-April, with the Liberal government still in power (Hidas, "Canada & 1956" 126–27). A memorandum had been sent to all immigration offices in Europe on 1 May 1957 explaining that "selection [was] to be restricted" to Hungarian refugees who had been visaed prior to the date of the memorandum; to those who had wintered in specially arranged camps in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France; and to refugees being selected by "special teams" in Austria, Italy, and Yugoslavia. Thereafter, visas would only be issued to refugees with close relatives in Canada or other acceptable sponsors as well as to "cases of exceptional merit."⁵⁰ Difficulty placing the Hungarians in employment was cited as one of the reasons for this ruling; ultimate decisions regarding further admissions or restrictions were to wait until after the upcoming general election (10 June 1957).⁵¹

On 7 August 1957, Phyllis Burns attended a meeting between Minister Fulton and representatives of major national voluntary organizations. The minister justified curbing the movement of Hungarian refugees by indicating that public opinion seemed to be turning against them, a trend likely to worsen if the winter brought "serious unemployment." Burns regretted the negative impact this curtailment would have on Canada's international reputation, as Austria would be left with the burden of caring for some 30,000 remaining refugees while a "have" country like Canada closed its doors.⁵² Burns and Joseph Kage, of the Jewish Immigrant Aid

Society, also challenged the department's plan to pay for return trips to Hungary for "ringleaders" of refugee discontent. They suggested that these situations warranted further investigation to determine whether the refugees had "legitimate grievances or specific personal problems," in which case offers of help would be more appropriate.⁵³

Women's views on the continued admission of Hungarian refugees were decidedly divergent as the movement approached the one-year mark. The Lethbridge, Alberta, chapter of the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire was concerned about the burden cities would bear for unemployed refugees once the Department of Citizenship and Immigration's one year of support came to an end.⁵⁴ In December 1957, Etta Burko of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies confirmed a decline in public sympathy for the Hungarians. That same month, Margaret Peck, a social worker in Montreal, tried to enlist the support of the Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants to speak out against the government's decision to "shut off" the immigration of refugees. The committee decided that getting involved in admission issues was beyond its remit.⁵⁵ This self-imposed limit on political action reflected a narrow interpretation of the Canadian Welfare Council's mandate and an unwillingness to establish a link between admission and settlement policies.

By the fall of 1957, Minister Fulton had begun to consider extending free transportation into 1958 and so recommended to Cabinet, but no decision was made. On 10 May 1958, Fulton sent a proposal to Cabinet to pay travel costs for a maximum of 3,500 refugees provided they had applied for visas before the end of April 1958 and would arrive before the end of the year. Ellen Fairclough inherited these dormant recommendations when she became minister of citizenship and immigration on 12 May 1958. She immediately came under pressure from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration to participate more wholeheartedly in trying to clear Hungarian refugee camps. In a June recommendation to Cabinet, she maintained

the limit of 3,500 but extended the deadline for visa applications to 31 August 1958.⁵⁶ This was hardly a gesture of enormous generosity. Being a woman did not make Fairclough more inclined to compassion or less concerned about Canada's economic situation. In her memorandum to Cabinet, she made it clear that once the deadline or maximum number had been reached, Hungarians would have to apply for admission as ordinary immigrants and pay their own passage to Canada.⁵⁷ The limits of Fairclough's compassion were patently obvious when she discussed Canada's potential contribution to "the final settlement of the Hungarian refugee problem" with the other members of Cabinet in July 1958. She frankly declared that "it might be considered that Canada had done enough, if not too much, in this matter" and it would be sufficient to offer to facilitate the admission of one-third the number that the United States had agreed to take, thus around 1,100 refugees.⁵⁸ The maximum of 3,500 was thus a far cry from the actual number that Fairclough and her Cabinet colleagues were prepared to admit.

Shortly after Fairclough's appointment, the YWCA's Public Affairs and World Service Education Committee passed a resolution commending the federal government for its "generous treatment of Hungarian refugees" while asking that 3,000 more be admitted.⁵⁹ The YWCA board of directors declined to send the resolution to the government without first consulting member associations. In the version sent to local associations, 3,000 was replaced with "a number." Although the majority of respondents decided to support this lukewarm resolution, in some cases it provoked "lively" discussion. In St. Thomas (Ontario) those opposed to the resolution pointed to "rising unemployment figures and the failure on the part of many Hungarian immigrants to make any attempt to integrate."⁶⁰ The middle-class women involved in women's associations were not only sensitive to the vagaries of the economy, but they also had very specific ideas of how the refugees should behave after their arrival in Canada. The Hungarian refugees experienced upheavals that ranged from the hope in October 1956 of establishing democratic institutions, through brutal repression that cost the lives of friends and

relatives, to exile a few weeks later (Dreisziger, "Refugee Experience" 73). Yet only a few months after their arrival, some Canadian women reproached them for their difficulty in settling into an entirely new situation. These women, by expressing their disappointment at this lack of enthusiasm for what they saw as the great gift of living in the free and democratic world, contributed to a climate that closed the doors to all but a few more refugees.

Voices of Hungarian refugee women

The voices of women refugees were not the most resounding in the Canadian public sphere. The Department of Immigration and Citizenship archives consulted revealed only one letter from a woman refugee and one from a Canadian woman of Hungarian origin. In the latter case, Mrs. R. Virag of Niagara Falls received a letter from relatives, dated 26 January 1957, describing their desperate situation in a French camp managed by private companies that made them work for miserable wages and housed them in rudimentary conditions. Mrs. Virag forwarded the letter to the Canadian Red Cross which in turn sent it (and its English translation) to the deputy minister of citizenship and immigration.⁶¹ In December 1956, Minister Pickersgill had arranged to have France accommodate 3,000 refugees during the winter of 1956–1957. Camp conditions and the forced wait fostered mistrust and discontent among refugees quartered in France and elsewhere (the Netherlands and the United Kingdom).⁶² By the time the Department of Citizenship and Immigration received the letter in March 1957, an official declared that camp conditions had "been remedied to a large extent," thus suggesting that other complaints had made their way to the department.⁶³

In her letter, refugee Maria Egger sought to know why she could not find a position teaching English to Hungarians despite her Ph.D. in English from the University of London and her years of experience in Hungary.⁶⁴ Apprehensions about the ability to continue one's career in Canada were widespread among the refugees and Egger's letter shows that women shared

this concern. It also raises the question of the discriminatory barriers refugees faced in finding work even when language and skill transfer were not issues. Márta Mihály, a forestry student from Sopron University, was appalled by the expectation that she and her classmates take menial jobs during the vacation period, a real waste of skills in her opinion (146–47). Eve Gabori, a librarian in Hungary, and her husband adopted a perspective more in keeping with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration's expectations: believing that their exile had reduced them to nothing, they would take any job. Fortuitous circumstances and a spirit of initiative enabled Mrs. Gabori to resume her career as a librarian in a relatively short time.⁶⁵

One refugee, Mrs. Gabor Gido, became the subject of a long memorandum from Deputy Minister Fortier to Minister Fulton due to letters she had sent—two to the prime minister, four to Queen Elizabeth, and one to President Eisenhower—asking for help in returning to Europe. In January 1957, the Gidos had been placed with a family in Edmonton. Mrs. Gido soon began to complain about this arrangement, the lack of opportunities for her husband to practice his trade, and the perception that her family was receiving less assistance than other Hungarian refugees. She threatened to go to Ottawa to protest, gathering other refugees to her cause along the way. Fortier advised Fulton not to respond to Mrs. Gido whom he described as “a chronic complainer.”⁶⁶ She may very well have been the type of person Burns and Kage saw as needing support to overcome a difficult transition rather than dismissal as a troublemaker.

Refugees protested the policy of dispersing them across the country in areas they considered too provincial. One woman and her family, sent to Vancouver, saw the dispersal policy as a circumventable inconvenience because “they turned around and headed back to Toronto straight away.”⁶⁷ Susan (Zsuzsa) Romvary managed to convince immigration officials in Montreal to allow her family to remain there instead of continuing on to Edmonton (91). In March 1957, Pickersgill declared that refugees were not “sent anywhere without their own

consent.”⁶⁸ Yet, Judy Bing Stoffman’s parents, accustomed to life in a “police state,” assumed that their only option was to remain in Vancouver even though they had friends and relatives and the prospect of work in Montreal.⁶⁹ When Marta Hidy and her husband, both classical musicians, learned that their destination was Winnipeg, they asked an immigration officer if they could go to Montreal or Toronto instead. He explained that the government was sending refugees to different cities and provinces to tap into the resources necessary to help them. Canada being a free country, they could choose later to go wherever they wanted. They remained in Winnipeg for years, giving life to the music scene there before their careers took them to Toronto.⁷⁰

The relationship between Hungarian refugees and Canadians played a role in admission by opening the door to other refugees. Positive relationships developed in the context of the government’s plan to house refugees in private home could be used to persuade other families to accommodate refugees. They also made for good press. In May 1957, the women’s magazine *Chatelaine* published an article about the Mayers, a couple hosted by an affluent surgeon’s family. Historian Valerie Korniek described the article as “romanticizing” the refugees and praising the generosity of Canadians and the “democratic consumer paradise” that was Canada (285). Mrs. M. Filwood, a reader responding to the article, was impressed that Katarin (Katey) Mayer “ironed clothes for the doctor’s wife and . . . did other helpful duties for her, just out of sheer enjoyment of helping.”⁷¹ Neither the author of the article nor its readers looked beyond the surface to consider the challenges of feeling indebted to one’s hosts, obligated to work as a cleaner in a hospital, and compelled to change one’s name in order to “Canadianize.” The article also gave a false impression of the type and quantity of homes that were willing to receive refugees free of charge.

In her autobiography, Eva Kende provided a vivid description of the encounter between Hungarian refugees and charity women in Winnipeg in February 1957. Kende

descended from the train as one of a “ragtag group” of refugees welcomed by a “contingent” of well-dressed women ready to set them on the path to “becoming Canadian” (n.p). Despite the differential positioning of the two groups, Kende found the women sincere, “even if their understanding of [the refugees’] plight was somewhat deficient.” This assessment explains some of the misunderstandings that occurred later between Canadian women and Hungarian refugees.

Although their voices were seldom heard in public debates about admitting the Hungarians, women refugees played a symbolic role in those debates. Stories of escape from the clutches of communism fascinated most Canadians, who not only consumed them for their compelling nature, but also because such stories confirmed their worldview.⁷² Agota Gabor, who arrived with her mother on one of the first refugee flights, said her youth attracted the attention of the assembled journalists. Before she could greet her father and brother, who had been in Canada since 1948, the journalists impelled her to “touch the ground of freedom,” thus spoiling the family reunion but providing images and storylines that fit Canadian constructions of the refugee movement.⁷³ On 27 January 1957, a member of Parliament extolled Canadian generosity toward the Hungarian refugees, while foregrounding women and children: “We are dealing with babies, little children, mothers and others who . . . have done more than all others to unmask communism and indicate to the world the true nature of this vicious force.”⁷⁴ The “others” were the men who made up the majority of refugees and certainly the majority of those admitted to Canada. The speaker clearly saw women and children as poignant victims who inspired sympathy. Saving babies and mothers also painted Canada in a more heroic role than receiving relatively healthy young men. Out of a total of 13,337 Hungarian refugees admitted between 26 November 1956 and 16 January 1957, only 3,976 were women. Children accounted for only 2,264 of the total admissions. By 30 April 1958, 12,877 female refugees of all ages had arrived compared to 22,350 male refugees.⁷⁵

A Department of Citizenship and Immigration memorandum of 22 January 1956 clarified what admission as an open placement immigrant meant for unsponsored, unmarried refugee women. The obligation to accept “any kind of employment initially” usually meant becoming poorly-paid domestics unless they were trained nurses or nurse’s aides.⁷⁶ Part of the department’s early reluctance to respond to the crisis by admitting large numbers of refugees was due to mistaken information suggesting that the majority of refugees were women, children, and old men. During a Cabinet meeting on 14 November 1956, Minister Pickersgill expressed the opinion that such refugees would be better assisted by sending relief to Europe and that Canada should only admit refugees “who could find employment” or offers of sponsorship.⁷⁷

Once the decision had been made to open Canada’s doors to a large number of refugees, Pickersgill instructed immigration officers in Austria to process applicants on a “first-come, first-served” basis with the exception of giving priority to Sopron University students (Pickersgill 50–51). Not only were these students predominantly male, but the focus on employability also made it unlikely that the first-come, first-served principle applied to single mothers since employment in homes and hospitals made no accommodation for dependent children. The case of Ibolya Grossman, a widowed mother of an adolescent son, however, suggests that exceptions were made, since she did not report any difficulty in obtaining her visa in December 1956 (Grossman 80). Because of her Jewish origins, she and her son received help from Jewish organizations while in Austria and again in Canada, and her first employers in the Winnipeg textile industry were also Jewish (79, 83, 85, 97). The assistance she received does not seem to have extended to official sponsorship; her admission may well have been due to a more open policy to women without men once the Department of Citizenship and Immigration realized they represented a very small portion of the refugee population.

The majority of adult women who arrived in Canada were married: eighty-two percent

as compared with fifty-two percent of adult men (qtd. in Hidas, "Canada & 1956" 134). Admitting women as part of a couple presented less of a risk than admitting single women since the wife could always be supported by the "male breadwinner," in keeping with the 1950s' view of the division of labor between husband and wife (Prentice, Bourne, Brandt, Light, Mitchinson, and Black 337). Eve Gabori and her husband were flabbergasted at the ease with which the decision to accept them was made. When she first met Canadian officials in Austria, Mrs. Gabori found them so nice that their attitude seemed suspicious. She was also surprised by their lack of interest in her religion and her excuses for joining the communist party.⁷⁸ From the beginning of the movement, both Minister Pickersgill and Deputy Minister Fortier had made it clear to their Royal Canadian Mounted Police colleagues, responsible for security screening, that the refugees should not be considered as security risks unless there was strong evidence to support such a charge (qtd. in Whitaker 85).⁷⁹ Their desire to flee Hungary was generally seen as sufficient evidence of their rejection of communism.

Women among the Hungarian refugees were, according to Susan M. Papp, "better educated . . . , younger and more adaptable to life in Canada" than pre-World War II immigrants (42, cf. Kocsis 104–14). They joined the women's committees of cultural centers and churches linked to Hungarian Canadian communities and breathed new life into associated activities. Although many may have reinitiated religious practices, Judith Gellert's 1964 study found that some resisted the pressure to join "a specific religious group or church" simply to have a social life (60). Despite their political choice in seeking refuge in Canada, becoming involved in political issues in their host country, including immigration policy, was not a priority for the majority of Hungarian women who arrived between 1956 and 1958 (Kocsis 103).

Conclusion

The Hungarian refugees' sacrifices in rejecting Soviet-style communism won the

admiration of many Canadians, including women and women's groups who expressed support for their admission to Canada in letters to government and through their various actions to help the Hungarians resettle. Long concerned with the "Canadianization" of immigrants (Prentice, Bourne, Brandt, Light, Mitchinson, and Black 54–74), many of these women thought that the refugees' anti-communist rebellion made them ideal candidates for rapid and successful integration and deserving beneficiaries of the assistance of well-meaning Canadians like themselves. As time went on, their good intentions began to subside in the face of an economic downturn and their judgment that the Hungarians were not sufficiently grateful for the generosity of Canadians and the opportunity of living in Canada. Some women's associations also saw the Hungarians as overshadowing their ongoing crusade to convince Canada to accept the "hard core" of displaced persons still languishing in European camps, a deserving anti-communist population that had suffered longer than the Hungarians.⁸⁰

The Hungarian refugee movement also brought to the fore the growing presence and influence of professional women working for social agencies that were increasingly turning their attention to immigrant welfare and settlement. The expertise of these women, mostly social workers, and the increasing importance of the organizations they worked for facilitated their access to immigration policymakers. Women's associations thus faced competition in gaining the ear of immigration authorities. Yet the government's need to draw on civil society to access sufficient resources to resettle the large number of refugees that it ultimately agreed to take created a window of opportunity for both volunteer and professional women to try to influence the policy contours of the Hungarian migration to Canada. Despite this window of opportunity, neither of these groups of women escaped the gendered expectations of the types of contributions they could make or that they play subordinate roles to male immigration officers. The Canadian Welfare Council's Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants and its secretary, Phyllis Burns, were prime examples of the trend towards feminized

professionalization of immigrant services. Although women welfare professionals promoted approaches to Hungarian refugee settlement that were more adapted to the refugees' needs than the government's budget, their interpretations of refugee backgrounds and aspirations were colored by Canada's cold war and family ideologies. The perspectives of women welfare workers thus spanned an evolving spectrum that included open-minded understanding, stereotyped representations of life under communism, and even exasperation with the refugees' supposed lack of effort to adapt to life in Canada.

The election of a Progressive Conservative government in June 1957 and its uneasiness about the economic situation emboldened those calling for an abatement of the Hungarian refugee movement. As minister of citizenship and immigration, Ellen Fairclough made only minor concessions to international organizations calling for continued Canadian cooperation. In her view, adjusting to a less favorable economic situation was more important than humanitarian concerns for refugees that had already benefited significantly from Canadian largesse. Mainstream women's associations and immigrant serving agencies welcomed immigrant and ethnicized women as lambda members or volunteers, but they were seldom found in leadership roles.⁸¹ Women organizers from the Anglo-Celtic majority had few qualms about supplanting women of Hungarian origin in the fundraising campaign on behalf of refugees, since they saw themselves as possessing the skills necessary for a better-organized and more professional approach (Wipper 86–89).

Women were solidly outnumbered in the Hungarian refugee movement, but well over 8,000 adult women arrived and expressed, sometimes through action rather than words, their opinions of the arrangements they encountered in Canada. Refugee women were also present in political debates on the admission of Hungarian refugees when their stories were used to influence public opinion. Language and cultural barriers and their subaltern positioning made it difficult for them to make demands related to their admission or that of other refugees, but

their stories reveal their efforts to shape their own Canadian destinies.

Université Catholique de l'Ouest

Notes

¹ This article is drawn in part from the author's doctoral dissertation: Sheena Trimble, "Femmes et politiques d'immigration au Canada (1945–1967): au-delà des assignations de genre?" [Women and Canadian Immigration Policy (1945–1967): Beyond Assigned Gender Roles?] (PhD diss., Université d'Angers, 2015), 545–67.

² Record of Cabinet Decision, 23 Nov. 1956, Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration fonds (hereafter DMCI), RG26, vol. 111, file 3-24-12-1 (hereafter vol./file), Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa (hereafter LAC).

³ Canada, *House of Commons Debates*, 28 Nov. 1956, 115; Report, "Hungarian Refugee Movement," (1959), 1–2, 4, DMCI, R626, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁴ Dominion Bureau of Statistics, "Table 32. Population by Origin and Sex, for Provinces and Territories, 1951," *Ninth Census of Canada, 1951*, vol. I, *Population, General Characteristics* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1953), 32-1.

⁵ Ibolya Szalai Grossman, *An Ordinary Woman in Extraordinary Times* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1990); Eva Kende, "The Tale of One Refugee," in *Looking in... Portraits of the Canadian Soul*, ed. M. D. Benoit (n.p.: Electric eBook Publishing, 2002), <http://www.arjay.bc.ca/canthology/eAnthology.htm#intro>. Accessed 30 Aug. 2022; Susan Romvary, *Zsuzsa Not Zsazsa: Balance with a Smile* (Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, QC: Shoreline Press, 1992); Olga Verrall, *Missing Pieces: My Life as a Child Survivor of the Holocaust*, Legacies Shared Book Series 22 (Calgary: U of Calgary P, 2007).

⁶ Multicultural History Society of Ontario (hereafter MHSO), “1956 Hungarian Memorial Oral History Project,” SFU Digitized Collections, <https://digital.lib.sfu.ca/islandora/object/hungarian:collection>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022; Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 (hereafter Pier 21), “Collections,” <http://pier21.ca/research/collections>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁷ Catholic Women’s League of Canada to Prime Minister, 6 Nov. 1956, Privy Council Office fonds (hereafter PCO), RG2-B-2, 1990-91/154, 108/H-17-1(a), LAC, quoted in Hidas, “Canada & 1956” 46, https://www.academia.edu/34176286/Canada_and_1956_pdf. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁸ “Paper Prepared in Support of Halifax Resolution by Mrs. Graeme McLean (CFUW) and Read at Annual Meeting of N.C.W. in Montreal,” June 1957, 3, National Council of Women of Canada fonds (hereafter NCWC), MG28 I25, 125/4, LAC; Minutes, Sub-Executive Meeting, 12 Feb. 1957, 2, Local Council of Women of Toronto fonds, F805, MU6363/F805-1-0-13, Archives of Ontario, Toronto; and External Affairs to Canadian Embassy, Vienna, 16 Nov. 1956, Department of External Affairs fonds, RG25, 86-87-336, 160/5475-EA-4-40 and Mrs. H. Atkinson to Pickersgill, 9 Nov. 1956, Jack Pickersgill fonds, MG32 B34, 57/I-2-5545-J, LAC, quoted in Hidas, “Canada & 1956,” 64, 71.

⁹ J. L. Manion to Constance Hayward, 7 Jan. 1957, 1, DMCI, RG26, 117/3-24-34-2, LAC.

¹⁰ Minutes, Meeting Respecting Hungarian Refugees, 27 Nov. 1956, 2–3, 9, DCMI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 6, 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, 2, 9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 4–5, 8; Division de la Citoyenneté canadienne, Bureaux régionaux de liaison, 10 Dec. 1956, DMCI, RG26, 117/3-24-34-3, LAC.

¹⁴ E. E. McCarthy, Acting Chief, Operations Division to All District Superintendents, 6 Dec. 1956, 2–3, DMCI, RG26, 117/3-24-34-1, LAC.

¹⁵ Mrs. M. A. Panaro, “Immigration Report,” 37th Annual Convention, 19–23 Oct. 1957, 83, Catholic Women’s League of Canada fonds, MG28 I345, 3/11, LAC.

¹⁶ “Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants,” 17 Mar. 1956, 2, Canadian Council on Social Development (Canadian Welfare Council) fonds (hereafter CCSD), MG28 I10, 332/3, LAC.

¹⁷ Bessie Harris and Harold Beals, “The Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers, Part I—A History 1963–2010” (Halifax: Nova Scotia College of Social Workers, 2011), 22, <https://nscsw.org/about/history/>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

¹⁸ Minutes, Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants (hereafter CWI), Special Meeting, 14 Jan. 1957, 2; Phyllis Burns to CWI, 10 Jan. 1957, 1, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/5, LAC.

¹⁹ Burns to CWI, 10 Jan. 1957, 1–4.

²⁰ Minutes, CWI, 14 Jan. 1957, 5–6.

²¹ Burns to CWI, 10 Jan. 1957, 3.

²² Minutes, CWI, 14 Jan. 1957, 1.

²³ Phyllis Burns to Special Meeting re Hungary Refugees, 22 Feb. 1957, 1–3.

²⁴ Minutes, CWI, Special Meeting, 25 Feb. 1957, 1; Address List for Hungarian Committee Meeting Invitations, n.d., 1–2, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/4, LAC.

²⁵ Minutes, CWI, 25 Feb. 1957, 3, 6, 8–9.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 3, 7.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 11–12.

²⁸ Henshaw to George Nowlan, Minister of National Revenue, 4 Nov. 1957, 1, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/9, LAC.

²⁹ Minutes, CWI, 8 Apr. 1957, 2, 332/7; M. Wallace McCutcheon, President, Canadian Welfare Council to Pickersgill, 12 March 1957, 1-6, CCSD, MG28 I10 332/8, LAC.

³⁰ Pickersgill to McCutcheon, 25 March 1957, 1-7, CCSD, MG28 I10 332/7, LAC.

³¹ Minutes, CWI, 8 Apr. 1957, 2, 5.

³² Ibid.; Minutes, CWI, 29 Oct. 1957, 1, CCSD, MG28 I10 332/7; Expected Attendance, CWI, 29 Oct. 1957, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/5, LAC.

³³ Address List for Hungarian Committee Meeting Invitations, n.d., 1-2; William A. Dyson to Burns, "Persons Involved in Local Work with Hungarians," 7 Feb. 1957, 1-2, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/4, LAC.

³⁴ Burns, Memorandum re Conference on Immigration held 7 Aug. 1957, 12 Aug. 1957, 1, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/7, LAC.

³⁵ Burns to Special Meeting re Hungary Refugees, 22 Feb. 1957, 1-3; Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration*, 96-97.

³⁶ My translation of the original French text.

³⁷ Address List for Hungarian Committee Meeting Invitations, n.d., 1-2; Dyson to Burns, 7 February 1957, 1-2.

³⁸ National Council of Women of Canada, 64th Annual Meeting, 3-4 June 1957, 5, NCWC, MG28 I25, 125/4, LAC.

³⁹ Conseil des œuvres de Montréal, "Rapport général des activités, 1956-1957," 22 May 1957, 21, Centre populaire de documentation, Montreal; Gertrude Notebaert, "L'Œuvre des réfugiés hongrois, Rapport final des activités, décembre 1956 - mars 1958," 11 June 1958, Centre social d'aide aux immigrants fonds, INST-01 411-841, 2737, Archives de l'Institut Notre-Dame du Bon-Conseil, Montreal.

⁴⁰ My translation. Gertrude Notebaert, "Rapport de la directrice," Assemblée annuelle, Service d'accueil aux voyageurs et immigrants (hereafter SAVI), 17 June 1965, 1-6, Fédération

des œuvres de charité canadiennes françaises fonds (hereafter FOCCF), F03 302, 48/575, Archives de Centraide du Grande Montréal (hereafter ACGM).

⁴¹ SAVI, “Evolution des Services d’accueil aux voyageurs et aux immigrants de 1955 à 1962,” mémoire présenté au ministère de la Famille et du Bien-être social, Jan. 1963, 4, FOCCF, F03 302, 48/574, ACGM; Minutes, CWI, 29 Oct. 1957, 1.

⁴² Charity Grant to Françoise Marchand, 7 Nov. 1956, 1, DMCI, RG26, 117/3-24-34-1, LAC.

⁴³ Paul T. Hellyer to Jennings, 6 Dec. 1956, DMCI, RG26, 117/3-24-34-1, LAC.

⁴⁴ Summary of Reports, 1951–1952, 4, 3/42 and 1955–1956, 62, 3/43, Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, Alberta chapter fonds, PR067, 1983. 456, Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton (hereafter PAA); Juhani Niinistö, “That Able Organizer from Finland,” *Vapaa Sana*, <http://vapaasana.com/BrunoTehunenProfile2010.htm>. Accessed on 30 Aug 2022.

⁴⁵ W. S. Stanbury, Canadian Red Cross Society to Laval Fortier, 11 Dec. 1956, 117/3-24-34-2; Stanbury to Fortier, with attached document: “Summary of Personnel Representing the Canadian Red Cross Society in Austria,” 2 Jan. 1957, DMCI, RG26, 112/3-24-12-5, LAC.

⁴⁶ Zeron, “In a Refugee Camp,” *The YWCA Journal*, May 1957, 7–8, 18, Young Women’s Christian Association of Canada fonds (hereafter YWCAC), MG28 I198, 3/11, LAC.

⁴⁷ Draft Reports of Workshops, Frontiers of Faith (III), June 1957, 2, YWCAC, MG28 I198, 3/13, LAC.

⁴⁸ Huggard to Joseph Kage, letter, 10 Mar. 1957, reproduced in Kage, “The Settlement of Hungarian Refugees in Canada,” in *Breaking Ground*, 105–7; cf. Jean E. Huggard, “Emotionally Disturbed Patients of Superior Intelligence” (Master’s thesis, McGill University, 1951).

⁴⁹ Press Release, 26 July 1957, 1–2; Fortier to Minister, 10 June 1957, 1–4, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC; Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration*, 116.

⁵⁰ Memorandum from A/Chief, Operations Division, 1 May 1957, 1–2, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁵¹ George Ignatieff, Ambassador to Yugoslavia, to External Affairs, 14 May 1957, Department of Citizenship and Immigration Fonds (hereafter DCI), RG76, 864/555-54-565-9, LAC; Fortier to Jules Léger, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, 16 May 1957, DMCI, RG26, 112/3-24-12, LAC quoted in Hidas, “Canada & 1956,” 129.

⁵² Burns, Memorandum re Conference on Immigration, 12 Aug. 1957, 3, 7.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁵³ Minutes, Regular meeting, 2 Oct. 1957, 258, Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, Lethbridge Municipal Chapter series, PR0267.003, ACC PR 1985.198/0006, PAA; cf., Press Release, 20 Dec. 1956, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁵⁵ Minutes, Meeting Concerning the Payment of Cash Assistance to Immigrants, 4 December 1957, 5; Minutes, Agenda Committee, CWI, 11 Dec. 1957, 4, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/8, LAC.

⁵⁶ Fairclough to Cabinet, 24 June 1958, 1–3, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 3; cf. Fortier to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, 27 Oct. 1958, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁵⁸ Cabinet Conclusions, 14 July 1958, 3–4, PCO, RG2, series A-5-a, vol. 1898, LAC; Report, “Hungarian Refugee Movement” (1959), 4.

⁵⁹ Minutes, Board of Directors’ meeting, 22 May 1958, 6-7, YWCAC, MG28 I198, 12/2, LAC.

⁶⁰ Report, “Replies from Associations re Refugee Resolution,” 23 July 1958, 1–4, YWCAC, MG28 I198, 18/6, LAC.

⁶¹ Margaret E. Wilson, Canadian Red Cross Society to Fortier, 18 Mar. 1957 with letter attached: “Dear relatives,” 26 Jan. 1957, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-4, LAC.

⁶² R. A. Butler, Whitehall, to Pickersgill, 25 Feb. 1957, DMCI, RG26, 112/3-24-12-6, LAC; M. T. interview, quoted in Anthony L. Kocsis, “Cultural Integration and Retention: The Dichotomy of the Hungarian ‘56ers” (Master’s thesis, University of Guelph, 1997), 37.

⁶³ James S. Cross to Margaret E. Wilson, 21 Mar. 1957, DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-4, LAC.

⁶⁴ Egger to Immigration Minister (15 Jan. 1957), DMCI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC.

⁶⁵ Gabori interview, MHSO, 7 Mar. 1978, <https://digital.lib.sfu.ca/hungarian-72/hungarian-interview-eve-gabori>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁶⁶ Laval Fortier to Acting Minister, 5 Sept. 1957, DCMI, RG26, 111/3-24-12-1, LAC. Copies of the letters, and their translations, were not attached to the memo.

⁶⁷ J. G. interview, quoted in Kocsis, “Cultural Integration,” 74.

⁶⁸ Pickersgill to McCutcheon, 25 Mar. 1957, 4–5.

⁶⁹ Bing Stoffman, arrived from Hungary, 4 Feb. 1957, Pier 21, Acc. n. S2012.2339.1, Jan. 2011, <https://5104.sydneyplus.com/final/portal.aspx?lang=en-US>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁷⁰ Hidy interview, MHSO, <https://digital.lib.sfu.ca/hungarian-58/hungarian-interview-marta-hidy>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁷¹ Jeannine Locke, “Can the Hungarians Fit In?” May 1957, 24 and Filwood to editors, July 1957, 2, *Chatelaine*, qtd. in Korinek, 284–86.

⁷² F. L. interview, quoted in Kocsis, “Cultural Integration,” 86.

⁷³ Gabor interview, MHSO, 3 Mar. 1978, <https://digital.lib.sfu.ca/hungarian-73/hungarian-interview-agota-gabor>. Accessed on 30 Aug. 2022.

⁷⁴ Canada, *House of Commons Debates*, 25 Jan. 1957, 675 (F.D. Shaw, Social Credit MP, Red Deer, Alberta).

⁷⁵ Canada, *House of Commons Debates*, 25 Jan. 1957, 681; “Hungarian Refugees Granted Landing Status, Age Group, Sex, and Marital Status, Eighteen Months ended 30 Apr. 1958,” DCI, RG76, 863/555-54-565, vol. 5, LAC, quoted in Hidas, “Canada & 1956,” 134.

⁷⁶ A/Chief, Operations Division, to Director, CGIS-UK London, and all District Superintendents, 22 Jan. 1957, 1, DMCI, RG26, 112/3-24-12-6, LAC; Hidas, “Arrival and Reception” 243.

⁷⁷ Cabinet Conclusions, 14 Nov. 1956, 7–8, PCO, RG2, series A-5-a, vol. 5775, LAC.

⁷⁸ Gabori interview, 7 Mar. 1978.

⁷⁹ Fortier to L. H. Nicholson, RCMP Commissioner, 6 Nov. 1956 and Fortier to Pickersgill, 26 Nov. 1956, DCI, RG76, 167/3-25-11-40, LAC.

⁸⁰ Minutes, Board of Directors' Meeting, 18 Feb. 1958, 2, Vancouver Young Women's Christian Association fonds, RBSC-ARC-1588, 3-13-1, Rare Books and Special Collections, University of British Columbia.

⁸¹ Minutes, CWI, 15 Oct. 1958, 6, CCSD, MG28 I10, 332/10, LAC; Iacovetta, “Making ‘New Canadians,’” 488–89.

Works Cited

Armstrong-Reid, Susan, and David R. Murray. *Armies of Peace: Canada and the UNRRA Years*.

Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2008. Print.

Bourbeau, Amélie. “Une expertise de terrain: l’expérience en travail social des prêtres et religieuse montréalais (1930–1970).” [Expertise in the Field: The Social Work Experience of Montreal Priests and Nuns (1930–1970)]. *Chrétiens et Sociétés XVIe-XXIe siècles* 21 (2014): 5. Print.

Corbeil, Yvan, Lisette Laurent-Boyer, and Mireille Richard. “L’Œuvre des réfugiés hongrois et l’adaptation à Montréal d’un groupe de réfugiés hongrois.” [The Hungarian Refugee

- Charity Organization and the Adaptation to Montreal of a Group of Hungarian Refugees]. Master's thesis, Université de Montréal, 1960. Print.
- Dirks, Gerald E. *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1977. Print.
- . "Canada and Immigration: International and Domestic Considerations in the Decade Preceding the 1956 Hungarian Exodus." *Breaking Ground: The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada*. Ed. Robert H. Keyserlingk. Toronto: York Lanes Press, 1993. 3–11. Print.
- Donaghy, Greg. "'An Unselfish Interest?': Canada and the Hungarian Revolution, 1954–1957." *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Hungarian and Canadian Perspectives*. Eds. Christopher Adam, Tibor Egervari, Leslie Laczko, and Judy Young. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2010. 256–74. Print.
- Dreisziger, N. F. "Toward a Golden Age: The 1950s." *Struggle and Hope: The Hungarian-Canadian Experience*. Eds. N. F. Dreisziger, Martin Kovacs, Paul Bódy, and Bennett Kovrig. *Generations: A History of Canada's Peoples*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982. 195–219. Print.
- . "The Refugee Experience in Canada and the Evolution of the Hungarian-Canadian Community." *Breaking Ground: The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada*. Ed. Robert H. Keyserlingk. Toronto: York Lanes Press, 1993. 65–85. Print.
- . "The Biggest Welcome Ever: the Toronto Tories, the Ottawa Liberals, and the Admission of Hungarian Refugees to Canada in 1956." *Hungarian Studies Review* 35.1–2 (2008): 41–83. Print.
- Gellert, Judith. "The Social Adjustment of Hungarian Refugees in Montreal." Master's thesis, McGill University, 1964. Print.
- Hawkins, Freda. *Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern*. Montreal:

- McGill-Queen's UP, 1988. Print.
- Hidas, Peter I. "Arrival and Reception: Hungarian Refugees, 1956–1957." *The Hungarian Revolution: Hungarian and Canadian Perspectives*. Eds. Christopher Adam, Tibor Egervari, Leslie Laczko, and Judy Young. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2010. 223–55. Print, ---. "Canada & 1956." Unpublished manuscript. Web. 30 Aug. 2022.
- Iacovetta, Franca. "Making 'New Canadians': Social Workers, Women, and the Reshaping of Immigrant Families." *A Nation of Immigrants: Women, Workers, and Communities in Canadian History, 1840s–1960s*. Eds. Franca Iacovetta, Paula Draper, and Robert Ventresca. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998. 482–513. Print.
- Knowles, Valerie. *First Person: A Biography of Cairine Wilson, Canada's First Woman Senator*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1988. Print.
- Kocsis, Anthony L. "Cultural Integration and Retention: The Dichotomy of the Hungarian '56ers." Master's thesis, University of Guelph, 1997. Print.
- Korinek, Valerie J. *Roughing It in the Suburbs: Reading Chatelaine Magazine in the Fifties and Sixties*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2000. Print.
- Nakano Glenn, Evelyn. "Racial Ethnic Women's Labor: The Intersection of Race, Gender and Class Oppression." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 17.3 (1985): 86-108. Print.
- Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996. Print.
- Papp, Susan M. "Hungarian Immigrant Women." *Polyphony* 8.1–2 (1986): 42–44.
- Patrias, Carmela. *The Hungarians in Canada*. Canada's Ethnic Group Series 27. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1999. Print.
- Pető, Andrea. "Roots of Illiberal Memory Politics: Remembering Women in the 1956 Hungarian Revolution." *Baltic Worlds* 10.4 (2017): 42–53. Print.
- Prentice, Alison, Paula Bourne, Gail Cuthbert Brandt, Beth Light, Wendy Mitchinson, and

- Naomi Black. *Canadian Women: A History*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2004. Print.
- Strong-Boag, Veronica. "Home Dreams: Women and the Suburban Experiment in Canada, 1945–1960." *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*. Eds. Veronica Strong-Boag, Mona Gleason, and Adele Perry. Don Mills, ON: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- Trimble, Sheena. "Femmes et politiques d'immigration au Canada (1945–1967): au-delà des assignations de genre?" [Women and Canadian Immigration Policy (1945–1967): Beyond Assigned Gender Roles]. PhD diss. Université d'Angers, 2015. Print.
- Whitaker, Reg. *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration*. Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys Ltd., 1987. Print.
- Wipper, Audrey. "Response to Revolution Among Hungarian Canadians: A Study of Organizational Conflict." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 6.1 (1961): 73–96. Print.

Autobiographies, Oral Histories, Personal Accounts

- Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21. "Collections." <http://pier21.ca>. Web. 30 Aug. 2022.
- Grossman, Ibolya Szalai. *An Ordinary Woman in Extraordinary Times*. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1990. Print.
- Hawkins, Freda. "Canada's Hungarian Refugee Movement: A Personal Recollection." *Breaking Ground: The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada*. Ed. Robert H. Keyserlingk. Toronto: York Lanes Press, 1993. 109–13. Print.
- Huggard, Jean. "From Emigrants to Immigrants." *Canadian Welfare* 33.6 (1 Feb. 1958): 271–76. Print.
- Kende, Eva. "The Tale of One Refugee." *Looking in... Portraits of the Canadian Soul*. Ed. M. D. Benoit. n.p.: Electric eBook Publishing, 2002. Web. 30 Aug. 2022.

Mihály, Márta. "Remembering 1956: Invited Immigrants—the Sopron Saga." *Hungarian Studies Review* 35.1–2 (2008): 143–50. Print.

Multicultural History Society of Ontario. "1956 Hungarian Memorial Oral History Project." SFU Digitized Collections. Web. 30 Aug. 2022.

Pickersgill, J.W. "The Minister and the Hungarian Refugees." *Breaking Ground: The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada*. Ed. Robert H. Keyserlingk. Toronto: York Lanes Press, 1993. 47–51. Print.

Romvary, Susan. *Zsuzsa Not Zsazsa: Balance with a Smile*. Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, QC: Shoreline Press, 1992.

Verrall, Olga. *Missing Pieces: My Life as a Child Survivor of the Holocaust*. Legacies Shared Book Series 22. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 2007. Print.

Zeron, Olive. "In a Refugee Camp." *The YWCA Journal*, May 1957. 6–8, 18.

Archival Fonds and Government Publications

Canada. *House of Commons Debates*. 28 Nov. 1956 and 25 Jan. 1957.

Canadian Council on Social Development fonds. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa (hereafter LAC).

Catholic Women's League of Canada fonds. LAC.

Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration fonds. LAC.

Fédération des Œuvres de Charité Canadiennes Françaises fonds. Archives de Centraide du Grande Montréal.

Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, Alberta Chapter fonds. Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton.

Local Council of Women of Toronto fonds. Archives of Ontario, Toronto.

National Council of Women of Canada fonds. LAC.

Privy Council Office Fonds. Cabinet Conclusions. LAC.

Vancouver Young Women's Christian Association fonds. Rare Books and Special Collections,
University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Young Women's Christian Association of Canada fonds. LAC.

Uncorrected Proof